

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-2022

Student Centered Language Teaching: A Focus on Student Identity

Rachel Mano
Utah State University

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

 Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Adult and Continuing Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#), [Latin American Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Modern Languages Commons](#), [Online and Distance Education Commons](#), [Other English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Other Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#), [Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Commons](#), and the [Spanish Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mano, Rachel, "Student Centered Language Teaching: A Focus on Student Identity" (2022). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1623.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1623>

This Report 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 digitalcommons@usu.edu.



STUDENT CENTERED LANGUAGE TEACHING:
A FOCUS ON STUDENT IDENTITY

by

Rachel Mano

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Sarah O'Neill
Major Professor

Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan
Committee Member

Dr. Sarah Gordon
Committee Member

Dr. Crescencio López González
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2022

Copyright © Rachel Mano
All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Student Centered Language Teaching:

A Focus on Student Identity

by

Rachel Mano: Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2022

Major Professor: Dr. Sarah O'Neill

Department: World Languages

This portfolio is a compilation of essays that describe what the writer has come to see as essential topics in second language acquisition. It begins with a professional environment piece, and then a teaching philosophy statement focused on student identity and interaction in the classroom. This is followed by an essay on observations of teaching. The next two sections focus on pragmatic resistance among advanced learners and the importance of preparing learners for peer interaction. The portfolio concludes with an annotated bibliography outlining the main concepts associated with Communicative Language Teaching, a method that is commonly employed in second language teaching.

(81 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the people who have supported me throughout the MSLT program. Dr. O'Neill has been instrumental in answering my questions, observing my teaching, and giving me guidance. Dr. Gordon was the very first person I met in this program. When I walked into her office, she was so welcoming. I was so nervous to start the program and her words of encouragement that day made all the difference in how I felt going into this program. Dr. deJonge-Kannan has gone above and beyond in supporting my writing development. She is not only knowledgeable but also very thoughtful. She uses words carefully and succinctly. Her skill in language was a valuable tool in helping me feel supported as a writer. I would also like to thank my colleagues. The opportunity to bounce ideas off one another is invaluable when you are a student. And finally, but most importantly, I would like to thank my family for their support. It has been a strenuous five semesters full of long days and nights of reading, writing and homework but all through it, they keep encouraging me to keep going. I could not have done this without their love and support.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
TEACHING PERSPECTIVES.....	3
Professional Environment.....	4
Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	6
Professional Development through Teaching Observations.....	14
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES.....	22
CULTURE PAPER	23
Orientation & Reflection.....	24
Exploring L2 learners' Resistance to Pragmatics	27
LANGUAGE PAPER	39
Orientation & Reflection.....	40
The Importance of Preparing Learners and Instructors for Peer Interaction in the Second Language Classroom	43
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	
An Exploration of Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction to Teaching in a Second Language Classroom.....	53
LOOKING FORWARD.....	70
REFERENCES.....	72

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACTFL = American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
CALLA = Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach
CI = Comprehensible Input
CLT = Communicative Language Teaching
ELF = English as Lingua Franca
IELI = Intensive English Language Institute, Utah State University
L1 = First Language / Native Language
L2 = Second Language
LF = Lingua Franca
MSLT = Masters of Second Language Teaching
NS = Native Speaker
NNS = Non-Native Speaker
OCF = Oral Corrective Feedback
PACE = Presentation, Attention, Co-construction, Extension
PI = Peer Interaction
SLA = Second Language Acquisition
SoTL = Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
TL = Target Language
TBLM = Task Based Learning Model
TPR = Total Physical Response
TPS = Teaching Philosophy Statement
USU = Utah State University
ZPD = Zone of Proximal Development

INTRODUCTION

In this portfolio, I have collected my writings on various areas of second language acquisition. My goals in choosing these topics were first, to develop an understanding of major themes in Second Language Acquisition (SLA); second, to learn to define my role as a teacher; and third, to understand how student identity impacts learning.

This portfolio is divided into three major areas. It begins with a compilation of writings that encompass teaching perspectives. This section includes: a professional environment piece, my teaching philosophy statement (TPS), and a reflection on professional development made possible through teaching observations. The teaching philosophy statement reflects the major areas of research in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) that I have focused on during my time in this program. A key element of my teaching philosophy that surfaced while I was preparing this portfolio is the importance of recognizing student identity. Student identity takes a leading role in the TPS and is also investigated within each of the following papers.

After the teaching perspectives section, I present two research perspective papers. The first discusses pragmatic resistance in proficient language learners and the second is an essay on the importance of preparing learners for peer interaction (PI). These two pieces have a direct connection to my goal of identifying the role of the teacher and interpreting how student identity impacts learning. The final piece in this portfolio is an annotated bibliography on communicative language teaching (CLT), one of the pedagogical approaches explored in the Master of Second Language Teaching program. The goal of this bibliography is to outline what CLT is and how to

implement it in the second language classroom effectively. All of these pieces will inform my future teaching.

TEACHING PERSPECTIVES

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The environment in which I see myself teaching is at the college level, in particular novice level Spanish online. I have taught beginning Spanish 1 for 5 semesters. Before becoming a college Spanish instructor, I gained extensive experience teaching adults during my eight years working in the corporate world, where I developed both teaching and presentational skills in a very different context than the university setting. I had the opportunity to present in person and online. I have found that I can apply some of these skills to teaching adults in college. Some of the most important skills needed with adult learners are empathy and being sensitive to one's audience to meet their specific needs. Another skill is creativity in presenting complex information in an easy-to-follow way for all participants. A third is creating paths of success that participants can follow.

I would like to teach novice level Spanish because I find it enjoyable to see students' faces light up when they start making connections with the language. This is especially noticeable in the beginning level courses because everything is so new. Watching the daily progress of students as they begin to communicate in Spanish is so rewarding. In addition, because I enjoy the challenge of connecting with my students using various technologies, and believe online teaching offers many affordances for increasing access, interaction, and engagement, my aim is to teach Spanish entirely online.

It is often thought that the online platform is not personal, but my own experience and a growing body of research has shown that it can be even more personal and engaging than a face-to-face class when instructors take the time to learn about and use the available online tools. The multitude of non-verbal features that students can use to show understanding and engage in the lesson, ensures that more students have the opportunity to participate. I have found that using

these features regularly keeps the class motivated and engaged during the whole of the lesson. Moreover, online learning is expanding due to the COVID pandemic and advances in technology. I believe that students learning a second language can benefit from the modalities afforded in an online class while still enjoying a high quality of education.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Introduction

Going through the Master of Second Language (MSLT) program at Utah State University (USU), I have inevitably found myself reflecting on my previous education to define my current teaching philosophy. In this program I have learned about culture, theories of language acquisition, methodology, and many theoretical and practical aspects of teaching. However, I realize these concepts and theories are just the tip of the teaching iceberg. There is a lot that any student could focus on. As I contemplated what truly encompassed a great language learning experience for students, three main ideas bubbled to the top of my list. These vital concepts are explored below: classroom communication, peer interaction during classroom activities, and the importance of recognizing learner identity.

Classroom Communication

It does not matter how much knowledge an instructor possesses, if she is not able to present in such a way that learners can interpret the target language (TL). It is not enough to know a language to be able to teach it well, because “Knowledge of the subject and comfort in public speaking are helpful, but a lecture is only successful if it communicates the material effectively to the listeners” (Yale Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning, 2021). Van Patten (2015) argues that instructors need to consider *how* they communicate to ensure that learners can interpret the meaning encoded in the target language. According to Shrum and Glisan (2016), creating comprehensible input (CI) for learners is key. As learners communicate in the language classroom, they can rely on CI to provide meaningful guideposts. These guideposts help lead to

effective communication with their instructor and with their peers. Effective language classrooms are communicative in nature. As Swain (1993) recommends, learners need the chance to test out the language for themselves.

Peer Interaction

When instructors are thoughtful about fostering communicative classrooms and focus on enhancing comprehensibility in their words and materials, this has a positive trickle-down effect on what learners can then do with the language when working with one another. Giving learners the time to interact with one another helps them to develop interpretation of meaning.

Negotiation, according to Long (1996), supports language acquisition in that it encourages learners to interpret, ask and answer, and solve language problems with their peers for the purpose of understanding one another. This back-and-forth negotiation of meaning is essential to learners acquiring the target language because it forces them to work through figuring out what their peer is saying while staying in the target language.

Peer interaction (PI) also supports the development of the skills known as noticing and monitoring (Sato, 2017; Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). Such PI skills come into play during interaction as learners begin to offer one another feedback on their output. Not only do learners notice their partner's output but they also notice and adjust their own (Swain, 1993). Where in a face-to-face classroom or online, students may interact in pairs or groups as they learn to negotiation meaning (Long, 1996)

According to Swain (1993) interaction and negotiation of meaning are essential skills of second language acquisition. She adds that output is a necessary component of this interaction.

Her hypothesis states that students need to speak out loud to understand where the language makes sense and where it does not. As they produce output, they can adjust their speech to create more target-like utterances. These adjustments have the potential to be achieved during peer interaction from corrective feedback to self-correction to recasting of what others have said, and more.

In observing a variety of language classes at the college level, I noticed that peer interaction was a readily used component of class instruction. Students were often placed in pairs or groups for role play and other activities. Often, learners were asked to work with a peer to test out the language, negotiate meaning and complete a language task. However, effective PI is not always easy to facilitate; through observation as well as my own experience teaching the novice level Spanish class at USU, I noticed that successful peer interaction is easier said than done. In my own teaching, I look for ways to boost interaction and make it more effective. It is important to recognize obstacles and challenges to PI in the L2 classroom.

Research has shown that learners (and even teachers) may avoid interaction in the classroom for various reasons (Lobatón, 2011; Sato & Ballinger, 2016; Sippel & Jackson, 2015). Such factors as peer dynamics (Lobatón, 2011), perceived differences in proficiency (Sato & Viveros, 2016), or simply not understanding how to collaborate with a peer effectively can all have a negative impact on interaction (Okyar & Eski, 2019; Shrum & Glisan, 2016; Sippel & Jackson, 2015; Swain et al., 2002). One major reason for resistance is that the classroom exercise might even conflict with a learner's identity. I discuss learner identity further below.

Student Resistance in Language Learning and Pragmatics

When a student feels in conflict with the classroom experience, resistance to peer interaction as well as resistance to other types of classroom experiences might occur. Culturally conditioned use of the target language, also known as pragmatics, is one such area where a learner's identity plays a vital role in acceptance or rejection. In general, pragmatics is an important part of language learning because it helps learners connect the words they learn to the cultural meaning in that target language. Pragmatic understanding can help unify cultures and connect people on a different level than just learning words and grammar alone. Pragmatic instruction can also help learners avoid misunderstanding in the TL. As such, instructors should include pragmatic teaching to ensure that students are well equipped to interact in culturally appropriate ways.

In order to address pragmatics, an instructor might teach in the TL and use explicit instruction or modeling as a way to make sure there are no misunderstandings during class instruction. An instructor might also explain to students that developing pragmatic awareness supports communicative and cultural competence and that the learner would do well to include pragmatics as part of their target language lexicon. An instructor might even explain the ill effects of ignoring pragmatics. However, even if an instructor explains the benefits of pragmatic understanding and plans a lesson around it, learners may still resist pragmatics. Research has shown that a learner's identity has a large part to play in this resistance to cultural pragmatics. There can simply be too wide a divide between the learner's own identity and that of the TL culture. Thus, being open to a joint exploration of identity through lessons that help students compare and contrast their own culture with the target culture, can help them reflect on their own

feelings and make decisions about what they want to adopt and explore. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL) World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages recommends cultural comparisons.

