

5-2016

Language Learning for Real-World Context

Jenifer Jones Burk
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>

Recommended Citation

Burk, Jenifer Jones, "Language Learning for Real-World Context" (2016). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 803.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/803>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact rebecca.nelson@usu.edu.



LANGUAGE LEARNING
FOR
REAL-WORLD CONTEXT

By

Jenifer Jones Burk

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Albirini
Major Professor

Dr. Roemer
Committee Member

Dr. Saavedra
Committee Member

Dr. Bradford J. Hall
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2016

Copyright © Jenifer Jones Burk
All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Language Learning for Real-World Context

by

Jenifer Jones Burk: Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2016

Major Professor: Dr. Albirini

Department: Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies

This portfolio contains the beliefs about language learning and teaching that the author possesses. The portfolio is based on the author's experiences as a language learner and a language teacher. The main theme of the portfolio is to enable students to use the language learned in the classroom in real-world contexts.

The first section comprises the author's teaching philosophy, emphasizing the role of the teacher, student, and environment. Following the teaching philosophy are three artifacts that address topics on language, literacy, and culture. First, the language artifact discusses corrective feedback and the feedback the teacher gives to students. Second, the literacy artifact discusses the benefits of biliteracy. Third, the culture artifact explores the role that immersion has in developing the cultural awareness of the language and culture. After the artifacts, the author concludes and extends the portfolio with three annotated bibliographies written throughout the Master's of Second Language Teaching program.

(113 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My first, deepest, and absolute gratitude goes to God, for with his help and strength, I can do all things.

I would like to thank Dr. Albirini for his help in refining my portfolio. His patience and professional guidance has helped me tremendously. I would like to thank him for providing me with feedback on my portfolio and making final changes to the document. He was one of my first professors upon joining the program. Previous to him, I have never attended class at a professor's house. His personable nature, yet high standard, has both encouraged and stretched me.

Thank you to each of my committee members. Dr. Saavedra taught me a fresh way of thinking about the world around me through diversity. I will forever be thankful for the insightful perspectives I gained from her guidance. I hope that I can always put those perspectives into practice throughout my life. Thank you also to Dr. Roemer for being an example of pursuing her dreams, no matter the distance. Her example of commuting to the University of Utah for her doctorate degree inspired me throughout my time, because I too commuted to complete the degree requirements. I am grateful for her abundance of encouraging words, which inspired me to continue.

I would also like to thank other professors who helped me throughout the MSLT program. Thank you to Dr. de Jonge-Kannan for guiding me throughout the phases of the program. I am grateful for the time she spent on my behalf reading and providing feedback on the various drafts of the sections on my portfolio. She taught me the importance of being meticulous and detail-oriented. I also learned that culture encompasses a large role in language learning and development. Dr. Spicer-Escalante

also helped me tremendously in developing my teaching philosophy. I am grateful that she always had an open door. She always provided an abundance of feedback and stretched me to defend my perspectives and philosophy. She also taught me of the importance of dual-language and immersion instruction. Because of the knowledge I gained, I hope to provide my future children with this effective way of learning two languages as they grow and develop. I am grateful for the perspectives I gained because of her.

I also need to say thanks to my classmates, colleagues, students, family, and friends. Each of our relationships is meaningful and purposeful to me. I am grateful that my family members and friends have been patient with the limited time that I had to associate with them.

Throughout all of my time in the program, no one has been more involved in my life than my husband, Kyle. I want to thank him tremendously because of his continual love, selflessness, support, and friendship. I am grateful that with all that we have gone through and experienced together, it only brings us closer. Never was there a better friend, shoulder to cry on, study buddy, listener, motivator, or travel buddy. He has urged and supported me to pursue my dreams and helps me find ways to accomplish them. I have never experienced such a pure and true selfless love in my entire life. I am thankful for him for allowing me to be at class and study—and for putting up with a dirty house and having pizza nights while I focused on my portfolio.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
TEACHING PHILOSOPHY.....	1
Apprenticeship of Observation.....	2
Professional Environment.....	7
Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	8
Professional Development through Teaching Observations.....	36
Self-Assessment of Teaching.....	42
LANGUAGE ARTIFACT.....	47
Introduction.....	48
Corrective Feedback.....	49
LITERACY ARTIFACT.....	60
Introduction.....	61
The Benefits of Biliteracy.....	63
CULTURE ARTIFACT.....	75
Introduction.....	76
Immersion and Instruction in Developing Pragmatic Competence.....	78
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES.....	89
Corrective Feedback.....	90
The Benefits of Biliteracy.....	96
Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Activities.....	102
MAPPING MY POSITIONALITY.....	109
LOOKING FORWARD.....	114
REFERENCES.....	115
APPENDICES.....	126

Teaching Philosophy

Apprenticeship of Observation

My experience learning languages other than my native language has varied both in the languages I have studied, and the contexts in which I have studied them. I have studied language in many ways—at university, at a private language school, at an intensive language school, in an immersed setting in other cultures, and in a combination of these ways. I have learned that the following factors help language learning: learning about the language before an immersion experience; student's motivation; great teachers; and becoming a student to be able to understand them. I will discuss the concepts I learned and give examples through my own experiences.

During my years of language learning, I performed best when the classroom setting preceded an immersion experience in a foreign-language-speaking country. I have studied languages exclusively in a classroom setting, exclusively on the streets of an immersed setting, and in a combination of the two. I would say that all are crucial.

At the end of my sophomore year in college, I spent close to six weeks in Antigua, Guatemala. Previous to that experience I had studied Spanish for a year and a half at the university level. The grammar, vocabulary, and language concepts I learned prepared me to live with a Spanish-speaking Guatemalan family. I would go half of the day to a Spanish language school, and then volunteered for the other half of the day: first at an art after-school program for children, and second at a hospital. Linguistically speaking, I was challenged and rose to that challenge. The classes were always with a native Spanish speaker, who sometimes didn't speak English. This was similar to the Guatemalan children and patients I worked with at the after-school program and the hospital. I could speak and use more than survival language in Spanish and was pushed

to speak only Spanish. However, less than six weeks in Guatemala seemed a very short amount of time as I embarked on a 19-month journey to Italy.

Ever since I can remember it had been a goal of mine to serve a mission for my church. A few weeks after submitting an application, I received a letter in the mail telling me where I would live for the next 18 months. When my call came to the Milan Italy Mission, I was more than enthusiastic to learn Italian and serve the people there. Before going to Italy, I spent nine weeks in Provo, Utah, at The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints Missionary Training Center. While there I studied Italian and practiced teaching Christian concepts in Italian, which means that I practiced oral persuasion and presentation skills. Although the days were long, studying from 7:30 A.M. until 9:30 P.M. except for exercise and mealtime, it seemed to pay off. I felt ready to go to Italy.

But when I arrived, I felt like the language I had studied couldn't possibly be the same language I heard people speaking so quickly. I felt like I could say mostly whatever I wanted to say on a very basic level—albeit sometimes in a round-about way, thanks to the missionary training center's focus on religious language. However, when people talked, I only understood general concepts—never individual words or the specifics of the conversation. I found it quite strange to find that missionaries who entered Italy with me tended to have the opposite problem: they could understand but not speak. My roommate and people around me seemed impressed by my ability to speak, but they didn't grasp that I didn't understand what they said to me. They assumed I understood as much as I spoke. I struggled and kept talking to Italian people on the street as I tried to be as immersed as possible.

As time went on, more concepts and words began to sink in, I was able to understand more phrases and better follow conversation, and at some point I seemed to understand everything. This was thanks to both immersion and constant input.

The second thing that I observed about language learning and teaching is that motivation of the student greatly contributes to success. I will discuss two examples I have experienced with this.

My interest was sparked, but not very well kindled, when I took two years of French in junior high school, mostly doing worksheets and mundane loophole jumps. I did not care to actually learn the language; I simply wanted to fill a requirement. It wasn't until my freshman year of college that I wanted to take up French again. I took beginning French at the university for four consecutive semesters, and discovered that it progressed much faster than my middle-school classes. It was challenging. But I learned a lot about grammar and how to learn another language.

During the fourth consecutive semester, I grew confident in the classroom setting because I knew my instructor very well. She always spoke French to us and was very inviting. She was a great instructor and pushed us to always practice the target language. I was much more successful acquiring some French in university than in middle school because I was more motivated. I feel that this was in part because of the great instructor I had. Her enthusiasm for the language and culture was nothing short of contagious. All of her students loved her and wanted to learn. Because I have not had an immersion experience with French, my French is not as good as it could be. But it is much better than it once was because of my increased motivation.

The foundation I had in French also helped contribute to my acquisition of other Latin-based languages. Half-way through my freshman year at college, only one semester after I started studying French again, I decided to study Spanish as well. This desire was motivated by a weeklong alternative break trip to Mexico. As we participated in volunteer and service opportunities, we met with the locals. I marveled as my English-speaking teammates conversed in Spanish, and I wanted to be able to do the same. So I enrolled in a beginning Spanish class.

I took both French and Spanish in the same semester. Finding the similarities between the two languages was fascinating for me, but even more exhilarating was finding the differences in the languages. Although I felt that I was not learning much *in* class, I found myself spending countless hours at the library doing much more than the required homework, simply comparing and contrasting the two languages. It was certainly difficult to study two Latin-based languages at the same time, because I would often confuse vocabulary words, but in a sense, it motivated me even more. If I found a word in one language, I would automatically be curious about the same word in the other language. I was curious about languages in general, and my simultaneous study of two languages further propelled my interest in both languages.

I continued my studies in both Spanish and French for another year and a half. I remember being engaged in learning the language and spending a lot of extra time studying. In the middle of my sophomore year, I was able to return to that same city in Mexico to do another alternative spring break. While there, I realized that I could communicate much better than I thought I could. I could ask for directions and converse

on a very minimal basis, and I could also connect with people as people and understand a different culture and way of life.

Some other things I have learned about language learning through my experiences are that a teacher can greatly improve the educational experience of students. Also, by becoming a student again, an instructor gains a new perspective and can improve instruction.

My recent experience in language learning occurred in Shanghai, China. I had been teaching ESL in the United States for a year when I decided to study Chinese in China for three months. Being in another country, studying language with a mindset of an instructor, helped me better know how to help my students. It has also helped me in my current teaching. I had no Mandarin-language background, but I had a great tutor while I was there—Mandy. She was extremely patient with me, and I felt her genuine concern for me as an individual, especially in my language development. I was very surprised how many concepts sank in, despite the major differences between English and Mandarin.

As soon as I completed my Linguistics bachelor's degree with a TESOL (Teaching English as a Second Language) certificate, I began teaching ESL in Salt Lake City at an intensive English-language school. I realized very quickly that I had many teaching practices and pedagogical implications that I needed to improve on. I wanted to become a better instructor, which brought me to the MSLT program at USU.

Professional Environment

I chose the Master's of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program at Utah State University for two reasons: I wanted to focus on pedagogy in the language classroom, and I wanted to keep my options open for a career involving teaching languages, but not limited to English. It has and will continue to qualify me as a language teacher, and it has given me much-needed experience.

My number one career goal is to teach English as a second language (ESL) at the university level in an English-speaking country. I have found a niche and love teaching English as a second language to adults. My goal is to continue to work for a university in an intensive English program or an English language institute connected to a university to help students improve their English to be able to be admitted to the program of their choice in the United States. I look forward to working with cultural and linguistic diversity. I feel that I will be able to relate well to my students, having been a language learner of many languages, as well as having a background and working knowledge of a diverse number of languages.

Another possibility is to teach Italian, Spanish, or French at a university level in the United States or abroad. This would require me to improve my skills and proficiency in one of those languages and to take and pass the Oral Proficiency Test. The MSLT is my passport to teach abroad if I find that is a better option than teaching ESL in the United States, and if the opportunity presents itself.

Teaching Philosophy Statement
Learning for Real-World Context

Introduction

My experience as a second language (L2) learner acquiring four languages has given me personal insights into the process of language learning. As a language instructor in diverse contexts, my pedagogical framework is expanding and growing. Through teaching ESL to adults for the past three years, I have gained new insights about my beliefs as an instructor. As a MSLT student at Utah State University, I have learned the research and professional knowledge applicable to teaching a L2. As a graduate student, I have learned about pedagogy and teaching. Because I have been teaching while pursuing a Master's degree, I have been able to put into practice the things that I have learned. I have learned how to teach communicatively, provide feedback to my students, and use task-based activities to provide students opportunities to practice the language. As I have applied the things I learned, I have solidified the practical application of the theoretical perspectives.

Applying what I have learned has caused me to reflect on my teaching philosophy (TP). Regarding the combination of teaching and learning, Keating (2007) described his experiences. He also explains my experiences perfectly, combining what I learn with my practice in the classroom: "My classrooms function almost like a laboratory, where the theory I read and write becomes embodied as I try to translate dense theoretical perspectives into relevant terms and practical contexts" (p. 17). In light of my

experiences as a L2 student, L2 instructor, and graduate student in L2 teaching, I have built a TP which comprises three supporting pillars: the role of the teacher; the role of the students, and the role of the surroundings. The central goal of my TP is to teach for application of language in real-world context.

Part 1: The Role of the Instructor

The first section in my TP explains my philosophy on what the role of the instructor is in students' L2 acquisition. I have had various language courses and various instructors, some of which focused on drills and memorization. Other courses provided me with opportunities to practice the language. From my experience, I was more engaged and learned more when I practiced the language. Because of my experiences, in my classrooms, I will provide students with opportunities to communicate in the target language (TL). A way in which I may provide opportunities to communicate is through task-based activities (TBA). TBA are situations that can be applied to real-life situations. While the students are using the TL, the instructor must provide feedback to guide them. I will expound on the three roles of an instructor in part one.

The role of the instructor: facilitator of communicative language teaching

I will focus my efforts on facilitating opportunities for meaningful communication, rather than transmitting knowledge (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandel, 2001; Brandl, 2007; Ellis, 2012; Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Lee and Van Patten (2003) say that when the instructor is the central figure of the classroom, both the expert and the person in charge of controlling the learning process, an Atlas complex develops in the classroom. Having experienced teachers who had Atlas complexes, I know that I want to provide my students with more effective language

instruction. Being a facilitator does not necessarily mean that a teacher cannot teach; as Freire points out, “the teacher must teach. It is necessary to do it. But teaching is not transmitting knowledge” (Freire, 1998, p. 89). Teachers should create and facilitate opportunities for their students to use the language. According to Hooks (2010), extending periods of lecturing can distract students. “Talking for more than twenty minutes usually means that a good portion of the audience has ceased to listen, that their minds have wandered off, away from the speaker towards all that really matters in their life” (p. 53). Rather than lecturing for extended periods of time, a teacher should facilitate learning by providing students opportunities to practice the language. I can give my students opportunities to use the language rather than lecture to them for the entire class period; otherwise I know I will lose their attention. These opportunities to use the language can be through pair or group work centered on communication that can be applied to the TL speaking community (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandel, 2001; Brandl, 2007; Brown, 2007; Cloud, 2000; Ellis, 2012; Hall, 1999, 2004; Lee & Van Patten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009; VanPatten, 2002). Communicative language teaching (CLT) is one way to facilitate language use in the classroom.

CLT should emphasize meaningful interaction rather than focus on accuracy of pronunciation and grammar (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Interaction that is meaningless focuses on rote memorization or drills. Interaction becomes meaningful when students can make connections and applications to their lives. Because meaningful communication is central to learning a language, “using the language to interpret and express real-life messages” (Lee & Van Patten, 2003, p. 6) should be a main focus of language instruction. I have noticed that my students’

motivation is higher when they are required to use the language. When they see the connection with their lives and how the language is useful for them, most often, they want to learn to be able to apply the language to their lives. In order to accomplish the classroom task, an instructor must provide her students with opportunities for both authentic communication and meaningful interaction. According to Hooks (2010), “the future of learning lies with the cultivation of conversations, of dialogue” (p. 38). In addition to narratives and descriptions, one way that students learn is through every day conversations because “much knowledge acquisition comes to us in daily life through conversations” (Hooks, 2009, p. 35). Because many people learn through conversation, I need to facilitate real-life scenarios where students can express themselves as they would in the target-speech community. Regarding face-to-face communication, also known as the interpersonal mode (Shrum & Glisan, 2009), Cloud (2000) says, “Educational professionals also accept now that the development of advanced levels of language competence, in a primary or second language, is most successful when it occurs in conjunction with meaningful, important, and authentic communication” (p. 2). When students learn from their peers using authentic conversation, they also use language in a meaningful way. Instructors who foster authentic communication in their classrooms assist students in communicating meaningfully.

Language is a complex system with many functions, one of which is communication (Kramsch, 1998). Meaningful interaction often happens in the form of daily communication. Most students study a language to communicate with others using the TL (Akbari, 2008; Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). This is the reason I wanted to study Italian, French, Spanish, and Chinese. I

wanted to be able to understand others and be understood. Students' goal to communicate with others corresponds with the goal of CLT and what an instructor can do to help students accomplish their goal (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). I want to create an environment where students communicate and use the L2 for a specific purpose (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Instructors can facilitate purposeful communication through TBA, can-do statements, and CLT (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). TBA can aid students' language development, which is what I will be discussing next.

Role of the instructor: task-based activities for real-world context

Instructors must consider many factors as they determine when and how they guide their students. I know firsthand that an instructor should balance curriculum requirements with students' goals and interests. It can be difficult to know what should be the focus of instruction. Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandel (2001) refer to language-teaching goals when they say, "a principal goal of language teaching for several decades has been and continues to be speaking proficiency" (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandel, 2001 p. 2). Just as I experienced as a language learner (LL), in order for students to develop communicative competence (CC), or the ability to function communicatively in the language, they need opportunities to practice the language (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandel, 2001; Brandl, 2007; Brown, 2007; Cloud, 2000; Ellis, 2012; Hall, 1999, 2004; Lee & Van Patten, 2003; Savignon, 1991; Shrum & Glisan, 2009; VanPatten, 2002). Communication has several different kinds of competence: grammatical, discourse, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and strategic (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2003). All of these kinds of competences can be involved in human interaction (Brown, 2007a). CLT provides students with opportunities to develop

and build CC. Effective teachers provide students with authentic opportunities for communication by using TBA.

Because TBA include real-life situations, they prepare students for real-life communication (Ellis, 2012; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). TBA have “students interact with others by using the target language as a means to an end” (Shrum & Glisan, 2009, p. 266). As my students interact with others in the target language, they will be able to apply the practice of their interactions to a real-world context because TBA should include real-life tasks which students can apply to the TL community (Ellis, 2012; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). According to Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001), TBA are centered on learners, are focused on exchanging meaningful information, and guide students through steps to completing a communicative goal.

Teachers and students can determine the students’ success by measuring appropriate completion of that task (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2009); completing the task can enhance students’ learning. I have incorporated real-world tasks into my teaching. I have seen that upon completion of the task, my students have been excited because they knew that they were successful. Completing a task includes both finishing the activity and successfully communicating through meaningful and authentic language. My students know when they weren’t successfully completing a task because either their peer couldn’t understand or they couldn’t finish the task. This gives my students opportunities to evaluate why the interaction or task was not successful. The group and pair component of TBA is essential and provides effective interactive opportunities for students while maintaining low anxiety (Brown, 2007). My students usually feel more comfortable experimenting with the language with a peer than

in front of the teacher and entire class. Some examples of group or pair work I like to include in my classroom are: think-pair-share activities, interviews, information gap activities, jigsaw activities, and role play (Ellis, 2012; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). With the use of the activities mentioned above, my students can practice the language with plenty of opportunities to interact and communicate in the TL. In my teaching practices, I strive to place students in simulated real-life situations. In these situations, my students can focus on meaning by practicing real-life situations. These situations prepare my students for the real world.

