

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

12-2022

Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in Dual Language Immersion Portuguese Classes

Janaina Quadros
Utah State University

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



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Quadros, Janaina, "Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in Dual Language Immersion Portuguese Classes" (2022). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1676.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1676>

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.



ORAL AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN
DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION PORTUGUESE CLASSES

by

Janaína Streisky de Quadros

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Joshua J. Thoms
Major Professor

Dr. Abdulkafi Albirini
Committee Member

Dr. Sarah O'Neill
Committee Member

Dr. Crescencio López
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2022

Copyright © Janaína Streisky de Quadros

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

ORAL AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION PORTUGUESE CLASSES

by

Janaína Streisky de Quadros: Master of Second Language Teaching
Utah State University, 2022

Major Professor: Dr. Joshua J. Thoms
Department: World Languages & Cultures

This portfolio results from the classes, readings, writings, class observations, and reflections during my time in the MSLT program. It comprises three major components: teaching philosophy, reflections through class observations, and a reflection paper on corrective feedback. Besides that, the reader will find some background about the author's educational and professional journey and intentions for the future.

The reflection paper focuses on oral and written corrective feedback in second language classes. It is the result of reviews of pertinent literature and the author's experience as a Dual Language Immersion (DLI) Portuguese teacher. It gives an overview of the importance of showing instructors the validity of providing feedback to second language (L2) learners, the two primary ways to do it, and the author's experience in applying what was learned about the topic in DLI classes.

(51 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Reaching any educational degree is not a one-person accomplishment. Although I feel proud of myself for concluding this program, I know I couldn't have done it without much help. My husband, Cleber Quadros, has helped me since the beginning with all the bureaucratic steps of starting a master's degree. Also, with his support and participation, he cared for our children while I spent many hours studying.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge all the teachers I had in the Master of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program. I felt comfortable being with all of them. They were not only experts in their fields but also great at teaching. I know a lot of the knowledge we acquire in this program comes from reading, reflection, and writing. However, having the chance to watch and participate in excellent classes was a motivation and guidance in how to continue my studies. I can't say enough how much I enjoyed going to class each week and learning from my professors and classmates.

Everything in life is more fun when good people surround us. I was fortunate to have great colleagues who made this journey so pleasant. I met people from different parts of the world, with different backgrounds, who were bright and had so much to teach me with their life experiences and view of the world.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Joshua Thoms for all the help he gave me since my first steps into this program. Dr. Thoms was an essential aid in the bureaucratic aspects of the program. Furthermore, he went the extra mile to show me support and to help me successfully finish this degree. Not only is he a very capable professional but also a humane and sensitive one. Without his human touch in this educational area, my journey wouldn't have been the same.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

INTRODUCTION TO THE PORTFOLIO.....	1
TEACHING PHILOSOPHY.....	5
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION.....	12
Context.....	12
Instructional procedure.....	13
Evaluation.....	13
MAIN PAPER.....	19
STATEMENT OF FUTURE GOALS.....	45
REFERENCES.....	47

LIST OF ACRONYMS

L2- Second language

MSLT- Master at Second Language Teaching

NEWL- National Examinations in World Languages

OCF- Oral Corrective Feedback

SLA- Second Language Acquisition

TPS- Teaching Philosophy Statement

USU- Utah State University

WCF- Written Corrective Feedback

INTRODUCTION TO THE PORTFOLIO

During my teenage years, there was only one thing I was sure of: I would not like to be a teacher. I don't know exactly why I had such a strong opinion. Maybe because my mom was a teacher and I saw the workload she had, or perhaps because I didn't love the school environment. Besides, I have always loved to travel and learn about the world. That is the reason my first college degree was in Tourism. While in college, I started teaching English in a Language school. It was supposed to be a side job to help me pay my college costs. However, I fell in love with teaching. I finished my Tourism program and I can honestly say that it was a learning experience for me, regardless of never having worked in that field. After some years of working as an English teacher, I decided it was time for me to go back to college and take my second college course- this time in education. The aspects of teaching that I knew by experience, I could then learn the theory, history, and new strategies in a classroom.

After concluding that program, I started working in a regular school, from elementary to high school. Unfortunately, the pay was considerably lower than what I was used to. Still, I wanted to gain the experience of teaching a more significant number of kids and following a different curriculum. However, I had a goal in mind: I would pursue a master's degree and qualify for better work opportunities. The experience of those years was essential for my coming to the United States of America.

In 2017, I applied to work as a DLI teacher in the state of Utah. After several recruiting steps, I was approved and came to the USA in July of the same year. I started working at Sunrise Elementary school in Logan, Utah. I was at that school for three years as a DLI Portuguese, Science, and Social Studies teacher. I loved my job, and teaching content in the target language was one of the highlights of those years.

During the pandemic, however, I was invited to work in secondary education as a DLI Portuguese instructor and as a Culture, History, and Media teacher. I am now going into my third year of working at the middle school (7th-8th grades) and high school levels. In Sky View High School, I teach 9th grade preparing my students for the NEWL (National Examinations in World Languages) proficiency test. I also teach college-level classes in partnership with a USU professor.

When I was in my third year of teaching DLI, I decided it was time for me to pursue that dream of having a master's degree. I knew the challenges I would have to be accepted to a master's program in a second language. Still, I was very excited and full of expectations about it. Being accepted into the program was one of my most significant accomplishments. My main goal in pursuing the degree was to qualify to pursue more possibilities in my career and to become a better teacher.

In the very first class, I realized that although I thought I was an excellent professional, there were many aspects of teaching a second language that I had never learned. That didn't discourage me. The course environment was so favorable that I felt comfortable expressing my opinions, asking questions, and being an active participant in class, even though English is my second language. My experience in the MSLT program was the best possible. I felt I belonged and was positively impressed with the professors I had. I loved the discussions we had in class and the many possibilities I encountered for improvement. Despite thinking I had the ability and maybe a gift to be a good teacher, being in the MSLT program has completely changed my perspective and knowledge about education. Now, I understand that having a natural ability to teach is an advantage, but not enough to be a qualified teacher. The master's program has helped

me understand the importance of keeping updated with the different theories of SLC and the new research that is constantly published.

One of the highlights of the course was building my teaching philosophy. Before that, I had never considered what was crucial for my teaching. Writing it made me ask others for feedback and reflect on my strengths and weaknesses. It was a time of much self-reflection and self-learning. Upon analyzing what were the crucial teaching points for me, I realized that what amazes me the most in education is its power for transformation, the ability education has to make people think more critically, analyze the world around them with via others' eyes, and think of solutions to the problems we encounter in many areas of our lives.

I knew that many of my good ideas and the bricks that helped me build my critical thinking came from discussions in class, where I could hear the teacher and my colleagues. Therefore, my classes have always valued promoting discussions and giving my students a voice. To do so, I need different strategies to teach, check for understanding, and assess students. Some will voluntarily engage in class; however, a significant number of students need different strategies so that the teacher can “hear their voices.” Writing my teaching philosophy helped me reflect and become aware of my values as a teacher, but it also helped me guide my planning, lessons, and assessments. Now, I am more aware of my values. Therefore, I need to be loyal to them - so they are not only words but actual teaching practices.

Writing my teaching philosophy was just one of the benefits I got from being in the MSLT program. By doing so, I was not only able to reflect on my values but also put them into practice. In addition, given that I was teaching while enrolled in the MSLT program, I was able to apply some concepts and theories I learned from my professors. Some of them were required by the professors, and some I wanted to check how they would work in my classes. I am glad to

say that I had a positive experience applying the new concepts I learned. Although I wouldn't know all the specific points that my students and I benefited from the MSLT program, some were very visible. For instance, applying my teaching philosophy in my day-by-day classes, striving to be true to my goal of helping them to develop critical thinking, having a class centered on my students, and adapting my strategies to better teach all kinds of learners were some of them. In addition, I could learn and apply an efficient use of technology in class and use a more implicit input, output, and corrective-feedback oriented approach.

Furthermore, my students and I benefitted from my studies on how to develop different strategies for oral and written outputs, provide feedback and assess student development in a manner that favors different kinds of learners. Finally, my perspective on the relation between language and culture was broadened as I fell in love with this subject and started applying it more often and in a more significant way in my lessons.

In the MSLT program, my passion for studying was rekindled, therefore, I don't want to stop here. I intend to continue studying about language, teaching and education in general. Reading about second language acquisition, reflecting, debating, and writing about it has had a substantial impact on the quality of my classes. It has helped me to encourage students to value education and the culture they are learning about. I am glad to say that my expectations when I enrolled in this program were met. I consider myself a more efficient and qualified language teacher. Besides that, I believe I am more prepared to progress in my profession with the knowledge I acquired in the MSLT program.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

Whenever a person asks me about my passions in life, I say teaching is one of them. Much more than the way I make a living, teaching is something I enjoy doing and feel confident about. Teaching gives me a unique chance to meet extraordinary and diverse people. My passion for education started when I was young. Studying made me want to know the world and its different people, and above all, the education I received (both at home and at school) was how I built my critical thinking skills and my ability to reflect on what happens around me. My experiences as a student helped me to build my teaching style, the way I see my role as an educator, and my teaching philosophy.