To give a specific example of how teaching cultural comparison can help students feel less resistant, I regularly teach my students a lesson about the Day of the Dead, which is a religious celebration in Mexico and some regions of Central and South America. Most of my students are not familiar with this religious celebration and many have a skewed interpretation of its purpose and meaning. Students have commented that they thought it was something related to Halloween, and that it seemed scary. When I give them a lesson in which we investigate this celebration together, the purpose and meaning is explained to them, and they get the chance to make a comparison with their own culture, they become willing to look at the Day of the Dead with a different perspective. They realize that is not about Halloween, but about family, something most students value highly. It is always a nice surprise to see them make this realization in common values shared with the L2 cultures and feel excited about the celebration. In fact, after this lesson, many students have even decided that this is a celebration they would like to adopt.

Sometimes it is not clear, even to the student, why they resist instruction. With guidance and patience, students can investigate their feelings and ideas and come to conclusions on their own. When they have the chance to learn and make conclusions on their own, I have found that they are more willing to listen and explore cultural differences with open eyes and sometimes even take that exploration further.

The Importance of Understanding Learner Identity

When a learner perceives that something in the classroom is too distant from their own cultural identity, they may choose to resist getting involved at all (Lightbown & Spada, 2013; Liu, 2016). Learner identity plays a large part in potential resistance. Because identity is such a personal phenomenon tied to culture language, and experiences it can be very hard to change (Ishihara & Cohen, 2010). Instructors should not attempt to change identity and should try to be as inclusive as possible of all identities and cultures in the classroom. Ultimately, teachers can help students to express their own identity, to have their unique voice heard, and to tell their own story, in the target language.

Instructors need to get to know their students as individuals and help them develop cultural sensitivity. Students come to class with what Vandrick (1997) calls “hidden identities.” Student identities are not readily observable on the outside which means that instructors need to consider how their students might think and feel about certain aspects of classroom instruction before presenting those items to the class. Hidden identities can have an impact on communication and even willingness to interact with peers (MacIntyre et al., 1998) The many learner identities in a class have an impact on the language experience for all involved. Thus, this type of understanding and preparation is crucial.

I would like to share a little bit about my own personal experience and how vital it is to understanding learner identity. I was raised bilingual, English/Spanish. I am also bi-racial and was very shy. As a child, I struggled to understand teachers, not just their foreign language but their emotions. body movements and instructions. Learning to read and write was a challenge for me as I tried to navigate a new environment as a kindergartener with the added challenge of not

being fully able to understand or speak English. Because of my dual-culturalism and bilingualism, I wrestled with how to define my own identity.

I yearned for a teacher who could speak Spanish and would take the time to understand my individual needs and frustrations. I could understand some English when I started kindergarten but not very much. I never found that teacher. As a result, I was lost for a long time in education, struggling to learn. There were no programs available for students like me who were learning English through monolingual immersion in school. This lack of support and understanding of my identity had an adverse effect on my self-esteem growing up. Part of my desire to become a teacher stems from my wish to be the kind of support to my students that none of my teachers could be for me. For this reason, I have a strong belief that the role of the teacher is to be well educated in order to be able to meet the needs of her individual students. Student identities are varied and might be hard to identify but one thing we know for sure is that the basic human need to feel included is very powerful (Akcaoglu & Lee, 2016).

Ishihara and Cohen (2010) say that effective teachers are sensitive to a learner's cultural identity when giving classroom instruction. Students want to feel connected and comfortable in class. As Gonzalez-Lloret (2020) adds, "building a sense of community in a traditional classroom is essential for learning to take place (p. 264)." A sense of community means that each person feels like they belong and that they have a role. When an instructor is cognizant of the potential differences in identity, she can also be prepared for resistance from students. She can skillfully support learners through a joint understanding of identity and carefully plan lessons that are inclusive. This anticipatory thinking lets a learner know that their identity is important.

Conclusion

I believe that all teachers want to create positive and effective experience for their students. But there are many items to consider in order to make that a reality. To begin with, effective communication is essential. As students file in on their first day of Spanish 1010 (novice level) with little more than the word “hola” in their lexicon, they need to leave the classroom that day feeling that they have gained knowledge and can learn more still. The responsibility of creating this motivating first-day feeling of achievement falls on the teacher. The communication teachers engage in with students can either help to enhance language learning or can potentially diminish it. The teacher has the responsibility of creating a welcoming, inclusive classroom that can help all learners and all identities be motivated to engage in their own learning.

PI with OCF has been shown to improve second language development. This interaction helps learners notice their own speech and that of their peers and make corrections and meaningful connections in the target language. This type of interaction is often seen in the language classroom, but it does not always yield the results some teacher might be expecting. There are many factors to consider with peer interaction. It is imperative that teachers are aware that not all students will initially want to interact with their peers in the same way. This is due to many reasons, but one of the most prominent is that of learner identity conflict.

As learners come to the classroom, they bring with them their own (sometimes hidden) identities. It is important for teachers to be aware of potential identities in their classroom and be welcoming and open to exploring ways to engage students despite discomforts with the language, culture, or identity. Teaching is not just simply applying the right methodology and

hoping for the best (Varghese et al. (2005). It is more than that. Aside from education that helps prepare a teacher for the classroom experience, a teacher prepares herself and her students for class by following best practices like those discussed above. As teachers focus on communication, peer interaction, and the impact of learner identity on language learning, they will be far more effective in the classroom. When a teacher puts this knowledge into action, learners are more likely to feel confident and eager to learn.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHING OBSERVATION

Introduction

I have had the valuable opportunity to observe Spanish instructors teaching in several contexts: beginning Spanish in middle school, high school, college, and even an adult online program. In addition, I also observed classes in which I do not speak the target language. These were a mid-level Korean language class and an advanced German literature class. These different observations gave me a wide variety of teachers from which to draw knowledge. Because the Spanish language observations were all in the same language in different contexts, it helped me make a comparison between the best strategies for teaching regardless of learner age. It was helpful to watch a variety of teachers in a variety of schools and teaching through a variety of modalities. I observed face-to-face, online, and hybrid models of instruction. In the end, there were a lot of differences between teaching styles and personas but there were some strong similarities that I would like to touch on. These similarities are the main take-aways from the observation and will inform my own teaching:

- 1) The importance of a comprehensible language experience.
- 2) Interaction between teacher, learner, and peers helps build language knowledge.
- 3) The impact of teachers being aware of and working with different student identities.

Present It So They Get It

As students come into a class with high expectations and eager hearts to learn a new language they can easily be let down when they feel confused or lost during a class session. By

the same token, an unmotivated student can change her attitude around when she feels competent in understanding and using the target language. The effort an instructor makes in ensuring that classroom instruction is comprehensible is key in keeping learners engaged, motivated, and learning.

During my observations, one key component of teaching rose to the surface and that was comprehensibility. Since some instructors taught in person and some online, their modes of keeping the target language comprehensible varied. Those who used Zoom (an online meeting platform) frequently employed multimodalities to keep learners actively engaged. The Zoom features, such as written chat, breakout rooms, emoticons, video, screen sharing, and audio sharing, kept learners attentive. I also observed the use of PowerPoint, Google Slides, annotation, and the white board.

Two language classes used Google Docs to type words and phrases that were spoken during class up on the screen for learners to see. I had never seen this done before. But this was very helpful, and I will use it in my own teaching. I realized that along with using all the other tools to help make language comprehensible, this added use of writing while speaking helped learners with noticing language form more readily. Although much research has shown that explicit grammar instruction does not support language acquisition (VanPatten, 2017), recent research by Wong & Simard (2018) reveals a different perspective. They say that there is a need for helping learners gain explicit knowledge of grammar in language classes. When learners are taught grammar explicitly, they tend to be able to use this knowledge in future language tasks. This is because explanations make grammar concepts more salient and recognizable.

For those instructors who taught in person, comprehensibility had a lot to do with their body movements, gestures, and voice inflections. These types of movements were most common in the beginner level courses as well as with the younger learners. Nonverbal communication appeared to be very effective in helping students negotiate meaning.

When I observed middle school and high school beginner Spanish classes, I often saw the teacher employing another important element: humor. They were obviously trying to meet the needs of that age group and to engage students. Visual aids were important in this context. Teachers also referred to posters on the wall, used projectors, wrote on white boards, and had images for students to look at to help interpret meaning. All of these served as tools to enhance comprehensibility in their classrooms. Confidence in language learning helps learners feel capable of interacting with the teacher and each other more. When learners feel confident with the input, they can then feel confident with their attempt at the output.

Interaction is Key

All language learners need the chance to test out the language. This “testing out” helps learners proceduralize grammar (Sato & Lyster, 2012), but it also helps them interpret the meaning and use of the language as well (Swain, 1993). As I got the chance to observe two classes in which I did not know the language. These languages were German and Korean. In these instances, I was transported to a position that I seldom experience, that of the novice language student. This perspective was illuminating! Since I could not understand the language, I focused heavily on the interaction in the class. Because interaction is a key component of language acquisition, the effort an instructor puts into encouraging learners to interact is key to language development (Long, 1996; Swain, 1993).

When peers did interact, as I noticed in an English as a Second Language (ESL) college class observation in the USU Intensive English Language Institute (IELI) program, students from diverse backgrounds had no problem interacting and working together. They generally seemed to like the chance to talk to a classmate. The biggest advantage to the peer interaction that I observed was that peers generally bounced ideas off each other first. And they supported one another through corrective feedback. This enabled students to work together to find the best way to say or write something. They debated the language forms, made corrections and once they agreed, they wrote down their answer.

Learners generally report that they feel more comfortable working with peers than with a teacher (Philp et al., 2014). Shrum and Glisan (2016) argue that a classroom environment must first be designed to encourage interaction. An interactive classroom is one in which there is time and space set aside for learners to ask questions and share opinions. The comfort level of learners is important to consider during classroom instruction. When instructors design and promote a comfortable learning environment, learners will demonstrate a lowered affective filter (Krashen, 1982). The affective filter is the learner's comfort and attitude toward learning. When it is set low, the student is not feeling tension. When it is set high, the opposite is true. This lowered filter positively affects their learning (Sato & Ballinger, 2016). This is to say that when students are feeling comfortable, they are open to learning and new experiences. According to Krashen (1982), when the affective filter is low, input can make its way into the language acquisition device, where it can be "acquired" and monitored and used as output. According to Shrum and Glisan (2016), "a nonthreatening environment encourages self-expression and learner autonomy (p. 37)." Through my observations, I tried to notice different ways in which the teachers attempted to lower the affective filter and encourage effective interaction.

The combination of interaction with oral corrective feedback enhances acquisition (Sato & Lyster, 2012). Getting the chance to test out the language without having to perform or be graded is a great support to learners who are novice learners. There is a shared feeling of togetherness, which is helpful to learning (Sato & Viveros, 2016). Students in these observations really did seem like they were comfortable with one another and thus worked well with each other.

In almost all my observations, I noticed that learners engaged with the instructor the most and then with peers second. This was the case for the in-class observations, as it was for the online class observations. I believe that most instructors are under the impression that peer interaction is very helpful and might even be aware of research that supports this claim, but not everyone had their students engaged with peers in the particular lessons I observed.

The Impact of Student Identity on the Classroom Instruction

During the observations, it was evident that the students, for the most part, genuinely seemed engaged and interested in the classroom instruction, regardless of proficiency level or age. This leads me to believe that these teachers are connecting well with their students.

Each student's identity is different upon entering the classroom. Since a teacher does not know what the class dynamics will be until the day of class, I think it is important to be flexible with lessons and discussion. This is not to say that the teacher abandons her prepared lesson, but that instead, she is willing to adapt it to students' needs. This is important to promote a more inclusive classroom environment in which all voices may be heard, and all learning styles supported.

