Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

5-2022

Building a Positive Teacher and Student Identity in the Chinese DLI Context

Lila Jensen
Utah State University

Recommended Citation

Jensen, Lila, "Building a Positive Teacher and Student Identity in the Chinese DLI Context" (2022). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1628.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1628

BUILDING A POSITIVE TEACHER AND STUDENT IDENTITY IN THE CHINESE DLI

CONTEXT

by

Lila Jensen

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

_____   _____

Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan   Dr. Sarah Gordon
Major Professor   Committee Member

_____   _____

Dr. Ekaterina Arshavskaya   Dr. Crescencio López González
Committee Member   Interim Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2022

ABSTRACT

Building a Positive Language Teacher and Student Identity in the Chinese DLI Context

by

Lila Jensen: Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2022

Major Professor: Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan

Department: World Languages and Cultures

This portfolio contains a selection of the author's research interests and learning achievements while in the Master Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program at Utah State University (USU). It represents the author's investigation, observation, and reflection as an MSLT student and as a Chinese teacher and coordinator for the Chinese Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program in Utah.

The first section of the portfolio contains the author's teaching perspectives including professional environment, teaching philosophy statement, and professional development through teaching observations. These perspectives represent her professional growth over the years in the field of Chinese teaching in the DLI setting. The second section consists of two research perspectives. They demonstrate the author's research interests that aligned with her teaching perspectives as a Chinese DLI practitioner. Lastly, an annotated bibliography is included with further discussion of pedagogical implications for the Chinese DLI classroom. (75 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The works presented in this portfolio highlight areas that have significantly impacted my career as a Chinese DLI teacher and mentor in recent years. However, there were many obstacles along this journey--English being my second language, working full-time, being a mom to three children, and a few life-changing events. I would not have been able to make it this far without the support from my dear family, friends, and professors.

First of all, I would like to express my most profound appreciation to my supervisory committee members: Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan, Dr. Sarah Gordon, and Dr. Ekaterina Arshavskaya, who provided me guidance, support, encouragement throughout the process of completing this portfolio. To Dr. deJonge-Kannan, I am in debt for making it possible for me to study in the MSLT program. From the very beginning to the end, she has given me invaluable and endless advice for academic writing and encouragement for overcoming self-doubt.

Dr. Gordon was always patiently answered my questions even though I did not have the privilege of taking one of her classes. I am incredibly grateful for her unconditional support and for nurturing along the process of fulfilling the last requirements at the end of my studies. To Dr. Arshavskaya, I cannot express my gratitude enough for inspiring me to develop a thesis on building a teacher and student identity with meaning and purpose. All three of my committee members have shown me an example of making a difference for students with their patience, kindness, and expertise.

Next, I would like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Abdulkafi Albirini, Dr. Maria Luisa Spicer-Escalante, Dr. Elena Taylor, and Dr. Joshua Thoms for their unparalleled knowledge in language teaching and acquisition and their insightful comments and advice on my assignments.

v

Their in-depth instruction helped me connect theories with practical applications that shaped how I approach second language teaching.

Special thanks to Dora Brunson, who introduced me to the MSLT program, which fulfilled my long-time desire to gain advanced education. Many thanks to Cassandra Hafen, Tracy Zia, and classmates who reviewed and commented on my rough drafts. Also, thanks to my colleague and best friend, Brenda Beck, who provided a shoulder for me to vent my frustration, prepared relaxing get-togethers for me to recharge and reset, and constantly reminded me to balance my hectic work-study schedule and self-care.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my three girls for their understanding and support. They were my cheerleaders and powerhouse. Their spontaneous goofiness and entertainment lightened my load as I wore many hats while working on my study and papers. They were the reason that I kept moving forward until the end.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACTFL = American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

AP = Advanced Placement

CALL = Computer-Assisted Language Teaching

CAT = Conversation Assessment Tools

CBI = Content-Based Instruction

CCC = Constructive Classroom Conversation

DLI = Dual Language Immersion

EFL = English As Foreign Language

ELL = English Language Learner

ESL = English As A Second Language

FL = Foreign Language

HLTP = High Level Teaching Practice

L1 = First Language / Native Language

L2 = Second Language

PACE = Presentation, Attention, Co-Construction, Extension

PLC = Professional Learning Community

SLA = Second Language Acquisition

TBL = Task-Based Learning

TL = Target Language

WCF = Written Corrective Feedback

WL = World Language

INTRODUCTION

The compilation of this portfolio is the capstone achievement of my time in the MSLT program. In this portfolio, I showcase the knowledge that I gained about language teaching and acquisition, grounded in the research literature. It also reflects my classroom practice as I learned from studying various pedagogical approaches and making observations of other practitioners. Most significantly, I offer recommendations for instructional implementations that will continue to benefit the Chinese DLI community at large.