Upon writing this teaching philosophy statement (TPS), I had the opportunity to ponder my beliefs about teaching, how I see my role in my students' learning, and what my weaknesses and strengths are. In addition, I asked for feedback on my teaching style from my colleagues, my students, and their parents.

I realized that the core elements of my TPS are building a student-centered class, developing effective teaching strategies to approach my students' differences and individualities, and helping them grow as world citizens by trying to promote their critical thinking about the knowledge they receive in class. I discuss these elements in the pages that follow.

Student-centered classroom

Although it is not clear when student-/learner-centered practices started, and authors have different opinions about it, some of them believe its roots come from constructivism.

Constructivism comes from the work of Jean Piaget (1896-1980), who states that learning is constructed from learners' experiences in life. Some (Li & Guo, 2015; Reed, Smith, & Sherratt, 2008; Starkey, 2017; Taber, 2011) believe that constructivism and a student-centered class are connected. According to Reed, Smith, & Sherratt (2008), "...social constructivist theories also

led to development around active learning: the notion that learning is not a passive process, but rather requires active involvement and engagement with both materials and peers” (p. 311). This form of pedagogy (constructivism) is necessary for a student-centered class both in traditional classroom settings and online (Li & Guo, 2015). Constructivism and a student-centered class value the learner’s background, therefore, students’ participation in class is encouraged as they can contribute in class. Thus, background plays a vital role in students’ learning (Starkey, 2017).

Not only is a student’s background vital in the construction of learning, but social interactions are also important as they help to add to previous knowledge (background), formal knowledge (usually received by the teacher), and personal knowledge (connected to one’s own beliefs and experiences). Learning with peers through social interaction helps most students understand concepts better, practice them, and learn from others and their mistakes. In this light, “Constructivism provides a basis for framing the concept of student-centered education” (Starkey, 2017, p. 4), which I aim to promote.

According to Starkey (2017), student-centered education has three dimensions: cognitive, student agency, and a humanist dimension. The first one focuses on the student’s learning processes and emphasizes the different pace everyone has in learning. In this dimension, assessing previous knowledge is fundamental in tailoring the best strategies to teach different students.

The second dimension, student agency, refers to the responsibility students should take for their learning. They must be included in the decision-making process as much as possible as they need to have a voice in class and be treated as highly capable human beings who can learn and make discoveries independently. Their participation in class is active.

Finally, the third dimension is centered on humanism, “a philosophy which views the individual and their potential for development across all aspects of being human as central to education” (Starkey, 2017, p. 7). In a student-centered class, not only academic knowledge is valued, but also their development in areas such as leadership, collaboration, problem-solving, communication, empathy, and others.

I constantly strive to build a student-centered class by being aware of those three dimensions. I believe my strengths include learning about my students’ lives, caring about them, and showing that *they* matter to me, not only their grades. I like to know about my students’ activities outside of school and their families, and I try to follow what they are doing by asking about their routines, interests, and experiences in life.

According to Qamar (2016, pp. 2-3), “Taking a student-centered approach the teacher makes the students share responsibility for their learning and let (sic) the students set a task for their learning goal.” Students feel more motivated and ready to learn when they know they play an active role in the learning process instead of only a passive part.

A student-centered approach is essential to all kinds of classes but particularly crucial in an L2 context. Without ample opportunities to communicate, talk to their peers, debate, ask questions, and participate in class, it is harder for a student to become fluent in the target language. Furthermore, when pupils feel they belong to the class, they have a voice, and their opinion matters, their motivation often increases, and motivation is the key to success in language learning. According to Inada & Inada (2022) “if students enjoyed the experience of learning a TL, their anxiety decreased, which will improve their TL proficiency”.

The importance of interaction in learning is not a new concept. Long (1981) formulated the Interaction Hypothesis, which states that language learners need not only input,

but also opportunities for output with teachers and classmates. By producing output, learners process the input they received and work towards the negotiation of meaning. As most teachers know, it is almost impossible to provide time for output if the conversation is only between teacher and student. When learners can interact with each other, the output is more constant in class (Namaziandost & Nasri, 2019). Therefore, in order to provide an effective student-centered class, where students are really in the center of the lesson, rather than the teacher, pupils need to have ample opportunities to express their ideas, make mistakes, negotiate meanings and “lose” their fear to speak an L2. By interacting with classmates, all students get the same speaking time and are in charge of their output, instead of only wait until/if the teacher calls on them. In sum, it is impossible to have a student-centered class without lots of opportunities for interaction.

Working with diversity in class and finding multiple strategies to teach all students

As most teachers, in all the years I have been working, I have had the chance to teach the most diverse group of kids. This is one of the beauties of education: having a constant exchange of knowledge. Different backgrounds have taught me to see learning from a different perspective. Moreover, my students’ different experiences, beliefs, and opinions have made my classes much richer and contributed to open-minded debates, thought-provoking texts, and unexpected interpretations of texts. Besides, the variety among students has helped my students and me to improve personal values that go beyond learning a language, such as tolerance, respect, willingness to reflect and change, and group work skills.

An effective learning environment means students feel safe and confident to ask questions, are motivated to learn, and when the class is over, they know more than they knew before. For some students, this is going to look like mastering the topic and, for others, being

able to give a short and simple explanation about a theme/topic. Whatever the case is, if students can develop a love for learning in my class, I consider this is an achievement.

Many aspects build up a safe environment, such as a polite and fair teacher, an anti-bullying atmosphere, respect, and a place where students feel free to ask questions, make comments, and crucially, make mistakes. According to Hattie (2012, p. 29): “Expert teachers create classroom climates that welcome admission of errors; they achieve this by developing a climate of trust between teacher and student, and between student and student.” Students' errors and mistakes are interesting as they inform me of the learning that is or isn't taking place.

Despite the fact that some people can learn in adverse environments, most people need a safe and comfortable place to learn. Considering a second language class, anxiety plays a significant role in developing the target language, especially among novice learners. If they feel they are in a high-threat learning environment, that anxiety will multiply. Therefore, striving to create a friendly and fair environment should be the goal of language teachers. Likewise, a class that provides autonomy to the learner can create a favorable learning environment.

Some of the ways I try to reduce anxiety and giving more autonomy to my students is by providing many opportunities for pair work. I individually assign their pairs depending on the activity they are doing, I consider not only their academical level but also their level of comfort on working with certain people. By working in pairs, not only they have the chance to speak more and figure out things by themselves and/or with their partners, but they reduce anxiety issues they might have when speaking the language; as the only person they have to talk to is their classmate. My students also have many moments that they need to read and write by themselves. Although working in pairs is a great idea, in particular for speaking and listening, I believe that when students have time to work by themselves, they put more effort in what they

are doing and activate their knowledge in a way they sometimes don't do with their friends. That's why a classroom that provides autonomy to the learner is ideal for L2 learning (Qamar, 2016, p. 294). A class that provides autonomy puts students more in charge of their learning

Helping students to become critical thinkers and global citizens

If I had to choose just one reason why I am a teacher, I would select this: the opportunity teachers have to help the new generation work for change in the world. Here I emphasize the kind of education that helps students to learn from the past and teaches them to analyze the news and contribute to the community they live in.

Using critical pedagogy is a way to help students to engage in class and learn how to think more critically, "Theoretically, critical pedagogy in classroom discourse embodies the practice of engaging students in the social construction of knowledge, which grounds its pillars in power relations" (Sarroub & Quadros, 2015, p. 253). By applying this kind of pedagogy teachers can give students a chance to see how the content they are studying relates to their society and environment. By associating what they are learning to "real life", not only students tend to be more motivated in class, but it also helps them to see education as something really useful in their lives, it favors the development of critical thinking that can lead students to question and challenge the reality around them. This idea of the social construction of knowledge (bringing to class what they already know and taking what they learn at school for their lives) helps students to "think outside the box," collaborate to find solutions, and think about ways of applying the content they are studying in "real life."

An aspect of fostering students' critical thinking is the integration of disciplines. According to McMillan (2010, p. 435): "education must consider social, historical, political, and aesthetic pieces of the puzzle." In teaching language, I consider an interdisciplinary methodology

an effective way to expose students to a broad range of vocabulary and expressions and an excellent opportunity to engage them in discussions about society, economy, science, arts, and technology. In addition, reading strategies can be transferred from one language to another; writing prompts can be related to what they are learning in Social Studies, and the paintings they are studying in class can be a foundation to speaking activities. These are just a few examples of how beneficial the integration of the various disciplines can be.

I have already taught a second language through the language itself and through content or via the integration of various disciplines, and I consider the integration between language, content, and culture the most effective, because it is the most engaging. Students feel motivated to learn if they can relate to the content they are studying. To be able to understand a language fully, students need to be exposed to authentic material from the target language and have opportunities to use the language in different contexts and for a wide array of situations. Exposure to different content in the L2 will help students have a richer vocabulary, improve their interpretation of texts, build their confidence to talk about several subjects, and develop their critical thinking.