One of the classes I observed allowed a lot of free flow of conversation for the students. I think this is a great example of meeting the needs of the students based on their identity. As the students led the discussion, they seemed comfortable about the topic and stayed interested in the discussion longer than other students I had observed who weren't given the opportunity to lead.

In observing these excellent teachers, I could see that the teacher's attitude about discussion had an influence on the flow of conversation. If she was willing to help students build the discussion they wanted, it not only kept the students involved but also carved out a place for the teacher to play an integral role as guide. This could be seen in how teachers pose questions to the class and generally converse with the class. In one particular class the teacher asked the students about their weekend. One student mentioned what she did, and the teacher picked up that theme and created further conversation about it. She could then use the theme to model correct output and even outline some grammar points.

Although I believe that teachers need to come to class prepared with an idea of where they want the lesson to go, it is important to be able to allow the students to lead the flow of communication within the lesson. When a teacher is prepared with a guideline for her lesson and offers up great questions to engage all students by being understanding of their identities, students can mold the conversation to meet their needs. This also allows the teacher to work with students when they have discomforts about anything in the lesson. This type of engagement can help lower the affective filter and reduce resistance in students who feel that the language experience is too distant from their own identity.

Conclusion

These observations have given me the chance to reflect on my own teaching. They helped me think about what might be working in my class and what could be improved upon. Observing also widened my perspective about what is possible. We don't all have to teach the same way. I found it useful to see the variety of ways in which we may tackle grammar or long lists of vocabulary, for instance. Observing someone else teach is especially helpful to a new teacher because it gives her the opportunity to see how a teacher works with students, material, and time.

An observation is just a snapshot in time. There is so much more behind what we are seeing, including other lessons and follow-ups, other techniques and activities. We can't make an accurate assessment of whether a technique works or not based on a few minutes of class time. If the observation helps us reflect, I think we should study that point of teaching in more depth to better understand it. After we know more, we can then apply it to our own teaching.

The biggest take-away for me about the observations exercises was reflecting on myself as a student in my own graduate classes. During graduate work, we are made to read, write and hopefully think! I find that professor's lessons that follow the pattern of being prepared, posing great questions, and letting students lead the discussion, have been the most engaging for me. It is this kind of lesson that helped me become more curious about certain areas of research in the scholarship of teaching and learning. These professors were prepared and knowledgeable. They posed great questions that got students thinking and thereby students felt like they owned the lesson. I know we covered the necessary material we were meant to as well, but it felt like the class led the way through the material instead of the professor. Guiding student learning is a skill. I saw this student-centered approach in many of the classroom observations, and even more

so in my graduate courses. When students feel that their ideas matter, they are engaged, they get curious, they create. Through observation and personal experience, I know it makes a difference in student engagement.

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

CULTURE PAPER

Exploring L2 Learners' Resistance to Pragmatics

ORIENTATION AND REFLECTION

The idea for the following paper came from a course that I took in the Master of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) graduate program. The class, taught by Dr. deJonge-Kannan, was called Second Language Pragmatics. The assignment was to write on a certain aspect of pragmatics associated with the target language we would teach.

While reading literature on the importance of teaching pragmatics, one major theme stood out to me: the possible consequences of ignoring pragmatics. Ishihara and Cohen (2014) and McKay (2009) argue that L2 speakers who resist TL pragmatics can be misunderstood and even perceived as being prejudiced. These, of course, would be situations any speaker would want to avoid. If misunderstandings and bad impressions are the potential results of resisting pragmatics, I did not believe that anyone would want to resist it. But, still, there are language learners who choose to disregard TL pragmatics, even when they know what is considered appropriate. I wanted to know why, and I wanted to know what I could do to create an environment in the classroom that would help learners accept TL pragmatics.

In my life, I have seen proficient speakers of a foreign language who choose to ignore pragmatics. I thought maybe they didn't know the potential effects it can have, or maybe they did know but they didn't care. In doing this research, I found that there are many reasons for resistance. Some of those reasons are negative transfer from the L1, the effects of English as the Lingua Franca (ELF), and identity conflict. Each of these can have an impact on resistance or acceptance of pragmatic norms.

In my readings I found that conflict might arise when there is too wide of a gap between the speaker's L1 customs and language use and those of their L2 (Lightbown & Spada, 2012; Liu, 2016). For example, if while performing the speech act of requesting food a learner feels that the act would be rude in their native language, they might feel that it is also rude in the target language. Essentially the speaker is under the impression that the speech act should not be used at all because it is not appropriate in their native language. And they would be wrong. This is an example of L1 negative transfer. The issue that arises in this situation is that native speakers expect their customs and norms to be followed by speakers. To them, the speech act is not unusual, it is customary. By resisting its use, the native speaker might presume that the L2 user is not in favor of their customs or is even prejudiced toward TL speakers. This, of course, can cause miscommunication and conflict.

One of our goals as language teachers is to prepare our students for communication with native speakers. This does not only mean that our students know the proper grammar and vocabulary to carry on a conversation, but also includes learners being able to communicate within the customs and cultural expectations of the target language community.

I know I will inevitably have students in my class who will resist using pragmatic norms of the target language. By being aware of the potential factors that negatively impact pragmatic acceptance, I am prepared to work with students on any challenges that they may have in relation to pragmatics. I can, therefore, take the necessary steps to prepare pragmatic lessons that steer students away from resistance and in favor of acceptance.

My role as a teacher is to prepare my students to communicate in the target language. This means that I need to make an effort to introduce pragmatics in the language classes that I

teach. It also means that I should teach those lessons explicitly and make connections with the native language of my students, to avoid miscommunication. Through this research I was able to better understand the points of view of both the non-native speaker and the native speaker. And I was also able to realize the momentous importance of this topic to language learners. Because of this class, I have begun creating pragmatics lessons for my language class. I also incorporate pragmatics throughout each lesson in some form. I have found that students are interested in this area of study, and they feel more confident and capable in the language when they understand the pragmatic norms that are associated with it.

Introduction

When acquiring a second language, there is more to learn than just pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax. There is also a need to understand the patterns and routines of the language as it is used by proficient speakers. This is referred to by Austin (1975) and Cohen (2008) as **Speech Acts**. Speech acts can include routine phrases that include thanking and apologizing, for example. Knowing the proper use of speech acts in the second language signals understanding of the culture and pragmatic awareness. Using speech acts appropriately involves the ability to thank or apologize in a way that is consistent with the norms of the members of the native community. This is distinct from the lexical and grammatical knowledge. And as Cohen (2010) puts it, using speech acts appropriately is “being able to go beyond the literal meaning of what is said, in order to interpret the intended meanings, assumptions, purposes or goals” (p. 5). The manner in which a proficient speaker uses their language to express themselves reveals key aspects of their identity and culture. And when second language users acquire and use these speech acts appropriately, they are displaying empathy and interest in the proficient user and their culture. This enables richer communicative acts for both interlocutors. Their communication can evolve from simply talking to each other to building unity.

Though pragmatic competence would be a second language learner’s ultimate goal, research shows there are many reasons why a learner who is otherwise proficient in the language and understands pragmatics might ultimately resist applying pragmatic norms. Occasionally a speech act in the first language (L1) has a different meaning than it does in the second language (L2). Some of these differences can be minor and can easily be adopted by the learner, but when

the difference touches upon sensitive issues such as hierarchy or cultural identity, interference may occur, resulting in resistance rather than adoption of L2 pragmatics.

The Effects of the First Language (L1) on Pragmatic Use

When influence of the first language on the second language leads to error, it is referred to as L1 negative transfer. Laich-Gomez (2016) shares an example of L1 negative transfer in relating an anecdote about a student refusing to use the imperative form while ordering food at a lunch counter in Spain. The student was familiar with the form and knew it was appropriate but resisted using it. She felt uncomfortable using the imperative form because in English, it carries a strong illocutionary force. On the other hand, in Spanish, in the context of ordering food, it does not carry the same force. She believed that if the imperative is rude in English, it must be rude in Spanish as well. Despite having learned the L2 pragmatics of ordering food, the influence from her L1 prevented her from implementing what she already knew was correct. This negative transfer from the L1 to the L2 caused the student to make a choice in her speech act that was not consistent with target-language pragmatics. Consequently, she did not communicate her meaning appropriately and may have appeared, to other proficient speakers, as resistant.

Another example is described by Liu (2016) who also studied pragmatic awareness. Liu interviewed three foreign pre-service language teachers living in Colombia. They were all non-native speakers of Spanish (NNS), and university students. They were all also considered proficient in Spanish. During an interview with the students, all three shared similar experiences of feeling “uncomfortable or awkward” in trying to use the language as the local people did (p. 140). Their first reaction was to take offense when pragmatic norms didn’t match their L1.

The students were proficient speakers and were immersed within the community, so why did they have so much trouble? Their resistance was due to influence of the L1 on the L2. They related that certain phrases and words (in translation) would be considered rude or even sexist in their L1 such as calling a young woman, “Mi amor.” These are considered pet-names to Americans and not a signal of respect. Therefore, when a native speaker used speech acts in a manner that did not match the L1, they thought that person was being rude to them. This caused the teachers to resist using the norms of the native language.

The three teachers reported that after living in the country for some time, they began to understand that their resistance was due to negative transfer from the L1. They noted that the native speakers’ words choices in fact showed courtesy, reduced distance, offered friendship, and demonstrated consideration. This is something they had not realized because of the negative transfer from the L1 to the L2. Although these NNS teachers were proficient in the target language and lived in the country for some time, they struggled to avoid transference. In like manner, Laich-Gomez (2016) reports that even learners who are proficient and familiar with pragmatics may still “deviate from target language sociocultural norms” (p. 3).

The L1 has a significant influence on the use of the L2, especially in pragmatics use. Since L1 and L2 speakers come from different cultures and backgrounds, it makes sense that there could be discomfort in these situations. Because of this, resistance is a likely result. For those who feel discomfort, accepting and using certain pragmatic norms might be avoided. It might even seem reasonable to some NNS to disapprove of speech acts, despite the negative effects these reactions might have on their relationships with NS. The reason for this resistance can be found in the NNS’s desire to retain their identity. A person’s culture is a major aspect of

their identity and therefore defines the choices they make in many things but especially in speech. This brings me to the second reason for resistance: conflict with identity.

Resisting as a Result of Identity Conflict

Identity is intrinsically tied to culture, and cultural norms. Norms differ from one community to another. For example, in one culture or sub-culture it might be considered rude to ask personal questions directly in casual conversation, while in others this is an expectation. Different cultures have different norms surround greetings, apologies, negotiations, excuses, expressing gratitude, and countless other aspects of language. In acquiring a second language, a learner is not simply exposed to a new language, but also, to some extent, exposed to a new potential identity.

For language learners, the gap between their cultural identity and that of their L2 might be too wide a gap to bridge. This space might create resistance in taking on pragmatic norms of the L2. Schumann (1986) was the first to introduce what is referred to as the Acculturation Model which explains that learners will attend to pragmatics to the degree that they are acculturated. Liu (2016) explains more. “Hence, the greater the linguistic, social and cultural distance between learners’ L1 and the target language, the more difficult it may be for learners to overcome the contradictory nature to bridge the cultural disparities” (p. 135). Feng (2015), Kim (2014), and Laich-Gomez (2016) concur with this idea. They suggest that such aspects as social status, power, and hierarchy influence learners’ willingness to adopt pragmatics. To the language learner, differences in cultural norms may feel like an attack on their own identity.

An example by Kim (2014) shows how Korean mothers were unwilling to take on American pragmatic norms when speaking to their own children. To paraphrase the study in general, American mothers use polite forms when speaking to their children such as asking their children what they would like instead of telling them. Korean mothers felt that if they used polite forms with their children like the American mothers did, they would lose dignity and respect. This is why they told their children what they should do instead of asking them for their opinion. To the Korean mothers, the American way of speaking to children did not garner respect from their children and respect for your parent is a highly valued aspect of the parent-child relationship according to this study.