This portfolio includes two major sections: Teaching perspectives and research perspectives. From the teaching perspective, the teaching philosophy statement, in which I emphasize building positive teaching and learning identities, is the focal point of the portfolio. I root my discussion in my firm belief in the effectiveness of the Chinese DLI approach. In the teaching philosophy, I argue that a learning environment that promotes strong language identity can promote learners' continuous growth in and beyond the classroom.

The research perspectives demonstrate my interest in integrating pragmatics and seeking effective corrective feedback approaches for grammatical form development in the Chinese DLI context. Both topics reflect a need for immediate application in the Chinese DLI setting with support from the more well-developed research in ESL and EFL. Lastly, the annotated bibliography reviews the research literature on implementing CF in the Chinese DLI writing context. This piece intends to draw implications of various CF methods from different angles.

TEACHING PERSPECTIVES

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

In my earlier years, while learning French, English, and Japanese, I taught Chinese as a second language to Americans and Japanese for language and cultural exchange experiences in public and private institutions. The students ranged from elementary children to business people in Taiwan and the U.S. Later, I developed an interest in effective language teaching pedagogies. This experience eventually led me to teaching in the elementary Chinese Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program in Utah.

Compared to teaching Chinese as a second language in which the language is a subject, I found the DLI framework, where the language serves as a medium for acquiring content knowledge, can significantly achieve more language and academic competence in the biliteracy environment. Thus, teaching the curriculum content and developing students' language skills simultaneously in DLI is rewarding.

After teaching 3rd-grade DLI for three years, an opportunity opened for me to work as an elementary coordinator in the program. The new position allowed for more peer observations and interactions, working side by side with other teachers. These experiences have encouraged me to investigate and apply instructional strategies that I have learned from the MSLT study and share them with my fellow teachers.

Upon completion of the MSLT program, I anticipate continuing the role of supporting the Chinese DLI teachers in providing high level instruction to the elementary students. In the future, I want to expand my experiences in this field to outside of Utah. To achieve this goal, I may choose to return to the classroom, and I also would like to stay involved in this professional environment's practice in other states or countries.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

The two most important days in life are the day you are born and the day you discover the reason why.

– Mark Twain

The Dual Language Immersion program (DLI) is a unique language learning context that provides various benefits and challenges. Throughout my teaching years at the Chinese DLI elementary level in the state of Utah, I stumbled through many trials and errors. However, these experiences motivated me to observe and learn from experienced colleagues and study in the USU MSLT program. Gradually, I have gained personal teaching perspectives that have become the foundation of my teaching style. My teaching perspectives encompass ideas related to building a strong teacher identity. It includes the perception of myself as a language teacher, the role of a teacher, and the purpose of the instructional decisions as I have evolved through learning and reflections (Varghese, Morgan, Johnston & Johnson, 2005). Subsequently, a positive teacher identity supports my second language teaching perspective: to provide a learning environment that fosters students' language identity development. This identity is defined as having the purpose, motivation, and connections with the target language and the world around them (Durán, Hikida, & Martínez, 2017; Silbernagel, 2015; Tang, 2019; Yeh, 2017). In the following sections, I further describe my teaching philosophy and the pedagogies that I use, based on the development of the language teacher and student identity. In addition, I explain how this teaching belief can support students in becoming autonomous learners and make language learning meaningful and fulfilling.

Like most novice teachers, I entered the Chinese DLI teaching world struggling to survive the experience. My daily focus consisted of rushing through the overly planned lesson

content and dealing with classroom management and the power struggle between my students and me. "How can I get my students to learn Chinese if they are not interested in being in the classroom?" "How can I get my students to follow the instructions if they don't even respect me?" These were the questions that I often asked myself. These questions underline the issue of teacher-student relationship, especially the roles that the teacher and students play, which influence and are influenced by the teaching style and student's learning behaviors.

By observing students' behavior and performance, teachers can perceive specific roles they play and the teaching style they lean towards in the classroom. Whether we see ourselves as a teacher, leader, facilitator, or advisor to our students, it significantly impacts students' learning outcome and the view of themselves as a student (Ferron, López, & Ramirez, 2019). For example, a traditional teacher who fixates on teacher-centered instruction is more likely to dominate the learning process and focuses more on the content. The students have less chance to participate in such an environment and their individual needs may be neglected. On the other hand, I believe having a student-centered instructional style demonstrates that a teacher plays a role as a facilitator. Therefore, the students are allowed to take the lead in the learning process and hold themselves accountable. This type of instruction makes learning more equitable to various students' backgrounds and learning needs. When the students' needs are met, they are more likely to participate in the lesson activities and the teachers assert more of their confidence and expertise in the lesson contents. In the language paper included in this portfolio, I address how to integrate pragmatics instruction in a student-centered DLI classroom. The interactive activities are designed to put the teacher in the role of a facilitator and engage the students actively in a collaborative learning environment.