Conclusion

In conclusion, students are my focus. Their needs being met, their expectations being reached, and their potential being fulfilled is my goal. I believe that I can only accomplish this by motivating them to learn, giving them a voice and a purpose in my classes, and making them see the relevance of their study.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHING OBSERVATION

There are several ways one can develop to be a better teacher. In this paper, I will discuss one of them: developing through class observation. During the time I worked in Brazil, I rarely had a chance to observe my fellow teachers. This wasn't encouraged at the schools I worked at, and I didn't have free time in the schedule to fit in observations on my own. I was only introduced to the observation class idea when I started working in the Cache County School District. It was part of the requirements for a first-year teacher to observe others. In addition, I made many other observations, some as part of my job's requirements and some for different classes of the MSLT program.

This has been an enriching experience as I had the opportunity to learn from others' strengths and weaknesses. It is interesting to notice in others' classes ways of teaching that we had never thought of before, ideas that never crossed our minds, and simple strategies that can make a big difference. It is also a unique opportunity for us to see the class from the lens of a "student" and, besides that, to have the chance to observe students during the class. In this paper, I will focus on one of the observations I made for the MSLT portfolio. This observation happened in one of the schools where I worked.

Context

My observation happened in a Spanish class in a middle school in Cache County School District. It was not a DLI class, and students were at the beginner level, taking their second semester of Spanish. There were about 24 students, who were arranged in groups of 4. It was a mix of 7th and 8th graders (12-14 years old). The class lasted about 60 minutes, and it was focused on the vocabulary learned in the previous lessons about places a tourist goes and problem-solving situations a tourist may encounter on a trip abroad. Students had the opportunity

to use their interpersonal and presentational skills in that class. The teacher posted the objective on the board and gave clear instructions at the beginning of the lesson. Their objective was to prepare a role-play of a situation that could happen in a hotel, airport, restaurant, or touristic place. All of the class was focused on developing this activity in their groups and presenting at the end.

Instructional procedure

The instructor started the class by reading the lesson's objective and giving clear instructions on the activity that would follow. He had already communicated with the students about the assignment in previous lessons, so they were aware they would be doing that on that day. The objective of the task was to create a role-play simulating a situation a tourist might encounter when traveling to another country. They needed to plan, write, and edit their role-play, practice, and then present to the whole class. All the instruction was done in English, however, the teacher would repeat the same instruction in Spanish. That was the pattern the teacher followed throughout the class.

He gave the students some possible touristic places they could choose from and he also told students to open their notebooks and use the notes they had taken and the vocabulary they had learned in the previous lessons. After students had chosen their topic, he reminded them about the number of lines they were supposed to write, emphasizing that every member in the group should participate actively both in the planning and in the presentation parts of the assignment, and he told students he would be at his desk where they could ask for help if they needed to. However, he encouraged them to work by themselves, limiting the help they would receive from the teacher so that both students and teachers could evaluate how much and how well they could produce on their own.

Students started talking and engaging with each other right away. Their group interaction was really good, as they would brainstorm ideas, improve them, and write them on paper. They rarely asked for the teacher's help. They had access to computers and could search words on Google Translate, although they were encouraged not to do it and use only their notebooks. While they were preparing their parts, I walked around and listened to their conversation. Occasionally, I would stop by and ask them a specific question about their work.

The teacher gave them about 40 minutes to plan and practice so they would have 20 minutes left to present. After they were working for about 30 minutes, Mr. X. walked around to make sure they were almost ready. He did not provide any feedback or try to correct students' mistakes at that point. Afterward, he randomly chose the order of the groups who would present. They were encouraged to use objects, move furniture, or any other resource that would create a scenario.

It was interesting to notice that even though they were in a position of being exposed to the whole class and being evaluated by the teacher, almost all the students seemed very comfortable performing their role-play. The students who were watching were supportive and respectful. I believe they felt comfortable doing it because they had a good teaching-learning atmosphere in the classroom and because the teacher didn't put much pressure on them and didn't correct them while they were presenting. After each presentation, he would compliment students on their work but did not provide specific feedback.

Evaluation

One of the reasons I chose to write about this specific observation, among so many others, was the positive impression I had watching the class. Overall, it was a very simple and

successful class. There weren't charts, power point presentations, music, dance-none of that, but it still engaged the students the whole time.

Another reason why I enjoyed it was that it had a student-centered approach. Although the students knew the teacher was there for them, they were allowed and had the tools to work and produce by themselves. This gave them autonomy, freedom to be creative, more possibilities to try the language, and much more interaction with each other than if the teacher were lecturing all the time.

Furthermore, the idea of having an assessment approach that allows students to work in groups and learn from others is in accordance with Vygotsky's (1978) idea of proximal development and scaffolding. The task allowed them to get out of their comfort zone of just copying vocabulary and doing worksheets and led them to creatively produce with what they had learned. They did have the scaffolding to prepare them for this output activity and were more prepared to go to the next level: using the input they received to simulate real-life situations. As not all students are at the same performance level, some kids in the group needed more help than others, and that's why having a group can help them to reach one step above, even without the teacher's intervention. In other words, the ability the student has to perform better when he receives guidance and encouragement from other learners. They had already studied the topic for some classes and now had the chance to apply what they had learned in situations that imitated real life. When teachers approach the language from a real-life situation, it is easier for the students to relate and engage in class.

The instruction given was clear enough that students didn't have to ask questions. They knew what they were supposed to do and did it. Considering the result of their role-plays, which I had the opportunity to watch, I would say they learned the content well. The role-play

presentations had a good amount of vocabulary, the grammar was correct, the pronunciation was not perfect but easy to understand, and the story created by the students made sense.

As my opinion of the class was very positive, I do not have many weaknesses to discuss. Maybe what I would have done differently, would be having the presentations in the following class. Although all groups were able to present, kids started getting a little anxious to get done with the presentations as they knew the bell was about to ring. Perhaps, instead of starting the presentations on the same day, I would have used the end of the lesson to go through all their writing, make some suggestions, observations, or compliments, and tell students they would have until the next class to get ready, so they would have time to practice pronunciation, memorize their part and only do the presentation in the next class. After watching that class, I took the time to see how I could apply a similar lesson in my curriculum. I was particularly impressed with the possibility of relating the content to real-life experiences. Inspired by his class, I could do similar activities in a few of my classes. One of them was in a unit related to professions. My students learned many different points related to the topic, such as vocabulary, grammar, text interpretations, and information through videos. One of their assessments at the end of the unit was to simulate a job interview. They had to use the vocabulary we studied and what they had learned about job interviews. I am glad to say it was one of the most successful activities I had in that class.

Observing his class and reflecting on the three points of my teaching philosophy, the most outstanding point was the student-centered approach. As mentioned in my TPS, I genuinely believe having students more in charge of their learning has many benefits, and I learned a very successful manner to do that with Mr. X. I could see firsthand how a teacher can have a whole class focused on the student interaction and production, with minimum intervention from the

teacher. Even though that was not the intention of the class, I also believe there was an element of building critical thinking through problem solving. When students must create a situation that simulates real life, they need to develop their thinking to come up with ideas that can be problematic, impolite, unfair, difficult to resolve, and how to deal with them from the perspective of a hotel manager, an airplane attendant, a waiter, and other professionals in the tourism area.

Lastly, I believe the teacher's approach favors many kinds of students. All teachers know that we have some students who have a hard time sitting still and listening to the teacher. When those students can do group work and talk throughout the class, it is much easier for them to engage in the lesson. In addition, this activity favors quiet students who do not feel comfortable participating in class. Even though presenting might be hard for those students, they had a long time to practice their language in a small group and feel more confident and prepared to present. This strategy works well too with academically lower students, those who struggle when they have to work by themselves. Having a group helps them to perform better in an assessment, gives them the chance to learn the content from the peer's perspective, practice the language with colleagues, and enables them to feel more confident to participate in class. Therefore, this activity is also in alignment with one of the points of my teaching philosophy of using different strategies to teach different students.

When teachers become aware of the core elements of their teaching philosophy, it is easier to identify them or the lack of them in other teachers' classes. Moreover, it becomes easier to think of ways that those core elements could be added to every class. In this case, even though the teacher successfully used two essential elements of my TPS, I believe he could have included more cultural elements to help students toward a global understanding and learn more about citizenship. I believe this activity had room to teach about cultural differences. For instance, how

you call a cab in New York differs from how you do it in Brazil. Also, the way people treat people who are serving them, as maids, waiters, housekeepers, etc., varies from culture to culture. In addition, students and teachers could think of situations that might cause trouble for a tourist abroad because of cultural or language barriers.

Another possibility would be extending this activity to make a reflection on how the interactions that they simulated in their role-plays could be affected by the place they were in, the culturally accepted values in that society, the way that society sees genders and races, as well as many other aspects that can interfere even in simple situations as the ones students presented in their role-plays. This would help increase their critical thinking and expand their language and view of the world.