The words, structures, and phrasing we choose to use can either support or contradict our personal identity. According to Kim (2014), language is a tool by which we display our sense of self. This tool enables the perpetuation of the identity. When cultures vary greatly, this creates a dilemma for language learners. Do they learn the language and take on the pragmatics as well, ignoring their own identity or do they keep their identity intact and run the risk of miscommunication and prejudice? Spencer-Oatey and Wang's (2019) research on Face delves into this internal conflict more deeply. Their research shows that identity is a crucial element in either adopting or resisting pragmatic norms of native speakers.

According to Spencer-Oatey and Wang (2019) Face is the persona that we believe others should see and who we believe we are. It is the identity that a person has constructed and hopes to maintain regardless of circumstance. When immersing oneself in a new cultural environment, identity and face are on display. This can be a threatening feeling for language learners, as maintaining face is crucial to identity. Feeling threatened can lead to resistance as seen in Kim

(2014), who studied 30 Korean students in a Midwest University in the US. Subjects ranged from age 24-59 years old and were all graduate students. The author found that accepting compliments was hard for Korean learners. They would respond to a compliment with the word “thank you” only because it was expected of them, but they did not feel like it was appropriate to accept a compliment this way. They reported that they were uncomfortable accepting a compliment because it went against their identity and cultural norm of being modest. Kim (2014) says “...language is the place in which one’s sense of self is constructed, yet it is also a site of struggle” (p. 7). There is a fine balance between staying true to one’s L1 culture while adopting the L2 language.

Kondo’s (2008) research of Japanese Foreign Language speakers (EFL) offers a similar example. In the research, focused on apology and regret, Kondo noted that Japanese EFL speakers used these two speech acts more and also differently than their more proficient English-speaking counterparts. Proficient English speakers would generally offer fewer apologies and regrets than the Japanese learners and would also include excuses as part of their apology. Japanese EFL learners were explicitly taught how to use apology and regret in English during this research, but they refused to use it the way they were taught. Kondo notes that to the Japanese EFL learners, “I’m sorry” is part of their social norm in Japan and they use it because it helps maintain harmony in their culture. Saying “I’m sorry” also shows humility, which is an integral part of Japanese identity. The need to retain a humble persona, while using either language, superseded the explicit pragmatic instruction they received about apologizing. This demonstrates that the cultural influence and the need to maintain that identity was more important to these learners than being pragmatically appropriate in English.

Both the L1's influence and the speaker's identity may lead to resistance of pragmatic use. The desire to portray oneself as a competent user of the target language is an ideal for beginners. But achieving that goal can be challenging and is a long process. A third factor influencing whether a learner will adopt L2 pragmatic norms is the rise of English as a global or international lingua franca (LF), which has developed English into a flexible tool that meets the needs of NNS for their own specific purposes.

NNS Resistance to Pragmatics- English as a Lingua Franca

English is considered a universal language and as such, many speakers have adopted it to fit their educational, business, and personal needs. It is extensively used in a broad range of countries, often between non-native speakers (NNS) whose native language is not English. In studying English use around the world, McKay (2009) noted that in India, NNS tend to use English differently than native speakers (NS) in the United States. In fact, their English was so different that they considered their use to be too polite for the US but quite appropriate for contexts and cultural norms in India.

According to Kondo (2008) and McKay (2009), English learners may reject pragmatics simply because they bend English to their own communicative needs. Since they are not in the dominant native English-speaking country, pragmatics aren't as necessary. In fact, their own culture's pragmatics can take precedence in these circumstances. According to Taguchi (2018) the "target language use no longer belongs to the native speaker community alone (p. 134)." And as more communities use English as their shared language, it will continue to evolve to meet those needs.

There are many types of communities that are examples of this metamorphosis of English. Taguchi (2018) emphasizes that even in education, specifically CLIL (Content and Language Integrative Learning) the classroom community itself develops its own style of speech acts. The everyday speech between teacher and student is in itself a new development of the shared language. In Kondo's (2008) research of Japanese EFL learners, it was noted that during the interaction of L1 Japanese students, they began to develop a new interlanguage between themselves. Their communication was not solely Japanese or English but instead a version of their own making. In this case, they ignored English language structure and norms and bent it to meet their own purposes.

Bending the language to meet the needs of the interlocutors is an essential characteristic in language use among NNS. The goal of English speakers may not be to speak like natives. Just as they have their own goals when it comes to language acquisition, they also have their own opinions about pragmatics. Keeping to the pragmatics that is most dominant or comfortable between the interlocutors, helps to ensure continued communication between speakers. In addition, using NNS pragmatics is not necessarily a sign that speakers have not learned enough of the target language to get it right, but instead it demonstrates that they are using English in the most appropriate way for who they are and how they use the language.

NNS Resistance to Pragmatics- The "Let it Pass" Principle.

Another factor in resisting pragmatics between NNS is the principle of "let it pass" (McKay, 2009), which is observed when NNS speakers interact with one another and appear comfortable with incorrect or inappropriate usage simply because they are aware this is neither of their native language and their errors are not impeding communication. Kim (2014) shares an

example of the “let it pass” principle in research involving a business professional working in Japan. The businessperson was taking Japanese lessons in order to improve her communication with her co-workers and advisor. In talking with her advisor, she generally did not refer to him with the proper honorific, even though the use of such is important in Japanese culture. As the advisor knew that she was still learning the language, he did not take offense when she spoke without using the proper honorifics. He simply “let it pass,” allowing her the latitude to use the form that she understood at the time.

Adjusting English to meet the needs of the interlocutors is valuable in extending communication across many contexts in which English is used as a lingua franca. Instead of focusing on using English perfectly to match NS norms, NNS can instead focus on communicating to meet their native culture norms through the use of English. Ignoring English pragmatics can be useful and practical in those contexts, especially for those who are interacting in business, education, or in the community where the dominant cultural norms are still in play. Just as English is bent to meet practical needs, it can also be bent to make a statement of resistance to the culture itself. Resistance to the culture through pragmatic resistance will be discussed in the following section.

Resistance to Pragmatics as a Sign of Preference for One Culture

Davis (2007) reports on a study he conducted with Korean ESL learners in Australia who were taught Australian pragmatics and speech acts. Surprisingly, the Korean ESL learners decided to ignore them. In interviewing them about this choice, it was found that they tended to resist using them because they preferred to portray themselves as North American in their English use rather than Australians. There was, in essence, an understanding among the learners that the

North American dialect was more desirable than the Australian. According to Davis, because “Korean ESL learners often have a long history and familiarity with North American styles before they come to Australia” (p.8), they also tend to identify with North Americans over Australians in terms of their language use.

Another technique used by NNS to demonstrate resistance to the culture is through code-switching. Code-switching is the interspersed use of two languages in one conversation. The interlocutors have both the L1 and L2 in common. They are not exclusively speaking the L1 or L2; they are using both simultaneously. An example would be saying “Mamá said I can go to the parque today (*Mom said I can go to the park today*). Code-switching develops in situations where interlocutors are exposed to two languages at the same time. An example is a native-Spanish speaker being raised in the United States where the dominant language is English.

Dumitrescu (2015), in studying Spanish speakers in the United States, mentions that English has a strong influence on Spanish speaker’s day to day lexicon. This influence also persists in communities among those who, “‘deplore’ the invasion of Anglicisms (p. 15).” This is to say that it is often challenging keeping the native language free of influence from the L2. Dumitrescu’s research argues that code-switching among Hispanic Americans is used to retain the speaker’s bilingual identity, but also to attempt to “balance the power in the language domains of the US (p. 16).” As Dumitrescu’s research demonstrates, Hispanic Americans don’t see themselves as only Hispanic or only American, but as both. They represent a type of new culture. This is a unique position, in which they take pride. Code-switching connects the bilingual community to each other but also helps bilinguals assert their dual linguistic and cultural membership among those of the dominant culture.

Conclusion

It is imperative to make space for pragmatics in language courses. As noted in this review, resisting pragmatics can have a negative effect on building relationships with native speakers. In order to help NNS and NS build relationships that are worthwhile, language students need not only learn how to speak the target language but how to perform the speech acts that are acceptable in the culture of the target language.

However, even with instruction, learners can still resist pragmatic norms. It is my opinion that resisting pragmatics, especially when the target language is quite distant from the native language in cultural expressions and attitudes, can continue to exist regardless of instruction. For this reason, a language instructor needs to take a few key points in mind when preparing lessons.

First, pragmatics must be included in instruction. Second, teachers need to be aware of the reasons for resistance. Through this knowledge, instructors can preemptively plan lessons that can successfully guide learners to consider the target culture pragmatic norms. This can be done with sensitivity and understanding. Third, instructors must also be aware of the importance of their student's identity and their own goals in learning the language. These goals may not be the same as the instructors. Learning a second language is challenging in itself. Taking on pragmatics will take time.

As many students tend to not have exposure to the culture of the target language they are learning, it is likely unless they travel abroad, that they will not be practicing the pragmatics that they are learning. That is not to say that instructors should ignore teaching pragmatics but instead, it means that instructors can measure the pressure they put on language students to adopt

it based on the situation. As noted in this essay, some learners may feel that by taking on these norms they are distancing themselves from their native culture and community. As identity is such a primal part of the human experience, instructors need to be aware of how important it is for language learners to express their own identity and culture all while learning a second language.

LANGUAGE PAPER

The Importance of Preparing Learners and Instructors for Peer Interaction in the Second
Language Classroom.

ORIENTATION AND REFLECTION

Peer Interaction (PI) is commonly seen in language classes, for example when students work with a partner on a given language task, such as: filling out a survey together, or asking someone's like or dislikes or just talking about their weekend plans. The purpose of PI is to enhance opportunities for language learners to test out the language for themselves. When learners get a chance to use the language to ask each other questions and try to answer them, they engage in negotiation of meaning, which helps them understand how to use the language in communication. PI activities are also more useful to students' language development when compared to listening to a lecture about language.

I was very interested in exploring the topic of PI from my first semester in the MSLT program. I had observed many language teachers use PI activities in their classrooms and I wanted to know how this helped students' language acquisition. In fact, in my experience, it seemed as if students did not like PI activities very much. I also noticed that during PI, students seldom spoke in the target language, they took a long time to get settled and start on the task, some students could complete the task quickly while others could not, and some students even used this time to check their social media accounts. In my opinion, PI didn't seem to be a very useful tool.

During my first few semesters of teaching, I struggled with PI. I knew that this was a useful method for students to learn the language, but I could not yet see how this was supposed to work. I wanted to research more about how I could make PI more productive for my students. In doing so, I found that PI is not as simple as placing a pair of students together and giving them a worksheet to finish together. There are many factors that may reduce the potential success of PI.

In the following essay, I will first define PI. Second, I will comment on the importance of teacher preparation. Then, I will address student resistance to PI. Next, I will introduce the importance of oral corrective feedback during PI for best results. And finally, I will lay out the current models of PI that a teacher can borrow to get started with using PI effectively.

Preparing teachers through education that addresses the benefits of PI can help to reduce the lack of knowledge or interest some teachers have in PI in the classroom. Because not all teacher education courses are the same, some teacher may not be aware of the benefits of PI. Other teachers may be aware of the benefits of PI, but they simply do not feel it is in the best interest of their students to use it. Unfortunately, when teachers don't implement PI, their students do not reap its benefits. As shown in this essay, research overwhelmingly supports PI for second language acquisition. When teachers are prepared, they can better help their students participate successfully in PI.