Another aspect of teacher identity that can affect students' behaviors is when instructors can embrace their own unique background and capability. For example, when I'm open about my authenticity as an English learner and native Chinese language teacher, my students reciprocate by being proud of learning and speaking a second language (L2). When I first taught in the American public school system, I felt very isolated from my school community because I was a Chinese DLI teacher and an English learner. As I was not familiar with the American education system and curriculum, I tried to avoid communication with my colleagues to minimize the mistakes I might make. My students also felt distanced from the other regular English-speaking class students since they had been Chinese-speaking students from first grade. Later, the situation changed when I became more open about sharing the aspects of the DLI program that I taught and the social norms and traditions in my home country. As a result, I began to grow confident in offering input for grade-level lesson planning in the professional learning community (PLC). This change opened the door for our Chinese students to share and present what they learned in Chinese at the school and beyond the school. Thus, with a positive teacher identity, teachers can create a learning environment that nurtures the students' language identity development (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2009) and motivates them to want to explore more beyond the classroom and seek more possibilities that the TL may offer them.

A recent study showed that student language identity is an important learning outcome (Zhou & Zhou, 2018). Why do students learn the language? What do students want to do with the language? What is their attitude about acquiring an L2 language? These are some of the factors that construct a student's language identity. The more positive language identity constructed by students, the more they want to learn the L2 language and culture.

Reflection is a crucial piece for developing teacher and student identity; recognizing and analyzing our students' learning behavior and performance helps guide our role as a teacher and achieve the goal of effectiveness in teaching. Teaching reflections take many different forms. One study showed sufficient in-service mentorship in feedback and self-reflection is a key to re-channel teachers' teaching purpose and perspectives, which drive classroom management, lesson planning, and instructional techniques (Varghese et al., 2005). For instance, I had dived into the Chinese DLI program with a mindset of teaching Chinese as a traditional World Language (WL) and with no Language Arts literacy background. Not until my English partner teacher, who was also my mentor, shared with me the aspects of English Language Arts literacy strategies, did I start to realize that I needed to weigh in more on biliteracy perspectives in lesson planning (Colomer & Bacon, 2020; Medlock Paul & Vehabovic, 2020; Davin & Heineke, 2018; Teng 2019). From then on, I began to pay more attention to bridging the language strategies and the cultural perspectives with my partner. By collaborating and gaining feedback from my colleague and synchronizing the literacy and culture concepts for both classrooms, my students improved their English and Chinese skills simultaneously.

To foster my students' identity and to encourage them to take ownership of their learning toward their personal goals, I believe in creating a productive classroom through raising cross-cultural (Lindholm-Leary, 2007; Stewart, 2012; Youssef, 2009) and cross-linguistic awareness (Aguilar, Barr, Phillips, & Uccelli, 2020). Students develop their knowledge by comparing their L1 and L2 linguistic and cultural experiences. For instance, when students learn new material, they can share their personal experiences and connect to the topic as they acquire the language and knowledge. This beginning stage is strengthened by purposefully scaffolding new knowledge and skills. With the new language skills and content, students can expand their

curiosity and creativity and make new meaning by presenting their own choices. In the literacy paper included in this Portfolio, I describe how to use the PACE model to co-construct meaning by inserting corrective feedback to develop grammar skills. This paper demonstrates how a teacher can scaffold the development of grammatical form by letting students take part in the learning process to strengthen their language identity.

The students' language learning identity can be increased by raising their cross-cultural awareness. This notion is also salient to the development of communicative language competence. Bateman (2002, p. 319) pointed out that "one of the long-held hopes of teachers of second languages and cultures is that the study of another language will lead to positive attitudes toward the target culture and its members and a desire to interact with them." If the students cannot make connections with the TL culture, they are likely to "check out" of the class and be less motivated or less engaged. This statement is especially true for the young DLI learners who entered the DLI program by their parents' choice without their own intrinsic motivation.

To build the bridge between students' native culture and target language culture, a teacher should consider the cultural representations from the presented texts and how students interpret them. In other words, the teachers need to be aware that "different interpretations of the texts come from different combinations of the properties of the text and the social positioning and knowledge of its interpreters" (Shardakova & Pavlenko, 2009, p. 30). The texts' various presentations and the social-cultural background of an interpreter affect the interpretations of the documents. Sometimes, the teaching materials do not equally represent student's native and target language culture. The texts' unbalanced cultural features can significantly impact the learner's attitude toward the documents and the target language and culture. For example, is the portrait of gender roles being stereotyped? Is a description of the social practices overly

generalized? In the Chinese DLI program, the instructors need to prevent our young language learners' perception of the Chinese culture from being misled by their interpretation of the mandated textbooks. However, if the provided texts are not ideal for representing both cultures, and all individuals, instructors can utilize multimodal representations to compensate for insufficient cultural features, in order to be more inclusive. I strive to create an inclusive classroom.