In conclusion, observing this Spanish teacher was a rich experience for me. It helped me to think of ways to improve my classes and emulate what he had done by adapting to my students' circumstances.

MAIN PAPER:

REFLECTION ON ORAL AND WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Introduction

Many aspects contribute to making a successful L2 teacher. Creating a respectful relationship with students, providing an environment where students feel safe and welcomed, constantly assessing students' knowledge, and giving feedback are among them. According to Hattie, "Expert teachers are skilled at monitoring the current status of student understanding and the progress of learning towards the successful criteria, and they seek and provide feedback geared to the students' current understanding" (Hattie, 2012, p. 30). As I desire to become an expert teacher, I wanted to learn more about effective feedback for L2 learners.

Although I have been teaching for about 21 years, I had never heard the term corrective feedback until I started taking MSLT classes. In the schools I worked at in Brazil, I had very few guidelines about how to provide corrections to students. They were not seen as a way of providing feedback, but to punish, grade, and show parents that teachers were doing their jobs correcting every word written by the students. Some of the guidelines we received were: everything on their workbook needed to be corrected; corrections should not be made in the classroom with students in there; all corrections should be done using a red pen; in summative assessments, bad handwriting needs to be corrected and students lose points in their final grade for that; etc. As one can notice, my knowledge about the topic was little to none and I had much room for improvement and many changes to be made regarding this topic.

In corroboration with my own experience, one of the papers I read also showed that college students in teacher preparation programs in Brazil had little knowledge about corrective feedback (CF). Students were in the last year of their language course and some were already teaching. When asked what they had learned in their college course about oral corrective

feedback (OCF) in an L2, the students' answers showed they did not remember any literature or debate about the topic, suggesting that CF is not a subject prioritized in language majors in Brazil (Pessoas & dos Santos, 2019).

I believe that once teachers become aware of the importance of OCF, they can use it as a tool to evaluate their teaching strategies and students' learning. They can assess the students' language proficiency through informal interactions in class and use the information to identify the ones who are struggling the most and what points should be retaught. With this in mind, I decided CF would be a very useful/practical and even crucial line of study for me. I realized I needed a deep knowledge of the topic to start applying it in my classes. The fact that I was always teaching while researching this topic helped me to relate examples of what I saw in the papers to my students and my specific teaching context. It also helped me to apply ideas in my classes and test their validity. In this paper, I will go over the literature review of oral and written corrective feedback and, I will reflect on some specific changes I made in my classes and report on some of the results I got.

Oral Corrective Feedback

Students make mistakes. I would dare to say that in a language class, students make even more mistakes than in other classes. Those errors can be pronunciation, grammar, comprehension, spelling and others. Although, input plays an important role in second language acquisition, and its quality and quantity may have a considerable impact in students' learning, they will still make countless errors before mastering various aspects of the language. What happens after committing those errors though can have a great impact on students' learning. According to Silva, Souza-Dias, and do Nascimento (2018), "teachers should have in mind that mistakes and corrections should serve as a supporting tool for a pleasant, peaceful and meaningful learning of languages" (p. 251).

In a student-centered class, errors should be welcomed. Students in this kind of class shouldn't be embarrassed of speaking because they are afraid to make mistakes. Creating an environment where students feel comfortable speaking a second language, even though it might not be flawless puts the student at the center of the learning. They can have a feeling of belonging, as they come to notice that all students make mistakes, and the teacher uses those errors as a learning tool for all students.

Since most educators strive for a peaceful, meaningful, and low-stress environment, I believe it is worthy for teachers to spend some time learning about the influence of CF, on learners and how to do it in a non-threatening way. If teachers fail to prepare for the predictable inevitability of errors, students will be missing an excellent opportunity to learn and grow from them. It is also crucial for teachers to evaluate their students and their own performance in class to help students achieve higher levels of proficiency and for instructors to succeed in their profession.

Although rubrics and success criteria will not be included in this work, it is worth noting that effective CF is very much related to the rubrics and expectations stated by the teacher. To provide honest feedback, teachers need to make sure students know what the expectations are for the tasks and how they will be evaluated for their work. Communicating what is expected in the assignments is essential for higher quality performance in the language. It shows a degree of respect between teacher and student, as the latter knows the specific aspects that will be evaluated (Hattie, 2018). Inasmuch, it helps instructors to focus on some specific points that were emphasized with learners, instead of overwhelming themselves by trying to correct every single mistake a student makes.

Oral corrective feedback can be defined as a reaction to the incorrect oral production of a language learner. It stimulates the learning process, leading the learner to notice the incorrect utterance and correct it (uptake and repair). From the information provided via OCF, learners are invited to identify and correct the difference between their utterance and the desired one (Pessoa & dos Santos, 2019). Although most modern studies agree that OCF helps students improve their linguistic skills, the scholarly literature offers varying perspectives. One of the authors who had a different view about CF was Krashen (1982). According to the author, CF “has the immediate effect of putting the student on the defensive” (p. 75). He argues for the power of positive evidence which is, from this perspective, the input learners receive concerning a specific aspect of the language. According to him, focusing on positive evidence is sufficient to guide students to proficiency.

On the other hand, Long (2007), upon developing his interaction hypothesis theory, concluded that input is crucial in acquiring a second language, however, it is not sufficient; output is essential for the development of the L2. Benati and Schwieter (2022), reviewing Long’s work, support the latter statement that interaction is fundamental in acquiring a second language, as “it connects to input, internal learning capacities, selective attention and output in a productive way” (p. 2). Inagaki and Long (2015) point that despite all the correct forms received through input, learners seem not to notice them. For instance, some L2 structures are difficult to acquire with positive feedback only, “since learners would have to notice the absence of an option in the L2 which the L1 permits” (Inagaki & Long, 2015, p. 9). Thus, error correction, also known as negative feedback, is essential in learners’ attainment of an L2 (Inagaki & Long, 2015).

Reinforcing the point above, Swain (1995) argues that input alone is not enough for language acquisition to happen. She argues that output is essential, and it serves three main

functions: the noticing/triggering function, the hypothesis-testing function, and the metalinguistic function (p. 128). Swain (2000) explains that when learners notice their linguistic deficiencies (which might happen with the help of OCF) they may attempt to repair their errors “by turning to a dictionary or grammar book, by asking their peers or teachers; or by noting to themselves to pay attention to future relevant input” (p. 100). Thus, output plays an important role in helping students to produce and make attempts with the language, consequently, make more mistakes, notice them, and be ready to receive feedback and move forward.

Lyster (2001) divides OCF into explicit and implicit correction; the latter is also known as negotiation of form or meaning. This classification complements the seminal study by Lyster and Ranta (1997), who distinguished six different kinds of OCF. Teachers can also use a combination of them, which is called multiple feedback. In this context, implicit feedback is offered when the instructor doesn't “give the answer” but helps the student to identify the error and this can be done in different ways. Explicit feedback, by contrast, is offered when the teacher identifies the error, corrects it, and, in many cases, explains the correction. Lyster provides examples of feedback or negative evidence, summarized in Table 1.

Table 1- Oral corrective feedback (adapted from Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Explicit correction	The instructor points out an error, provides the correct form, and explains the subject.
Recasts	The teacher repeats the wrong sentence minus its error (correcting the error).
Clarification request	An inquisitive look can be given or questions such as: <i>What do you mean? Pardon me? Sorry?</i>
Metalinguistic feedback	Some clues are provided in relation to what is wrong. Suggestions such as, <i>pay attention to the tense. What article do we use for masculine words? Is it singular or plural?</i>
Elicitation	The use of at least 3 strategies to elicit students to find and correct the error. Some examples are: the teacher repeats parts of the sentence but pauses for the student to complete it with the right form. The teacher uses questions to elicit the correct form and the teacher asks the student to reformulate the utterance.
Repetition	The instructor repeats the wrong part of the sentence, usually with rising intonation, so that the student can perceive where the mistake was.

The three studies that will be briefly analyzed below address the kind of feedback teachers tend to use the most and how efficient they are. For example, Lyster and Ranta, who analyzed four language teachers' CF report that all of them used recasts more often than any

other type of feedback (55%). In order of frequency used, the others were elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

In a later study, Llinares and Lyster (2014) compared three different language teaching scenarios: English as the L2 in Spain, French Immersion Programs in Quebec, and Japanese immersion programs in the US. They analyzed the frequency and distribution of different types of feedback and learner uptake. In all three settings, recasts were the most used OCF. In two of the groups, recasts led to the most uptakes from learners, whereas this was not the case for the third group. The authors reasoned that the difference can be attributed to what the teachers did after the recast. In the former two groups, recasts were followed by an explanation from the teacher. On the other hand, in the third group, the teacher only repeated the sentence minus the error but didn't give any explanation of why the previous sentence was incorrect. Consequently, students weren't aware of their mistakes and didn't correct them. From this study, one can conclude that recasts can be a valuable form of feedback. However, a key component of its effectiveness is students noticing it. Although it is not the only way to help students notice their errors, an explanation following the recast can help learners to notice the mistake and have clues on how to correct it.