Not all students like PI. Students may resist PI for a variety of reasons, from a discomfort with the social dynamic of working with another student, to identity issues as explored in the portfolio above, to feeling insecure about their own abilities. As will be addressed in the following essay, oral corrective feedback (OCF) is a valuable component of PI. OCF requires that students speak out loud to one another and correct themselves and each other. This is not something all students find comfortable. Moreover, as research has also shown, novice learners and those exposed to communicative language teaching (CLT) may struggle with speaking to one other in the TL and potentially receiving OCF. Finally, I have laid out some of the models that teachers can use to help them incorporate PI in their classrooms.

When teachers are educated on the benefits of PI and equipped to prepare students for OCF, gains in proficiency are likely to result. These gains are worth the effort of learning about PI and the effort to prepare students to use it.

Introduction

Peer interaction has become a hallmark of the language classroom experience for second language learners. I have frequently observed learners working together with peers during language lessons. This is done with the understanding that interaction has a positive effect on second language acquisition (Long, 1996; Swain, 1993; Van Patten, 2017). Although research has shown that peer interaction has many language-related benefits for learners, there is other research that shows that peer interaction isn't as simple as just "pairing up" (Swain et al., 2002; Storch & Aldorsari, 2012; Tomita & Spada, 2013). In fact, as will be outlined in this review, several factors can inhibit or promote successful interaction. Without awareness of these factors, learners and instructors may encounter challenges that can stop interaction in its tracks.

Defining Peer Interaction

Peer interaction is best defined as the back-and-forth dialogue between language peers for the purpose of understanding one another when communicating (Long, 1996). VanPatten (2017) describes two main purposes of communication: building relationships and gathering information. As learners engage in activities in class for the purpose of building a relationship or to gather information to solve a language-related problem, they are participating in peer interaction. This can be accomplished through various types of class activities.

Based on the long line of research that has demonstrated that interaction is beneficial to language development, it is hard to argue with such a methodology not being essential in language classrooms (Long, 1996; Sato, 2017; Sato & Ballinger, 2012; Sato & Lyster, 2012).

Lobatón (2011) argues that the more students interact, the more their target language proficiency will develop. And Walqui (2006) goes as far as to say that interaction is how learning occurs.

According to Swain (1993), interaction enhances learning through a very particular feature called output, which is defined as the interaction that gives learners the opportunity to test out the target language through production with a peer. Production enables learners to notice their speech and that of their peer, which is an important part of language learning. Lobatón (2011), Swain (1993), and Swain and Tocalli-Beller (2002) argue that when peers produce language together, and monitor one another, they begin to build a metalinguistic understanding of the target language. This is to say, they develop an interpretation of language rules.

Exploring Teacher Preparation

The importance of teacher preparation cannot be understated. As content designers, teachers pave the way for successful interaction. The main way to prepare educators is via teacher education (Kartchava, 2021; Loewen & Sato, 2018; Sippel & Jackson, 2015; Swain et al. 2002). Research by Ha and Murray (2021), Loewen and Sato (2018) and Lyster and Ranta (2012) shows that education and professional development resources can influence an instructor's actions. Lyster and Ranta (2012), Kamiya (2016), and Roothoof and Breeze (2016) found that pre-service teachers were highly influenced by the literature they read in their teacher preparation program. If, during their teacher preparation program, peer interaction is not promoted or even discouraged, a teacher might never implement it. Teacher education can be challenging because, as DeKeyser (2010) argues, the instructor's own cultural identity can have a significant impact on their pedagogical choices.

Both Sato and Viveros (2016) and Lobatón (2011) discuss how these two factors – lack of knowledge and outright dislike – played a major role in the results of their research and consequently the level of student participation. In studying Chilean learners of English, Sato and Viveros (2016) noted that eighty-three percent of teachers initially stated that they did not believe in peer interaction as a methodology. The teachers had been taught in their teacher preparation programs that peer interaction was not a useful tool and so they avoided it altogether. As a result, learners would not interact during the classroom experiment in the way Sato and Viveros had hoped. Not all students are comfortable with collaboration and not all help one another effectively (Swain et al., 2002). This situation, as exhibited by the Chilean learners, reflects the value a teacher places on the methodology.

Another example can be seen in Lobatón's (2011) study. Instructors in her study believed that dependent students (those who relied on the teacher frequently) would rely on their more independent peers to do all the work for them if placed in partnerships. For this reason, the students in this class were never given peer interaction opportunities. The issue, from Lobatón's (2011) point of view, was that the teachers had preconceived notions about their students' abilities to interact successfully even though they had never offered peer interaction activities. Their instructional approach was based on their personal beliefs, which had not benefited from experimentation.

Peer Resistance to Interaction

As discussed above, some research shows that learners prefer not to interact with peers for various reasons (Lobatón 2011; Sato & Ballinger, 2012). This information is important for

teachers to know as they work with learners to prepare them for this experience. Learners need to know what they are expected to do when interacting with a peer (Sato & Lyster, 2012; Walqui, 2006); therefore, expectations for an activity or task must be made clear and learners must be prepared properly by a teacher who knows the reasons for resistance.

Sato's (2017) research suggests one reason for students' resistance to peer feedback is a lack of trust in peers' ability and inclination to offer the best kind of feedback. Sippel and Jackson (2015) researched learners' perceptions of feedback from peers during interaction and found a similar response to Sato's research; learners say they believe there is merit to peer interaction, but some admit they prefer the teacher to correct them and not their peers. This is not surprising, but it is important to bear in mind as this would mean that instructors would have to consider how to foster trust before placing learners in peer interaction situations.

Swain et al. (2002) list several factors that affect interaction, including students' lack of confidence in themselves and even conflict while working with peers. Some learners who lack confidence regarding their social standing with their peers avoid displaying their level of proficiency for fear of rejection from peers (Tomita & Spada, 2013). Students know where they stand in comparison with other students. They may know which classmates have a higher or lower proficiency level. Some students may not want to let their peers know that they find the class easy or that they feel lost. All these insecurities can drastically reduce the amount of interaction they are willing to engage in (Fujii et al., 2016). Storch and Aldorsari (2012) add that a learner's own goals can affect their level of interaction.

These social dynamics influence whether peer interaction will be accepted by learners and consequently whether it will take place at all. Okyar and Eksi (2019) suggest that learner's

psychology impacts the quality of collaboration. This is to say, a learner's mindset can affect their willingness to work with their peers. Indeed, Sato and Ballinger (2012) claim that social relationships between learners can negatively affect interaction, thus hindering L2 development.

As I have demonstrated elsewhere in this portfolio, teacher preparation is vital. Research by Dao (2020), Sato and Ballinger (2012) and Sato and Lyster (2012) suggest that effective preparation is a necessity if learners are to have success in their interactions. Sato and Ballinger (2012), Fujii et. al (2016) and Kartchava (2021) recommend that one of the steps in preparation is to take the time to tell students that PI has been shown to yield positive results in language acquisition. This implies that students need to know that PI is a valuable use of class time and, that it has its basis in research. In addition to having clear expectations laid out for them, learners also require modeling and guidance by their instructors on how to interact successfully. Modeling can be seen as a teacher and a teaching assistant playing the role of students and demonstrating how to interaction.

As instructors learn how to guide students in interaction and students apply what they know to that experience, all can benefit more from this engagement. While research has shown that interaction with peers is valuable to second language acquisition, it has also been demonstrated that the benefits of interaction can be magnified if peer feedback is incorporated.

The Need for the Added Treatment of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF)

Researchers such as Fujii et al. (2016), Sato and Ballinger (2012), and Sippel and Jackson (2015) have concluded not only that interaction is beneficial to second language acquisition but

also that the inclusion of oral corrective feedback (OCF) is essential for its success. OCF refers to peers correcting one another's output during interaction exercises. According to Ellis (2006), OCF is when a learner responds to an error that they hear in a peer's speech. Peer OCF is beneficial to language acquisition because when students are taught to correct one another, they tend to be more aware of their partner's and their own output (Chamot, 2005, Collins & White, 2014; Krashen, 1982; Sato, 2017; Sato & Lyster, 2012). This awareness can foster self-monitoring, which is when a learner also notices their own speech.

The monitor hypothesis was first introduced by Krashen (1982), who states that when language rules are apparent to learners, they use them to monitor their own speech and that of their peers. Noticing non-target like speech and pointing it out through the use of OCF allows learners the chance to engage in helpful language repairs. Sato and Lyster (2012) say that monitoring is the first step in recognizing errors in one's output for the purpose of modifying them. Monitoring can also be used to prevent errors, as learners evaluate their potential output before they even produce it. Monitoring can help learners build a mental representation of the target language (Kartchava, 2021; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Other researchers list additional benefits.

Multiple benefits are reported by Fujii et al. (2014), Sato and Ballinger (2012), and Sato and Lyster. They found that learners who received instruction on how to offer effective OCF and employed it during interaction activities developed greater accuracy of the target language, improved fluency, increased in variety of their feedback, and even self-corrected more than learners who did not receive instruction on OCF. Additionally, Sato and Ballinger (2012), Sippel and Jackson (2015), and Sippel (2019) also found evidence of long-term retention of grammar and vocabulary through preparing learners before interaction. Swain et al. (2002) highlight

additional benefits to OCF, claiming it: 1) helps to access procedural knowledge, 2) builds cognitive processing about the target language 3) builds long-term memory about language use, 4) helps learners focus on form, 5) increases interaction between peers, 6) encourages more noticing, and 7) increases time on task. Notably, these benefits are attributed to instructor modeling for learners how to interact using OCF.

Models of Interaction with OCF

Lyster and Ranta's pioneer study in 1997 led the way to extensive research on OCF that is still referenced regularly today. Their research involved the development of an OCF model which includes 6 types of feedback frequently seen in the language classroom. Of the six types of OCF, Okyar and Eski (2019) taught learners how to use recasts (where one student restates what the other student has said but adds any corrections of output in the correct place) and metalinguistic feedback. The results showed this instruction helped learners increase self-correction and frequency of feedback. Fujii et al. (2016) point out that learners need to have knowledge to share knowledge. They suggest that learners be taught how to think about thinking (metacognitive instruction). They argue that metalinguistic lessons can aid learners in offering more OCF. Metacognitive instruction does two important things: increase collaboration between learners and improve noticing. Metacognitive exploration helps learners realize what they know and what they do not (Braund & DeLuca, 2018).

Philp (2014), Sato (2017), and Sato and Lyster (2012), among others, propose that modeling be among the preparation techniques offered to learners. This includes teaching listening skills (Philp, 2014). Chamot's (2005) strategies named the "metacognition model"

involves monitoring, problem solving, and evaluation. These were based on Chamot et al. (1999), who proposed the CALLA method. CALLA stands for Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach. This model advocates a 3-step approach of modeling, practice, and use. Okyar and Eski (2019) and Dao (2020) used the CALLA method in their preparation of learners.

Preparing learners can increase interaction and effectiveness of peer OCF. When learners are prepared to offer feedback, they also expect feedback (Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sato, 2017; Walqui, 2006). However, peer interaction with corrective feedback does not come naturally to most learners (Sato & Lyster, 2012). They need help to have a successful experience.

Chamot (2005), Fujii et al., (2016), and Sato and Ballinger (2012) add an important consideration, namely that metacognitive practice and feedback may not be possible for all students. Nevertheless, DeKeyser (2010) claims that "retrieval of knowledge in the course of language processing is a complex skill that requires much practice" (p. 157). In fact, it is not likely that novice level learners can successfully engage in such sophisticated language and interaction as expected of more proficient learners whose higher proficiency level includes greater metalinguistic understanding of the target language. And limited skill in peer OCF can be expected in language classrooms where there is a focus on communication over form (DeKeyser, 2010). In addition, the ACTFL Standards (2012) proficiency guidelines express that novice low learners are not at the level where they can yet be a conversational peer. They require scripted statements and responses they can read to their partner instead extemporaneous exercises. This is important for me to bear in mind currently, as I am teaching novice-level learners.