Language teaching should focus on meaning in order to improve students' language retention. According to Sousa (2006), when students confront an activity in class, they may ask, "does this make sense and does this have meaning?" (p. 48). In fact, when students connect what they are learning with a past experience, they may retain more of the material taught (Macquire, Frith, & Morris, 1999). In addition, according to Sousa (2006), meaning results in the greatest impact on learning and highest probability of retention. If students' learning has meaning, they will realize the usefulness of what they are studying and are more likely to remember it for the future. Effective language teachers focus on their students' need for meaning and connections. When my students participate in tasks, I can direct their attention to the connections that they can make. By doing so, I can help my students see the application of what they are learning in their own lives.

My classroom instruction exists primarily to prepare students to communicate in the outside world, just as Shrum and Glisan (2009) indicate it should. In preparation for the outside world, students need feedback from the instructor to improve. The

instructor's role in giving feedback is important to aid students' language progression.

Instructors might ask: how do I provide feedback? Effective ways in providing feedback will be addressed in the next section.

Role of the instructor: feedback

Instructors can give specific feedback and help learners develop the language (Ellis, 2012). Even when exposed to rich language input, students do not automatically produce error-free and grammatically correct language (Lightbown & Spada, 1990). According to Lightbown and Spada's finding, students need feedback in addition to rich input. Various kinds of corrective feedback (CF) have been identified and some are more appropriate than others in different situations (Yang & Lyster, 2010).

Even though several kinds of CF have been identified, these variations of CF can be used to help students in different situations. The different forms of CF include: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, repetition and elicitation (as defined by Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Explicit correction is when the instructor clearly tells students what was incorrect and how they should have answered. Recasts refer to the teacher repeating what the student said, only fixing the error, without requiring the student to produce or correct the error. Clarification requests are when the teacher tells the students that what they said is incomprehensible. When teachers provide metalinguistic feedback, they indicate that an error exists but require students to find and correct the error. Elicitation is when the teacher repeats part of what the student said but pauses where the error was to allow the student to complete the utterance. Elicitation can also be used when the teacher tells the student to reformulate their utterance. Repetition includes when the teacher says what the student says but changes the intonation of the

part that was wrong.

There are several different forms of CF, and some may be more appropriate than others in various situations. Some forms of CF provide input to the students, such as recasts and explicit corrections. Others promote output of the students, such as repetition, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation. Some clues are implicit, such as recasts, repetition, and clarification requests. And others are explicit, such as explicit correction, metalinguistic clues, and elicitation (Ellis, 2012). Many instructors use recasts, or implicit CF, most often (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). However, elicitation and metalinguistic CF are more likely to elicit student self-repair (Tsang, 2004). Although some debate exists about which form of CF is best for which linguistic form, scholars agree that using several forms of CF is best for students (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Roothoft, 2014). Several forms of CF provide a wider variety of feedback, reaching more students in different ways.

The amount of feedback teachers believe they should provide is often less than the amount of feedback students expect to receive (Brown, 2007a). Even with the differing expectations, teachers need to find a balance in how much feedback they provide students. I have experienced this firsthand. I have had students tell me that they wanted me to correct every mistake they made. Depending on their level of CC, I would literally be interrupting them every few words. It is an important balance because too little CF, or even too much positive feedback, may create fossilization in learners (Brown, 2007a). Fossilization refers to the learner's persistent use of incorrect forms. On the contrary, if I use too much CF, the students may feel discouraged and think that they are always incorrect (Brown, 2007b). The possibility of discouragement or

fossilization occurring may cause instructors to wonder: “when should I provide CF to my students?”

Instructors can determine if it is the appropriate time to provide CF by asking the question: can I understand the meaning of the utterance? If the instructor can determine the meaning from the utterance, the instructor can let the mistake pass without correcting it. If the instructor cannot understand the meaning, then the instructor should clarify and correct the error (Brown, 2007b). The instructor should also ask: is the mistake part of the target focus of the day or week? If the mistake is part of the current focus, the instructor should use the moment as a teaching moment to address the error. If the error is outside the focus of the lesson or the unit and has not yet been covered in class, then the instructor can overlook the mistake temporarily (Long, 1997).

I want to guide my students through opportunities to communicate through TBA for real-world context. These activities should use input and output, and timely and effective feedback. As I provide learners with opportunities to develop their language, they will need help from me. Although an instructor plays an important role in L2 development, the instructor is only one of three important factors in developing a L2.

Part 2: Role of the Students

I believe that the students can be a major contributor to their language learning success. In the second section of my TP, the role of the students, I discuss several subsections. These include: motivation, willingness to communicate, participation in class, overcoming difficulties with identity, and searching for opportunities to communicate. There can be great variation in language ability and aptitude among

learners. One important part of their success depends on how motivated students are in learning the TL.

Role of the students-Motivation

A strong driving force for students to learn a language is the students' own intrinsic motivation to learn the TL. This motivation includes both the reason why students study the language and the way in which they execute their studies. In fact, cultivating motivation is crucial for students' success (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011). Therefore, it is crucial that instructors and students understand how to maximize their motivation. As the instructor, I can enhance motivation, or desire to learn; however students are individually responsible for their own motivation to learn the language. Intrinsic motivation, according to Brown (2007a), continues to grow as students' language ability grows. When I was studying French, I remember thinking that the more things I learned how to say, the more interested I became in learning more, and the more eager I became in wanting to be a better LL.

Students might dream of their ideal L2 self. Students' ideal L2 self includes the best traits of a LL, which could be traits they possess and those traits that they don't yet possess. Dreaming of their ideal L2 self can motivate students to close the gap between their current state and what they dream of becoming (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011).

Another way in which students can motivate themselves is contemplating what purpose learning the language will have. If students view language learning as an investment, they view the resources that they will gain as valuable. Examples of these resources gained through studying a language might include: "language, education,

friendship, capital goods, real estate, and money” (Norton, 2013, p. 6). All of these can be beneficial to anyone.

Motivation can be enhanced through sociocultural opportunities to communicate. Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) refer to motivation as psychological, and Norton (2013) adds that it can be enhanced through sociocultural situations. As students discuss and are engaged with one another with meaningful communication, their “deepest drives are satisfied” (Brown, 2007, p. 213). These drives refer to meaningful communication and connection with others that students possess. Dörnyei (1994) argues that the individual’s motivation toward the speech community contributes to the LL’s desire to communicate with the speech community. If LLs desire to be valued members of the community, they will work harder to be able to communicate effectively. While living in China, I wanted to be part of the community. I went to dinner parties and could barely understand words at first. Time, exposure to the language, effort, and desire to improve my language abilities enabled me to eventually be able to do simple tasks like pay the bills. This desire to be a member of the community is what fueled my desire to learn the language. The desire to communicate with others in the TL, and a student’s willingness to act on that desire, enhances motivation and is an important role in developing students’ CC. MacIntyre, Dörnyei, Clément, and Noels (1998) propose that students’ willingness to communicate (WTC) should be the primary goal of language teaching, even above linguistic competence or CC. Students’ attitudes toward the language can contribute greatly to their eagerness to converse in the TL.

Role of the students: Willingness to communicate

Because of the motivation for language acquisition, students should be willing to try to communicate and experiment with the language. Some students are not willing to try to communicate because they are nervous to make a mistake. These students gain less language exposure and practice less than students who are willing to communicate. Regardless of mistakes, the student's WTC, or "intention to initiate communication, given a choice" (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Conrod, 2001 p. 369), is influential in a LL's second language acquisition (SLA) (MacIntyre, 2007; MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Conrod, 2001; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). When students have a low level of WTC, others often perceive them as shy. Student should try to improve their WTC and, with the help of the surroundings and help of the instructor, they can become more confident in initiating conversation in the TL (Brown, 2007a). The initiation might start in the classroom environment where the student is more comfortable because of lower anxiety. As the students gain confidence using the TL in a purposeful way, the students' WTC can then be transferred outside of the classroom. This real-world context outside the classroom can be a place where students seek opportunities to initiate conversation in the TL, thus improving their CC.

Even though students want to use the language purposefully and meaningfully, a student's WTC and attitude towards TL production and interaction implies the possibility of failing to produce meaning (Brown, 2007a). The risk, conscious or unconscious, should not hold students back from producing output. Although I have experienced that many LLs experience a fair amount of anxiety when trying to learn a L2, they should continue to try, regardless of anxiety and nervousness. It is important to overcome the nervous feelings to be able to use the language. Brown (2007a) adds this about WTC:

“Successful language learners generally believe in themselves and in their capacity to accomplish communicative tasks, and are therefore willing risk takers in their attempts to produce and to interpret language that is a bit beyond their absolutely certainty” (p. 73). Students who will be successful in learning the language understand that the reward of eventually being able to communicate and make connections with others in another language is worth the risk of having a communication failure. Students’ desire to learn the language must be greater than their fear of making a mistake (Brandl, 2007; Ellis, 2012; Shrum & Glisan, 2009).

The influence of nervousness, low motivation, and low self-esteem influences what Krashen (1982) refers to as the students’ affective filter. When students experience low anxiety and stress, they are better able to learn the language (Brown, 2007a). This is why I try to make my classroom a safe place where students can first practice the language with peers and the class first before testing and applying the language to the real world. Worrying about accuracy should not hinder students from being willing to try to communicate meaning. Because of students’ WTC, they will want to participate in class.

Role of the students: participation in class

By participating in my class, students will practice tasks that are applicable to the target-speech community by using input and output with the language that could be used in the TL speech community. By completing the tasks, my students and I can determine success of the class (American Council on The Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL], 2015a). While actively participating in class tasks, my students need to be able to ask questions and/or clarify when they do not understand, also known as the negotiation of meaning (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). I want my classroom to be a place

where the students actively participate in activities. They cannot be silent, because they need to practice the language and ask questions when they do not understand. Savignon (1991) discusses students' role in the classroom: "Today, listeners and readers are no longer regarded as passive. They are seen as active participants in the negotiation of meaning" (Savignon, 1991, p. 261). By using clarification requests with classmates or with me, my students can negotiate meaning when something is unclear. Bower and Kawaguchi (2011) found that individuals participate in negotiation of meaning to overcome communication problems more than to correct language errors. Negotiating meaning is an important language learning and communication skill. Active participation in the classroom means communicating with classmates and the teacher. Hooks (2010) describes the relationship between learning, teacher, and student when she states that "[students] learn best when there is an interactive relationship between student and teacher" (p.19). The relationship between teacher and student is key to students successfully negotiating meaning when directions, vocabulary words, or an activity is unclear, or when communication problems occur. Yuksel and Inan (2014) found that students were more likely to negotiate meaning in a face-to-face situation, fostering a better environment for the students. Negotiating meaning is an important skill the student should develop, even though many students might expect to have a lecture-based classroom when they are inactive during the lesson.

As I provide the student with opportunities to communicate meaningfully with other students through communicative activities, "the responsibility of the student is to participate fully in the activities" (Ballman Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell 2001 p.8). According to the ACTFL standards (ACTFL, 2015b), when students are active

participants they will learn the TL by “interacting, interpreting, and presenting” (p. 1). These are also known as the three modes of communication (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). In this way, students are able to participate fully in the classroom activities that the instructor prepares for the students, enabling them to develop their CC and language abilities. Students cannot learn the language without practice; thus the need for their active participation in classroom activities to practice the language is imperative. As students are willing to communicate, at some point in time, they will likely experience difficulties with identity. These issues with identity, if addressed, can be a positive experience.

Role of the students: overcoming difficulties with identity

All students encounter difficulties in their language learning at some stage, but their persistence in overcoming these difficulties is significant in contributing to their language-learning success. In fact, as LLs progress they develop a new identity (Brown, 2007a; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Norton, 2010). Brown (2007a) describes the students’ new identity as follows:

As individuals learn to use a second language, they also develop a new mode of thinking, feeling, and acting—a second identity. The new “language ego” intertwined with the second language can easily create within the learner a sense of fragility, a defensiveness, and a raising of inhibitions. (p. 72)

The new identity or, as Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) call it, the “personal core” can be fragile when learning a new language and culture. The fragility occurs is in part because they are re-creating another part of who they are. Living in the L2 speech community can be hard for many reasons, which may include navigating the social complexities of

the TL. Norton (2010) says that many are now concerned with how the individual relates to the social world in addition to the linguistic input and output. Learning a language is not only a skill to be learned but also to be practiced based on social contexts (Norton, 2010). I have experienced the fragility that comes from learning a language in the TL community both as a student and an instructor. Because I am currently teaching students who are new to Salt Lake City, I have noticed the struggles that the students are experiencing. My students have expressed frustration, homesickness, confusion and other issues. Struggles with identity can include issues stemming from being immersed in the TL community and the subsequent confusion regarding personal and cultural identity, many of which my students are currently facing.

A common difficulty students experience upon immersion in the TL community is culture shock, or the “anxiety a person may feel when entering a new cultural atmosphere” (Kurylo, 2012, p. 417). Upon arrival to the TL speech community, many individuals find that the changes of their language and cultural community can be stressful. Students may feel lost in relation to their L1 identity (LoCastro, 2013) because of the many changes and differences surrounding them. Kurylo (2012) refers to the stressful experience as an “identity in crisis” (p. 120), causing students to question themselves, their morals, and why they do the things they do. Norton (2013) also agrees that identity affects language learning. One of the reasons that identity affects language learning is that students’ L1 can often impede L2 acquisition (LoCastro, 2013). Some students often develop imagined identities as well as imagined communities (Norton, 2013). Imagined communities refer to “groups of people not immediately tangible or accessible with whom we connect with through the power of the imagination” (Norton,

2013, p. 8). Students need not let the crisis overcome them. To the student, the difficulty is real. However, students can use identity to overcome both real and imagined difficulties.

Students can overcome or battle the identity problems or culture shock when immersed in the TL speech community. Students can have an awareness of all the linguistic and cultural changes that they are experiencing. The awareness brings added patience of students with themselves and others. They will likely eventually be accepting of their own dynamic, complex, and changing identities (LoCastro, 2013). Students' acceptance of their changing identities might eventually lead to a new identity that includes aspects of the TL and culture. Even if their changing identity does not include the target culture, students will naturally become more accepting of others' identities. Kurylo (2012) argues that, unlike identity, self-identity is "self-constructed through shared meanings of understanding with others" (p. 429). This reinforces the idea that self-identity is a negotiated and changing process. Even though instructors can help students with their struggles of culture shock and identity, students need to be aware, accepting, patient, and flexible with themselves. This flexible way of thinking helps students to change and adjust their self-identity to their surroundings.

Role of the students: searching for opportunities to practice

Learners should search for opportunities to practice the language as much as possible. They should focus on what is important to them and what they want to learn and practice; the application to the student is what drives their memory (Cahill & McGaugh, 1998; Sousa 2006). Because students will practice communicating in the TL in a CLT classroom (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandel, 2001; Brandl, 2007; Brown,

2007; Cloud, 2000; Ellis, 2012; Hall, 1999, 2004; Lee & Van Patten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009; VanPatten, 2002), students will be equipped to search for opportunities to practice the language outside and inside the classroom as much as possible. My students who practice outside the classroom have made great strides in their L2. The practice students participate in is one of the key aspects to their success in learning their L2 (Shrum & Glisan, 2010). I believe that this practice is why I was successful at learning Italian; conversely, a lack of practice is why I do not feel as confident with other languages.

Practice doesn't make perfect, but it does make the students' developing interlanguage permanent (Sousa, 2006). In fact, according to Shrum and Glisan (2009), brain-based research has shown that frequency (or practice), and saliency (the language that is noticed by the learner) are two variables that can lead to permanent language learning. If learners practice meaningful and purposeful communication, their language acquisition will be positively affected, because they will find application of what they are learning to the real world. Both emotional investment and stimulating experiences may lead to more permanent learning (Shrum Glisan, 2010). The learner needs to practice in and outside of class as much as possible. Because of the need for the learner to practice the language in the classroom for real-world context, the learner will also need to practice outside of the classroom in the target-speech community. Because of the need for a situation to practice the language, I will be discussing the role of the surroundings next.

Part 3: Role of the Surroundings

If the student is highly motivated, the surroundings can enhance the learning. The role of the surroundings is divided into three sections in my TP: the surroundings inside

the classroom, the surroundings out of the classroom, and the socio-cultural aspects of the language learned outside the classroom. The reason I chose these sections for my TP is because of my own experiences. During my language learning, I have experienced learning a language exclusively in a classroom, exclusively outside a classroom, and in classroom instruction paired with immersion to the target-speech community. I have seen from my own experiences that I was more successful when I paired language instruction inside a classroom with optimal exposure to the language and culture outside the classroom.

I plan to continue teaching in an immersion setting in order to prepare my students in the classroom for the language that awaits them outside the classroom. I teach ESL to adults in the United States, where English is the language that surrounds my students on a daily basis. I believe that while studying a language, students should be surrounded by the language. I do not believe that an immersion setting alone provides CC. Rather, I believe that the real-life application of principles learned in class can help students develop CC through practicing the language outside the classroom. Without the opportunities, LLs couldn't practice as much. Being surrounded by the language enables students to apply and practice the language learned in the classroom in a real-world context with socio-cultural applications (LoCastro, 2013).

Role of the surroundings: inside the classroom

The environment within the classroom can play a big role in SLA. Research shows that students' motivations in learning a language is to be able to speak and communicate with others in that TL (Akbari, 2008; Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2003). Because students need practice to communicate with others, "the

classroom functions more cooperatively when everyone contributes to make sure all resources are being used, to ensure the optimal learning well-being of everyone” (Hooks, 2009, p. 22). As Hooks (2010) discusses, all students participate and cooperate and need to practice the language that will be applicable to how they can use the language outside the classroom. An effective way for application of the language to the outside world is through TBA and CLT as previously discussed. Because TBA require that the students do something with the language that is applicable to the real world (Shrum & Glisan, 2009), authentic texts need to be used, to appropriately mimic the outside world. These things all contribute to the overall environment of the classroom.

The use of authentic texts can be motivating to students, because if a text holds meaning, it can be applied to our world. Some students find connection and application to the real world highly motivating. Authentic texts, as defined by Shrum and Glisan (2009), are “those written and oral communications produced by members of a language and culture group for members of the same language and culture group” (p. 85). If the texts are organized well, the student finds authentic texts motivating (Ollier & Richard-Amato, 1983). Instructors often encounter problems with the provided textbook or lack of adequate materials. However, according to Matsuda (2012), teachers can supplement their textbooks to enhance the curriculum. Students need the classroom to mirror the TL community so that the students are adjusted to the TL. The classroom should provide structured language learning just beyond students’ ability (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Living in the community does not provide structured language learning; rather living in the community provides language that is likely beyond their language capabilities. What language the learner is exposed to, and the language that students are required to produce,

is also known as input and output (Shrum & Glisan, 2009).