The previous studies align with Inagaki and Long (2015), who claim that teachers have traditionally offered explicit feedback by providing the right answer either by repeating the sentence minus the error (recast) or by pointing out the error and supplying an explanation for it. However, in a more recent study, Rauber (2016) analyzed two Portuguese L2 classes with two different teachers. She found that the three most used forms OCF were elicitation, explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback. All of them together summed 81% of all the feedback

provided by the teachers. Therefore, in this study, the implicit kind of feedback was higher than the explicit. Rauber (2016) also investigated which OCF led to more learner uptakes. The study shows that only 23% of the total corrections resulted in uptakes by the students and, that the most successful uptakes (the ones that led to repair) were the ones followed by OCF elicitation technique. It is interesting to notice that the results in effectiveness of feedback are usually, but not exclusively, done through students' output. When students repair their error giving the teacher the correct form, the instructor can see that, for the moment, the student understood the correction and was able to repair it. However, we need to consider that even if students do not produce an output right away, they might still have understood and mastered the topic, however, they did not express it through output, which makes harder for teachers/researchers to analyze. A way to verify if the student noticed the correction and it led to repair is providing other situations for learners to use that form again. It can be done after a few minutes, or in the next classes. Depending on how well they perform it the next time, it can show teachers if they have learned it or not. On the other hand, even if the learner produces an output right after the correction, and has it right, it is no guarantee that the next time he/she encounters that same form, they will produce it correctly.

One may wonder why only 23% of the feedback resulted in uptakes. Although this was concluded in Rauber's (2016) study, I believe similar results would be found in other language classes. From my own experience and by observing teachers, I notice that many times the correction is made in a rush and the instructor doesn't leave much time for uptakes and repairs. A different reason why a small percentage of feedback leads to uptakes is that a significant number of OCF is explicit. Thus, the teacher does the explanation or gives the right answer and leaves no room for the student to reformulate the sentence.

Another point to consider when deciding on implicit or explicit kind of feedback is the kind of error that is being corrected. A study in French DLI classes showed that negotiation of form, which can be defined “as a linguistic error made explicitly and followed by ongoing negotiation” (p.1), was more beneficial to immediate repairs, compared to recast or explicit correction, especially for lexical and grammar errors (Dziubalska-Kolaczyk, Wrembel, & Kul, 2010). As my experience in DLI classes, many of the lexical and grammar errors made by the students are for factors other than not knowing the correct form. They know it well, they are able to do it in drill activities, however, they struggle when they are trying to communicate. Therefore, using negotiation of form is usually enough to remind students of what they already know. The researchers noticed in the study that “When teachers used either metalinguistic clues, elicitation, repetition of error or clarification requests, they turned the floor to students along with cues for the latter to draw on their own resources, thus allowing for negotiation to occur bilaterally” (Lyster, 2001, p. 273).

Recasts, however, proved more effective in phonological errors (Lyster, 2001), especially among novice learners or first-time errors, because an L2 learner can struggle to identify the sounds and the difference between the sound produced and the correct one. The speaker is so used to speaking certain phonemes that both speaking them in another way or even recognizing them in the target language is not an easy task. That’s why in those cases, a more explicit approach might be more beneficial, as the learner would hear the correct sound, and better yet if the teacher emphasizes the parts of the phonological error that needs to be addressed. For instance, an ESL speaker speaking “word” but meaning “world”; if the instructor just says: “pay attention to the R”, it might confuse the student, or sometimes the learner can see there is a difference between what he/she said and what the teacher said. However, as in some languages

like Spanish and Portuguese, there isn't the RL sound. Producing this sound is difficult for them and, providing just a reminder of what is wrong won't help them pronounce it correctly if they don't know how to do it. On the other hand, if the teacher repeats the word "world," putting much emphasis on the "R" and, giving some hints on how to make the "R" sound, for instance, how should your tongue move to produce such sound, and asking the student to repeat it, will be much more beneficial to the learner. Lyster concludes that teachers were right in providing recasts to phonological errors and negotiations of form to the lexical ones.

There are some other situations when explicit learning and correction are necessary. Certainly, those situations vary from class to class. Some of the scenarios that would justify an explicit CF would be a difficult subject, a lack of time for implicit learning, a student who is struggling with the topic, or failure in previous attempts using implicit feedback. I believe students need to have a chance to self-repair their errors, but teachers should use their previous experiences with the learner, their knowledge of the content, the learning objective(s), and the class dynamic to decide the right time to switch from implicit to explicit feedback.

Another difficulty teachers might encounter is determining which error should be corrected among the amount of mistakes students have in their outputs. Alsolami (2019) distinguishes errors in communication as global and local. Global errors are those that affect communication, preventing the interlocutor from properly understanding the message. Local errors, on the other hand, have little effect on communication; consequently, they can be overlooked. According to Alsolami (2019):

The approach used in correcting linguistic errors should only focus on certain types of errors at a time. Some of the errors do not distort communication as they hardly change

the meaning of the phrases or statements. Such mistakes should not be corrected as the learner self-corrects as they get a better knowledge of the language. (p. 674)

Language instructors need to develop the ability to distinguish between local and global errors to figure out whether to offer feedback at that moment or not. It is not possible for a language teacher to notice or correct all the mistakes students do in class. Thus, discerning what needs to be addressed and at what moment makes a difference in the pace of the lesson, the environment of the class, and the results achieved (Alsolami, 2019).

Although providing feedback is beneficial in the acquisition of an L2; if students cannot perceive the correction, they probably won't repair the error. This is considered ineffective corrective feedback. For the student, it is merely another sentence spoken by the teacher. It may lead to repair sometimes, just because students can repeat what the teacher said without having a clue of why they are saying that. Other aspects contributing to the ineffective use of OCF include “inconsistency, ambiguity, and ineffectiveness of teachers. Regrettably, “some of the teachers use unsystematic oral corrective feedback approaches that have a negative impact on the language skills of the students” (Alsomali, 2019, p. 674). Having consistent feedback also helps to reduce the anxiety correction that might arise in some learners.

Reflections

As my knowledge and use of OCF were almost zero when starting the MSLT program, I can say that I have both learned a lot and changed my classes considerably regarding this topic. Below I will list some of the aspects that I changed related to my feedback strategy to make it more efficient.

1. Although this is not the main theme of my study, I should address that one of the most important concepts I have learned is the importance of developing successful criteria, rubrics, and setting expectations. As I saw the relation between rubrics, better assignments, and easier

and fairer oral corrective feedback. I started trying to develop activities and assessments with the end in mind. Before developing activities and rubrics, I started asking myself the following questions: What do I want my students to accomplish with this task?; What specific points do I want to evaluate?; and How will my students be better after this assignment? For every assessment, I now determine what my objectives are and the essential points I want to evaluate. They vary from a specific grammar point, vocabulary use, the ability to express ideas, clarity, and others. Ever since I began doing so, the quality of their work improved considerably, as they now know where their focus should be. Lastly, my workload and the quality of my feedback have completely changed after I realized the importance of rubrics. Now, I do not overwhelm myself trying to correct and communicate every single error, which allows me to focus on the crucial aspects of the evaluation and made listening to and reading their output more pleasant.

2. The second big change I had was after reading Alsolami's (2019) paper. A crucial question regarding CF is how can I decide which error deserves the attention of my feedback? In a language class with an average of 25 students, it is impossible to address every mistake, nor will it be effective, as students are not in class only to be corrected. Therefore, I decided to adopt Alsomali's (2019) concept of global and local errors in OCF. He says that global errors affect communication; consequently, they should be addressed as often and as efficiently as possible. Local errors, however, are those that do not prevent the conversation to flow or a person to be understood. Especially in day-by-day output produced in class, interrupting students to provide feedback on mistakes that don't alter the conversation might have the effect of cutting the flow of communication, irritating students, disrupting the class, and not being efficient, as, at that moment, students are trying to communicate something and will not be very open and attentive to corrections.

3. The third significant change that I made was after reading Lyster, Ranta, and Llynares's papers. Knowing that there are different kinds of CF, how they are divided into implicit and explicit, and understanding which ones produce more results, helped me become more aware of the feedback I give. After analyzing each one, comparing it to my experience in class, and connecting it to my classes in the MSLT program, I decided that what worked better for me and my students was the implicit kind of CF. From my perspective, implicitness is often better both in teaching new content and in correction. It puts the students in charge of their learning and it gives them the chance to understand and correct errors by themselves. Implicit or indirect feedback is also better to foster students' confidence and self-esteem. While an L2 learner is trying to produce output in the language, not all of the errors reflect their actual skills in the language. Other factors that can increase errors are distraction, health problems, fatigue, social factors interferences, a rush to communicate, and peer pressure (Silva, Souza- Dias & do Nascimento, 2018). Sometimes all they need is someone who signals that something is not correct.