In conclusion, my teaching experiences in Chinese DLI and study in the MSLT program have shaped the teaching perspectives presented in this portfolio. These beliefs are derived from the development of a teacher identity and its impact on the students' language identity growth and motivation for learning. To begin developing a positive teacher identity, teachers must engage in self-reflection on their attitude toward language teaching and identify the impact of the roles they play on the students. Once the teachers can be in tune with these essential elements of identity building, they can provide an inclusive classroom environment and culture that foster students' growth in cross-cultural and cross-linguistic awareness. This awareness includes understanding the TL culture, developing a meaningful purpose for learning the language, and connecting with the TL by comparing it with their language and culture. In addition, teachers should be aware of the learning materials' representations to help students build a positive perception toward the TL and maintain the desire to explore the language and culture. The annotated bibliography in the last section of this portfolio introduces various sources on corrective feedback in Chinese writing. These studies point out that teachers' and students' perceptions of written corrective feedback, as well as instructional decisions regarding such feedback, affect the learning process and its outcome. It further supports my teaching philosophy

that a teacher's attitude, motivation, and purpose have a significant impact on students' identity

development.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

There are three principal means of acquiring knowledge... observation of nature, reflection, and experimentation. Observation collects facts; reflection combines them; experimentation verifies the result of that combination.

Denis Diderot

Throughout my study in the MSLT program, I had the privilege to visit language classrooms multiple times in the context of dual language immersion (DLI) and English as a second language (ESL). On those occasions, depending on the intention of the visits in the different stages of my career in DLI education, each language teacher's teaching styles, approaches, and techniques offered me invaluable lessons. Nevertheless, observing through the lens of language teachers' and students' identities by far resonates the most with my personal experiences. It directs my curiosity to the interplay between identities, effective classroom practices, and student language development both in and beyond the classroom. This professional development through classroom observation helped me identify the foundation for my teaching philosophy.

A classroom representing strong language teaching and learning identities shows an engaging, meaningful, and continuous language growth learning environment. On the other hand, teachers who center their teaching only on the curriculum requirements rarely create opportunities for students to connect with the target language (TL) and exclude students' involvement in decision-making. Thus, the instruction results in lower student participation and disinterest in exploring more than required.

The following reflections are from a collection of observations of these classroom visits. One key point is that teachers' practices, driven by their teacher identity (or teaching persona),

influence the students' perceptions toward learning the target language. In other words, their background, purpose, motivation, and beliefs as a teacher can significantly impact students' attitudes toward learning.

In the DLI learning context, I often wonder how students perceive the TL when the language itself serves as a tool for acquiring content knowledge. What motivates students to participate in learning activities? What role does a teacher play in students' attitude to learn? In a 3rd-grade DLI French class, for instance, the teacher combined a well-prepared math content lesson with appropriate classroom structure and management skills. The instructor also used real object demonstrations, slideshow explanations, and hands-on manipulatives to enhance content learning (and address different learning styles with visual aids and tactile exercises). In addition, the teacher utilized whiteboards and worksheets to do formative assessments.

While the math instruction ran smoothly and was paced appropriately, the teaching focused on a teacher-centered approach, which is heavy on content and lacks language development. The teacher did most of the talking while students followed the instructions. Although there were partner talks on occasion, the conversation contained short and one-way responses. In this one-time class section observation, which I admit is limited, I noticed that students moved from one activity to the other without exploring the topics led by their interests and curiosity.

As a DLI teacher, I often juggle language and content teaching in a limited timeframe. It is easy to focus on covering the teaching materials and neglecting the students' interests and feedback. However, as I shifted my teaching toward a more student-centered approach, I discovered many beneficial outcomes. For instance, students can learn and practice different language expressions beyond academic vocabulary when connecting their interests with the

content. Second, students are likely to explore the content and language more when they relate to their personal experiences. Third, allowing students to be involved in decision-making and take accountability creates purpose and motivates them in learning. Lastly, soliciting students' prior knowledge and feedback will enable me to navigate and tweak my instruction to fit their needs.

In a 3rd-grade Chinese DLI class, the teacher used an open-ended journal prompt to improve students' writing skills based on the previous lesson. The prompt aimed to have students express their opinions on the topic that they have learned. The instructor provided a writing sample and many related vocabularies with pictures on the classroom wall as visual aids to help students write independently. After the students completed the task, she conducted a class discussion with two of the students' journals. Then the lesson continued with each student sharing their journals with a few of their peers. While the students shared their journals, the teacher walked around to assist students. From the observation, I could tell the accumulated scaffolding processes from the previous lessons had paid off as the 3rd-grade students could complete the task successfully within a limited time.

This observation shows an example of a student-centered teaching approach with a clear teaching purpose—the teacher constructed a series of systematic lesson activities toward an end goal. The progressive lesson activities, scaffolding over many days and perhaps weeks, would develop students' language skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking. At the end of the unit activity, the open-ended journal prompt allowed students to reflect on what they had learned and apply it to their personal experiences. In my class, I realized that lesson planning focuses on the overall learning goals that develop well-rounded communicative skills on the same topic, motivate students' interest, and increase their confidence in content and language knowledge.