Role of the surroundings: input and output

Because of the nature of language use, both input and output activities are important for the development of language skills. Shrum and Glisan (2009) claim that students “must have maximum opportunities to hear the TL at a level a little beyond their current range of competence” (p. 80). I refer to input as the language that students are exposed to and output as what the students produce using the TL for a meaningful, real-world purpose; this can be through speaking or writing (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Both input and output are important in language learning because both are needed for language use. With regards to input and output, VanPatten (2002) claims that, “input provides the data...output helps learners become communicators, and again, may help them become better processors of input” (p. 4). Krashen’s input hypothesis is founded on language acquisition through input that is slightly more advanced than what the learner is capable of understanding. Long and Swain’s output hypothesis states that output is necessary for SLA and results in higher levels of language competence (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). I find myself between Krashen’s input hypothesis and Long and Swain’s output hypothesis. I believe that both input and output skills are necessary for students to become communicators in a TL and the competencies can transfer to input and output respectively (Van Patten, 2004). Like Van Patten (2011), I believe that input activities can aid in students’ output. In Van Patten’s study, students who were given input activities to learn passives performed significantly better in both producing and restructuring passives. As Van Patten (2011) showed, both input and output are intertwined and directly affect each other. With enough time, the LL’s internal grammars

become effective at managing many pieces of language information (Brown, 2007a). The automaticity (Brown, 2007a), or “automatic, fluent processing of a relatively unlimited number of language forms” (p. 64), of language communication will naturally flow after the students are exposed to the language and interact with others in a comfortable setting. Learners must have comprehensible input to acquire a language (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). The input needs to be comprehensible or just above the students’ ability to understand. When students pay attention to and process the words and structures they are exposed to, the language eventually becomes intake (Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009).

Input is crucial for language learning, but input alone is not sufficient for individuals to acquire a TL. They must be able to experiment with words and structures and produce them; interaction is needed. Interaction is why content-based instruction (CBI) is an approach that allows for connections to be made (Kennedy, 2006). Hall (1999, 2004) said that to develop students’ CC, they should engage in topics or activities with a communicative goal. Just as people communicate in daily situations by listening or reading and speaking or writing, students need practice with both input and output to be able to function in the real world. My classroom will include practice for communicative goals that require students to engage in activities that require both input and output. The students can learn from context and process the content based on the goal. Stoller and Grabe (1997) add that CBI can integrate content and language regardless of which language is used in instruction because instruction is centered on meaningful themes and topics. The goal is for students to develop both content knowledge as well as language knowledge (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). The whole goal of

my classroom engagement is to prepare my students to use the language outside the classroom. Because of the need for application of the language to the outside world, a large portion of my TP encourages students to seek experiences functioning in the language outside of the classroom.

Role of the surroundings: outside the classroom

A common complaint among LLs is that they study a language for several years yet they do not have any language ability (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2003). I experienced this as a junior high student of French for two years. I could conjugate verbs, but I could not communicate with someone in French. For many, including my junior high self, one reason is because they have not received enough meaningful input (Lee & Van Patten, 2003). The input that LLs are exposed to is crucial for learning a language (Shrum & Glisan, 2009); they need the exposure and input to the language, and then to use the language or produce output. I was not exposed to much French. A classroom setting is important for language learning, but it is not enough; classroom language instruction alone might not lead to language acquisition (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Lee & VanPatten, 2005; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007). A few hours sitting in French each week certainly was not enough for me to enhance my L2 skills. Even though it was a beginning course, I didn't feel that I learned much. Whereas, if students are immersed in the culture and the language, they are exposed to the necessary input that a classroom alone cannot completely or perfectly replicate. I believe that if I had had more exposure to French, through immersion, I could have learned more French. Because of the need for input, the need for immersion is important. Lee and VanPatten (2003) state,

Some aspects of communication can be developed only in a native-speaking environment. If we view the classroom as a springboard to the non-classroom world and not as a substitute for it, we can focus on the things that can be done well in classrooms and leave the rest to the outside world. (p. 5)

The classroom environment is important and will likely continue to play an important role in language learning. The role of the surroundings outside of the classroom is also important.

Being surrounded by the language, culture, and target-speech community benefit students in many ways (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Grieve, 2015). Students can have the added practice that comes with being surrounded by the language (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Grieve, 2015). This exposure to the language can help LLs acquire the language faster (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Through my teaching of the most basic level of English Listening/Speaking Intro class, I have observed this myself. Students who live with Americans progress faster than those who live with family or friends who share a common first language. All my students make progress in the language, but those who live with English-speakers progress drastically faster, even in a short two-month period. Even at such a basic level, exposure to the language and immersion significantly influences my students' language development.

Language development consists of many parts. Socio-cultural aspects of the language are important. Even though variation of abilities and language aptitude exists among LLs, scholars agree that without exposure, LLs cannot develop some aspects of communication (Hassall, 2014; Lee & VanPatten, 2005; Roever, Wang, & Brophy, 2015).

Role of the surroundings: Learning socio-cultural competencies through immersion

Sociolinguistic competence, one of the sub-competencies of CC, has to do “with the social rules of language use” (Savignon, 1997, p. 41). Some might argue that using the social rules of the language could be as important as the grammatical rules, or even more important in some instances. In fact, “if a person commits a linguistic error, he is just perceived as less proficient in the language. If he makes a pragmatic mistake, however, he might appear as rude, disrespectful or impolite” (Wannaruk, 2008, p. 319). In addition, DeCapua and Wintergerst (2004) say that an individual could appear “uncooperative, ill mannered, rude or a combination of all three” (p. 244). This perspective can make a difference in how interlocutors perceive the LL depending on the kind of error (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2004; Shrum & Glisan, 2009; Wannaruk 2008). No LL wants to appear rude; thus the need for sociolinguistic competence.

Cultural competence, according to Cloud (2000), is the ability to communicate in compliance with the cultural norms of the language. Learning culture as “people, customs, and artifacts” (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 5) is vital; after all, “effective communication requires more than simply knowing a linguistic code. It requires knowing how to use the code in socially and culturally appropriate and meaningful ways; that is to say, it requires cultural competence as well” (Cloud, 2000, p. 2). These cultural norms and rules are important but can be difficult to develop in the classroom because the teacher is the only example of target culture. All of the students bring their own cultures, not the target culture. Lee and VanPatten (2003) argue that students cannot develop the social rules of the language isolated from the target-speech community in a classroom.

In terms of culturally appropriate linguistic behavior, classrooms isolated from the second language speaking community will always do poorly in preparing students to conform to certain norms. Why? Because the classroom cannot duplicate the multiple cultural contexts that native speakers live and work in on a day-to-day basis. The classroom is a fixed context devoid of native-speaker cultural behavior. The best way to develop culturally appropriate behavior of any sort is to live and work in the culture in question—and to keep one's eyes open and ask lots of questions. (p. 5)

Even though teachers can help students learn the pragmatics of the language in the classroom through explicit instruction (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010), Lee and VanPatten (2003) state that the target culture is a better option. Because students cannot learn these cultural norms solely in the classroom, I teach and plan to continue doing so in the TL community so that my students have the best opportunities to learn the language. It is their responsibility to take advantage of using the TL.

Many scholars agree that the exposure that students have to the TL is key to the development of their pragmatic competence, which can be maximized in study abroad opportunities (Beltrán, 2013; Dwyer, 2004; Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Grieve, 2015; Matsumura, 2003; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Schauer, 2004, 2006). I remember saying something that was grammatically correct, but pragmatically incorrect. I would not have known that it was wrong without the exposure to the target culture and a native speaker looking at me strange. Kinginger (2011) argues that study abroad can have positive effects on social interaction of the LL. The fact that positive effects on social interaction occurs during study abroad is because, in most cases, they have more

exposure to the TL, which is essential for practice (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Taguchi, 2008; Beltrán, 2013). In fact, the longer the stay, the better (Beltrán, 2013; Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Grieve, 2015; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004).

Conclusion

In conclusion, I will guide my students to become fluent communicators in the TL. I will aid their motivation by providing them with ample opportunities for meaningful interactions, based on real-world context, through group work with CLT and TBA. The students will be given many opportunities to participate in activities and group work in a comfortable atmosphere that aids in their motivation as well as lowering their anxiety while I provide timely and effective feedback.

The ideal student will stay motivated, be willing to communicate, participate in class, and look for opportunities to use the language.

By being in a classroom rich in CLT and TBA that model the outside world, students will be able to practice inside the classroom and be able to apply what they practice in the classroom to real-world contexts (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Because my students will be immersed in the TL speech community, they will be able to practice the language outside the classroom and thus develop their pragmatic competence because of exposure to the language and spend as much time in the target-speech community as possible.

Professional development through classroom observation

Teaching a language is a complicated endeavor. There is a lot that goes into teaching. Instructors must balance covering the curriculum and content while providing the students with opportunities for communication. Instructors also need to provide the students with feedback of their utterances without giving so much feedback that the students become frustrated. Instructors need to coordinate teaching culture as well as the language while considering students' goals and interests. I have felt similar struggles during my past three years of teaching: what to focus on and how to find the balance of all of the aforementioned items. Observing how other instructors find this balance has greatly helped me visualize and implement improvements in my teaching.

During my time in the MSLT program, I have done over 12 observations of different language classes. The classes have varied: modern languages and ancient languages; languages I know and languages I do not know; classes I was currently teaching and classes I wasn't teaching; adult classes and classes for children; lower-division language classes at a university level and upper-division classes in the target languages of various topics; dual language and immersion classes at elementary schools; and, finally, ESL university preparatory classes. I have observed language courses in Chinese, Russian, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and ESL; all of these have improved my view and perspective in teaching second languages. These classes have been models of teaching and ways to improve teaching. As I was observing and analyzing the effectiveness of these classes, I always concluded that there was one thing that made the difference of the class: communicative language teaching. I will focus on

CLT throughout this section of my teaching philosophy statement (TPS), discussing the use of CLT in a few of the classes that I was able to observe.

The most important thing that I learned while doing these observations was the importance of focusing on communication in the classroom. I thought back to a professional seminar course I once took which emphasized CLT. An effective way in which CLT can be applied in the classroom is through task-based activities. Because TBAs play such a vital role in CLT, I will focus on CLT and TBAs in discussing my observations. Lee and VanPatten (2003) say that a TBA needs a communicative goal to be learner centered and to have meaningful exchange of information and to guide the students through steps. In many of the classes that I observed, the instructors implemented a completely different approach.

Models to improve CLT

I observed a Chinese course at a university. This course was conducted entirely in Chinese. Many of the students had spent time in a Chinese-speaking country or had taken several Chinese courses previous to taking the course.

The Chinese classroom was teacher centered, and the students had little communication opportunities, either with the professor or with fellow students. I started thinking about a lot of other classrooms that I have observed in the process of my MSLT degree, and I realized that many classes were the same in that way. It makes me wonder why classrooms continue to be so teacher centered. It seems many university classes are lecture-based and teacher centered, and many professors seem to have a large Atlas complex. After observing this class, I really want to make my classes focus on

communication and help students develop their communicative competence. Many of the students seemed bored and not engaged with the instructor and content.

I also observed a beginning Greek 1010 course at a university. For many students, this course was their first exposure of Greek. Truth be told, the class was rather boring. I watched the students, and they seemed to be quite bored as well. I think that the quality of the class could have been greatly improved with pair or group work. The instructor did not use the target language much. The vast majority of the lesson was in English. The students needed to follow what the instructor was saying about parts of speech and verb conjugations. However, they were rarely asked to produce the language. When they were asked to produce the language, it was with one word utterances to complete the verb conjugation chart. The instructor would ask questions, and the students would provide the answers. There was little emphasis on communication and opportunities for interpersonal communication.

Great models of CLT

I observed some great examples of the use of communication in the classroom. I observed an effective ESL course for adults. This course was connected to a university, but the students had not yet been accepted to the university. Many of the students were enrolled in the English intensive course in order to prepare for the academic English work they would do in the university. Most of the students had lived in the city for several months.

This pre-university ESL course was much more communicative than the Greek and Chinese university classes I had previously observed. I think that this is because of many reasons including: ancient versus modern language, student motivation and

preparation, and instructor style differences. I have noticed that many preparatory university classes are communicative, but once students are in the university, the learning is lecture-style. As an observer, I was much more interested in the more communicative class. It seemed to me that the students were more engaged, participative, and interested in the communicative class than in the lecture-based class. The class moved easily from one activity to the next with the students at the center of the class. The instructor was a facilitator.

Upon joining a course for students studying English prior to being accepted to a university, I was very impressed. The class environment was interactive and required the participation of the students with each other as well as the instructor. Students spoke in the target language even though many of their peer students shared their native language. They participated in the class activities, and they were engaged with the content, each other, and the instructor.

Another class where I observed communication integrated into teaching was at an elementary-level Spanish-immersion class. The second grade students had been in an immersion program for one or two years previous. The elementary school is known for its immersion program, and there are often waiting lists for students to be accepted into the immersion program. The school year had just begun a month prior, but I was surprised how well the students were able to understand and produce Spanish.

In a second-grade Spanish-language immersion class, the students always spoke in Spanish. I don't think I once heard a student speak English. I only observed for two hours or less, so it is likely that the students spoke English later in the day. During the Spanish lesson, however, the students never spoke English. The students seemed to

understand the directions and the questions well. I do not plan to teach dual-language immersion (DLI), but it made me want to enroll my children in DLI schools after seeing this type of instruction and how well the teacher used the target language to promote target-language use for the students. Even at such a low-proficiency level, activities can be provided to encourage target-language use. This also made me realize that no matter what context an instructor teaches in, CLT is always possible. When CLT is emphasized, the classroom—the students, everything—is improved and enhanced with the use of target language and meaningful contexts is the focus.

Differing greatly from the young Spanish learners, I also observed Russian adult learners. However, these adults had a significant degree of knowledge about Russian because it was an upper-division course at a university. The semester had also just begun.

In observing the Russian upper-division course, I found that CLT can still be the focus. The students were expected to do a lot of pair and group work discussing classical Russian films. The instructor couldn't have been better at providing the students with opportunities to communicate in meaningful interactions with their peers and the whole class. Observing this class made me want to join and learn Russian.

The MSLT program has opened my eyes to a very effective teaching approach: communicative language teaching. I am happy that I took full advantage of doing these observations. I was able to see effective and less-effective models of CLT in different contexts and languages. My teaching has improved through these observations.

I realize that I have only focused on CLT throughout the course of these observations. There is a lot more to teaching, which I realize. I have learned many

things from doing these observations. However, the main thing that I learned was the importance of CLT in the classroom. For reasons I have discussed above, I think that CLT is necessary to engage students.

Self-assessment of teaching

Throughout my time in the Master's of Second Language Teaching program, I have recorded myself teaching four times. With these recordings, I assessed myself, and received feedback from my colleagues, academic coordinator, level coordinator, and director.

The first recording was in my adult ESL classroom in a private language school in Salt Lake City. Many of the students in the class wanted to learn English to be able to function in the English-speaking community. Others had the goal of using the language for a university or a career context. The age range of the students was from young adults in their 20s to older adults in their 60s. The course was an intermediate grammar course. Many of the students have lived in the United States for several months and had received prior language instruction. The goal of the lesson was for students to be able to discuss travel experiences the students have had using the present perfect form of the verbs.

The next two lessons were the same lesson during different sessions at different times in my adult ESL classrooms at the English Language Institute (ELI) at the University of Utah. Most of my students at the ELI classes were highly motivated. Their goal is to achieve a high score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) test, thereby qualifying for acceptance to the university program of their choice. The students were young adults in their 20s. Many of the students have completed undergraduate degrees in their countries and would like to pursue graduate degrees. The class was an intermediate listening and speaking course. The main objective for the class was for the students to share and justify their opinion on common issues. The students needed to use discussion strategies, such as sharing and soliciting opinions, agreeing,

disagreeing, requesting clarification, and offering facts and examples. We had discussed these discussion strategies previous to the class.

The final time I observed myself was teaching Italian to my classmates and colleagues at Utah State University for my Teaching Methods class. As part of the class requirements, I taught in Italian for 20 minutes. My colleagues, who were acting as my students, had no previous Italian instruction. Even though they hadn't had instruction, they all speak another language and many of them speak Spanish or French. The goal of the lesson was for the students to be able to order food in Italian. We focused on food vocabulary in Italian and did a role play of students ordering food in a restaurant.

Three appendices are attached to my portfolio: A, B, and C. They contain three lessons plans and the needed handouts of each of classes I recorded and assessed. Appendix A is an adult language class I taught at Internexus Language School. In Appendix B, I was observed teaching an ESL lesson at the ELI. I received feedback and recorded myself twice teaching this lesson. Appendix C is my lesson in Italian for fellow MSLT students. Next I will discuss things that I have done well, improved over time, and will improve in the future.

Areas of Success

One strength of my first lesson was the students' engagement with the activities. The students were required to get out of their chairs and move around. The topic of traveling experiences was interesting to my students. I believe that most of my students had an interest in traveling. All of them had traveled at least outside of their home country, if not further. Because of their interest, they were active in the activities.

As pointed out by the academic coordinator observing me, the learning environment was also very conducive to learning and practicing. While participating in a walking gallery around the room, the students had to get out of their seats and ask/answer questions about the different topics that were posted around the room, for example, the most beautiful place they have been, the most famous place they have visited, and other questions similar. The students had to use the present perfect correctly in sentences and questions to discuss this with their partner.

Areas Improved Over Time

Looking back at my first lesson plan and first video is a completely different experience after taking the Methods course in the MSLT program. Because I completed this video and observation before taking this class, I found that my teaching and lesson planning have drastically changed. I now view a communicative activity completely differently. Because of this, the main area for improvement needed after the first lesson was to have communicative activities that are focused on real-world application and less focus on grammar. My academic coordinator reassured me after viewing the first lesson that the activities were communicative in nature. However, I have since learned in the Methods class that they could be more communicative.

Another thing that I needed to improve from this lesson was to give the students more practice with the focus of the day. Although I had many areas of improvement, the two things I focused on in subsequent lessons were designing and implementing communicative activities and providing more practice to the students. My view of myself shifted from instructor to facilitator—one who gives students opportunities to practice the language in meaningful contexts.

Because of the new knowledge I gained in the Methods course, I recorded myself teaching again. With added practice for the students and my new view of myself as facilitator, I noticed improvement. After viewing the video and receiving comments from the level coordinator, I would say that I accomplished my goals. The students had several activities that they practiced expressing their opinion. These activities were varied with pair, group, and classwork. I also was able to use a variety of handouts, PowerPoints, videos, and movement around the classroom to facilitate these activities.

In the last lesson, I focused on making communicative activities with TBA that can be applied to the real world. The final activity of the class was for students to order food at a restaurant in Italian. I was required for my Methods class to teach a mini Italian class to my peers. After viewing the video, and because of the comments from my classmates and colleagues, I was able to achieve this. In this real-world situation, students would be able to apply what they learned in an Italian-speaking community.

Even though I did find significant improvement in my teaching in these areas, I also found weaknesses in my teaching. I believe that teachers can't become perfect instantly. Rather, they must continually improve one thing at a time. Because of this, I have included some improvements that I plan to make in the future.

Improvements for the future

During my third and fourth lessons, I had technological difficulties. The words on my PowerPoint were not lined up correctly, and the topics for discussing opinions were not very clear on the projector. I know that this is part of teaching. I could have prepared myself better for something like this to happen. Because of both of these technology issues, I was slightly thrown off. I was able to improvise with the given

circumstance, but it could have been more effective had the technology functioned how I wanted it to.