This being said, I try to use the implicit method the most, helping my students achieve better results using the negotiation of meaning, which can be used through clarification, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, and repetition. In second language acquisition (SLA) theory, negotiation of meaning is "the process by which two or more interlocutors identify and then attempt to resolve a communication breakdown" (Ellis, 2003, p. 346). Negotiation of meaning provides learners with signals to help them peer or self-repair their errors instead of just having the teacher repeat the correct form (Lyster, 2001). Negotiation of meaning can happen in many forms. It might simply be a confusing face that leads the speaker to restructure better the sentence (elicitation) or it may be a question to clarify a part of the utterance that wasn't

understood (clarification request) and, it can be a conversation that goes back and forth among speakers so that an understanding is reached. I noticed that when negotiation of meaning is used, uptake happens most of the time.

4. Once I had decided that my focus would be on implicitness through negotiation of meaning I started using it in class more consciously. In the interpersonal mode, in small groups, I walk around and when I hear either a global mistake or a local one that has already been taught many times, I interrupt that student or group and use repetition or elicitation repeating the sentence using a rising intonation in the wrong word or structure. Within seconds, the student or someone in the group will identify the mistake and correct it. On the other hand, when a student is interacting with me, for instance, by telling me a story, I like to use clarification requests. For example, a student is telling me a story about the weekend and uses a false cognate. I briefly interrupt and ask what he/she means by that word, then in most cases, they realize their mistake and either can correct it by themselves or they ask for help to remind them what the correct word is.

In the presentational mode, I rarely interrupt my students for feedback. However, it doesn't mean that mistakes will never be addressed. When they are presenting something, I am always taking notes of patterns of errors I notice. Depending on the frequency and gravity of them, I plan a mini class to reteach/address those issues. In this scenario, I use more explicit forms of feedback because it shows me they did not learn it enough to produce output confidently and accurately. If the frequency is less, I spare some minutes of the class to write them on the board and let my students find out what is wrong (elicitation). Using negotiation of meaning, they can either do that by themselves or with others. Once they notice it, they are encouraged to reformulate the utterance so that it sounds right. After that, I provide more similar

examples and ask them to use the correct form. When they struggle to find the errors, I use some metalinguistic clues to help them to determine and correct what was wrong.

5. Although I try to make a conscious effort to have a student-centered class and let the students figure out errors and repairs by themselves, I am also aware that in not all instances will this be possible. Lyster (2001), Huzaifah, Nur, and Norlizawati (2018), and Bryfonski and Ma (2020) have pointed out in their studies that phonological errors are easier to be identified using a more explicit approach, such as via recast. I realize this is true, in particular in lower-level classes and with words that students are not very familiar with. Trying to use elicitation, for instance, when a student mispronounces a word, does not prove to be very effective as the learner does not know what he did wrong. In their minds, the grammar was correct, the idea was communicated clearly, and it is hard for them to notice there was something wrong in the phonetics. In this case, repeating the word with a different intonation helps the student to notice the difference between their output and the teacher's. Bryfonski and Ma (2020) report that L2 learners of Mandarin were more able to perceive recasts as a form of phonological correction because they could notice that the tone used by the teacher was different from the ones used by them. Thus, although it was just a repetition of the sentence minus the error, students were led by the tone of voice to pay attention to where the mistake was made.

Therefore, teachers need to make sure students are noticing the correction, or the repetition of the correct word. The learner needs to be aware of the input, so that it becomes an intake. Even more than just being aware, the student must register consciously either input or feedback so that the language is acquired (Unlu, 2015). I like to ask my student to repeat the word to make sure a repair is made. When I see a pattern of phonological error in class, after

recasting and explaining any phonological pattern, I always ask students to repeat that in unison multiple times, as in this way, nobody feels embarrassed by not pronouncing a word correctly.

Although the studies mentioned above and my own experience show that recast is more efficient, as I teach advanced level classes, I still use elicitation and repetition for many of their phonological errors, as they already know the word and are familiar with that. I also choose to use recasts for errors that are made with words they have recently learned or that are not frequently used.

Although it is not possible to plan for the errors we will hear in class, being aware of the different kinds of feedback techniques I can use has helped me to recognize more of my students' mistakes. It has also given me a different perspective on how important OCF is so that students don't fossilize their errors. I am aware I still have a lot of improvement to make, but the studies I read, the strategies I have learned have been helping me to put more effort in determining the errors that should be corrected, how to do it and find ways to determine if the feedback was efficient or not.

Written Corrective Feedback

Writing provides an opportunity for students to express themselves without the fear of speaking to a group of people, search and use new vocabulary, learn new words of transition, and develop critical thinking ability. Therefore, language learners should have ample opportunities to practice their writing (Fan & Ma, 2018). However, teachers need not only to assign writing tasks but also to provide meaningful written corrective feedback (WCF). Written corrective feedback can be divided into two main perspectives: a classic grammar vision (also known as local or micro-level) and a holistic one (global or macro-level).

Similar to OCF, the classic vision focuses on grammar regardless of whether it is interfering with the understanding of the text. Prepositions, conjunctions, spelling, and other grammar aspects are crucial in the writing rubric and feedback. The global approach focuses on clarity of ideas and the ability to express thoughts in a way the reader can comprehend. The holistic or global vision is more in tune with the modern learning strategies and philosophies that integrate language with the writing curriculum and task-based language teaching (Cárcamo, 2020).

Besides the holistic and classic approach, there are other elements to consider in how to provide WCF. Cárcamo (2020) offers a comprehensive written corrective feedback typology for research and educational purposes. This typology helps teachers decide on the proper WCF for specific tasks. Furthermore, having a classification that assists teachers in evaluating what kind of feedback works best for the students. Cárcamo's typology offers a practical insight into how a teacher can evaluate a student. His typology is summarized below:

- The correction can be direct, indirect, or unlocalized indirect. The latter refers to pointing out an error but not giving the correct answer.
- A correction can focus on form and function, structures, vocabulary, and lexical items, or it can be holistic and focus more on the general clarity and understanding of the text.
- Feedback can be given by the instructor, peers, or even be computer-mediated.
- Feedback can be written in the margins, typed in the margins, delivered through individual conferences, and via other forms of feedback delivery.
- As for the notes, they can be written in just the correct form or with an accompanied explanation. It can be done through colors and symbols, underlines and circles, or instructors and

peers can decide on a final comment addressing all the major problems; yet some may prefer no comments.

Some of the points mentioned above are included in Hartshorn (2010) and the idea of dynamic feedback. Dynamic feedback is defined as having some essential elements that help students to learn how to write more accurately. It includes feedback that reflects what learners need the most, based on their written production and “a principled approach to pedagogy that ensures that writing tasks and feedback are meaningful, timely, constant, and manageable for both student and teacher” (Hartshorn et al., 2010, p. 87).

One way to make dynamic WCF meaningful is in the form of coded symbols. Students previously learn those symbols and are supposed to keep track of their errors in an error list. This puts the learner in charge, as they are expected to improve their writing according to the coded symbols provided by the teacher. Moreover, it helps students and teachers identify high-frequency errors (Hartshorn et al., 2010).

According to Hartshorn (2010), the dynamic WCF is timely and constant, which means teachers need to provide feedback in the next class period and students are expected to return their improved work as soon as possible. The cycle continues with the teacher returning the coded symbol feedback. Finally, the last and vital aspect of dynamic WCF is being manageable. Feedback is manageable for teachers when they have enough time to communicate and give feedback according to the rubric previously given. It is effective for students as they have the time to “process, learn from, and apply the needed feedback from their teachers” (Hartshorn et al., 2010, p. 88).

From my perspective as a teacher, applying dynamic WCF promptly is hard. Among all the tasks teachers have, finding the time to provide meaningful feedback available for students in

the next class seems almost impossible without overwhelming the teacher with hours of review. In the school structure where most language teachers work, it is challenging to provide meaningful, timely, and manageable feedback considering the number of students they have. To make it possible, teachers should have more preparation time or more qualified help in class to assist them in this process.

In this light, Hartshorn et al. (2010) suggest that teachers “limit the length of students’ writing” (p. 89). They also recommend that students should produce 10 minutes of paragraphs daily. “Ten minutes was chosen because it seemed long enough to provide a meaningful writing sample, while still being manageable enough for the teacher to mark and for the student to process” (p. 89).

In Huzaifah, Nur, and Norlizawati's (2018) study that looked at dynamic corrective feedback used with English as a second language (ESL) students and color-coding, the authors pointed out that it helps to reduce students' anxiety that accompanies feedback. Color coding, different than using red pen to mark all errors, is a system that offers some advantages. For instance, the teacher can use certain colors to compliment students: yellow might mean a creative idea, green means a well structure sentence and so on. Another benefit of color-coding, especially compared to the “only red pen use”, is that it is easier for the students to identify the kind of error that needs to be corrected. For example, blue might be a verbal tense mistake, pink might be a spelling mistake. Certainly, for it to work well, students need to know what the colors mean, however, once they know it, it can lead them to repair their errors more quickly and easily.