In a university ESL class observation, the instructor used poetry to teach pronunciation such as stress, intonation, and pause. The teacher drew on students' background knowledge by asking them several questions, such as: How does their native language stress a sound? Why do they stress a specific sound in a sentence? What do they know about poetry? Why is poetry an excellent way to learn pronunciations? The instructor facilitated the learning community, allowing students from diverse backgrounds to constantly relate each essential set of skills with their native languages and cultures.

The chosen learning materials are also critical in building learners' learning identity. The poetry was related to the topics close to these ESL students' backgrounds. The material was well suited for the language objective. The way the teacher deconstructed the content material made students feel included and empowered. The use of a literary text offered authentic material and more comprehensible input, while inviting interpretation, analysis, and interaction. As students reflected on the poem and connected it with their backgrounds and personal experiences, I noticed they became more confident in using the language despite their low proficiency. The teacher also used multimodal text representations to maximize students' learning experiences. For example, the students learned poetry in writing text and picture slides. They also connected with the author from learning her biography. Moreover, the students watched different videos where the author or an actress recited the poem. With multiple text representations, the students learned from dynamic methods that enhanced their negotiation of meaning and understanding.

In this class observation, the instruction reminded me to pay attention to each student's unique background and choose multimodal learning materials to spark students' interests. Activities designed to allow students to reflect on the content and personal experiences foster an inclusive learning environment. I also need to be empathetic with my students' learning

conditions, especially those with lower proficiency. For example, occasionally, I should allow silence, and offer a longer pause or more time for students to respond to prompts.

In conclusion, through classroom observations, I had opportunities to examine my teaching and identify the strength and weaknesses of my practice. I also implemented and witnessed some of the teaching methods I learned from these observations in my classroom. Gradually, I established a teaching philosophy rooted in teacher identity. This identity encompasses a student-centered approach in my role as a language teacher. The classroom is designed to allow students to co-construct ideas with the teacher and peers. I also provide interactive activities that will enable students to use critical thinking and produce output that demonstrates their learning. Thus, students hold responsibility for their learning outcomes.

Additionally, I make my instructional decisions based on reflection and learning from students' feedback. Each stage of the lesson activity should provide scaffolding aimed at students performing the skills collaboratively and independently. Finally, I create an inclusive learning community that encourages all students to develop their sense of purpose and confidence by building cross-linguistic and cultural awareness in a meaningful context. The multimodal lesson materials enable students to interpret meanings in multiple ways that match their learning style and enrich their learning experiences. By modeling a strong language teacher identity, the teacher enables students to develop a sustainable identity that supports their continuous growth.

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

LANGUAGE PAPER

Integrating Pragmatics Instruction in Dual Language Immersion Classroom Through

Interactive Activities

Abstract

Effective pragmatics instruction is crucial to developing communicative language competence in

L2 teaching. Pragmatics instruction teaches language learners how to use the language

appropriately in social contexts and cultural norms. Dual Language Immersion (DLI) is a

bilingual program in which language and academic content are taught in the majority language

and target language. Due to challenges such as time constraints, strict language separation rules,

curricular requirements, and teacher-student roles in DLI classrooms, DLI teachers often struggle

or neglect to implement pragmatics into their instruction. Despite those challenges, studies show

content-based instruction (CBI), student-centered, and interactive approaches effectively foster

students' pragmatic awareness and development (such as using strategies for expressing opinion,

and agreement or disagreement in supporting content learning activities). The purpose of this

study is to explore these types of instructional approaches, focus specifically on the constructive

classroom conversation model, and develop pragmatic competence and content learning

simultaneously in a DLI setting.

  Keywords: pragmatics, dual language immersion (DLI), content-based instruction (CBI),

constructive classroom conversation (CCC), formative assessment

Introduction

Numerous studies have been conducted to identify effective pedagogical practices for developing students' communicative language competence. Due to the demand for modern bilingual education and its promising outcomes (Gómez, 2013; Lindholm-Leary & Block, 2010; Marian, Shook, & Schroeder, 2013; Valentino & Reardon, 2015), DLI programs have been adopted rapidly across the U. S. in many schools in recent years (The National Dual Language Immersion Research Alliance, 2016). The role of the target language in a DLI classroom differs from its role in an FL program. Unlike language-based foreign language programs, where language itself is the focus of instruction, the DLI classroom uses the target language as a medium for acquiring content knowledge within a core curriculum (Snow, Met, & Genesee,1989).