Another thing that I could improve is to be patient and increase my wait time before interrupting my students' thoughts. As I was watching myself, I would ask a question and then, before waiting long enough; I would call on someone to answer it or I would help the students with the answer. I should be okay with silence and let them think silently before I prompt them with another question or give a hint at what the answer might be. This is something that is important to help students process the question and be able to think before other students blurt out the answer or before another question is asked.

Language Artifact—Corrective Feedback

Note: I wrote this original paper in collaboration with Ariel Finlinson. I have since made significant changes to the paper and have included in my portfolio with Finlinson's permission.

Introduction/Background

Even though “errors are a natural part of the acquisition process” (Shrum & Glisan, 2009, p. 20), students expect teachers to provide feedback to the students to help in their acquisition of a second language. Corrective feedback (CF) is “a term used to indicate that an utterance in a learner's language is deviant and that a change or a correction is needed to make it more target-like” (Mifka, 2013, p. 13). CF has become a prominent topic in research (Mifka, 2013). Educators wish to help students develop their grammatical competence during second-language learning. CF has been found to be an effective way of improving students' grammatical competence (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010). More particularly, researchers have investigated which type of CF is the most efficient in causing student uptake (Kennedy, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tsang, 2004), and which type of CF affects not only short-term learning but also long-term retention (Ellis et al., 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010).

In a foundational study, Lyster and Ranta (1997) recorded types of CF most often used in several foreign-language and second-language classrooms. They include: explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic CF, elicitation, and repetition. These types of CF form the basis for most of the studies that will be covered in the following literature review. An overwhelming finding of the studies reviewed is that elicitation, or prompts (which most often include metalinguistic CF, repetition, elicitation, and clarification requests), was the most effective type of CF for grammar

development (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010). I will also discuss students' uptake in response to teacher CF (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Types of CF

The forms of CF prompts include: metalinguistic clues, repetition, clarification requests, and elicitation (as defined by Yang & Lyster, 2010). Recasts of the correct form of their incorrect utterance occur when that the instructor repeats back what the student said, only the instructor fixes the mistake. The class discussion is then continued without encouraging or discouraging student repair (Yang & Lyster, 2010).

In examining various types of CF, Lyster and Ranta (1997), Tsang (2004), and Kennedy (2010) look at the types of CF teachers give that elicit uptake by the students. In the study by Lyster and Ranta (1997), four different primary French-immersion teachers were observed, and the researchers recorded how often each type of CF was used. After observing several classes, Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that the most common CF used by teachers is recasts. At the same time, they realized that this is the least effective form to encourage uptake. Tsang (2004) also examined several different types of CF in English as a foreign-language classroom used by teachers of students who are in grades seven to eleven in Hong Kong and the effect various CFs have on student uptake. The findings show that recasts were also the most common type of CF in that setting as well, and that recasts encouraged the lowest percentage of student uptake, while elicitation resulted in 100% uptake by the students. They also observed the relationship between the type of CF and the students' ability to correct their error. Recasts were the least effective in initiating student correction (repairs), while the types

used less often (e.g., elicitation and metalinguistic CF) were more likely to elicit student self-repair.

Kennedy (2010) also supports these findings with her study of 15 children ESL learners whose native language was Cantonese. She found that prompting types of CF (such as elicitation) encouraged far more student uptake and repair than correction containing the answer (i.e., recasts). Along the same lines, Tsang (2004) found that instructors used explicit CF and recasts most often. Student uptake, however, didn't seem to stem from self-repair, but simply from students repeating what the teacher had said. Tsang (2004) also noted that most of the phonological repairs from students were following recasts and explicit CF, and grammatical repairs from students came from negotiation.

Yang and Lyster (2010) and Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) conducted similar studies testing the effectiveness of recasts vs. prompts on the development of the past tense *-ed* structure (Ellis et al., 2006) and the past tense of regular and irregular verbs (Yang & Lyster, 2010). Yang and Lyster (2010) tested university-level Chinese students majoring in English language and literature to complete their study, while Ellis et al. (2006) tested ESL learners, the majority of whom identified as East Asian, studying at a private university in New Zealand. Both sets of researchers conducted a study with three different classes. One class received CF in the form of prompts, and the second class received CF only in the form of recasts. In Yang and Lyster's (2010) study, the third group (or the control group) was neither encouraged nor discouraged to correct their errors, and their interactions in the classroom were focused only on meaning. Ellis et

al.'s (2006) control group was given a chance to practice the target structure, but received no CF.

Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam, (2006) and Yang and Lyster (2010) administered three tests for their study: a pretest, immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test. Yang and Lyster (2010) found that all of the groups made progress from pretest to post test on the acquisition of irregular verbs for the oral part of the test. The prompts group, however, was the only group that made significant gains for developing the use of regular verbs on the written and oral parts of the test. Ellis et al. (2006) found that the recasts group performed better than the control group, but that the prompts group performed better than the recast group. These studies support the idea that overall, CF in the form of prompts is more effective than recasts (Ellis et al., 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010), but having some form of CF is better than having no CF (Ellis et al., 2006).

The type of CF that tends to be more beneficial also depends on student preferences and level of language proficiency. Llinares and Lyster (2014) note that each student comes from a unique cultural and social background, and has an individual learning style. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) point out that the desire for correction varies across students, especially in relationship to their language abilities and cultural background. Therefore, according to Llinares and Lyster (2014), it's important for teachers to vary the types of CF that they use to fit the needs of the students. They conclude that there probably is not one type of CF that works best for all students (Llinares & Lyster, 2014), and, as affirmed by Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden (2013), the level of students may also affect which type of CF is most beneficial. Llinares and Lyster's results show that in reference to advanced students, it barely mattered which

type of CF was used. The advanced students scored almost the same whether receiving recasts or prompts (Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013).

This literature from Mitchell et al. and Llinares et al. supports the use of prompts as the most effective form of CF not only for uptake, but also for acquisition of certain grammar principles (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Tsang, 2004; Yang & Lyster, 2010). Prompts are also more effective in drawing students' attention to their errors and initiating student self-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Recent articles, however, consider the wide range of needs of a variety of students coming from different cultural and language backgrounds (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). It is hard, therefore, to generalize the results of these studies to all language-learning levels and cultural backgrounds of students, an important thing to consider in all types of research, but this is especially true for these studies. Specific types of CF may also be more beneficial depending on the grammatical form being covered in the classroom. More studies are needed to investigate which type of CF is effective for different language levels and cultural backgrounds of students and for different grammatical forms. However, Dargusch (2014) points out that experienced teachers provide a range of feedback to the students.

According to research done by Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden (2013), an important aspect of error correction is that instructors need to give it immediately after the error was produced. I will be discussing when it is appropriate when to provide CF.

When to provide CF

Hall (1995) said that input is necessary in second language acquisition (SLA), however, input alone is insufficient for learners to develop language skills. Swain's

(1985, 1995) output hypothesis states that learners need to speak the language to achieve communicative competence. Thus, it is the instructor's job to provide the student with meaningful opportunities for communication in the target language (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Often, students' utterances are filled with many errors, causing teachers to wonder which error, if any, should they correct and when should they do so.

Brown (2007a) states that instructors should "provide appropriate CF and correction" (p. 2007). However, what is appropriate CF? Even though the students are dependent on the instructor for CF, it is important not to correct everything. An important reason for this is to keep the students' anxiety levels at a minimum (Brown, 2007a; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). According to Shrum and Glisan (2009), when anxiety levels are low, students are more likely to change input, or the language the student is exposed to, into intake, or the language that is actually internalized.

When instructors signal to students to alter an utterance, the students can either accept the message because of how it was delivered or they reject it because of too much negative CF (Brown, 2007b) or possibly not register that CF was offered. Learners often stop their attempts to communicate because they fear that there are too many things that are wrong with their utterances and they don't think that they can get anything right (Brown, 2007b). However, instructors must find a balance because excessive positive CF also inhibits students' learning. Excessive positive CF is when the instructor allows for many uncorrected utterances. If learners have too much positive CF, "fossilization" occurs (Brown, 2007a, p. 346), meaning bad habits become concrete. "The task of the instructor is to discern the optimal tension between positive and negative cognitive feedback" (Brown, 2007a p. 346). Instructors need to choose CF that is "appropriate for

the moment” (Brown, 2007a, p. 331), as determined by the teacher. The best way an instructor can decide which errors to treat and which to ignore are to focus on the errors that are part of the current or past pedagogical focus of the lesson (Long, 1977). Another way that an instructor knows when or not to correct a student is if the utterance is comprehensible. Incomprehensible speech should always be corrected (Brown, 2007b).

Even though students expect to have their errors corrected (Brown, 2007a), Krashen & Terrell (1983) recommend no direct treatment of error at all. In the real world, language learners only receive a small amount of CF when conversing with native speakers. Brown (2007b) argues that the language classroom needs a balance between the real world, which is overly polite by not correcting errors, and the extreme expectations that language learners bring with them to the classroom. The great task of language instructors is to find the balance between providing enough CF to meet student expectations and being supportive and encouraging of students’ attempts.

Tsang (2004) speculates that some CF may be so ambiguous that students do not even recognize the teacher is providing CF. Lyster and Ranta (1997) claim that CF requiring students to think about their errors is more likely to encourage student self-repair because students’ attention is drawn to their error. Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden (2013) add that giving immediate CF, both orally as well as written, is more beneficial than delayed CF. With immediate CF, students are able to better recall the CF as well as the error (Mitchell et al., 2013). This is why prompts overall seem to be the most effective form of CF, because this type of CF immediately draws students’ attention to the error and invites them to make the correction, thus engaging their awareness (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010).

CF through formative and summative assessment

Dargusch (2014) argues that feedback is a key part of student academic achievement and learning. Instructors use different methods to provide CF to students with the goal to close students' gap between their performance and improved level (Dargusch, 2014). Formative, or ongoing informal assessment, and summative, or formal assessment such as a final test or quiz, assessments are ways in which instructors can gauge the students' knowledge and comprehension as well as provide CF to the students (Shrum & Glisan, 2009).

Instructors need to gauge what students understand and whether they have truly learned different material. Therefore, teachers often ask questions that require answers from the students. These are assessing questions, or "questions that usually have one right answer or a predictable set of responses" (Shrum & Glisan, 2009, p. 81). The instructors can then give the students CF such as "good", "correct", or "that's right" (Tharp & Gallimore, 1991). This is an effective way of assessing the students' knowledge and giving them CF.

In an English as a Foreign Language public speaking course in Japan, students were assessed by their final presentation. The researchers studied the effectiveness of assessing presentations and slideshows using a rubric. The feedback that the teacher gave the students before the final presentations was integrated into the presentations. The 22 students being studied showed gains from the summative assessment in making presentation slideshows because of the instructors' formative assessment (White, 2015). Similarly, in Queensland, Australia, when instructors gave feedback on rough drafts of students' papers (Dargusch, 2014), the students showed improvement. The researcher

found significant links between assessment criteria, standards, and the feedback that was provided. The two instructors involved in this study said that students were dependent on the teachers' feedback for improvement. The instructors didn't want to use assessment criteria because the students would not self-asses or understand the feedback with these resources. The researchers urge teachers to understand the role of their feedback in student learning.

In addition to informal formative assessment, instructors may use tests to supply CF. Tests used to simply be a way to assign grades to students. However, in the new approach to assessment, teachers use tests as ways to provide CF to the students (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Even though "a test is a sample of behavior" (Savignon, 1997, p. 210), students receive CF on a presentation, test, or written assignment. Instructors who follow the ACTFL standards use TBA in their teaching. While doing this, these instructors target grammar only needed for completing that task and give CF to students (Ballman, Lisking-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). Even though the students expect the instructor to provide the CF (Brown, 2007a), the instructor does not always have to be the person who gives the treatment for errors (Brown, 2007a). An effective way to do this might be peer editing and peer feedback on presentations, papers, and so forth.

Some scholars take the position that final grades and marks cannot be used as formative assessment (Harlen & James, 1997) because these final grades are limited in providing students ways that they can improve; rather they are used to measure student performance. Evidence that grades alone do not provide enough feedback to promote growth is convincing (Belanger, 2004; Black & Wiliam, 2004), however difficult to implement.

Schools without final grades would find it difficult to assess improvement and gauge learning. Biggs (1998) proposes a way in which students focus on the evolution of learning, in which feedback leads to the next assessment. However their institution promotes assessment, instructors should choose assessment that “causes thinking” (William, 2013, p. 214).

Factors affecting CF

Speculation among researchers is concerned with CF and age differences of learners (Oliver, 2000). Some question how the use of negative CF differs among the ages of students. In Oliver (2000), 10 adult classrooms and 10 child classrooms were analyzed. Both age groups received negative CF and used this CF to change their non-target utterances. This shows that students, both adults and children understood the CF and reacted to it, or changed their error.

Brown (2007b) cites some examples of children receiving CF. In each of these examples, the children are less concerned about the correctness of their statement than about the meaning of what they are trying to get across. In fact, it almost seems that the children are not aware that they are receiving correction at all. Studying children’s language acquisition is not the same as studying adults’ language acquisition, but there can be applications to be learned for both. Even though I do not plan to teach children, adults are similarly more concerned with the meaning that is being conveyed. This coincides with Shrum and Glisan’s (2009) argument that meaning should be the center of language teaching. In fact, in many oral situations where CF is provided, the individual is focused on the meaning.

Even though oral CF and written feedback are different because of the different skills, they both focus on meaning. Scholars have debated the effectiveness of written versus oral corrective feedback (Ferris, 2006; Truscott, 1996). Bitchener (2008) argues for written CF. In his study, four groups of 75 low-intermediate international ESL students in New Zealand were given different types of feedback for their writing. Those who received written corrective feedback outperformed their peers in accuracy treatment of their errors and retained this accuracy two months later.

Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) add to this research by pointing out that students' views of CF can also inhibit or help their overall learning experience. Previous language instruction may play a role in their desire for CF, and students who have previously learned a language tend to want to learn the new language in a similar manner to how they have previously learned. This is why it is important that teachers are able to use a variety of different types of CF depending on the needs of the students in the class (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Lyster et al., 2013; Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013).

Along with students' ideas and expectations about CF, teachers also have certain beliefs. Roothoof (2014) conducted a study regarding the relationship between oral CF that teachers use and their beliefs about CF. Many of the instructors studied were unaware of the types of CF they were using, as well as the amount of CF they were providing. Teachers also expressed concerns with the balance of providing CF versus interrupting students' thought and learning processes. In the data, recasts were definitely the most common type of CF given (Roothoof, 2014). Like previously mentioned research, this article should encourage instructors to use a wider variety of CF in their

classrooms and also urges teachers to be more aware of the needs of their students and use CF that will benefit the majority of their students.

Conclusion

As previously discussed, CF is a way that teachers improve students' grammatical competency (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010). Tsang (2004) found that recasts are the CF used most often by instructors, but many scholars agree that prompts are the most effective type of CF for grammar development (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010). However, according to Llinares and Lyster (2014), and Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden (2013), it's important for teachers to vary the types of CF that they use to fit the needs of the students, their cultural backgrounds, and their learning styles. Using a variety of CF forms will most likely help the most students (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). CF can negatively or positively affect the students' anxiety levels (Brown, 2007a; Shrum & Glisan, 2009), therefore, instructors need to find the balance between giving too much and too little CF (Brown, 2007b), and errors should be corrected if the utterance is incomprehensible (Brown, 2007b). Teachers can use formative and summative assessment techniques to provide the students with CF (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). No matter the age of the students, meaning should be central to providing feedback (Oliver, 2010; Brown, 2007b; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013). It is important to give a variety of CF based on students' needs (Llinares & Lyster, 2014; Lyster et al., 2013; Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). In addition, instructors need to be aware of their own beliefs and how their beliefs affect their teaching (Roothoof, 2014).

Literacy Artifact—The Benefits of Biliteracy

Note: I wrote this original paper in collaboration with Ariel Finlinson for a Dual Language Immersion course. I have since made significant changes to this paper applying the benefits of biliteracy to my teaching context, an adult immersion language learning setting. I have included it in my portfolio with Finlinson's permission.

Introduction

Bilingual education (also known as Dual Language Immersion) has been unpopular with the American public for reasons of ignorance, racism, and political misunderstandings (Crawford, 2003). These have acted as barriers that discourage many Americans from supporting bilingual education. The lack of support has also prevented DLI's implementation in some areas (Crawford, 2003), and hurt the performance of students who would have benefited from a bilingual education (Collier & Thomas, 2004). It can be discouraging for those who believe in bilingual education and bilingualism when their neighbors do not see the need or the relevance to their lives. Even though I do not plan to teach in a bilingual environment, I do plan to teach students who are immersed in the target language and culture. The students in my context will be exposed to the target language inside and outside of the classroom. The same barriers and lack of support concerning DLI apply to my context as well. Although these social barriers exist, many scholars have supplied overwhelming evidence that dual language immersion education is beneficial for students from minority-language speaking backgrounds (Cloud et al., 2000; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Genesee, 2008).

The benefits of dual language immersion education are long term and far reaching (Cloud et al., 2000; Spicer-Escalante, Wade, and Leite, 2015). Most of these benefits can be applied to children in a bilingual setting and to adults in an immersion setting of the

target language and culture. In order to prepare students for the future global market they will be entering, it is important to equip them with the tools they need to succeed (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). One skill that will aid in their success is that of biliteracy. Biliterate individuals experience academic (Hamayan et al., 2013), cognitive (Juarez, 2015), economic (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), political (Geisler et al., 2007), socio-cultural (Hamayan, 2013), and continued (Met, 2008) benefits throughout their lives. Before presenting these benefits, however, it is first important to understand the definition and background of bilingual education as well as the connection to immersion programs for adults. It is also important to understand the implications and importance of these programs.

Abstract

This paper introduces research about the benefits of biliteracy. Individuals who are biliterate can use that skill to contribute as leaders, teachers, doctors, and residents of the United States and around the world. In this paper, I will connect dual language immersion (DLI) with immersion programs for adults. I am interested in the success of DLI programs and what these programs have in common with immersion programs for adults. This is relevant to me because I teach adults who are in an immersion context. The main benefits of studying in a DLI context, also called the three ABCs of Immersion, are: academic achievement, biligualism/biliteracy, and cultural competence (Spicer-Escalante, Wade, & Leite, 2015). Even though DLI programs were originally developed for bilingual education for children, the benefits of biliteracy can be applied to adults in an immersion setting. In the last sections I will focus on the academic, cognitive, socio-cultural, political, economic, and continued benefits of being biliterate. These benefits of biliteracy may give students, whether children or adults, the skills that could lead to a successful future in the 21st century (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). As an instructor of ESL to adults, I will focus my efforts on helping adults learn a language through immersion in the target language and culture.

Connecting Bilingual Education with Adult Immersion Programs

Background

Swain and Lapkin (2005) have identified some “core features of immersion.” These features have been adapted as the times and situations in bilingual schools have changed. The following features are more reflective of the current DLI schools (Swain & Lapkin, 2005):

The immersion language is the medium of instruction [;] ... the immersion curriculum parallels the local L1 [or first language] curriculum [;] ... overt support needs to be given to all home languages [;] ... the program aims for additive bilingualism [;] ... exposure to the immersion language is largely confined to the classroom [;] ... students enter with similar levels of proficiency in the immersion language [;] ... the classroom culture needs to recognize the cultures of the multiple immigrant communities to which the students belong. (p. 172)

These core features promote the goal of any program that immerses students in the target language to aid in students' development of the second language. Many of these features can be applied to adults in the target language and culture setting.