Although it is the teacher’s duty to correct students’ mistakes, I believe instructors need to be careful to not only point the errors, but also take some time to mention what was good or outstanding. In my opinion, this is also a very positive way to provide WCF. If the student sees a

structure, idea, introduction, conclusion that received a compliment, they will probably read that part again, with more attention to see what they did good and, chances are that they will remember that in the next writing opportunities. Therefore, praising can also be an efficient kind of feedback. Only receiving bad comments, lots of marks pointing errors, might be discouraging for students. It is also not very helpful when teachers cross many sentences out and simply write what the correct form is. Unintentionally, some teachers write many negative comments in the margins and, especially for younger learners, it can make them think they are incapable of good writing. Using color-coding avoids the need to write negative comments and puts the students in the center of their learning.

Another important aspect related to written corrective feedback is who gives it. As stated by Cárcamo (2020), WCF can be provided by the teacher, classmates, or through collaborative work. Bostanci and Sengul (2018) analyzed three classes that received different sources of WCF. The first class received only the instructor's feedback, the second only peers, and the third class received collaborative feedback. The authors state that “collaborative feedback is the process in which students and teachers collaborate to discover the errors; they share their knowledge about these errors and participate in the learning process together” (p. 76). The classes were evaluated for five weeks, during which the students produced five written texts regarding the same topic each week. The authors found that the class that received collaborative feedback improved their writing skills significantly compared to the other two classes.

Collaborative WCF is frequently used at the college level. Indeed, one needs to consider the engagement and maturity level of students who are expected to collaborate, which may be easier for college students. Notwithstanding, elementary and L2 teachers should provide opportunities for learners to engage in collaborative writing. Not only does it help in writing

development, but it also prepares children for their university education. Giving students opportunities to engage in the feedback can help them learn from their peers' mistakes, promote a student-centered class, increase students' responsibility, and improve the relationship between students and students and teachers.

Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) state multiple benefits of using collaborative writing through peer-review. Some of them are the authenticity it brings to a text when they know "real" people will be reading them, the responsibility that turns to students rather than only the teacher, and the development of their critical thinking through analyzing others' writings; it is also a way to reduce their anxiety when receiving teacher's feedback, as they were able to see that their classmates also make mistakes and need correction. In addition, sometimes students can perceive errors and engage in better ways to provide feedback to their peers than the teacher does. In addition, collaboration among students provides for a better sense of community in the classroom.

Finally, the most beneficial tool to provide written feedback, in my view, is the conference with students. Ferris and Hodgcock (2014) emphasize the advantages of having one-to-one writing conferences. One of them is the time management aspect for teachers. If they can allocate those in their class periods or class preparation time, it saves them time and energy that "otherwise would be devoted to marking student writing" (p. 252). Besides, and maybe the most critical advantage, is immediacy. When conferring with students, they can see and correct their mistakes simultaneously. In contrast, when they get a paper with marks and corrections tips, they might only overlook and never correct them.

Reflection

Doing this research in the CF area and learning about it in my MSLT classes has helped me improve so much concerning the feedback I provide my students. Even though I am glad to say that from the knowledge I gained, my students can benefit both from oral and written corrective feedback, my forte is WCF. I believe that WCF is easier for me because it is less disruptive, it gives me more time to think, the risk of embarrassment and anxiety is less, and it is easier to notice written errors and confusing ideas.

Although there are many new strategies that I learned and now apply in my classes, three stood out and make a big difference for my students and me. The first relates to dynamic corrective feedback. Some of its foundations are the need to be manageable, meaningful, timely, and constant. When I read that, I was very confused and concerned about how to do it. I kept thinking that this concept was just impossible and a beautiful theory but not applicable unless I were teaching adults in a small class; never in classes with an average of 25 teenagers. However, the studies showed positive results of using DCF, and I realized I should try it.

Fortunately, I came across Hartshorn's (2010) work, and from it, I got the insight that I should limit the length of my student's writing but still have them produce some short daily writing. With that in mind, I reduced and planned my primary writing assignments better, and I could plan 10 minutes of daily writing in such a manner that they would lead to the primary assignments. Those short writings would usually be chunks of drafts of their final paper. I decided it would be better to have my students write their daily outputs in a notebook so that they wouldn't have any interference from the internet. In other words, they would use their own words and knowledge. Not all of those drafts were corrected, but most of them had to be read by another classmate so that they could receive some feedback on it. I can say that this practice has probably been the one I have seen the most impact in my teaching. By doing so, the quality of

my learner's papers improved drastically in all aspects of their writing. Moreover, comparing the classes where I did this consistently with the ones where I did not, the first group showed less resistance and anxiety in writing, fewer complaints, and students started enjoying writing.

The second leading change was related to who gives the feedback. As a student and teacher, I had in mind that the teacher was supposed to "correct" the learner's work. Nonetheless, even before learning about other options, as a student of the MSLT program, I had to read and provide feedback to my colleagues from the first course I took. Honestly, at first, it was something that I intensely disliked. I didn't want to "waste" my time going over my classmates' papers and did not want to have a peer review my work. In my mind, only the professor would be qualified to do so. However, the more I did this, the more I realized the benefits it brought. Besides, when I took the writing in a second language course with Professor Taylor, she focused on the benefits of peer review.

When I first tried to implement peer-review in my lessons, though, it was a disaster. Reviewers were not engaged and would say something like "Nice job"/ 10 out of 10. Others were engaged but lost on how to do it and kept coming to me for every word they were in doubt. After much practice and learning techniques from my MSLT professors and tips from Ferris and Hedgcock's (2014) book, I realized I had to teach my students to do peer-review. I realized that students had to have a rubric to do a proper peer review; they needed to know where to focus and what elements needed to be reviewed. I also had to establish a way to assign peer-review. Although I did use the automatic function on Canvas to do it, I preferred to take the time to assign peers manually; this way, I could consider students who had similar levels and who would be kind and emphatic when correcting papers from academically lower students and I even tried to match students who I knew would be the first to complete the assignment.

My students had to learn how to provide feedback. Besides giving them a rubric with points assigned for each category, I often asked them to write at least three comments on their classmates' papers. I would tell them that they needed to be specific in their comments and negative comments should be made politely. To begin with, I had to model how they should peer-review. First, I showed them how I, as a teacher, would provide feedback. Second, I asked students as a whole group how they would provide feedback on some writing samples I showed them. Then they got samples to practice in pairs and, finally, they got some samples to review by themselves. After much practice, they started doing it with their colleagues' papers. I am glad to say that this effort was worthy. Not only has it taken some of the burdens from my shoulders, but it has guided me and my students to my priorities in class: having a student-centered class with students more engaged in their learning.

The third aspect and my favorite, the one I see better results in, is the WCF through conferences. I learned this concept from Ferris and Hedgcock (2014) and some of my professors in the MSLT program. Doing it in big classes is not easy, although it is something I really appreciate doing. Unfortunately, I can't do it as often as I would like to. However, I try to have a system in which I can confer with each student at least once each trimester. With some students, I can do more than that. The system I use is when they are doing their daily drafts, they bring them to me once they finish them. When I do this, I can confer with about $\frac{1}{3}$ of my class. The challenge is the time and what to do with the other students while I am conferring. The way I do is the fastest students, the ones who finish writing first, come to me while the others continue their writing. Once more students are finished, they line up and wait for their turn. While they wait in line, they have to read their draft to the classmate next to them.

My fast finishers are the ones who get more conference time with me. I keep track of all the students I had the chance to confer with. For the ones I didn't see, I call to my desk in the following classes while students are doing another task, for instance, when they are reading, completing a sheet, or working on projects. The conferences usually take a few minutes, as the drafts are short. During those conferences, I try to provide complete correction/feedback; we go over grammar, vocabulary, linking sentences, how well the idea was expressed, and if the student could stay on the proposed topic. We read the text together and stop at problematic parts. When this happens, I don't tell them what is wrong; instead, I ask them what they meant in that part and how that could be written better to be understood easily by any reader. Sometimes, I point out that there is a wrong structure or a misspelled word, and I ask them if they can identify what is wrong and correct it. Most of the time, they can do it. When they cannot, I help them with some elicitation, followed by an explanation. Even when they can identify and correct their error, I like to ask them more questions related to the kind of errors they made to ensure they understood what was wrong.

I think conferences are effective because the students must go over the text again and be led to identify the error and correct it. On the other hand, when learners receive feedback through comments on the margins, they always have the choice to pay attention to those, correct them, and take time to understand why they were wrong or just ignore them, especially if they know they already have a passing grade. Another benefit is that I can answer their questions right away when I am with them. I notice that students who have more opportunities for those conferences tend to have fewer mistakes of the same kind. In addition, it is a unique chance to know my students better, create bonds, and develop a relationship.