There, of course, is much more research that can be sorted through to understand peer interaction in the language classroom. Much of what was described in this essay points to the abilities of more advanced learners. As noted, novice learners are not particularly equipped at

being able to engage in PI with OCF like more advanced learners are. The omission of how to develop successful PI for novice learners is of interest to me. My own opinion is that in order for research to have quantitative data, participants need to be able to participate to a degree that their learning could be measured. It is possible that measuring a novice learner's gains in vocabulary or correct grammar use might just not yield results strong enough for researchers.

Conclusion

From the literature, it can be concluded that interaction is very important to language development for learners. In addition, OCF does more to enhance second language development than PI alone. This is not to say that PI alone is not beneficial to language learners, but instead that OCF can expand the experience for learners. PI on its own can help foster relationship building and give learners a chance to practice the target language with a peer, but OCF gives students the added benefit of building a metalinguistic representation of the language through feedback as well as the chance to learn to monitor their own speech.

There are so many factors that stand in the way of successful peer interaction in the language classroom, even more than I have mentioned in this essay. To avoid resistance from learners, instructors need to be aware of these potential pitfalls. Preparing learners through modeling, practice, and use will help them be more active participants who contribute to an effective learning environment.

PI and OCF are not something all learners are familiar with or even comfortable engaging in. This means that instructors need to take the time to explain to learners that PI is indeed a useful classroom activity. They also need to demonstrate to learners how to offer OCF

effectively. This should be done before expecting students to begin PI activities where OCF is expected.

Novice learners and those who do not have explicit target language instruction have limited skills at their disposal to be able to offer OCF to peers. One conclusion that I have drawn from the research about what can be done for these learners is to, focus on PI as the goal of the task versus expecting novice learners to engage in OCF before they are ready. As students interact with one another regularly, they can become more comfortable with this type of experience and OCF can be added later on when they have developed a bit more understanding of the target language. When students are more comfortable, they will interact more, and instructors can build upon that positive move. In addition, if OCF is an expectation in a novice level class, then it is important to realize that students need exposure to explicit language instruction. Without this exposure they have no idea what feedback to give. For novice learners, the target language can get in the way of solving language problems. If OCF is the goal, then instructors need to remove any barriers to its success and for novice learners, that barrier is a lack of L2 vocabulary and syntax. For this reason, it would also be helpful to allow novice learners to offer feedback using their L1 instead of the L2. When novice learners are given the freedom to express their feedback in the L1, communication between peers can increase, feedback is enhanced, and confusion reduced. Then, after learners have developed the skills to offer feedback and have developed more understanding of the L2, they can then try OCF with their peers in the target language.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

**COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING THEORY AND TASK-BASED
LEARNING: AN INTRODUCTION TO TEACHING IN A SECOND LANGUAGE
CLASSROOM.**

Introduction

Research on the communicative theory has supported and encouraged me in moving forward with confidence in teaching Spanish to college students. In this paper, I will first define aspects of communication; second, I discuss the importance of implicit instruction and its use in grammar instruction; third, highlight the need for comprehensible input; and finally, describe the use of the task-based learning model (TBLM) and activity design. In my understanding, these are all essential components of the communicative language teaching theory.

It is important to learn about communicative language teaching (CLT) because of its frequent and increasing use in second language teaching. Indeed, Hunter and Smith (2012), looking at the historical changes of CLT over time, describe that when CLT was first emerging between 1958 and 1973, the view of CLT was simply a focus on more communication and less drills. As CLT began to develop over time, a shift in its popularity began to evolve making it a “recognizable phenomenon” (p. 434). CLT research supports the use of this method in language teaching because of the many demonstrated benefits to learners. Among them is the increased opportunity afforded learners to communicate with peers in pairs and small groups. Through peer interaction, learners can test out the language more than if the focus is on the teacher, as

explained above in this portfolio. According to Ballman et al. (2001), student interaction is more motivating to students than teacher lectures.

Even with scholars arguing for more clarity and direction on how to define and incorporate CLT today, the benefits of applying CLT-type tasks in a language classroom can easily be observed by simply testing it out (Hunter & Smith, 2012). As an instructor focused on the needs of my students, I have concluded from this review that CLT-focused instruction can meet those needs effectively.

Teaching My First University Class

My teaching experience in higher education began in the fall of 2019 when I was hired by Utah State University to teach beginning Spanish. I always had an interest in teaching and had recently been a trainer for 8 years in the sales world. Even though I was teaching adults in sales, I did not have any formal pedagogical training in higher education. The only thing I had to recommend me for this new career was that I am bilingual, and I have a major in Spanish from USU. Within a few months of being hired I was given my resources and a sample syllabus to get started. The expectation was that, because I was a native-speaker and had a Spanish degree, I had what I needed to run a class. I quickly learned how wrong that was.

This class was run on a flipped classroom model, in which students would learn from textbook and online explicit grammar instruction at home and use class time for hands-on practice with the language. My instructions were to create and carry out activities for practicing the homework during the 50 minutes of class time and to not focus on any formal grammar instruction. The reason offered for the latter was that the online textbook would take care of that.

It was the responsibility of students to learn grammar from that source and not from me. Class time was to be used for practice in using the language only.

Without knowing anything about theory or pedagogy, I searched online for ideas on how to present this material to students in a coherent way. I also created activities to help learners practice the vocabulary and grammar concepts they were learning in their online book. I worked tirelessly to build slides, create worksheets, design reference material, and orchestrate activities that would be meaningful to the students. I knew meaning was important.

By the end of the semester, I was thoroughly exhausted. Although I enjoyed my first semester of teaching and I received above average numbers on my evaluations, I did not feel adequate as a teacher. I felt overwhelmed as I had done most of the talking and answering questions in class. And, most of all, I felt a pang of guilt for not giving my students the experience that they probably should've had. I started the MSLT program the very next semester, so that I could learn how to do a better job for my students and improve my own practice as a teacher.

Since then, I have gained pedagogical foundations by learning about Language Acquisition Theory, the Communicative Teaching Approach, and the Task-Based Learning Model in the MSLT program. I have eagerly gone back to my slides, worksheets, and tasks and modified them to align with my new understanding.

Communicative Language Teaching

CLT was first introduced by Savignon in 1983. Savignon (1987) describes that when the subject of CLT was becoming popular, teachers, methodologists, and linguists all participated in

developing a definition of CLT and methods to incorporate it for education. The interest from many areas of research encouraged its further development. Before that time, CLT teachers and researchers were feeling let down by the predominant audiolingual method, causing them to look for the silver-bullet, as it were, to teaching language. Savignon (1987) relates that what teachers needed was “to understand the language acquisition process as one that involves learners not only intellectually, but physically and psychologically (p. 235).” To Savignon the goal of CLT is communicative competence, which is when students are proficient enough with the target language to be able to express their meaning effectively. This goal is fundamentally shaped by an understanding of the meaning of communication. Moreover, CLT is more student-centered than other older, more traditional methods, and focuses on everyday communication and oral interaction.

All language acquisition that becomes part of the linguistic system of the mind serves a purpose – communication. Van Patten (2017) and Gonzalez-Lloret (2020) classify two goals of communication: cognitive-informational and psycho-social. Gonzalez- Lloret calls the two goals of communication “task-driven or socioemotional” (p. 264). Andrews (2013) calls these same two goals, transactional and interactional. Transaction in this context means that students will communicate for the purpose of gathering information. And interactional means, the communication is meant for social purposes like getting to know one another.

To instructors, this means that there is a need to involve learners in communication for the purpose of meeting psycho-social or cognitive-informational goals. During interaction, students need the opportunity to express thoughts and ideas (psycho-social/interactional), interpret what their peers are saying, and share information (cognitive-information/transactional) to meet communicative goals. Shrum and Glisan (2016) recommend that in order to help learners

meet these communicative goals, instructors should encourage learners to be cooperative.

What this means is that teachers should model how to communicate with their peers. She should demonstrate that interactive exchanges should be helpful and friendly. Showing learners how to interact will help them be more cooperative. As learners develop the skills of cooperation, they will then be more apt to share personal opinions and diverse points of view which can increase their output and enrich their exchanges.

Implicit and Explicit Language Development: Implications for Instruction

In second language acquisition (SLA) there are certain concepts we know to be true about how learners acquire language. These ‘givens’ should be understood by all language teachers, as these are factors that we cannot change and must learn to work with, in order to assist students in acquiring language. According to Lee and VanPatten (2003, p. 17):

1. SLA involves the creation of an implicit (unconscious) linguistic system.
2. SLA is complex and consists of different processes.
3. SLA is dynamic but slow.
4. Most L2 learners fall short of native-like competence.
5. Skill acquisition is different from the creation of an implicit system.

One of those concepts is that SLA is created through implicit means. Lee and VanPatten (2003) argue that all language learners naturally develop an internal linguistic system for the language they are learning. This is true for first language (L1) learners and second language (L2) learners. This system is predominantly developed by implicit knowledge, which means that learners are developing a system of meaning and use of the language through exposure (Lee & VanPatten, 2003; VanPatten & Williams, 2020). Furthermore, much of this unconscious

knowledge does not have to be taught explicitly; rather it “emerges spontaneously when learners engage in normal interaction in the L2, where the focus is on meaning” (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 25). Dörnyei (2009) supports this argument in saying that language is acquired without conscious decision. The brain doesn’t acquire language through explicit means like it does other subjects such as math or science (VanPatten, 2017). We need to treat language instruction differently. Therefore, VanPatten advocates for a focus on building *meaning* through language use, rather than focusing on *form* and rote memorization of formulas.

A Focus on Meaning over Form

Research has shown that explicit grammar instruction does not assist in language acquisition (VanPatten, 2017). Explicit grammar instruction is simply skill building, not language acquisition. And grammar forms taught in isolation tends to be forgotten over time.

Although grammar is necessary to learning a TL, making it the focus of the language instruction, does not necessarily help learners communicate any better. When communication is the goal, form becomes a support rather than a focus of class time communication. Ballman et al., (2001) echoes this sentiment saying that grammar should be used as a tool in support of communicative goals. CLT suggests that class time is better spent working on communicative tasks where the goal is not rote grammar-rule memorization or regurgitation, but instead meaningful communication. Ballman et al. (2001) also argues that language lessons need to have a connection to student’s lives and the contexts in which they plan to use the TL. Essentially, for communication to be useful to learners, it must also be meaningful. Rote memorization and repetition of grammar is not as meaningful to learners as the chance to express their own thoughts and ideas and listen to those of their peers.

According to VanPatten (2017) and VanPatten and Williams (2020), grammar skill building, and language acquisition development are not the same thing and do not operate in the same space in the mind. One does not help the other and these centers of the brain do not connect. Explicit grammar knowledge cannot be converted to implicit knowledge (VanPatten, 2016). Implicit knowledge is information that we cannot explain, it is just something we know. Therefore, explicit grammar knowledge, which can be explained and defined, is not implicit knowledge. VanPatten (2016) is arguing that since language learning is implicit in nature, grammar training does not support this part of the brain. If, instead, grammar is taught implicitly through communication, then that instruction can become part of the implicit load along with all other parts of implicit language learning. By putting the focus on communication with the support of grammar, CLT helps to increase implicit knowledge of the language. An example of this is when students are asked to talk to a peer about what they did during weekend. As they share their experiences, they naturally use the past tense without thinking about it. The form is imbedded in the activity without being the main focus of the exchange.