The unique framework of the DLI model aims for success in both content knowledge and language development (Howard, Sugarman, Christian, Lindholm-Leary, & Rogers, 2007; Swain & Johnson, 1997). However, the integration of pragmatics instruction to help DLI students develop more native-like communicative competence has not been widely discussed by researchers. This review will examine primarily the constructive classroom conversation (CCC) model (Hakuta, Zwiers, & Rutherford-Quach, 2013) that facilitates student-student meaningful discussion through academic conversations as an instructional approach to foster students' pragmatic awareness. Because students' interactive discussion is the backbone of the constructive conversation instruction model, strategies for expressing opinion, agreement, and disagreement are highlighted as an example of integrating pragmatics in content learning.

Pragmatics Challenges in DLI

Many studies have shown that DLI education offers benefits to students: closing the

achievement gap (Thomas & Collier, 2011), improving cognitive development (Thomas &

Collier, 2005), boosting economic advantage (Fixman, 1990; García & Otheguy, 1994;

Halliwell, 1999; Mann, Brassell, & Bevan, 2011), and raising global awareness (Jackson &

Malone, 2009). However, some studies suggest immersion students' language proficiency lacks

variety in language use and adequacy in grammatical skills (Mougeon, Nadasdi, & Rehner, 2010;

Rounds, Falsgraf, & Seya, 1997). One major criticism that is often voiced is that the production

of immersion students' language tends to be "sociolinguistically less appropriate" and resembles

their L1 (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012, p. 253) and therefore may be deficient in pragmatics.

To study how well children in the U.S. master other languages in class, Cohen (2015)

explored the idea of what it means to be truly proficient in the target language in the DLI

program. One of the issues he studied is how well the learners perform pragmatics appropriately

in the target language in high-stakes situations such as making polite requests. In comparing

academic and social language, Cohen mused,

> In developing an L1, children have numerous opportunities to enrich their social
>
> language, whether talking about whom they like and dislike, their concerns and
>
> aspirations about the special things in their lives, their interactions with siblings
>
> and their parents, and the like. To what extent are these areas developed in the
>
> L2? (Cohen, 2015, pp. 336-337).

The function of the target language in a DLI setting is primarily for academic purposes.

Due to the context and overuse of academic language in textbooks and other teaching materials,

it is not surprising that immersion students' oral language lacks sociolinguistic appropriateness compared with native speakers of the target language (Mougeon, Rehner, & Tedick, 2004).

A study of DLI teachers' experiences (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012) illustrates the instructional challenge of balancing content and language. The researchers identified five themes in the teachers' struggles with integrating content and language instructions:

1. Identity transformation - seeing themselves as content and language teachers;

2. External challenges - facing time constraints, lack of resources, district pressures, and other factors that are outside of the teachers' control;

3. On my own - experiencing a growing sense of isolation;

4. Awakening - developing an increased awareness of the interdependence of content and language; and

5. A stab in the dark - having difficulty identifying what language to focus on in the context of content instruction.

(Cammarata & Tedick, 2012, p. 257)

In order to face these challenges, the authors conclude that DLI teachers need to understand that language is learned through meaningful interaction with the content. The DLI setting, in fact, provides language learners the advantage of acquiring the TL through "using" language in various contexts while learning content knowledge. Therefore, pragmatics teaching can be incorporated as part of language goals in the lesson.

Before exploring pragmatics instruction, DLI teachers need to understand how their students use the language in solving pragmatic problems in their L1 and the TL. The instructional design should guide learners to distinguish pragmatic differences in L1 and TL. Thus, it prepares students to avoid transferring social and pragmatic rules from their L1 and

raises the cross-cultural awareness that the DLI program aims to promote (Decapua & Dunham, 2007; Spicer-Escalante, 2017). In light of the challenges in balancing content and language teaching, more empirical research should examine instructional approaches that teach required core curricula and integrate communicative language skills simultaneously. Content-based instruction (CBI) allows language students to acquire knowledge through task-based activities, which provides optimal language learning in an interactive environment (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, Grabe, & Stoller 2017; Met, 1999; Stoller, 2004).

Content-based Instruction (CBI) Approach

Content-based instruction (CBI) refers to an educational approach integrating content and language in the target language classroom (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989). According to Met (1999), the CBI approach designs content-driven language instruction for two specific objectives: the academic skills for the subject matter and the communicative skills for the target language. CBI integrates language and content learning through interactive activities (Met, 1998), focusing on constructivist teaching (Kaufman, 2004), which encourages students to actively participate in subject learning with meaningful and authentic language use. The DLI instructional framework provides ample space for such approaches. Research has shown that the target language in CBI serves as the medium for performing academic tasks and becomes the byproduct of academic tasks. The target language instructor carries out specific content and language learning goals through an explicit scaffolding process by teaching, modeling, and guiding students in interactive activities for clarification, practice, and assessment (Zwiers, O'Hara, & Pritchard, 2014). Pragmatic language teaching needs to be part of the language goals in contextualized academic learning activities.