As my final remarks on this topic, from my personal experience, rewriting, editing, and correcting is painful. I don't like to do it. When I receive a paper with lots of comments, I get discouraged and would rather write a new paper than review and correct my errors. Therefore, I understand the students' frustration with WCF. However painful it might be, I can honestly say that the feedback I received from my peers and professors during the MSLT program was the number one factor to help me improve my writing. Rewriting is not fun, but it is the only way to understand what we did wrong and repair it.

As I understood the importance of WCF, I have been trying to show my students the benefits of receiving feedback on their writing and doing something about it. I am striving to help them see that it is not only about the grade but about the love for writing, the importance of it in learning the language, and how much better their work is after receiving feedback and working on it. I think my efforts are fruitful as my students are increasingly accustomed to receiving WCF and repairing their written errors.

In conclusion, writing is crucial in learning an L2. Even if a person thinks he/she will never have to write in the L2, it is still a way to develop many essential language skills. However, although just writing helps students, writing without feedback has a much-lessened effect on improving the language. I believe it is vital for teachers to constantly study and keep up to date with new research on better strategies to provide WCF so that it is indeed something students will benefit from. Furthermore, those new strategies can help instructors to give meaningful feedback feasibly to those that already have so much on their plates.

STATEMENT OF FUTURE GOALS

Everything that ends brings a mix of feelings. We don't want to finish something we are used to doing and enjoying. It is a moment of reflection on what and how it was done. On the other hand, there is that feeling of accomplishment, completion, and achievement. Besides, it makes us reflect on the possibilities moving forward. I believe everything we accomplish in life, although they have a deep meaning in themselves, they are also steps for future achievements. Ends are often a time of confusion and indecision on what the next steps should be. After finishing my portfolio for the MSLT course, I am getting to experience all those feelings.

Although I am not entirely sure what to do next, I am sure of something: I want and will continue studying. My main goal would be to enter doctoral degree program. I am aware of the limitations I have in pursuing that. I need to be a full-time employee, and I know the commitment and dedication a doctoral program demands. Also, English will always be my second language, and I know my struggles with the language, especially in academic writing. Nonetheless, I would love to have the chance to pursue this more advanced degree as I think it will deepen my knowledge of language teaching and open doors for me.

I love being a teacher, and I love the places I work now. I am fortunate enough to work in a thriving and supportive school district, have a good work environment, and teach excellent students. I intend to keep teaching in Cache Valley School District for some years. My goal is to become a better teacher, improve the quality of my teaching, and help my students develop more passion for the language and achieve higher proficiency levels.

In the future, with the knowledge and experience I am acquiring, I would love to help the DLI program in the state of Utah to grow and improve. With the training, studies, reading, and experience I have, I would be able to participate in the curriculum preparation process, training,

and decisions that involve the Dual Immersion program at the state level. There are always new teachers arriving in the program that need help and support. Also, research is always being updated, and the curriculum needs to be updated from time to time in order for students to receive the best education possible.

Another area that I am interested in is teaching at the college level. I would like to have a completely different experience of teaching adults and having higher expectations from them. I believe teaching in this scenario gives more opportunities for more profound debates and reflections on culture, language, and education. Teaching in college, I would have the chance to help future teachers become aware of the importance of this profession and help them with the knowledge they need.

I hope the MSLT program was a step for future accomplishments and not the end of the line. We have many outstanding professionals in education, but I know there is always room for more professionals. I believe I can make a difference in this area, and that's why I want to become more and more educated so that I can be the one contributing to the important task of spreading culture and all the benefits that come with learning a new language.

REFERENCES

- Alsolami, R. (2019). Effect of oral corrective feedback on language skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(6), 672-677. doi:10.17507/tpls.0906.09
- Benati, A. & Schwieter, J. (2022). The legacy of Professor Michael H. Long and his influence in second language acquisition. *Bilingual processing and acquisition*. 14, p. 1-7
- Bostanci H.B., & Sengul F. (2018). Who is the most effective agent when giving indirect written corrective feedback? *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 76, 73-92. DOI: 10.14689/ejer.2018.76.4
- Bryfonski, L., & Ma, X. (2020). Effects of implicit versus explicit corrective feedback on Mandarin Tone Acquisition in a SCMC Learning Environment. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 42 (1), 61-88. DOI:10.1017/S027226311900031
- Cárcamo, B. (2020). Classifying written corrective feedback for research and educational purposes: A typology proposal. *Profile: Issues in teachers' professional development*, 22(2), 211-222
- Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based language learning and teaching. *Oxford University Press*.
- Fan, N., & Ma, Y. (2018). The role of written corrective feedback in second language writing practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 8(12), 1629. doi:10.17507/tpls.0812.08
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcok, J. (2014). *Teaching L2 composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. 237-270
- Hattie J. (2012). Teachers: the major players in the education process. *Visible learning for teachers*.

- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(1), 84-109. doi:10.5054/tq.2010.213781
- Hattie, J. (2012). *Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning*. Routledge.
- Huzaiafah A.H., Nur F.N., & Norlizawati G. (2018). Colours as a form of corrective feedback in EFL learner's writing. *GEMA online journal of language studies*. Volume 18(4).
<http://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2018-1804-08>
- Inagaki S. & Long M. H. (2015). Implicit negative feedback. K. Kanno (Ed.) *Acquisition of Japanese as a Second Language*. P.9-30. John Benjamins Publishing Company
- Inada T. & Inada Toshiya (2022). Lower anxiety in class could be expected to have improved English proficiency. *International Medical Journal*. Volume 29 (3). pg 184-187.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. *Oxford: Pergamon Press*.
- Lee, HyeKyoung, "Changing the World through the Word: Developing Critical Consciousness Through Multicultural Children's Literature with Critical Literacy in an Elementary Classroom" (2017). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6796.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6796>
- Li, L., & Guo, R. (2015). A student-centered guest lecturing: A constructivism approach to promote student engagement. *Journal of instructional pedagogies*.15.
 digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu
- Llinares A., & Lyster R. (2014). The influence of context on patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake: A comparison of CLIL and immersion classrooms, *The Language Learning Journal*, 42:(2), 181-194, DOI: [10.1080/09571736.2014.889509](https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2014.889509)

- Long, M. (1996). "The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition." In W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition* (413–468). Vol. 2: Second Language Acquisition. New York: Academic Press.
- 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. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>.
- Mahmoudi, A., Khoshnood, A., & Babaei, A. (2014). Paulo Freire Critical Pedagogy and its Implications in Curriculum Planning. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(14), 86-93. doi:ISSN 2222-288X
- McMillan, E., Vasseur, L., & Undefined, U. (2010). Interdisciplinarity in action. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 5(3), 1-12. doi:10.4324/9781315177298-15
- Namaziandost, E., & Nasri, M. (2019). A Meticulous Look at Long's (1981) Interaction Hypothesis: does it have any effect on Speaking Skill? *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 6(2), ISSN: 2376-760X
- Pessôa, A.R., & Lima, M. S. (2019). Representações sociais de professores pré-serviço de língua estrangeira sobre feedback corretivo oral. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 19(1), 69-90. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-6398201912743>
- Qamar, M. B. (2016). The Impact of Learner's Autonomy on Teaching Oral Skills (Speaking Skills) in an EFL Classroom. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(2), 293. doi:10.17507/jltr.0702.07
- Rauber, B.B. (2017). The role of oral corrective feedback in L2 Portuguese classrooms. *Rev. Entrelinguas* 3(1), p.6-18. Doi.org/10.29051/rel.v3.n1

- Reed, P; Smith B., & Sherratt C. (2008). A new age of constructivism: 'Mode Neutral'. *E-learning* 5(3), p.310-322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2304/elea.2008.5.3.310A>
- Rousseau, L. (2021). "Neuromyths" and Multiple Intelligences (MI) Theory: A Comment on Gardner (2020). *Front, Psychol*, 12:720706. Doi 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.720706
- Sarroub, K. L., & Quadros, S. (2015). Critical Pedagogy in Classroom Discourse. Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education. New York & Abingdon: Routledge. 250-260. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/index.html#year_2015
- Silva, E. D., Souza-Dias, R., & Nascimento, J. F. (2018). Do not give up! The importance of mistakes in the process of teaching and learning foreign languages. *BELT - Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 9(1), 244. doi:10.15448/2178-3640.2018.1.31053
- Starkey, L. (2017). Three dimensions of student-centred education: A framework for policy and practice. *Critical Studies in Education*, 60(3), 375-390. doi:10.1080/17508487.2017.1281829
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97–114). Oxford University Press.
- Taber, K. (2011). Constructivism as educational theory: Contingency in learning, and optimally guided instruction. *Nova Science Publishers, Inc.* p. 39-61.

Uddin, M.N. (2022). L2 Teacher's oral corrective feedback practices in relation to their CF beliefs and learner uptake. *Theory and Practice in language studies* 12(4), pp. 617-628.

<https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1204.01>.

Unli, A. (2015). How alert should I be to learn a language? The noticing hypothesis and its implications for language teaching. *Procedia: social and behavior sciences*. 199, p.261-267.