Even with these identifying factors from Swain and Lapkin (2005), variation can be found between children DLI classrooms and adult immersion classrooms, all of which have goals for biliteracy. The various models of bilingual education all aim to achieve specific goals according to the cultural environment and situation of the surrounding areas. The following section will define and illustrate the different types of bilingual education and how it is applicable to adult immersion programs.

Application of Models of Bilingual Education to Immersed Settings for Education

All of the models of DLI in this paper are additive programs, as additive bilingual education seeks to maintain students' first language (L1), while also equipping them to become proficient in a second language (L2) (Genesee, 2008; May, 2008). Additive DLI programs have been shown to be more beneficial than subtractive programs, as subtractive programs do not support minority-language speaking students' L1 (Genesee,

2008; May, 2008). Such programs are actually detrimental to minority-language speaking students' L2 learning (Genessee, 2008), and many of these students whose L1 is not supported actually drop out of school (May, 2008). Adults studying in an immersion setting are encouraged to acquire, maintain, and increase literacy skills in their L1 because of the benefits, which will be presented later.

DLI models have four types of programs: one-way developmental bilingual education, one-way foreign/second language immersion programs, two-way bilingual immersion education, and indigenous or heritage programs (Christian, 2011; Cloud et al., 2000; Cloud et al., 2008; Genessee, 2008; Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Much of my target-teaching environment shares several aspects with DLI schools. These include: the students developing proficiency in the target language through using the target language in the classroom; encouraging the students to develop their L1; and encouraging learning of cultural practice and sociocultural applications to the target language. Although it is not possible for the instructor to know all of the students' first languages in an adult ESL immersion setting (at times students have different first languages than their classmates), the instructor's knowledge of the students' first languages and backgrounds can be beneficial. By knowing about the students' background languages, the instructor may be better able to help the students make connections to and contrast with their first language. However, the focus for the students is immersion in the target language through using the target language inside the classroom, just like a DLI program, and, additionally, outside the classroom. However, this is highly dependent upon the students' motivation and necessity to use the target language.

Benefits of education in an immersed setting

Many students have benefited from the growth of DLI and adult immersion programs in the United States. Genesee said, “There is no doubt that immersion programs are the most effective approach available to second language teaching in school settings” (Genesee, 1994, p. 9). Although Genesee was speaking of a DLI context, his words could be applied to an adult immersion context. In an adult immersion setting, minority-language speaking students grow and learn in the target language by using the target language. This growth and learning is manifest in academic achievement, bilingualism/biliteracy, and cultural competence.

If students continually improve their L1, their L2 improves because the language knowledge and strategies transfer. Young students in DLI programs have the support needed for their first language because two languages are being taught. However, in an adult immersion program, this may not be the case. Even though some instructors may not be able to help students improve their L1, they can encourage students to improve their L1. Students should be urged to continually improve their L1 while studying the target language. According to Cloud et al. (2000), minority-language speaking students whose L1 is supported, are able to gain high levels of a second language (L2) (Lindholm-Leary, 2001), while developing academic skills in their primary language (Christian, 2011; Lindholm-Leary, 2001). This is applicable to adult ESL learners as well because many students’ goal is to be admitted to a university or graduate program that may require strong academic skills. Because academic skills can be transferred from one language to another, students should be motivated to improve their academic skills in their first language. This improves minority-language speaking students’ ability to learn a L2, because language skills often transfer from their L1 to their L2 (Genesee, 2008).

Collier and Thomas (2004) add that if DLI students improve their L1 while learning the L2, students can close previous gaps in their learning or academics (May, 2008). Due to DLI, minority-language speaking students not only develop proficiency in the target language, but also sometimes achieve above average-level proficiency. It may take several years for DLI students to reach these levels, but it will happen if they gain proficiency in their native language (Collier & Thomas, 2004). In addition, students acquire positive attitudes to learning as their language learning progresses (Lindholm-Leary 2001).

Additional benefits include cross-cultural communication and greater appreciation for diversity. Students in a DLI setting learn how to “appreciate people from other countries” (Hamayan, Genesse, & Cloud, 2013) and develop a “greater intercultural understanding and tolerance” (Cloud, Genesse, & Hamayan, 2000) for other cultures. This may be true not only in DLI settings of young learners, but also in adult immersion programs. This is important now and will be greatly influential to the future generations as they will need cross-cultural communication and skills to engage in international business, politics, and communication. Even though learning a different language will not help students understand all cultural differences, it will open their minds to view the world in a new way. As a result, they will be more open to other cultures (Cloud et. al., 2000), helping prevent or at least diminish cross-cultural misunderstandings and issues. With cross-cultural skills, students will be better equipped with skills necessary for their professions in the future.

Biliteracy

As the popularity of second language education has grown, individuals have become aware of the benefits of learning a second language (Lee & Jeong, 2013; Parkes & Ruth, 2011). As a result, individuals who have recognized these benefits seek the opportunities for themselves and family members to enroll in second-language-learning programs, including adult immersion programs and DLI programs (Parkes, 2008). They value the many benefits in many aspects of life available to those who become biliterate (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Geisler et al., 2007; Haarmann, 2006; Hamayan, 2013; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Juarez, 2015; Lindholm-Leary, 2000; Met, 2008). Gaining literacy skills in a second language will not only benefit current individuals, but future generations in the growing global market (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). One of these benefits includes gaining communication skills in an additional language (Fortune & Menke, 2010).

Academic use in DLI

Being considered proficient in a L2 takes more than just being able to speak. Proficiency includes being able to write and read academically (Hamayan, 2013). According to Parkes (2008), 93.6% of parents who enrolled their children in DLI programs did so in order for their children to learn to read, write, and speak in two languages. Similarly, adults share the same motivations of becoming literate in a second language when they attend immersed language courses. Language-learning programs prepare students to read and understand not only everyday speech and simple texts, but to get the full meaning and depth of academic texts (Met, 2008). Individuals who enroll want to ensure that they will succeed in a global world market: this will be increasingly

important as the world sees the progression of international trade, business, and politics (Lingholm-Leary, 2000). DLI programs in the United States have focused on preparing students to be successful in the 21st century through second language acquisition, creating biliterate and bilingual individuals (Spicer-Escalante, Leite, & Wade, 2015). Studies show that their efforts have been successful (Lee & Jeong, 2013). Following are some of the many benefits students gain through biliteracy.

Benefits of Biliteracy

Academic advantages

Even though, on average, students in a DLI context take a minimum of six years, and up to eight years, to fully develop the target language (Collier & Thomas, 2004), the resulting benefits for both languages are astounding. While learning a L2, students actually gain a better understanding of their L1 unless they stop using their L1 or have not acquired literacy in the L1 (Hamayan Genesee, & Cloud 2013). Surprisingly, biliterate students often perform higher on their first language test than monolingual students (Cloud et al., 2000). The advantage of many intensive language programs is that students can become fluent in an L2 (Genesee, 2008). Montanari (2014) cites an example of this in an Italian immersion program where students were fluent readers in just a few short years. In accordance with Geisler et al. (2007), teachers are working to reach the goal “to have a citizenry capable of communicating with educated native speakers in their language” (Geisler et al., 2007).

Cognitive advantages

Speaking of biliteracy, Juarez (2015) argues that the biggest advantage is not biliteracy itself but cognitive development. According to Haarmann (2006), the brain of

a student is ready and able to make new and different connections. Through developing knowledge of another language, certain parts of the brain are better developed in bilinguals than in monolinguals (Haarmann, 2006). This is especially true of students who learn a second language from a young age, such as those enrolled in a DLI program. Cloud et al. (2000) report that through development in the brain, or in cognitive capabilities, DLI students who know two languages perform better at problem solving and finding patterns than monolingual students (Cloud et al., 2000). Lazaruk (2007) adds to the aforementioned research that these students also are more linguistically aware, have more thought flexibility, and can examine the language better. Adult students can apply these skills to their professions. Increased problem solving, thought flexibility, and brain development are not needed for a specific profession, but could improve performance in any profession.

Economic advantages

Because cross-cultural communication and international business are increasing, the need for biliterate adults in the workforce continues to grow (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). The business community is worried because individuals are not being prepared to work in our increasingly diverse global economy (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Along with the business community (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), DLI instructors have worked to boost students' preparedness and equip them to be successful in the 21st century (Spicer-Escalante et al., 2015). Many of the multilingual areas of the world are also central economic and business locations, for example the European Union, Asia, and the Americas (Cloud et al., 2000). People who are biliterate are, and will be, needed for this

new global market (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). This need can be satisfied with the DLI and adult immersion programs that prepare students to be bilingual and biliterate.

Genesee (2008) states, “Indeed, individuals and communities who know English and other languages will have the real advantages (economic, political, etc.) in the future in comparison to those who know only English” (p 23). Educating students in a L2 and promoting biliteracy gives them the knowledge to better their circumstances. An adult ESL instructor should encourage students to develop the literacy skills in the target language. But Genesee (2008) continues that, “It is biliteracy, not just oral bilingualism, that is important if young people are to thrive in and take advantage of global realities” (p. 24). Students need not only oral skills in a L2, but must be able to write, read, and analyze texts (Hamayan, 2013), because companies and organizations need employees who can write letters, documents, and reports, and give presentations in a L2.

Increased job opportunities are among the economic benefits for students studying another language (Cloud et al., 2000, Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Bilingual, biliterate adults are in high demand as companies look for employees with diverse skills (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Students who acquire proficiency in a L2 obtain the literacy and oral skills needed to work in diverse and linguistically challenging jobs that require literacy skills in the target language.

Political Advantages

Biliteracy also supports several political advantages. Unger (2001) reports that education in a DLI setting battles prejudice and racism, both of which contribute to a lack of peace in communities around the world. This might also be true for those in adult immersion programs. Because of the immersion setting and the students’ various

backgrounds, DLI students are exposed to these cultures (Cloud et al., 2000), as are adults in a diverse classroom. This exposure to diverse cultures brings positivity into the students' lives. In addition, according to Swain and Lapkin (2005), these different cultures may be celebrated in the classroom. Geisler et al. (2007) add that the great need for monolingual Americans to learn other languages was no longer questioned after the events of September 11, 2001. In 2005, Democratic U.S. Senator Daniel Akaka argued, "Americans need to be open to the world; we need to be able to see the world through the eyes of others if we are going to understand how to resolve the complex problems we face" (Akaka, 2005, p. 19). Through being immersed in the target language and interacting with diverse classmates, ESL immersion students learn to respect differences of other cultures and learn to work with members of a diverse team (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Students who learn a second language provide hope now and for the future, as they know how to work for peace in the world. They will do this because they will be less culturally ignorant (Geisler et al., 2007) and more culturally educated (Cloud et al., 2000; Hamayan et al., 2013; Parkes & Ruth, 2011).

Socio-cultural advantages

As students are able to encounter cultural differences (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), through biliteracy, another world of speakers, friends, and cultures opens up to them. According to Kenner (2013), learning to write in two languages is not only a cognitive benefit, but also helps students' cross-cultural communication. Many students who enroll in community ESL programs are not literate in the L1, which creates more of a challenge, but this challenge can bring these individuals great opportunities. This cross-cultural communication and education expands a person's opportunities to read texts, helps them

make friends outside of one's original culture, and exposes students to a new culture because of the new language (Cloud, Hayaman, & Genesee, 2000). By reading authentic texts in the L2, students gain a greater depth of understanding of the language and culture of the L2 they are learning (Hamayan, 2013). DLI students also are able "to communicate with members of other cultural groups, be they members of cultural groups in one's own neighborhood, or groups in other countries or regions of the world" (Cloud et al., 2000, p. 4), as are adult immersion students. In fact, "biliteracy extends [students] learning and enables them to share cultural experiences with their families and communities" (Kenner, 2013, p. 37), uniting, not separating individuals. Through biliteracy, students are able to make friends from around the globe through social network platforms and knowledgeably navigate ever-growing international and cross-cultural communicative communities.

Continued Learning

Even with all of the previously mentioned benefits from biliteracy, arguably one of the most beneficial benefits of biliteracy is that of continued learning. Fortune and Tedick (2008) claim that encounters with text cause students to have a large vocabulary. As teachers expose students to authentic texts, students' lexical competence will continue to increase, and, according to Met (2008), students with a higher vocabulary are more likely to read more. This will, in turn, increase their vocabulary even more (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). In acquisition of a second language, "students are expected to use their literacy as a tool for learning" (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). Even when students have finished the second-language-learning programs and moved on in life, literacy is the means by which they can continue to develop and improve their L2.

Conclusion

In order to continue developing students' L2 proficiency (Fortune & Tedick, 2008), and be successful in the 21st century's global market (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), it is crucial for them to become biliterate. According to Christian (2011), the bilinguals outnumber monolinguals in the world. Second-language-learning programs can prepare future generations to compete in a multilingual economy. Jon Huntsman, Jr., former Utah Governor, said:

Being a multicultural person—or at least a citizen of the world—is in the very foundation of everything we do here ... [W]hether it's education policy or economic development policy; it's all set in a global context these days. If you miss that point, then you've missed our time and place in the world. (Robinett, 2009, p. 18)

In years past, illiterate individuals were considered to be economically disadvantaged; however, in our day, illiteracy may have a new meaning. According to Gregg Roberts, the Utah World Language Specialist, “monolingualism is the new illiteracy of the twenty-first century” (as cited in Spicer-Escalante et al., 2015). Second-language learning is our pathway to fighting the new illiteracy of monolingualism. As programs are developed to help students become bilingual and biliterate, this fight will be won.

**Culture Artifact—Immersion and Instruction in
Developing Pragmatic Competence**

Introduction

In this paper, I will explore how pragmatic instruction and immersion impact the development of pragmatic competence. I was initially interested in the topic because of my own experiences while learning the cultural appropriateness of another language. My first week in Italy, I thought that two women were mad at each other and fighting. But my American friend, who was proficient in Italian, informed me that they were simply discussing something. To me, with my American perspective, it seemed like they were mad at each other. But they were just passionately talking about the topic. I learned more sociocultural appropriateness from being immersed in the language and culture than from my instruction in a formal classroom. Over time, I was able to distinguish when Italians were angry and when they were simply passionate about what they were talking about.

After studying four different languages, I noticed that my own language learning and pragmatic competence best developed when I had received instruction prior, during, and after I participated in an immersion experience. I wanted to know if this was supported by the current literature. Because of my own experiences I thought that immersion plays an important role in pragmatic development. After reading the research, I propose that the most effective way for students to improve their pragmatic competence is through immersion in the target language and target-speech community and through pragmatic instruction.

In the first section of the paper I will define pragmatics and discuss the importance of immersion on developing pragmatic competence. In conclusion, I will discuss the factors that affect immersion and pragmatic competence. These factors

include: length of stay in an immersed setting, instruction, and exposure to the target language.

Abstract

This paper reviews the current literature surrounding pragmatic development, immersion, and pragmatic instruction. The author argues that LL need both pragmatic instruction and an immersion experience in the target-language community to develop pragmatic competence (Lee & VanPatten, 2005; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007). If students do not develop the social rules of language use, they might appear uncooperative or impolite (Decapua & Wintergerst, 2004; Wannaruk, 2008). In an immersion setting, the LLs are able to read and hear models of how the target language and speech community use speech acts appropriately.

Following the models found in input, the LLs are then able to practice appropriate socio-cultural behaviors of the language and culture. The setting influences the students' choices of how to communicate (LoCastro, 2003). Variation in pragmatic competence development is due to differences in length of stay, instruction, and exposure, among other factors. These should all be taken into account when examining the complexities of study abroad and pragmatic development.

Keywords: study abroad, immersion, pragmatics, and pragmatic development

Defining pragmatics

Most students' main motivation to study a foreign or second language is to be able to speak the language for communication purposes (Akbari, 2008; Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2003; Shrum & Glisan, 2009). This includes learning the grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and other aspects of language that most people think of when they think of learning a language. However, the possibly more complex

parts of learning a language include sociocultural aspects of communication. After all, “language expresses cultural reality” (Kramersch, 1989, p. 3). This expression of culture includes both the culture and language. Thus, engaging in socioculturally appropriate conversations is complex because much of what contributes to pragmatics is interpretation. Pragmatics is “the study of language from the point of view of users, especially the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication” (Crystal, 1985, p. 240). In other words, pragmatic competence refers to being able to function in everyday situations in “culturally appropriate ways” (LoCastro, 2003, p. vii). This includes speech acts, which are ways that interlocutors use the language to indicate intention or purpose. Examples of speech acts include: requesting, giving advice, expressing opinion, giving constructive feedback, complaining, complimenting, refusing, and so forth.

The choices that interlocutors make to be able to function appropriately can be difficult for language learners. This is especially true because their first language and culture may influence learners’ perceptions and choices. Culturally and socially appropriate norms are the product of the communities of the individuals that use these languages (Kramersch, 1989), and LLs need to learn target-culture and target-language norms, whether they intend to stay for a short or long period of time. Either way, LLs will need to function in the community to be able to fully learn the language—and to do that, they will need to learn the social rules of the language as well.

Developing pragmatic competence

Even though students' goal is to communicate, they make errors. Making mistakes is a natural part of learning a second language (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). The type of error can make a big difference in how the interlocutors perceive the LLs (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2004; Shrum & Glisan, 2009; Wannaruk, 2008). Many students often produce "grammatically correct, yet situationally inappropriate spoken or written communication" (Tatsuki & Houck, 2000, p. vii). The grammatical errors are perceived as less severe than pragmatic errors because of how the LL is viewed. In fact, DeCapua and Wintergerst (2004) say that LLs who use language that is not pragmatically appropriate may be viewed as "uncooperative, ill mannered, rude, or a combination of all three" (p. 244) or "rude, disrespectful or impolite" (Wannaruk, 2008 p. 319). An interlocutor can flout an expectation, or what Grice (1991) calls a maxim, such as the maxims of principle of quantity, relation, manner, and quality principles. These are also known as Grice's Maxims (LoCastro, 2013). Once one of these principles is not followed, it sends a message to the listener, who subconsciously expects something different (LoCastro, 2013).

Even though no LL wants to say something culturally inappropriate and be perceived as rude, it happens often. Thus, LLs need to develop pragmatic competence, which is defined as, "knowledge of the linguistic resources available in a given language for realizing particular illocutions, knowledge of the sequential aspects of speech acts and finally, knowledge of the appropriate contextual use of the particular languages' linguistic resources" (Barron, 2003, p. 10). Because pragmatic competence is crucial, language learners need to know *how* to develop their pragmatic competence. Students

may have difficulty developing their pragmatic competence (Tatski & Houck, 2010), especially if they do not have pragmatic instruction. In the next section, I will discuss the research surrounding pragmatic instruction and developing pragmatic competence.

Effects of instruction on pragmatic competence

According to Derakhshan and Eslami (2015), instruction plays a crucial role in pragmatic competence. In fact, recent research has investigated the role that instruction has in developing students' pragmatic competence (Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007). This growing area of research suggests that some features of pragmatics lend themselves well to instruction (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015). It seems unclear which kind of teaching is best for learning (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015). However, when immersion is coupled with instruction, the students are able to make significant pragmatic gains (Soler, 2005).