When learners are asked to memorize explicit grammar rules, "...knowledge that is learned may not be converted into acquired knowledge" (VanPatten & Williams, 2020, p. 25), because learners are deprived of opportunities to use the rules in unscripted interactions. In other words, explicit grammar rule teaching can be useful for fill-in-the-blank worksheets that assess interpretation of grammar rules, but they do not become useful for communication. This is because they do not build a mental representation of the target language for the learner. When form is the priority, the result is simply learners striving for completion and not engaging in negotiation for the sake of communication. Adair-Hauk and Donato (2007) add "simply thinking

that the students' ability to explicitly recite a textbook grammar rule is equal to knowing how to use this rule is misguided (p. 219)."

For teachers, this information can seem daunting to comprehend and to apply. At least, it does for me. There is an array of explanations on how to teach grammar, made more confusing by a lack of consensus in the definition of the terms associated with CLT (Hunter & Smith, 2012). To help alleviate some confusion, the following delves into some of the issues associated with implicit grammar instruction that might be useful to language instructors.

The Complexity of Grammar Instruction

Dörnyei (2009) counters VanPatten's research by saying that explicit language teaching is important because implicit language learning is how babies learn language, but it may not be how older children or adults learn. He adds, "mere exposure to L2 input accompanied by communicative practice is not sufficient, and therefore, we need explicit learning procedures" (p. 36). Wong and Simard (2018) argue a perspective similar to Dörnyei's, saying that explicit language instruction helps learners notice and use grammar concepts more easily. When grammar is taught explicitly and students can point to its form, it is more easily noticed when they use it for communication. It also enables them to extend their grammar knowledge into future learning. Shrum and Glisan (2016) say that noticing and monitoring, "produces higher achievement, increases retention, and develops interpersonal skills (p. 253)." Savignon (1987) cautions that a focus on form needs to be carefully measured because it can inhibit the fluid expression of learners' thoughts and feelings. Lightbown and Spada (2018) add that form-focused learning does not just mean repeating grammar rules. Focusing on form also teaches learners to notice when their speech is not correct. And for a beginner, this is a crucial element.

Sato and Kleinsasser (1999) researched Japanese teachers in Australia and found that although many had been exposed to CLT, most did not know how to define it or implement it in their teaching. The major challenge for these teachers was that they had no idea what the role of grammar was in a CLT classroom. These teachers were highly influenced by their own beliefs and experiences, especially their teacher education program and observation of other teachers. “Educators who are hoping that language acquisition theories will give them insight into language teaching practice are often frustrated by the lack of agreement among the ‘experts’” (Lightbown & Spada, 2018, p. 121). In fact, Dörnyei (2009) argues that CLT has not been organized in such a way that instructors understand the theory or its application. Even terms such as *input*, *form*, and *meaning* are being used to mean different things by different authors, making interpretation of the research literature difficult. This is also one of the reasons teachers retreat to their own ideas and beliefs instead of testing research out in their classrooms. Promoting a middle-ground approach, Lightbown and Spada (2018) recommend that a teacher’s aim should be on balancing a focus on form with a focus on meaning.

The Importance of Comprehensible Input

Comprehensible input refers to the way in which language is modified so that students can interpret its meaning. Lightbown and Spada (2018) call this modified input. Some suggestions by VanPatten (2017) to help make the language comprehensible are: speaking slowly, using high-frequency words, using simplified input, repeating, having learners respond to questions by simply choosing A, B, C or determining T/F, focusing on speech settings that are familiar, making real-world connection to the student’s life, giving plenty of opportunities to

negotiate for meaning, and using classroom time for peer interaction. Even vocabulary lists can become comprehensible if they are repeated regularly and used in meaningful ways such as connecting them to a learner's interests (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

Learners have a limited amount of space for processing input (Ballman, 2001). With the added element of the instruction being in an unfamiliar language, learners can quickly fill their working memory to capacity before class time is even over. Novice learners can encounter a high cognitive load under these circumstances because, "they lack the experience and conceptual framework that make cognitive processing more efficient" (Feldon, 2007, p. 125). Therefore, input must be as comprehensible as possible. Class time is also very limited, so providing input that can be comprehended and can be used for communication needs to happen smoothly and quickly.

Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development (ZPD) is a valuable piece of research to add to a language teacher's repertoire that can help with smoothness and speed. This knowledge can help teachers to provide the best input for her particular student. Vygotsky suggests that all learners have, what he calls, a ZPD or a zone of proximal development. This zone is like a stage in the learner's development. Students are both in a zone or stage and developing into another one. Through understanding the ZPD of her students, teachers can cultivate and stimulate language development and growth of her students through tailormade instruction. As students are taught within their zone, the material they are presented is within their reach of understanding. This is to say that language lessons need to be well thought out, so they are as comprehensible as possible to students. Krashen (1987) suggests that within the zone, a teacher can present material that is not only in that zone but one step higher than it. Krashen

calls this the $i+1$. Essentially this means that with support (+1) the learners (i) can develop even past their zone of development.

The purpose of making input as comprehensible as possible is to reduce the cognitive load and give learners the input they need for interacting in the target language and accomplishing the goals of communicative tasks. As students develop their communicative competence, their working memory is not as easily overloaded, and they can juggle increasingly more complex tasks.

Techniques for Comprehensible Input

Some techniques to help make input more comprehensible are, instructors being aware of their rate of speech. A slower rate of speech is helpful for novice learners. Adding facial expression and hand gestures also help learners understand the instructor's meaning. Using visual aids can improve learners' interpretation of words and phrases that are new to them (Van Patten, 2015).

A technique offered by Adair-Hauk and Donato (2016) for increasing comprehensible input during reading is the PACE method. This method consists of steps that walk students through a story in a simple but comprehensive way for the purpose of interpreting both form and meaning of a story.

“P” stands for presentation. At this stage the teacher simply presents the story without showing the written script of the story and asks simple questions about what the students see. “A” stands for attention and is the phase where the teacher helps students pay attention to certain aspects of the language. An example is the teacher pointing out certain forms of grammar that

she would like students to notice within the text. It is as simple as highlighting a word or two. “C” stands for co-construct, where the teacher and the student work together to piece together the meaning of the story including drawing conclusions or predicting outcomes. “E” stands for extension and is the part of the method where students can create a product which demonstrates their understanding of the story. Through this method, students can deduce both form and meaning in a simple, easy-to-follow way.

Another tool for helping to make input comprehensible is, total physical response (TPR), a teaching method developed by Asher (1977). TPR can be used at any level of proficiency, but I have found that it is especially helpful to novice students because it gives them the chance to interact with the target language even from the very first day of class.

TPR involves teachers using physical movement and simplified speech as a way to increase comprehensibility of input for students. Teachers can incorporate TPR in teaching vocabulary, for example, through simple question/answer, pictures, props, songs, stories, sign language, and labeling item that represent the vocabulary (Seely & Romijn, 2006). One of the main components of TPR that makes it so helpful for language acquisition is that it requires repetition (Shrum & Glisan, 2015). As teachers provide input, they continue to come back to each vocabulary word as they add more to the list. Shrum and Glisan (2015) argue that TPR can help learners acquire a large vocabulary because of the repetition involved. The extra input that students receive helps them further interpret meaning.

Teachers can also introduce TPR through a strategy of giving simple commands. Seely and Romijn (2006) suggest that in order to increase comprehensibility of the input, commands should be related to everyday life such a getting ready in the morning or preparing a sandwich. This type of activity can be helpful to novice learners who have little language to negotiate with

because the commands revolve around a task that they are familiar with. These actions are easily interpreted because they look like what they mean. Teachers can introduce the commands through modeling the action. After modeling, she can ask students to perform those same actions to show they understand the meaning. This is what is called internalization. According to Seely and Romijn (2006) internalization is key to the use of TPR. When a student begins to internalize the terms, they are then at the point where they can also produce them easily. “If you can already understand something before you say it, it will be easier to say it (Seely & Romijn, 2006, p. 7).”

Lee and VanPatten (2003) and VanPatten (2017) both emphasize the importance of teachers tailoring their discourse to the students’ proficiency. It is important that the teacher consider what will most likely have a positive effect on her students. She needs to consider what types of methods will be fun and engaging. For teachers, it is very helpful to know a few methods like these to help in creating comprehensible lessons for all students. Through the use of simple input, easy-to-follow directions and interactive actions, learners can put their focus toward understanding the meaning of a message (Ballman et al., 2001). This can help them feel success right from the very beginning of the course.

The Task-Based-Learning-Model (TBLM)

In CLT, tasks are designed to encourage communication. The goal of a task is not simply completion, but engagement in negotiation of meaning through interaction (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). This can be accomplished through peer work, interviews, presentations, surveys, and the like. The focus on *using* the TL to accomplish tasks is what makes the Task-based-learning-model (TBLM) so effective.

TBLM frames instruction around meaningful, communicative tasks during classroom instruction for the purpose of language acquisition (Pica, 2005; Shrum & Glisan, 2016). Task-based instruction helps to engage learners because it increases the opportunity for communication and cooperation between peers. Task-based activities interest learners because they are relevant to real-world encounters (Shrum & Glisan, 2016). Meaningful messages should be part of task-based activities. These are activities that mimic a real-world experience. According to Shrum and Glisan (2016) these types of activities motivate a learner to use the TL. “If students find the course interesting and relevant to their needs and if they experience success and satisfaction in that success, they are motivated to participate and to persist” (Ballman et al., 2001, p.15). Tasks encourage learners to produce more output. Since output opportunities help to build learner’s metalinguistic understanding of the target language and cement some of the grammar uses in their long-term memory, giving learners as many opportunities to speak should be a focus of the class time (Lobatón, 2011; Swain, 1993).

The ACTFL World Readiness Standards for Learning Language (ACTFL.org) have introduced three communication standards. These standards provide a model in planning task for students:

Standard 1.1 Interpersonal: Students engage in conversations, provide, and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.

Standard 1.2 Interpretive: Students understand and interpret written and spoken language on a variety of topics.

Standard 1.3 Presentational: Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.

Activity Design

Ballman et al., (2001) offer a variety of tips for activity design that can go hand in hand with the TBLM. Activities should be short and have a specific communicative goal. The teacher should model exactly what needs to be done. It is important, especially with novice learners, to focus on giving clear and simple directions in both spoken and visual / written form. Instructors should circulate during the activity to ensure that learners are staying on task. And finally, instructors should encourage oral communication in the target language as much as possible.

ACTFL (actfl.org) suggests having the end-goal in mind when preparing activities by creating “Can-Do” statements for students. The ACFTL Can-Do statements help learners track their development and work toward their goal. As they see their own progress, students are motivated. These Can-Do statements also help instructors design their lessons to ensure students meet the objectives. If students are not accomplishing the Can-Do goals, or are having difficulty, an instructor can introduce smaller steps to help learners meet the objectives.

Communicative Tasks to Try

Some examples of tasks that can stimulate communication and meet the requirements of the three ACTFL standards are information gap activities (Ballman et al., 2001; Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Pica, 2005), the use of stories and authentic materials (Adair-Hauk & Donato, 2002; Lightbown & Spada, 2018), collaborative dialogue exercises (Swain et al., 2015), interviews (Ballman et al., 2001), games and problem solving (Lee & VanPatten, 2003), and roleplay (Lantolf & Poehner, 2008; Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Shrum and Glisan (2016) reference

many other tasks including jigsaw sequence, think-pair-share, and even creative activities. Any of these can be adjusted to meet the proficiency of the students in the class. Tasks like these stimulate conversation and engagement by learners. “Students who regularly engage in carefully constructed task-based activities learn how to listen, to trust their ability to extrapolate and form hypotheses, and to use what they know in novel and creative ways” (Savignon, 1987, p. 15).

Instructors need to give students the opportunity to use the language in fluid and novel ways, to communicate with their peers and with the instructor. When learners work with peers, they are afforded more opportunity to produce language than when the lesson is teacher fronted (Lightbown & Spada, 2018).