Constructive Classroom Conversation

Constructive classroom conversation (CCC) (Hakuta et al., 2013) is an interactive academic discourse activity that echoes the CBI approach focusing on subject-area content, analytical practices, and language learning (Heritage, Linquanti, & Walqui, 2015). The framework of CCC consists of three dimensions: turn-taking, building on each other's ideas, and focusing on the topic. A purposefully designed prompt initiates the activity to develop the content and the language. To effectively engage students in meaningful academic discourse, the instructor needs to explicitly teach and model what a constructive conversation looks like and sounds like by promoting five constructive conversation skills (Zwiers & Crawford, 2011):

1. Elaborate and clarify

2. Support ideas with examples

3. Build on and/or challenge a partner's idea

4. Paraphrase

5. Synthesize conversation points

(pp. 31-44).

The DLI instructor can incorporate pragmatic knowledge of expressing opinion, agreement, and disagreement during the students' discourse of the content learning into this conversation skills scaffolding cycle. The teacher can also provide materials and activities as described in Glazer's (2014) excerpt in explicit-inductive teaching by providing authentic language uses and various expressions in helping students to recognize the patterns in utterances. In addition, language supports, such as sentence frames, can help students initiate, clarify, agree, or disagree with the previous idea in discourse (Bailey & Heritage, 2014).

For example, following a Math prompt, the instructor can direct 3rd-grade DLI students to converse with a partner and jointly determine whether they agree or disagree with a solution to a Math word problem. They must follow the CCC skills by using the appropriate pragmatic language to argue, clarify, support, and provide evidence to their opinion (Zwiers & Crawford, 2011). A teacher could demonstrate this conversation with a TL native speaker or show a video (Hall, 1995) that models authentic and appropriate language use for these speech acts. Sentence frames like "I think…" can help a student to initiate the discussion, "because…, therefore…" to clarify the opinion, "I agree…, but don't agree…" to show agreement and disagreement, "what do you mean by…" can request for more clarification. While students are engaged in the activity, the teacher uses proximity to assess students' pragmatic language strategy. The teacher may try to overhear a "good" pragmatic strategy, then have the student explain the language strategy they used to the whole class. By listening to the students' discussions, the teacher can assess students' competence in the appropriate language use in support of the content learning. This assessment strategy allows teachers to adjust their instruction and promote a better learning outcome in content and language. The targeted speech act (opinion, agreement, and disagreement) can be repeatedly practiced with CCC for content learning throughout the school year. This instructional approach allows students to practice the speech act in a wide range of contexts, thus maximizing pragmatic learning in the constraint of time, content-driven context, and L1 and TL separation in the DLI classroom (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012).

Formative Assessment

One of the critical features of CCC is that the instruction is driven by students' conversational discourse (Zwiers & Soto, 2017). By engaging students in meaningful interactive academic conversations, teachers create an ongoing formative assessment that guides the

scaffolding and feedback cycles and simultaneously promotes language development and content learning (Bailey & Heritage, 2014). Heritage (2007) interprets the formative assessment as "a systematic process to continuously gather evidence about learning" (p. 141). Moreover, formative assessment provides data for a teacher to identify students' current learning state and actively engages students in the learning process and moving toward the learning goals.

In the CCC instructional model, formative assessment focuses on observing students' interactive talk either in responding to the instructor's prompt or engaging in a collaborative task. Since the students' conversation is subjective, the teacher can build conversation assessment tools (CAT) aligned with learning objectives and instructions, including conversational skills, academic language use, and content knowledge (Zwiers, 2019). One CAT example is creating an observation and analysis form that targets students' conversational skills in taking equal turns, building turns on the previous turn, and focusing on the topic. After modeling the conversational skills, an instructor provides a prompt to generate partner talk, then records a couple of pairs of students' short conversations and transcribes them into text. The instructor fills out the CAT form to analyze the students' output quality in each conversational skill using the transcribed text. This assessment tool provides essential data for reflecting instruction and planning for future lessons. Another type of CAT is building rubrics that focus on the specific linguistic features and grammar rules that the instructor wants the students to perform in the discourses. A rubric provides students with language support in detailed and visual descriptions during the conversation, it is ideal for peer- or self-assessment. This assessment tool also supports students in providing feedback to their partner's talks.

In addition, the instructor can design CAT to match specific pragmatic learning goals and instruction in a different lesson stage. For instance, in a science lesson, the 3rd-grade Chinese

DLI students work with their partner to observe and record an apple's physical traits. The instructor creates a preassessment prompt to determine whether the students can use the appropriate expression to negotiate with their partner and develop descriptions for the observed object's physical traits. Then, the instructor can modify the following instruction by observing and assessing the students' conversation. Formative assessment yields instant evidence on the input and output language related to the subject (Zwiers & Soto, 2017); therefore, the instructor can adjust their instructions and prompts to achieve the expected outcomes. As Zwiers and Crawford (2011) state "Another goal of assessment is to teach—with the assessment, not just before it. Conversations can do both—assess and teach at the same time" (p. 240). The evaluation provides concrete data for students' language production progress and allows the teacher to reflect on pedagogical effectiveness and adjust the instruction according to the assessment result.