Much of the current research supports the claim that pragmatic instruction aids in students' development of learning the cultural norms of the language (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Isahara & Cohen, 2010; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007; Soler, 2005; Takimoto, 2008). One of the reasons why instruction helps pragmatic development is because LLS "require information on how to talk about what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate speech acts in different contexts" (Tatsuki & Houck, 2000, p. 1). Language learners can receive this help through instruction. In fact, Tatsuki and Houck (2000) emphasize that students must be aware, notice, and pay attention to interactions taking place. Students must understand when and why certain interactions are pragmatically inappropriate. They are more likely to do this when an instructor directs students' attention to these inappropriate interactions. The students understand this best when they "realize why that particular form was used in relation to the context factors" (Isahara &

Cohen, 2010, p. 103). For example rather than just giving examples of the difference of simple present and present continuous in English, an instructor might address why each of the forms are used in different situations. Instruction of application of forms to the context can help students learn the social rules of language use.

In several studies with adults, scholars found that instruction helped students make pragmatic development gains with suggestions (Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007), and requests (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Soler, 2005; Takimoto, 2008), such as “why don’t you do your homework” or “you could talk to your advisor about this”. Gains were also found with instruction of apologies (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015). Soler (2005) found that when teachers used explicit and implicit instruction, students’ request strategies made significant gains. In fact, their ability to use request strategies showed more advantage when they learned explicitly. Similarly, Martínez-Flor and Soler (2007) studied three groups of students. These groups consisted of: a control, implicit, and explicit group. This study also found that both implicit and explicit pragmatic instruction aided students’ awareness of suggestions. Takimoto (2008) found that of the randomly assigned adult Japanese English as a foreign language student groups, the deductive group performed better than the group receiving inductive instruction on the listening test with problem solving. Takimoto (2008) also found that the groups with instruction performed significantly better in producing complex requests than the group without instruction. Apology and requests were the focus of Derakhshan and Eslami’s (2015) study of adult ESL learners. The learners were divided into groups and were exposed to video clips, after which they either discussed and participated in role-plays or interactive translations, and then were given a post-test. The findings show that instruction was also

useful in raising awareness of apology and requests, but those in the discussion group performed better than the other groups.

In all of these studies, students' pragmatic competence significantly improved with the help of instruction of pragmatics. However, as we will see later, instruction alone is not enough for pragmatic development (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015).

Limitations of instruction on pragmatic competence

I have discussed how instruction can aid students' pragmatic competence development and will now discuss how immersion in the target language can aid this process. Derakhshan and Eslami (2015) claim that a classroom is a "limited environment" and that "opportunities for human interaction are rather restricted" (p. 2). Some things are not correctly simulated in a classroom when not all of the students are from the target-language background. The students cannot learn from the classroom environment when it does not expose them to a pragmatically accurate depiction of real-world target-language interaction. "Learners in a foreign language setting don't have the same exposure and opportunities for practice as learners who are immersed in the L2 community" (Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007, p. 14). This exposure to the target language and socio-cultural norms of the target language in the classroom can often lack the "sociolinguistic input (of the language) that is essential in order for learning to take place" (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015, p. 2).

Exposure and practice allow for development of pragmatic competence because students are influenced by the setting to make choices about how to communicate (LoCastro, 2003). If learners do not communicate in pragmatic appropriate based on the target-speech community, they may communicate based on the classroom's inaccurate

pragmatic rules. In addition, if learners learn the social rules of a classroom, this might not mirror the pragmatic rules of the target-speech community. However, as learners acquire intercultural communication skills and learn to adapt to each of the different rules of showing politeness and respect, they are better able to communicate with other different populations (LoCastro, 2003). These are things that students can learn in an immersion setting. Learning pragmatics in a classroom helps, but Lee and VanPatten (2005) argue, “some aspects of communication can be developed only in a native-speaking environment” (p. 5).

Factors of immersion on pragmatic competence

Students who have studied abroad “in contrast to the classroom learner possess a set of well defined...beliefs about what constitutes appropriate linguistic data and language learning methodologies” (Freed, 1998, p. 50). Even with these beliefs about appropriate linguistic data, those who have been abroad “appear to speak with greater ease and confidence” (Freed, 1998, p. 50). Freed’s (1998) early description of study abroad claims that study abroad results in proficiency but introduces numerous variables that affect the development of the language, which include:

individual differences in learning styles, motivation and aptitude, the features of specific language to be learned, the degree to which they are actually “immersed” in the native speech community and the interaction of these variables with formal classroom instruction in the study abroad context. (Freed, 1998, p. 32)

These variables can change considerably depending on each student and their individual differences.

Even though the research suggests that immersion can help pragmatic development, there is great variation among learners. In fact, Hassall (2014) studied learners and the development of their pragmatic competence. He found that the variation that occurred among learners may be because of their L2 identity development, initial low proficiency, lack of prior foreign language learning experience, and the timing of formal instruction (Hassall, 2014). In addition, Roever, Wang, and Brophy (2015) found that learner proficiency was the most important background factor that affected learners' pragmatic development in a study abroad context. Because of the differences among individuals, it is important to be cautious to avoid overgeneralizing.

Effects of exposure to the target language

Many sources agree that study abroad can lead to linguistic and sociocultural improvements in the target language (Beltrán , 2013; Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Schauer, 2009; Taguchi, 2008). In fact, Schauer (2009) argues that studying abroad can have many positive effects on all aspects of language learning, but especially on social interaction. This is in part because “in a second language environment, learners have more opportunity to gain pragmatic awareness” (Taguchi, 2008, p. 426). However, variation in development of pragmatic competence depends on more than whether one is surrounded by the target language and culture. According to Beltrán (2013), exposure is necessary in SLA. However variation occurs among students immersed in the target-language speech community. Students cannot simply live in the target-language community with expectations of positively affecting their L2 proficiency and pragmatic competence. As previously discussed, individual differences among students in immersion are highly influenced by the experiences that students have to develop their

pragmatic competence (Freed, 1998).

When immersed, the students who seek maximum exposure to the target language and target-speech community will have the most practice (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015). Grieve (2015) studied adolescent learners of Australian English living with a host family. Grieve (2015) found a direct correlation with social integration and acquisition of markers of adolescent language, such as “like” and “and stuff”. Hassall (2015) shows that fellow L2 learners can also have a positive effect on pragmatic development when learners explicitly discuss pragmatic differences and stimulate learning of pragmatics among learners. Because of this, their pragmatic competence developed. In conclusion, exposure to the language can affect SLA. The length of stay can also affect how well students acquire pragmatic features of the language.

Effects of length of stay

The length of stay in the target-language community affects pragmatic development, but not all scholars agree on the extent to which this is true. Some scholars disagree about the time associated with pragmatic development gains. Matsumura (2003) found that the first three months are significant for the students’ pragmatic development. Beltrán (2013) found that the overall time the students spent in the country proved significant, which conflicted with Matsumura’s findings. The first six months was the most critical time in developing students’ pragmatic competence with evaluating appropriate request acts. Felix-Brasdefer (2004) says that pragmatic competence is required in latter stages of learning development, rather than the first few months. Therefore, the longer the student stays in the country, the better the pragmatic performance becomes. Grieve (2015) also found that students studying five months in

Australia produced fewer approximation and identification intensifiers associated with adolescent language than students in a 10-month program. In other words, the adolescent students' pragmatic knowledge developed based on how long they had been studying in the country. Medina-Lopez-Portillo (2004) also concluded from qualitative and quantitative data that students' intercultural sensitivity development was linked to program duration, which was significantly and positively correlated with intercultural sensitivity. Dwyer (2004) found that a yearlong study abroad positively affected students' continued language use and intercultural and personal development. Dwyer (2004) also found that these impacts could be true for individuals over 50 years. Although many scholars agree that longer study abroad aids in students' pragmatic development (Beltrán 2013; Dwyer, 2004; Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Grieve, 2015; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004), Beltrán (2013) claims in his study that after 5.5 years, students' assessment of the request acts did not improve, but rather worsened.

Although some scholars disagree about duration of study abroad, one thing is certain, immersion in the target language and target-speech community improved learners' pragmatic competence (Beltrán, 2013; Dwyer, 2004; Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Grieve, 2015; Medina-Lopez-Portillo, 2004; Matsumura, 2003). Schauer (2009) found all German learners of English in his studies increased pragmatic competence in at least one way, although the results varied among students. Scholars have shown that is also true for requesting (Achiba, 2003).

Conclusion

In conclusion, because pragmatic competence is crucial for students to learn a language (DeCapua & Wintergerst, 2004; Kramersch, 1989; LoCastro, 2003; Shrum &

Glisan, 2009; Wannaruk, 2008), opportunities to develop pragmatic skills are also essential (LoCastro, 2003; Wannaruk, 2008). I have provided a brief summary of the research literature surrounding pragmatic development and the effects that pragmatic instruction and study abroad have on learning socio-cultural aspects of the language. Pragmatic instruction can greatly enhance the pragmatic development of the student (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Lee & VanPatten, 2005; Isahara & Cohen, 2010; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007; Soler, 2005; Takimoto, 2008), but it is not enough (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Martínez-Flor & Soler, 2007). LLs can learn certain aspects of the language only during immersion in the target-speech community (Lee & VanPatten, 2005). In an immersion setting, learners have more exposure to the socio-cultural aspects of the language and more input (Freed, 1998; Hassall, 2014; Beltrán, 2013), but learners need maximum exposure and length of stay in the target-speech community to reap the full benefits of study abroad (Derakhshan & Eslami, 2015; Felix-Brasdefer, 2004; Matsumura, 2003, Beltrán, 2013).

Annotated Bibliography

Originally written in collaboration with Ariel Finlinson, but since modified significantly.

The benefits of biliteracy

Knowing that some people have reservations about DLI, I was interested to investigate why there is such unpopularity of DLI. It did not make sense to me that so many people are uninterested in becoming biliterate and bilingual. **Crawford (2003)** discussed that most people's reservations with DLI stem from racism, or being uneducated. This was particularly interesting to me. I know from my own personal experience that when I am indifferent to a topic, it is usually because I have limited information towards that topic. Crawford (2003) discusses that ignorance, and a lack of knowledge about the topic is a very large reason why DLI is not popular with many individuals.

Reading Crawford (2003) lead me to read **Crawford (2008)**. I realized that the unfavorable history attached to DLI is more complex than what I originally thought. There is so much more that goes into why the general American public did not grasp onto DLI and become supporters of it. There were many individuals that did not believe that individuals could become biliterate, or they were misinformed on the success rate of students who eventually become biliterate. Because of the complexities of the history of DLI, it can often be misunderstood. I decided to then dive into the history of DLI with more details.

I first learned about the beginnings of DLI education when I read **Fortune and Tedick (2008)**, about the first two-way program started in Miami-Dade County in Florida. This program, boasting of biliteracy in English and Spanish, began when parents who had been exiled from their native Cuba wanted their children to receive a Spanish

education, even though they now lived in Florida (Fortune & Tedick, 2008). In clarifying the types of immersion and what defines DLI education, Fortune and Tedick (2008) taught me the importance of differentiating between the DLI models, which will be discussed later. This is important because when research is presented about DLI, I need to know which model the researchers were studying, as the features of each model affect the study and results.

Fortune and Tedick (2008) also mention the importance of vocabulary in learning to read. Vocabulary acquisition a key element to becoming biliterate. This is especially true due to the fact that with the development of reading and comprehension skills, students will be able to continue learning content, language, grammatical structures, and vocabulary through reading. Their literacy skills enable them to continue lifelong learning and language learning, which will only develop their biliteracy skills further.

Similar to the Miami Dade County, the first one-way program that began in Utah was also started because of parents' influence (**Leite, 2013**). This time, it was because a young girl and her parents had recently moved from Maryland where their daughter had been enrolled in a bilingual French program. Partly because of this family's encouragement, the Alpine School District started a total immersion program in 1979. The first DLI program to open in Utah was in Orem, at Cherry Hill Elementary (Leite, 2013). From reading Leite (2013) and Fortune and Tedick (2008), I learned that the influence of parents should never be underestimated. Since then, DLI has immensely grown, particularly due to the successful launch of additional pilot programs at Eagle Bay Elementary in Farmington, Utah, as well as the increased state involvement, and governor's support.

Along with learning about the origins of bilingual and biliterate programs in the United States and Utah, I have read about the different models and the definitions of each model (**Genesee, 2008**). One-way immersion classes consist of the majority of students from the same cultural and linguistic background. In this type of immersion the students learn a L2 in the classroom by studying 50% of the instruction in their L1, and 50% of the instruction is in their L2. Two-way immersion occurs when two language groups are represented in the classroom. Besides still getting 50% of instruction in each language, these students benefit from having native-speaking classmates. In learning about each of these classrooms and programs, I feel more able to constructively examine the benefits of each.

Swain and Lapkin (2005) discussed how to implement needed changes when the socio-cultural and political context changes around the students. They discussed the situation in Canada when an influx of immigrant students swarmed Canadian schools. The new population changes created issues that the Canadian school system hadn't encountered before. The Canadian programs were unique in that they didn't consist of two main first language groups—rather they were made up of one large native-French-speaking group and a dozen other native languages. In this article, they discussed the solutions the administration and teachers discovered to find some successes in such a difficult situation. Even though students usually develop speaking and listening skills before reading and writing, the teachers found some effective ways to help aid biliteracy. The individuals in this program had help from the community and parents of the students. To reinforce the students' L1 literacy skills, the parents and community helped by providing books in native languages. This helped the students' first language, which also

helped the students become biliterate. This example helped me better understand that the features of the curriculum should mirror and solve the problems in the local area. There is not just a one-size-fits-all approach, and the culture outside the classroom is directly correlated with what is in the classroom. I also learned that unfortunately, many times with such diverse L1s, the exposure to the L2 is usually confined to the classroom setting. This is especially true because of the lack of support found inside the students' homes.

Even though **Unger (2001)** was short in length, I gained a lot of insights from reading this article. In discussing the benefits of DLI, Unger (2001) provided insights about how DLI gives students an environment to practice cross-cultural communication and develop cultural and linguistic competence. I realized that many of the students in a program like this gain friends from a different culture. The bonds they make can sometimes last for their lives, and these students remember the friendships gained. It sometimes influences the future relationships they create. In this paper, Unger (2001) finds support to argue that DLI programs fight to equalize the status of both languages in the school. Because of this equal status, each of the cultures is, in turn, also equalized. The students, who eventually become members of society, have a great appreciation for this other culture. In this fight, DLI even combats against racism and prejudice.

Met (2008) said "language, literacy, and academic achievement are the fundamentals of schooling" (p. 49). It is incredibly important that students have a lot of encounters with text because this is a great way to be exposed to vocabulary. I knew that the language of academics is vastly different from day-to-day language, however I quickly became aware that the need for literacy in academic achievement. Monolingual students aren't making as many advancements in vocabulary as students who read

extensively in a second language. Students can improve linguistically through everyday living; however, making academic language advancements takes much more time and effort. The reason for this is that in spoken social language, the speaker has context to guess and infer. In academic language, the student cannot usually guess; there is very little context to aid the student. The language used in general settings versus academic settings is quite different; thus, the need for students to be exposed to academic literacy is crucial if they are to develop academic language skills in two languages. Up until a certain point, students first learn literacy. Then after students' basic literacy skills are developed, students use literacy as the vehicle to learn rigorous academic content. If a student is illiterate, the student will not be able to progress academically. Literacy truly is an essential part of schooling in general, not to mention bilingual and biliteracy education. Without literacy in a first language, literacy in a second language seems near impossible. When learning a second language, literacy in that second language aids vocabulary expansion as well as learning grammatical structures, spelling, and so forth.

Fortune and Menke (2010) added to the previous research about literature saying students who learn to read in their second language base it off their first language. After reading this, I can personally relate. I would compare everything to my first language. This is especially true for students studying a second or third language with the same or a similar alphabet. When thinking about how to teach a student who is illiterate, you would have to start from the complete beginning, even how to hold a pencil. Because these skills transfer, it is important for students' L1 to be supported. Students need to progress the literacy skills in their first language and in their second language because their knowledge about their L1 transfers to learning their L2. This was

true for me. While learning a second language I found myself using a similar reading strategy I had originally used to learn my first language and applying it to my second language. Another thing I learned from this article is that learning to read is one of the most taxing things for a student's cognition. I think that many individuals overlook learning how to read. If learning how to read is so challenging, learning how to read in another language must also be extremely tough for students. Even though this is difficult, there are so many advantages and necessities of literacy that it is well worth the effort. Biliteracy has many benefits for the future of individuals in the United States. Thanks to DLI, these benefits will be realized in future generations as more DLI programs are opened throughout the United States and worldwide.

Oral Corrective Feedback

I have been teaching ESL to adults for three years, and I have wondered what is the best way to help students when they make errors. Upon realizing that I give my students various types of feedback, I wondered if I should alter the feedback I give them. The reason I wondered this is because I noticed that my students respond differently to different types of feedback. I realize that I should be attentive to their cognitive demands and anxiety levels, but I wanted to know if I was giving them the right feedback. I remembered hearing the term corrective feedback (CF) while I was studying my undergraduate degree, but I don't remember learning a lot about the topic. I did, however remember my professor mentioning that it was a controversial topic in the SLA. At the time I was somewhat interested, but I didn't become fully engaged in the topic until I was able to choose a topic that I was interested to read and learn about. I subsequently chose to study CF to enhance the feedback I give my students.

Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden (2013) discuss the idea that giving immediate feedback is more beneficial than delayed feedback. The reason for this is because the students often forget what they said when time has passed. This was beneficial for me because I often want to wait before I give any kind of feedback to my students. I believe that there is a balance between giving immediate oral feedback and waiting so that the student is not embarrassed to be corrected in front of classmates. Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden argue that students are able to recall the feedback better when it was immediate. Regardless of the type of CF the students receive, Mitchell, Myles, and Marsden argue for immediate feedback.

Even though **Brown (2007)** focuses on first language acquisition, I think that it gives a helpful background to a study of oral CF. The author cites some examples of children receiving CF. In each of these examples, children are less concerned about the correctness of their statement than about the meaning of what they are trying to communicate. In fact, the children seemed unaware that they were receiving correction; they just wanted to communicate the meaning. Focusing on the meaning communicated coincides with the teachings of communicative language teaching. Languages exist to enable individuals to utter and communicate meaning to other individuals. Because of the nature of the students' responses to feedback, I learned from Brown that the feedback that I give my students should always be centered on the meaning of the utterances. I should focus on the things that I can and cannot understand first and communicate that to the student.

Seeking answers to the questions that arose while I read Brown (2007), I turned to **Llinares and Lyster (2014)**, who examine different types of oral CF. The authors argue that there probably is not one type of CF that works best. This is because there are many different situations and many different individuals with different learning styles. All of these differences contribute to the need for different types of feedback when an error is produced. Teachers should be able to use different types of feedback depending on the needs of the class and classroom environment. In my adult ESL classes, each student comes from a different cultural and social background, and has a unique learning style. It is important for teachers to vary the types of feedback that they use to fit the needs of the students in each classroom environment.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) studied six ways teachers use CF in classrooms. In their foundational study, several teachers were observed. The researchers recorded how often each type of oral CF is used. They also observed the relationship between the type of feedback and the students' ability to correct their error. Surprisingly, the most common type of feedback, recasts, was the least effective. In reading this article, I wondered why instructors in this study use the least effective type of feedback with their students. Are the instructors not aware that the form of feedback they are using is least effective? If they are aware, why are they still using it? After the students received the recasts as feedback, they were not very successful in initiating student correction (repairs). Another surprising finding is that the instructors used the most effective type of feedback the least, which was repetition. When instructors used this type, they were more likely to elicit student self-repairs. The type of CF used in a classroom can aid students' uptake. In this study, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition were shown to be effective strategies for eliciting uptake from the students. This made me ponder my own teaching and the oral CF that I offer after hearing errors from the students. I would like to study my own feedback and how it is hindering or helping my students.