LOOKING FORWARD

I started this program as a nervous graduate student and apprehensive first-time beginning Spanish instructor. I was worried about being able to understand all the readings and unsure whether I had the skill necessary to write at a graduate level. As I have persisted through each course, I have developed exponentially in these areas. I speak in a new language- the language of pedagogy. I write in a new style also. Most importantly, I think in terms of teaching and learning. In all, this graduate program has been a rewarding experience for me, and I have grown as a teacher.

Throughout the process of gaining my education, as I have wrestled with various concepts in teaching, I have begun to come to terms with who I want to be as a teacher. The reason for the wrestle is two-fold. First, I have a desire to interpret research for classroom use but am finding that this is not always a simple process. Looking to research is necessary for my development and I will continue to pursue that, but I have found that there needs to be a careful balance between applying research and “going with my gut” so to speak. This is not to say that my “gut” has all the answers, but that a balance between evidence-based approaches in research and classroom practice can yield positive results. Secondly, one of the most important lessons I have learned through this research is that student identity is an extremely powerful force that needs careful consideration.

Student identity informed all of my research even when it was not the focus. While writing about communicative language teaching, I found that being aware of how individual novice students think and feel when they enter a language classroom helps me build the most comprehensible lessons for them. In addition, it helped me create a more welcoming and

inclusive space for learning. In my observations, I realized how often teachers did not teach ideas in the same way. It was obvious that teachers adapt to meet their student's specific needs, diverse identities, and different learning styles, proficiency levels, and backgrounds. Additionally, in my research on peer interaction, it was quite evident that although interaction is a key element in language acquisition, there are many reasons that students may not initially want to participate. And knowing these reasons is important. Knowing my students is important to me. And finally, in looking at learner resistance to pragmatics, the most glaring reason for resistance came from a mismatch between student identity and cultural expectations held by speakers of the target language community. One of the best lessons I have learned from reflecting on student identity is that preparing learners for each classroom experience is one of the most valuable steps I can take as a teacher.

As a teacher, I want to be knowledgeable. This means continuing to study current research and instruction techniques. I also want to be aware of my students' identity and how that plays a role in their learning. The classroom experience is dynamic. It has a lot of moving parts. But of all those moving parts, a focus on student identity as well as a balance between research and classroom practice is important. I believe that studying these two areas will help me become the best teacher I can be.

References

- ACTFL Proficiency Standards (2012). <http://www.actfl.org>
- ACTFL (2015). The National Standards Collaborative Board. World-Readiness Standards for Learning Languages. <http://www.actfl.org>.
- Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (2002). The pace model: A story-based approach to meaning and form for standards-based language learning. *The French Review*, (76)2.
- Akcaoglu, M., & Lee, E. (2016). Increasing social presence in online learning through small group discussions. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2293>
- Andrews, L. (2013). *Language exploration and awareness: A resource book for teachers* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315045146>
- Asher, J. J. (1977). *Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook*. Sky Oaks Productions.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words: The William James lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198245537.001.0001>
- Ballman, T. L., Liskin-Gasparro, J. B., & Mandell, T. B. (2001). *The communicative classroom*. AATSP/Heinle.
- Braund, H., & DeLuca, C. (2018). Elementary students as active agents in their learning: An empirical study of the connections between assessment practices and student

- metacognition. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 45(1), 65–85.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0265-z>
- Chamot, A. U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112–130.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190505000061>
- Chamot, A. U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P. B., & Robins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. Addison Wesley Longman.
- Cohen, A. (2008). Teaching and assessing L2 pragmatics: What can we expect from learners? *Language Teaching*, 41(2), 213–235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004880>
- Cohen, A. (2010). Coming to terms with pragmatics. In A. Ishihara & A.D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Routledge.
- Collins, L., & White, J. (2015). The quantity and quality of language practice in typical interactive pair/group tasks. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31, 47-67.
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v31i0.1186>
- Cutshall, Sandy. (2012). More than a decade of standards: Integrating “comparisons” in your language instruction. *The Language Educator*, 32-37.
<https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/publications/standards/Comparisons.pdf>
- Dao, P. (2020). Effect of interaction strategy instruction on learner engagement in peer interaction. *System*, 91, 1-13. <https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102244>
- Davis, J. M. (2007). Resistance to L2 pragmatics in the Australian ESL context. *Language Learning*, 57(4), 611-649. <http://doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00430.x3>

- DeKeyser, R. (2010). Practice for second language learning: Don't throw out the baby with the bathwater. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(1), 155–165.
<http://dx.doi.org/10/6018/ijes/2010/1/114021>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The 2010s, Communicative language teaching in the 21st century: The principled communicative approach. *Perspectives*, (36)2, 33-43.
- Dumitrescu, D. (2015). Pragmatic and discursive aspects of the US Spanish. Instituto Cervantes at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University. <http://doi.10.15427/OR015-11/2015EN>
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19(1), 18–41. <https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.19.04ell>
- Feldon, D. (2007) Cognitive load and classroom teaching: The double-edged sword of automaticity. *Educational Psychologist*, (42)3, 123-137. <http://doi.10.1080/00461520701416173>.
- Feng, X. (2015). Proficiency effect on L2 pragmatic competence. *Studies in Second Language Learning & Teaching*, 5(4), 557-581. <http://doi:10.14746/ssllt.2015.5.4.3>
- Fujii, A., Ziegler, N., & Mackey, A. (2016). Peer interaction and metacognitive instruction in the EFL classroom: Pedagogical potential and research agenda. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.). *Peer interaction and second language Learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp.63–89). <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.45.03fuj>
- González-Lloret, M. (2020). Collaborative tasks for online language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(2), 260–269. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12466>

- Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. *System*, 96, 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102405>
- Hunter, D., & Smith, R. (2012). Unpackaging the past: 'CLT' through ELTJ keywords. *ELT Journal*, 66(4), 430–439. <https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1093/elt/ccs036>
- Ishihara, N., & Cohen, A. (2014). *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet*. Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315833842>
- Kamiya, N. (2016). What effect does reading academic articles on oral corrective feedback have on ESL teachers? *TESL Journal*, 7(2) 328–349.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.210>
- Kartchava, E. (2021). *The role of training in feedback provision and effectiveness*. In H. Nassaji, & E. Kartchava, (Eds). *The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching*. Cambridge Handbook in Language and Linguistics, (598-619). doi:10.1017/9781108589789
- Kim, Y.H. (2014). Learner investment, identity, and resistance to second language pragmatic norms. *System*, 45, 92-102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.002>
- Kondo, S. (2008). Effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction: Refusals by Japanese EFL learners. In E. Alcón & A. Martínez -Flor (Eds.), *Investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing*. Cromwell Press. Doi. 10.21832/9781847690869-01
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press.

- Laich-Gomez, P.M. (2016). Second language learner's divergence from target language pragmatics norms. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(2), 249-269. doi.10.14746/ssl.2016.6.2.4
- Lantolf, J., & Poehner, M. (2008). *Sociocultural theory and the teaching of second language*. Equinox Publishing.
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (2014). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Liu, C. (2016). Cultural collision: The interference of first language cultural identity on pragmatic competence of the target language. *GIST: Education Issue* (13), 131-147. <http://dx.doi.org/10/26817/16925777.323>
- Lobatón, J. (2011). Peer interaction: A social perspective towards the development of foreign language learning. *Profile*, 13(1), 189-203.
- Loewen, S., & Sato, M. (2018). Interaction and instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 51(3), 285–329. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000125>
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C Ritchie & T.K Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of language acquisition, volume 2: Second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10/1016/B978-012589042-7/50015-3>

- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (2012). Counterpoint piece: The case for variety in corrective feedback research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 35(1), 167-184.
<http://dx.org/10/1017/S027226311200071X>
- MacIntyre, P.D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K.A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a second language: A situational model of second language confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545-562.
- McKay, S. (2009). Pragmatics and EIL pedagogy. In D.F. Sharifian, (Ed.). *English as an international language: perspectives and pedagogical issues* (pp. 227-241). <https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.21832/9781847691231-015>
- Okyar, H., & Eksi, G. (2019). Training students in peer interaction and peer feedback to develop competence in L2 forms. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 58, 62–94.
- Philp, J. (2014, August). *Peer interaction and second language learning: What are the possibilities*. 5th Annual International Conference on TESOL: New Trends in English Teaching and Learning, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. <https://www.vnseameo.org/>
- Pica, T. (2005). Classroom learning, teaching, and research: A task-based perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(3), 339-352. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00309.x>

- Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Language Awareness, 25*(4), 318-335.
doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580
- Sato, K., & Kleinsasser, R.C. (1999). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): Practical Understandings. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*, 494-517. <https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1111/0026-7902.00037>
- Sato, M. (2017). Oral peer corrective feedback: Multiple theoretical perspectives. In H. Nassaji, & E. Kartchava (Eds.). (2017). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432>
- Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2012). Raising language awareness in peer interaction: a cross-context, cross-methodology examination. *Language Learning and Language Awareness, 21*, 157–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.639884>
- Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: Monitoring, practice, and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*, 591-626. [http://doi: 10.1017/S02722631120000356](http://doi:10.1017/S02722631120000356)
- Sato, M., & Viveros, P. (2016) Interaction or collaboration? Group dynamics in the foreign language classroom. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer Interaction and Second Language Learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp.91-112). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://dx.doi.org/10/1075/llt.45.04sat>
- Savignon, S. J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Addison-Wesley Longman.

- Savignon, S. J. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching. *Theory Into Practice*, 26(4), 235.
<https://doi-org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1080/00405848709543281>.
- Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 7(5), 379-392.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1986.9994254>
- Seely, C., & Romijn, E. (2006). *TPS is more than commands- At all levels* (3rd ed.). Command Performance Language Institute.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2016). *Teacher's handbook, contextualized language instruction* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Sippel, L. (2019). The impact of peer corrective feedback on vocabulary development. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52(3), 595–611. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12416>
- Sippel, L., & Jackson, C. N. (2015). Teacher vs. peer oral corrective feedback in the German language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(4), 688–705.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12164>
- Spencer-Oatey, H., & Wang, J. (2019). Culture, context, and concerns about face: Synergistic insight from pragmatics and social psychology. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 423-440. <http://doi: 10.1177/0261927X19865293>
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2013). Pairing learners in pair work activity. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(1), 31–48. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168812457530>
- Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50(1), 158-164. [Doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.50/1/158](https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.50/1/158)

- Swain, M., Brooks, L., & Tocalli-Beller, A. (2002). Peer-peer dialogue as a means of second language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 171–185.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000090>
- Swain, M., Kinnear, P., & Steinman, L. (2015). *Sociocultural theory and second language education: An introduction through narratives*. Multilingual Matters.
- Tomita, Y., & Spada, N. (2013). Form-focused instruction and learner investment in L2 communication. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 591–610.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12031.x>
- Vandrick, S. (1997). The role of hidden identities in the postsecondary ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(1), 153–157. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587980>
- VanPatten, B. (2016). Why explicit knowledge cannot become implicit knowledge. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(4), 650–657. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/flan.12226>
- VanPatten, B. (2017). *While we're on the topic: BVP on language, acquisition, and classroom practice*. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (2020). Early theories in SLA. In B. VanPatten, G.D. Keating, & S. Wulff (Eds.) *Theories in second language acquisition* (3rd ed.) Routledge.
- Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education*, 4(1), 21–44. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jilie0401_2
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2006) Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(2), 159–180. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050608668639>

Wong, W., & Simard, D. (2015). *Focusing on form in language instruction*. In The Routledge E-Modules on Contemporary Language Teaching.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315679532>

Yale Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning. Preparing a lecture.
<https://poorvucenter.yale.edu/teaching/ideas-teaching/preparing-lecture>