When I read **Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013)** I was glad to find another perspective about the effectiveness of different types of feedback: the students' views of CF. The desire for correction varies across students, especially in relationship to their language abilities and cultural background. However, students preferred receiving larger quantities of CF than what teachers felt that they should provide. Many advanced students have even asked me to correct them every time they make a mistake. I have told

them that sometimes I cannot correct every mistake. They seem to be upset by this and tell me that their other language instructor corrected every mistake they made. Lyster et al. also found that previous language instruction can also play a role in a student's desire for CF. Students who have previously taken language classes tend to want to learn the new language in a similar manner to how they have previously learned. Lyster et al. argue in favor of strategy training for the instructors. This can strengthen the role CF plays in instructor and peer interaction.

Many times in my teaching I correct the students, but for some reason, the students don't apply the feedback. I was particularly interested in **Tsang (2004)** because the article examines teacher feedback and student uptake, meaning the extent to which students are able to apply the feedback received from the instructor. This study took place in Hong Kong with eighteen different English lessons at the equivalent of grades 7–11 in the United States. This article presents three main themes. The first theme was that the two types of feedback most frequently used were recasts and explicit CF. Recasts are the instructor's correctly formulated utterance, or implicit instruction. Explicit CF, for a metalinguistic explanation, involves telling the student what was incorrect and the correct way to say it. Second, the students' attempts for repair weren't prompted by recasts or explicit feedback. Instead, the student repair that happened most frequently was because of repetition. Repetition feedback is when the instructor repeats the students' utterance but puts emphasis on the incorrect part. The student will notice the error and repair, which is referred to as uptake. Third, most of the phonological repairs from students were following recast and explicit feedback. Negotiation with the instructor and student resulted in the student repairing the grammatical error. For phonological errors I will

focus on recast and explicit correction. For grammatical repairs, I will focus on negotiation of meaning.

After exploring students' beliefs, I wanted to learn about instructors' beliefs regarding CF. **Roothoof (2014)** discusses relationships between instructor's beliefs and their oral feedback practices for SLA. The scholar wanted to know how much of instructors' beliefs are reflected in their teaching. For example, if instructors believe that students should not be explicitly told what was wrong in their utterance, do they actually practice this in their classroom. Roothoof found that when an instructor provides a certain type of feedback, it might not be in line with their beliefs. Conversely, an instructor's beliefs about CF do not necessarily determine and predict the instructor's actions. Many of the instructors studied were not aware of which type of feedback they were using nor of the amount of feedback they were providing. They also expressed concerns with the balance of providing feedback versus interrupting students' thought process and learning processes. In the data, recasts were the most common type of feedback given. This article encourages instructors to use a wider variety of feedback in their classrooms. These findings, or the need to use a wider variety of feedback, are consistent with what Llinares and Lyster (2014) found: students are better served when they receive varied feedback.

Even though this next study is not for ESL, the application of CF to language learning can be applied in general. **Kim, LaPointe, and Stierwalt (2012)** studied Korean as a foreign language in classrooms by manipulating feedback to determine how phonetic acquisition and retention was affected. The experimenter provided 10 sentences orally to the students at random, after which the students repeated the utterance. The

students were presented with the sentences either 25 or 100 times each. During the practice session, the experimenter provided feedback to the students' utterance either 20% or 100%. After receiving the instructor's feedback, the students produced Korean utterances to a panel of native Korean speakers, who judged the Korean utterances produced by the students based on their intelligibility, naturalness, and precision. The findings showed that 20% feedback on 100 practice trials was the best combination out of any other feedback combination studied. I apply this to my teaching through the principle that the more practice I can give to my students, the better. In addition, I should not correct every incorrect utterance the student utters. These findings are consistent with other findings previously discussed in this annotated bibliography that students need a lot of practice with a moderate amount of feedback.

In summary, these are the articles and books that have informed the way in which I provide CF to my students. There are other readings I completed which were not mentioned, however these are those that were most influential.

Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Activities

My first exposure to communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based activities (TBA) was while reading *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* by **Brown (2007)**. While reading Brown, I learned about the history of methods and how CLT was introduced. While reading, the idea that the role of the instructor is a facilitator struck me. The idea that the instructor is the facilitator, not the “all knowing, font of knowledge” (p. 47) seemed strange to me because my educational background was that the instructor should know everything. I had many classes where the students come, sit, take notes, and leave with little or no interaction among classmates or the instructor. However, in CLT, students are “active participants in their own learning process” (p. 47). This means that students are in charge of their learning and the teacher is the coach to help them.

The key to CLT is that students use the target language purposefully and proficiently to communicate in a way which could be applied to a real-world context. Because of this, it might be difficult if the instructor is not fluent or does not have the language ability to foster communication in the classroom. In a CLT classroom, the students focus on meaning not form, which contrasts greatly to the audio-lingual method, according to Brown.

Because CLT focuses on meaningful communication, TBAs offer a great framework to accomplish this. TBAs put tasks at “the core of language teaching” (p. 50). Learners use the language to accomplish an objective by completing a series of building steps to complete the final task. TBAs help teachers and students clearly design and assess outcomes while focusing on meaningful language.

My next exposure to CLT was reading *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen* by **Lee and VanPatten (2003)**. I read this because I wanted to explore the idea of CLT in more depth. It also enhanced my knowledge of TBAs. To be a TBA, a task must have a clear communicative goal. Lee and VanPatten (2003) say that TBAs must be learner centered, require meaningful exchange of information, and guide the students through steps to complete a final task. Through these steps, the students practice contextualized language.

Lee and VanPatten also helped me understand the role of the teacher as facilitator more clearly by defining the Atlas complex. When instructors have a high Atlas complex, they are at the center of the classroom and everything revolves around them, which is contrary to CLT. An Atlas complex can be identified based on whether the teacher gives the students opportunities to use the language or if the instructor is the center of the class. It can be also be evident in extensive lecturing. In fact, TBAs help relieve the Atlas complex and focus the learners on completing the task.

Input and output are important in the topic of second language acquisition (SLA). The language the students are exposed to, or input, is useful if it has these three things: it must be comprehensible, it must be meaningful, and it must require the students to do something with the language (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Input becomes intake when the students attend to the language. As students attend to the language, they make connections to prior knowledge. Because of these connections, the students are more likely to retain the language longer. Output, or production of the language, is arguably as important as input. While reading Lee and VanPatten (2003) I realized that my role as the instructor is to provide opportunities for both input and output.

After reading Lee and VanPatten (2003), I read **Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001)** because of references to their work. The thing that I learned that has informed my teaching the most is that classroom communication appears in three different modes: interpersonal or engaging in conversations; interpretive or understanding spoken or written language; and presentational or students presenting information. Each task may use one, two, or all three of these modes.

The Communicative Classroom by Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001) also introduced me to the concept of negotiation of meaning. Even though the term has a broader meaning in sociolinguistics and communicative studies, the authors' definition is "asking the other person to repeat an utterance, to say it more slowly, or to express it in a different way" (p. 5). This definition may be applicable to SLA, which is applicable to students. Students can negotiate meaning to be able to complete the task if they don't understand something or need clarification.

The reason that language teaching exists is to enable students to communicate in the target language. This is usually the main goal of those who study a new language. The development of this communication is called communicative competence. I wanted to explore communicative competence more, so I searched Savignon because many scholars had quoted, cited, and referred to her work. I next read *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*, **Savignon (1998)**, which says that communicative competence has four parts; grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. These different aspects of communicative competence inform different aspects of learners' emerging language acquisition and proficiency. Teachers need to help students develop these

different competences because all of these subcompetencies are important in SLA and CLT.

Possibly the most influential book that I have read in the MSLT program is *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction* by **Shrum and Glisan (2009)**. Of all that I have read, Shrum and Glisan present such a practical and applicable approach to CLT and TBA. From Shrum and Glisan, I have learned a lot about focusing on the three modes of communication and how it helps students develop students' target language proficiency. Although *Teacher's Handbook* teaches more than I can say, I have seen examples of how to actually apply what I have learned about CLT in the classroom because of all of the examples that are included in the book.

VanPatten (2002) helped me further understand CLT. In *Input processing in second language acquisition*, VanPatten focuses on input specific to meaning and form. The article says that when exposed to the language, students typically focus on meaning first. Then, once they understand the meaning of the input, they move to focusing on the form. Because of this, instructors should adjust their teaching accordingly, by first focusing on meaning when introducing a topic and providing input to the students. This idea was intriguing to me but seemed logical because language is highly functional in nature. When people talk to someone else, it is usually done so with a purpose in mind. Interlocutors first process the reason for the interaction, or the meaning that they are trying to communicate, not the form. This is directly connected with CLT because of the role that meaning has on the language classroom. CLT requires that the students focus on communicating using the target language in meaningful ways. According to VanPatten, using the language with meaning at the center of the classroom coincides with how

students naturally process the language. Teaching this way enhances students' natural processes.

I believed that communicative language teaching was important and that it was the best approach to language teaching, but I wanted something concrete to apply to the courses I was currently teaching. This is when I read about the *Can-Do Statements*.

What **The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2013)** published about the *Can-Do Statements* informed my view of TBAs and CLT in a real way. The *Can-Do Statements* reiterate the importance of incorporating tasks in the classrooms that students should accomplish. These tasks must require meaningful and authentic communication, which is central to TBAs and CLT. These *Can-Do Statements* have helped me simplify the courses I teach so that I focus on what the students will be able to do as a result of attending class throughout the semester. These achievable goals are learner centered with the goal of preparing the students to use the language in a real-world context outside of the classroom in the target language. In addition, I have found that *Can-Do Statements* help turn student-learning goals into specific and concrete objectives, which are measurable by students and instructors.

Because both input and output are crucial to learn a language, **Swain (1985)** influenced my understanding of both output and input in CLT and TBA. Swain argues that it is possible to comprehend the meaning without having a syntactic understanding of the input. Defending what Krashen originally said, Swain argues that learners acquire syntax by understanding a message rather than focusing on the form. Both of these claims can be applied to output. Learners create output because they want to convey meaning. Even if the learners' utterance is not completely understandable, interlocutors

may negotiate meaning to facilitate comprehension. Negotiation of meaning is such a big part of language acquisition. When students negotiate meaning, they focus on the meaning; this requires output.

Finally, I read **Long (1996)** because I wanted to know more about the role of negotiation of meaning and comprehensible input. In CLT and TBA, the term *comprehensible input* is an important part of language teaching. This refers to the language exposure that students gain, which is just above what they might understand. Long argues that comprehensible input is sometimes problematic in SLA because speech and texts are often over simplified to the extent that meaning is compromised and ungrammaticality occurs. This simplification might enhance students' comprehension, but the language is not authentic to the target language. Long also argues that while comprehensible input is not enough for acquisition to occur, output is also valuable in SLA. Those who are required to use the language meaningfully score far better and achieve higher levels than those who don't. This coincides with the principles of CLT and TBA that students are required to do something with the language.

When I first heard the term *negotiation of meaning*, it seemed obvious to me that it was an important concept that students could utilize, but I wasn't sure how that was connected with input. After I read how Long addresses the connection, I learned that input becomes more accessible when students can ask questions and clarify when confusion occurs. When students do this, they attend to the meaning and they make connections. This makes their retention of the language better because of their attention and awareness. This is how students can transfer input to intake, fostering long-term retention.

In summary, even though I have read many other sources, these are the sources that have most shaped my understanding of CLT and TBA. While reading, I have been able to implement these findings into my own teaching. I can say that I agree wholeheartedly with CLT and TBA. I have seen the progress of my students as well as my progress as a language instructor. These resources are not a complete list however; they are the articles and books that I have read which have been most influential to my learning of CLT and TBA.

Mapping My Positionality

In thinking about diversity and how it pertains to the classroom, specifically my classroom, there are several influential readings that have shaped my positionality. They have also shaped who I am today and have informed my teaching. I will discuss these readings in different sections: minority groups, exploring colonization, and pedagogical implications.

Minority Groups

In an attempt to save lost or endangered cultures, many researchers study indigenous cultures. Although they start out with good intentions, individuals studying indigenous cultures often harm rather than help these cultures. While reading Smith (1999), I realized that there are so many issues with research of indigenous groups. Some of these include: a loss of indigenous cultures, and researchers' pre-conceived cultural notions and biases. Knowing this, I will be cautious and consider these biases and issues.

Initially when I used to think of diversity, I simply thought of race. However, diversity is not confined to merely race. Much of the reason we have so much diversity is because of class. McLaren (2007) argues that the idea of class has to do with political, social, and financial factors. Many people are criticized, prejudiced against because of their class. This may be because of one's money, or position, or connections to politics, or lack thereof. The idea that there is a class struggle is intertwined with a capitalist society. McLaren (2007) also argues that although social systems usually have good intentions, they do more harm than anything else and should be implemented cautiously. I definitely have perceptions about welfare recipients. I need to check my misconceptions about the unemployed and minority groups. Poverty is definitely an

issue—I have heard of people abusing the system and of people who *don't want* to make more money because they would lose eligibility for Medicaid or welfare. This is an issue, and I think we need to recheck the system. It is not as much about individuals being racist but the system. A lot of life requires knowing the system. For example, if you grew up in a house that knows the system of how to get into college, including scholarship applications, and so forth., you will have the help you need when questions arise. If you don't have examples of others, then it is a lot harder to know the system. I will be completely honest. I grew up with a lot of privileges. I know that is because of the family I was born into and the education that they have. Education overcomes inequality.

I will be honest, before reading **Hooks (2000)**, I believed individuals who called themselves feminist were anti-male. After reading the article, however, I realized that “Feminism is a movement to end sexism, sexist exploitation and oppression” (p. 4). I definitely reconsidered my ideas and stereotypes regarding feminists. I support all individuals' rights. I had always thought that someone who was feminist wanted to work and have the same income and equal rights of a man. But in a way, feminists can also describe a woman who wants to stay home, who hopes her husband will be able to make enough money to survive on one income. The history of teachers initially started with men, but once they had to go to war, women were needed to replace them—but they were paid less because they were women, and it has stayed that way ever since. Society wasn't ready for women to become teachers. Only single women could teach because married women should be at home. Even though this was only part of the reason for the teaching background, many things, including racism and an influx of immigrants, aided women to

become teachers. They needed the women to teach immigrant children in the schools because women were good nurturers and soft-hearted. In considering this history and reading Hooks (2000), my idea of the feminist society has dramatically changed.

Exploring Colonization

A lot of why the idea of “othering,” exists can be traced back to what Hall (1996) calls “The West and the Rest.” This discusses the European idea that Europeans are superior to other people. Because of this belief, Europeans dehumanized many groups, such as the Native Americans and other colonized groups . Even the idea of Orientalism could have been made up. Orientalism might have been different than we view it now. Through reading these ideas, I couldn’t help but self-reflect on my own positionality. Yes, Europeans did discover and colonize areas of the world, but people existed in these areas before Europeans arrived, and their cultures were hugely important. Even though my ancestry belongs to Western Europe, I do not agree with what some individuals did in colonizing. Remembering this in the classroom and respecting all cultures, whether colonized or not, is crucial as a teacher who values diversity. This always made me realize that there are two sides to every story, not just the side that is famous and you are well aware of. I have mostly been fed the pro-European story; the brutalities of colonization have somehow not been involved in my formal schooling. The way I view the world is because of these biases I have been fed. After reading Hall (1996), I have a more clear idea of what happened.

Another article discussing colonization, **Quijano (2007)**, opened my eyes to the idea that dominant cultures may cause cultural destruction. The idea of generalizing cultures is impossible because there are merely experiences of individuals. There are

undoubtedly similarities in a general region or area, but you cannot generalize everyone or even everyone's experiences to a culture.

Pedagogical Implications

In Chapter 8, 9, 10, and 12 of Bell Hooks's book, she argues that sharing personal stories and having the students share their stories embraces the diversity of the class and creates community, and brings people together. Engaged pedagogy produces "self-directed learners, teachers, and students who are able to participate fully in the production of ideas" (p. 43)" Hooks also argues that lecturing is not the best way to allow for diversity to penetrate the classroom and should be kept to a minimum, avoiding any situation where the students hear but don't really listen. Rather than lecturing, a teacher should let the students question and answer, and discuss what is important to them. The students naturally bring with them their cultures and knowledge of those cultures. I don't need to teach the diversity of their cultures, but rather allow them to share and provide a means to bring it out of them.

I have really tried to implement this into my classroom. I have tried to create an open environment with my students, so that they feel that they can share their thoughts and stories. I have noticed that different classes with different individuals are more prone to be open and one person really does make a difference in the overall environment.

Keating (2007) summarized very well how stereotypes hurt us as individuals, especially in connecting with one another, "Categories and labels, although sometimes necessary, can prevent us from recognizing our interconnectedness with others" (p. 2). These differences are destructive especially race. Keating also points out that difference in race does not mean difference in culture. Original discriminations actually came from

places of oppression and manipulation, of wanting to get financial or political gain and trying to create a hierarchy. To be colorblind is not an effective approach; rather it is good to discuss race openly in complex ways. By being colorblind, we would be ignoring the histories of these races or minority groups.

Looking Forward

I am grateful for the opportunities I have had to teach while I have studied. I have been able to incorporate what I learned into my classroom.

Upon my completion of the MSLT degree, I plan to continue teaching at The English Language Institute at The University of Utah. I hope to be able to continue to give my students practice with the language in order to be applied to real-world contexts. I hope one day in the future I can teach English abroad again.

I wish that I will be able to continually learn and that my education will not end when I complete my degree.

References

- Akbari, R. (2008). Transforming lives: Introducing critical pedagogy into ELT Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 276–283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn025>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2015a). *ACTFL performance indicators for language learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-performance-descriptors-language-learners>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (2015b). *World-readiness standards for learning languages*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/all/world-readiness-standards-learning-languages>
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), & National Council of State Supervisors Foreign Languages (NCSSFL). (2013). *NCSSFL-ACTFL can-do statements: Progress indicators for language learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements>
- Ballman, T., Liskin-Gasparro, J., & Mandell, P. (2001). *The communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Pragmatics & beyond, new series (Vol. 108). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Beeman, K., & Urrow, C., (n.d.). *Initial literacy instruction in dual language programs; sequential or simultaneous?* Retrieved from <http://www.thecenterweb.org/irc/pages/fduallanguage-news.html>
- Belanger J. (2004). ‘When will we ever learn’? The case for formative assessment supporting writing development. *English in Australia*, 141, 41–48.
- Beltrán, E. V. (2013). Length of stay abroad: Effects of time on the speech act of requesting. *International Journal of English Studies*, 14(1), 79–96.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes/14/1/155211>
- Biggs, J. B. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning: A role for summative assessment? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 5(1), 103–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050106>
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102–118.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2004). The formative purpose: Assessment must first promote learning. In M. Wilson (Ed.), *Towards coherence between classroom assessment and accountability*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bower, J., & Kawaguchi, S. (2011). Negotiation of meaning and corrective feedback in Japanese/English eTandem. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(1), 41–71.
- Brandl, K. (2007). *Communicative language teaching in action: Putting principles to work*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Brown, H. (2007a). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

- Brown, H. (2007b). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Cahill, L., & McGaugh, L. (1998). Mechanisms of emotional arousal and lasting declarative memory. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 21(7), 294–299.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236\(97\)01214-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0166-2236(97)01214-9)
- Christian, D. (2011). Dual language education. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 1, pp. 3–20). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1): 1–20.
- Crawford, J. (2003). *Hard sell: Why is bilingual education so unpopular with the American public?* Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Language Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory.
- Crystal, D. (2011). *Dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (Vol. 30). John Wiley & Sons (2nd ed.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Dargusch, J. (2014). The nature of feedback in English: Teacher practices. *English In Australia*, 49(3), 21–31.
- De Courcy, M. (2002). *Learners' experiences of immersion education: Case studies of French and Chinese*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- DeCapua, A., & Wintergerst, A. (2004). *Crossing cultures in the language classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Derakhshan, A., & Eslami, Z. (2015). The effect of consciousness-raising instruction on the pragmatic development of apology and request. *TESL-EJ*, 18(4), 1–24.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 515–523. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02071.x>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Motivation* (2nd ed.). Harlow, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Dwyer, M. M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 151–163.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 339–368. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263106060141>
- Ernst-Slavit, G., & Mulhern, M. (2003, September/October). Bilingual books: Promoting literacy and biliteracy in the second-language and mainstream classroom. *Reading Online*, 7(2). Retrieved from http://www.readingonline.org/articles/art_index.asp?HREF=ernstslavit/index.html
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81–104. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524742.007>

- Fortune, T. W., & Menke, M. (2010). *Struggling learners and language immersion education: Research-based practitioner-informed responses to educators' top questions*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA).
- Fortune, T. W., & Tedick, D. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Freed, B. F. (1998). An overview of issues and research in language learning in a study abroad setting. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 4(2), 31–60.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Teachers as cultural workers*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, (12), 234–245.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1632/prof.2007.2007.1.234>
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion*. Santa Cruz, CA: UC Berkeley Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.
- Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Grice, H. (1991). *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Grieve, A. M. (2015). The impact of host family relations and length of stay on adolescent identity expression during study abroad. *Multilingua*, 34(5), 623–657.
- Haarmann, H. (2006). How does the brain cope with multiple languages? In E. M. Rickerson & B. Hilton (Eds.), *The 5 minute linguist: Bite-sized essays on language and languages* (chap. 15). Oakville, CT: Equinox Publishing.
- Hall, J. K. (1995). “Aw, man, where we goin’?”: Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6, 37–62.
- Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). Language teaching in dual language programs. In *Dual language instruction A to Z: Practical guide for teachers and administrators* (chap. 5). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hamayan, E, Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). The first steps: Planning a dual language program. In *Dual language instruction A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators* (chap. 2). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Harlen, W., & James, M. (1997). Assessment and learning: Differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 4(3), 365–379.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969594970040304>
- Hassall, T. (2014). Individual variation in L2 study-abroad outcomes: A case study from Indonesian pragmatics. *Multilingua*, 34(1), 33–59.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/mult-2013-0050>

- Hassall, T. (2015). Influence of fellow L2 learners on pragmatic development during study abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 12(4), 415–442.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/ip-2015-0022>
- Hinkel, E. (Ed.). (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning: Volume 2*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hooks, B. (2009). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. New York City, NY: Routledge.
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. D. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Harlow, United Kingdom: Longman.
- Juarez, L. (2015, March 6). ‘Learning in a language’—MCISD rolls out biliteracy program. *Progress Times*. Retrieved from
<http://www.progresstimes.net/news/local-news/7079-learning-in-a-language-mcisd-rolls-out-biliteracy-program.html>
- Keating, A. (2007). *Teaching transformation: Transcultural classroom dialogues*. New York City, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher’s choices. *TESL Canada Journal*, 27(2), 31–50.
- Kennedy, T. (2006). Language learning and its impact on the brain: Connecting language learning through the mind through content-based instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(3), 471–486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02900.x>
- Kenner, C. (2003). Biliteracy benefits. *Literacy Today*, (37), 21.
- Kim, I. S., LaPointe, L. L., & Stierwalt, J. A. (2012). The effect of feedback and practice on the acquisition of novel speech behaviors. *American Journal of Speech-*

Language Pathology, 21(2), 89-100. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2011/09-0082\)](http://dx.doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2011/09-0082))

- Kramersch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.
- Kurylo, A. (2012). *Inter/cultural communication: Representation and construction of culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Lazaruk, W. (2007). Linguistic, academic, and cognitive benefits of French immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 63(5), 605–628. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.63.5.605>
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York City, NY: The McGraw-Hill Education.
- Lee, J. S., & Jeong, E. (2013). Korean–English dual language immersion: Perspectives of students, parents and teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 26(1), 89–107. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2013.765890>
- Leite, J. (2013) History of Utah dual language immersion. In *Mainstreaming Dual Language Immersion: The Utah Model for Replicable and Sustainable Language Education* (Doctoral dissertation) (pp. 45-99). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Accession Order No. AAT 3411606)

- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12(4), 429-448. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009517>
- Lindholm-Leary, K.J. (2000). *Biliteracy for a global society: An idea book on dual language education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021333/Biliteracy_for_a_Global_Society.pdf
- Lindholm-Leary, K. J. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Llinares, A. & Lyster, R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms. *The Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 181–94. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509>
- Long, M. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In H. D. Brown, C. Yorio, & R. Crymes (Eds.), *Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice*. Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- LoCastro, V. (2003). *An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- LoCastro, V. (2013). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York City, NY: Routledge.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1–40.

May, S. (2008). Bilingual/immersion education: What the research tells us. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 19–34). New York: Springer.

Macedo, D. 2000. The colonialism of the English only movement. *Educational Researcher*, 29(3), 15–__. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029003015>

MacIntyre, P. (2007). Willingness to communicate in the second language: Understanding the decision to speak as a volitional process. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(4), 564–576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00623.x>

MacIntyre, P., Baker, S., Clément, R., & Conrod, S. (2001). Willingness to communicate, social support, and language-learning orientations of immersion students. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 23(3), 369–388.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263101003035>

MacIntyre, P., Dörnyei, Z., Clément, R., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>

Martínez-Flor, A., & Soler, E. A. (2007). Developing pragmatic awareness of suggestions in the EFL classroom: A focus on instructional effects. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée*, 10(1), 47-76.

- Matsuda, A. (2012). *Principles and practices of teaching English as an international language*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Matsumura, S. (2003). Modelling the relationships among interlanguage pragmatic development, L2 proficiency, and exposure to L2. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 465–491. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.4.465>
- Medina-Lopez-Portillo, A. (2004). Intercultural learning assessment: The link between program duration and the development of intercultural sensitivity. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 10, 179–199.
- Met, M (2008). Paying attention to language: literacy, language and academic achievement. In T.W. Fortune & D.J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 49-70). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Mifka, P. N. (2013). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback and the role of individual differences in language learning*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang AG.
- Mitchell, M., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). Interaction in second language learning. In *Second language learning theories* (pp. 160–187). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Molyneux, P. (2009). Education for biliteracy: Maximising the linguistic potential of diverse language in Australia's primary schools. *Australian Journal of Language & Literacy*, 32(2), 97–117.
- Montanari, S. (2014). A case study of bi-literacy development among children enrolled in an Italian–English dual language program in southern California. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 17(5), 509–525.

- Norton, B. (2010). Identity, literacy, and English-language teaching. *TESL Canada Journal*, 28(1), 1.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation* (2nd ed.). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual matters.
- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning*, 50(1), 119–151. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00113>
- Oller, J. & Richard-Amato, P. (Eds.). (1983). *Methods that work: Ideas for literacy and language teachers*. Rowley, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Olsen, L (1998, June). *Reflections on the key role of two-way bilingual immersion programs in this proposition 227 era*. Keynote speech at the Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Conference, Santa Barbara, CA.
- Parkes, J. (2008). Who chooses dual language education for their children and why. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(6), 635–660. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/beb470.0>
- Parkes, J., and Ruth, T. (2011). How satisfied are parents of students in dual language education programs?: ‘Me parece maravillosa la gran oportunidad que le están dando a estos niños’ *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14(6), 701–718. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2011.577762>
- Roberts, G. & Wade, O. (2012, Fall). Utah’s Quest to Mainstream Dual Language Immersion for All Students. *Soleado*. Retrieved from http://www.dlenm.org/images/DLENM_soleado/2012.Fall.Soleado.pdf

- Robinett, C. (2009, Winter). Through the art of listening. *Converge*. Retrieved from http://media.govtech.net/Converge/CVG_Mag_Feb09.pdf
- Roever, C., Wang, S., & Brophy, S. (2014). Learner background factors and learning of second language pragmatics. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 52(4), 377–401. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral-2014-0016>
- Roothoof, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System*, 46, 65–79.
- Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice* (2nd ed.). State College, PA: McGraw-Hill.
- Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage pragmatic development: The study abroad context*. London, United Kingdom: Continuum.
- Scott-Simmons, D., Barker, J., & Cherry, N. (2003). Integrating research and story writing. *Reading Teacher*, 56(8), 742–745.
- Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2009). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle.
- Soler, E. A. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33(3), 417–435.
- Sousa, D. A. (2006). *How the brain learns* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Spicer-Escalante, M., Wade, O., & Leite, J. (2015, March). It takes a village to raise multicultural children: The story of Utah dual language immersion. Paper presented at the meeting of National Association of Bilingual Education, Las Vegas, NV.

- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 169–186. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2005.00086.x>
- Taguchi, N. (2008). The role of learning environment in the development of pragmatic comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(4), 423–452. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263108080716>
- Tatsuki, D. & Houck, N. (2010). *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts*. Crofton, MD.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Tsang, W. (2004). Feedback and uptake in teacher-student interaction: An analysis of 18 English lessons in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *RELC Journal*, 35(2), 187–209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/003368820403500207>
- Unger, M. (2001, November). Equalizing the status of both languages in a dual immersion school. *The ACIE Newsletter*, 5(1). Retrieved from http://carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol5/Nov2001_EqualStatus.html

- VanPatten, B. (2004). *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.
- VanPatten, B., & Uludag, O. (2011). Transfer of training and processing instruction: From input to output. *System*, 39(1), 44–53.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.01.013>
- Walker, C.L. & Tedick, D.J. (2000). The complexity of immersion education: Teachers address the issues. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 5–27
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00049>
- Wannaruk, A. (2008). Pragmatic transfer in Thai EFL refusals. *RELC journal*, 39(3), 318–337. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0033688208096844>
- White, E. (2015). Synergizing formative and summative assessment of presentation slideshows. *Arab World English Journal*, 6(3), 3–29.
- William, D. (2013). Feedback and instructional correctives. In J. McMillan (Ed.), *SAGE Handbook of Research on Classroom Assessment* (pp. 197–212). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Yang, Y., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 235–263.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990519>
- Yuksel, D., & Inan, B. (2014). The effects of communication mode on negotiation of meaning and its noticing. *ReCALL*, 26(3), 333–354.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0958344014000147>

Appendix A Lesson Plan #1

Course: Adult ESL Grammar 310 at Internexus Language School

Class business	-Take Roll, Check Homework	Time: 5-10 minutes
Review	-The students answered review questions that were written on the board on a piece of paper (see A below). They needed to choose the correct verb. As a class go over the answers -Review correct answers from the homework	Time: 10-15 minutes
Warm-up questions with partner	Students ask and answer the questions from the handout in pairs.	Time: 5 minutes
Present perfect in questions	-Focus 3 p. 216 – Focus 3 presents how to use present perfect in questions. Together we discussed how to form and answer questions in the present perfect -Exercise 5 p. 218	Time: 5-10 minutes
Practice Walking gallery topic: traveling	In pairs, the students walked around the room to instructor generated different papers posted. On each paper was written something like beautiful lake, favorite vacation, famous place, museum etc. One partner asked the other a question using the present perfect and the description on the paper. The other partner would answer using the present perfect. For example, student A would say, “What is the most famous place you have been?” and student B would say, “The most famous place I have been is the Eifel tower.” The students would have a brief discussion about the topic before moving on to the next paper posted and continue until they have visited each paper posted.	Time: 25 minutes

A: Review Questions:

Directions: Choose the correct verb.

1. I went/have been to Mexico before.
2. We went/have been to Mexico last week.
3. My dog ate/has eaten my homework last night.
4. Have you seen/you saw this movie?
5. What is something exciting you have done/you did last week?

B: Handout: found at isllcollective.com

13 Questions (10) - Have you ever ...? 

1. (ride) a horse _____>
2. (eat) frogs' legs _____>
3. (see) a ghost _____>
4. (go) to Disneyland _____>
5. (drink) goat's milk _____>
6. (have) oatmeal for breakfast _____>
7. (dream) you could fly _____>
8. (visit) an art museum _____>
9. (play) baseball _____>
10. (climb) the Eiffel Tower _____>
11. (do) a presentation in English _____>
12. (make) a sandcastle _____>
13. (be) in an accident _____>

Student A

13 Questions (10) - Have you ever ...? 

1. (ride) a camel _____>
2. (eat) snails _____>
3. (see) a UFO _____>
4. (go) to Japan _____>
5. (drink) snake blood _____>
6. (have) rice porridge for breakfast _____>
7. (dream) you were chased by a monster _____>
8. (visit) a factory _____>
9. (play) ice hockey _____>
10. (climb) Big Ben _____>
11. (do) something dangerous _____>
12. (be) late for school _____>

Student B

Appendix B Lesson Plan #2, 3

Course: Adult ESL Listening/Speaking 440 at The University of Utah ELI

1. Can-do Statement: I can share my justify my opinion on common issues

2. Student learning outcome: Utilize discussion strategies such as sharing and asking for opinions, agreeing and disagreeing, asking for clarification, and offering facts and examples.

Class business	Take role	Time: 5 minutes
Listening/Speaking topic	- (Write on the board, think, share with a partner, then class discussion) What are some things you did last week? Use at least 4 phrasal verbs.	Time: 10-15 minutes
Review Homework / Phrasal Verb Practice	Phrasal Verbs Week 4 page 2 Match Phrasal verbs with definitions	Time: 10-15 minutes
Opinions	Review the handout expressing opinions and ways to express opinions. See A below	Time: 2 minutes
Video clip	-Video Clip of trailers with questions. What do you think he/she should do? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=adPB_2i6GK8	Time: 10-15 minutes
4 corners activity	See B below	10-15 minutes
Group opinions	See C below	10 – 15 minutes
Create Dialogues	In pairs, students create dialogues -Dialogues should include 1. 6 phrasal verbs 2. Each person expresses his/her opinion 3. Each person agrees and disagree	10 – 15 minutes
Homework	Phrasal verbs exercises Pg 3, 4 Phrasal verbs practice quiz	10 – 15 minutes

A: How to express your opinion

How to express your opinion

Expressing opinion

I think...
 As far as I'm concerned,...
 To my mind,...
 According to me,...
 As I see it,...
 It seems to me that...
 In my point of view/my opinion,...
 From my point of view,...
 I am of the opinion that...
 I take the view that...
 My personal view is that...
 In my experience,...
 As far as I understand/can see/see it,...

Agreeing or disagreeing

Agreeing with an opinion:

I agree with this opinion.
 I completely agree with this view.
 This is absolutely right.
 I couldn't / can't agree more.

Partial agreement:

I agree with this point of view, but...
 This idea is right, but...
 I agree with you, but...

Disagreeing with an opinion:

I'm afraid I can't agree with you.
 I disagree with you.
 I don't agree with you.
 I'm not sure I agree with you
 I think you're wrong

B: Four Corners Activity

In this class activity, students practice expressing and defending their opinions.

Procedure

Place each sign (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree) in a different corner of the classroom.

Read one of the statements that require students to give an opinion, e.g. Celebrities earn too much money.

Tell the students to go to the corner that best matches their opinion.

The students in the same corner discuss why they chose that opinion and then report it to the rest of the class.

After each corner has explained their opinion, the students from the different corners politely refute another corner's opinion and afterwards see if any of the students want to switch to another corner.

Repeat the process with another statement and so on.

Teach-This.com ©2014 Permission granted to reproduce for classroom use.
TEACH-THIS.COM

Four Corners

Statements

1. Celebrities earn too much money.
2. Multinational global corporations are to blame for most problems in the world today.
3. It is impossible to have a happy family life and a successful career.
4. Military service should be obligatory.
5. Everyone who earns a salary should pay income tax.
6. Smoking should be banned in all places, including private homes.
7. Arriving late to meet friends is rude.
8. We shouldn't allow children to eat fast food.
9. The government should build more low cost homes to sell to poor families.
10. Teachers give too much homework.
11. Women will never be equal to men in the workplace.
12. The death penalty is acceptable in some cases.
13. The Internet is a good way to find a boyfriend or girlfriend.
14. Couples should live together for a year or so before getting married.
15. If banks fail and people lose their savings, the government should pay them whatever they lose.
16. Making mistakes in English is OK as long as people understand you.

17. War is not an option for solving international disputes.
18. The government is responsible for making sure that all citizens of a country have at least a minimum living wage job.
19. It's a good idea to charge people for driving through city centers.
20. Real human communication is getting worse because of computers.
21. These days couples split up more because they make the decision to get married too quickly.
22. It's not acceptable for a woman to ask a man out on a date.
23. Quality of life will greatly improve in the future.
24. It's much better to travel independently than in a tour group.

Teach-This.com ©2014 Permission granted to reproduce for classroom use.

C: Group Opinions

In groups of 3 or 4, students discuss topics. The leader chooses the topic and the others must use the other students express their opinion on each topic. Each student should use each expression. Adapted from Reese & Wells (2007)

The leader uses:

Our topic today is ...
 I'd like to know what you think about ...
 What's your opinion on this topic?
 I think we're getting off the topic ...
 Would anyone like to comment?
 Who has a different opinion?
 Let's move to the next topic.

Other participants use these for

Expressing opinion

In my opinion...
 I think (that)...
 My sense is (that)...
 I feel (that) ...
 It seems to me (that)...

Disagreeing

I hate to disagree, but...
 I'm not sure I agree with you, because...
 While I partly agree with you, I do think that...
 I'm afraid I don't agree with you, because...
 While what you say sounds reasonable, I also think that...

Agreeing

I couldn't agree with you more, because...
 I definitely agree that...
 I think you're right that...
 Yes, I agree that...
 I also think that...

Appendix C Lesson Plan #4

Course: Methods 6400 Mock Lesson Plan

1. Can-do Statement: In 20 minutes, students can learn to order food in Italian.

Introduce food vocabulary	Say the food in each section (drinks, salads, pastas, etc.) and use a picture of the food on the power point. Ask the students to repeat the food.	Time: 10-15 minutes
Likes/dislikes	Tell the students which food I like and ask which they like.	Time: 10-15 minutes
Check comprehension	Provide the picture of the food and ask the students how to say the name.	Time: 2 minutes
Order food	In groups of four, the students order food from one person, who is the waiter.	Time: 10-15 minutes