Conclusion

In conclusion, pragmatics competence is one of the essential components for developing communicative competence. In the DLI classroom, however, pragmatics language instruction is often neglected in language arts and other subject areas. However, in real-world situations, the appropriate language expression is essential for effective communication in various social contexts. Thus, DLI classrooms must create opportunities to integrate pragmatics teaching in content learning and daily classroom routines. As Hall (1995) states, "much communicative learning in language classrooms is realized through engagement in regularly occurring interactive practices" (p. 38). Hall's study on classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence emphasizes the significant role of classroom interactive discourse. The success of peer participation in classroom discourse depends upon the success of the interactive

practice frameworks constructed by L2 teachers. These frameworks include providing opportunities for a variety of discursive language use, with students actively engaged in back-and-forth meaningful discussions that mirror the real-life communicative environments (Hall, 1995). A DLI classroom provides the ideal CBI language learning environment, where students can simultaneously develop content knowledge within the core curriculum and pragmatic competence. Most importantly, students' language proficiency assessments should be performed and recorded periodically to track students' learning progress to adjust teaching content and reach the expected content and language goals.

LITERACY PAPER

Seeking Effective Corrective Feedback Approaches for Grammatical Form Development

in Chinese Dual Language Immersion Context:

A Research Proposal

Abstract

In recent years, the Chinese Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program in K-12 education has grown. It provides an alternative pathway for language acquisition to traditional world-language programs available in K-16 settings. Even though evidence indicates that DLI students excel in academic achievement compared to their non-DLI counterparts in the same grade, their language production lacks grammatical accuracy. The matter of effective pedagogical approaches for corrective feedback (CF) in Chinese DLI contexts has not been explored. In response, the following study is proposed. A quantitative method will be applied to data collected from fifty 5th- grade Chinese DLI students using three CF formats: explicit correction, recast, and metalinguistic feedback on grammatical form in Chinese Language Arts lessons throughout the school year. In addition, all three CF strategies will be embedded in the PACE model, in which the grammar instructional steps focus on meaning and form connection. The data will be drawn from one pre-test at the beginning of the school year and three post-tests after each instructional treatment. Results will show whether it is achievable to implement CF in core curriculum-based Chinese DLI classrooms. The results will also indicate which CF format is most helpful in developing the correct linguistic form in speaking and writing. Thus, this study will provide a basis for designing a teacher training program that guides Chinese DLI teachers to focus on form in core curriculum-based instruction.

Keywords: corrective feedback (CF), explicit correction, recast, metalinguistic feedback

Introduction

The role of language use in DLI classrooms is distinct from that of the regular world language (WL) program. In DLI, language is used as a medium for teaching and acquiring academic knowledge and content. In this context, language is constructed around content-based instruction focusing on meaning rather than form (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). Moreover, due to time constraints, core standard curriculum requirements, and 100 % TL usage, many DLI teachers report that grammatical development receives limited attention in their instruction (2012). Evidence shows DLI students' language production often lacks sociolinguistic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy (Harley, 1986; Mougeon, Nadaski, & Rehner, 2010).

Researchers have expressed concern that DLI students' L2 production often shows L1 grammar structures in L2 speaking and writing (Menke, 2010; Mougeon, Nadaski, & Rehner, 2010). This phenomenon inevitably exists among elementary Chinese DLI classrooms where instructors are pressured to plan lessons that help students achieve academic goals. Form development is often neglected in the lesson objective. As a result, currently there is no systematic grammar instruction in CF that will foster long-term grammatical development through the program's secondary level.

From a proficiency standpoint, the quality of grammar produced by L2 learners affects comprehensibility by listeners and readers (Saito, Trofimovich, & Isaacs, 2016). According to American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines, one of the differences between novice and intermediate proficiency levels is that their first language influences novice learners' language production. As they move up to a more advanced level, their language structure becomes more accurate and is comprehensible to native speakers of the TL

(ACTFL, 2012). Therefore, DLI teachers need to pay close attention to grammatical instruction, as it will have a long-term impact on their students' linguistic development.

Students need to be able to use correct grammar forms to develop intermediate and above proficiency levels. Therefore, DLI teachers need to implement effective CF on students' grammatical structures. An effective CF method enables students to develop grammatical accuracy in a limited time. Yet, there is a lack of research on integrating effective CF in the Chinese DLI context. Thus, it is essential to identify effective CF instructional strategies that incorporate form-focus in content learning within the Chinese DLI core curriculum.

This study focuses on the current pedagogical challenges in grammatical instruction that have influenced students' proficiency across K-12 Chinese DLI programs in Utah. As with DLI in other languages, its elementary education focuses on core curriculum content required by the state. Moving toward the secondary level, the focus of DLI instruction shifts to Chinese Literacy and Culture, Media, and History courses, which prepares students for Advanced Placement (AP) tests and relies significantly on the production of form for comprehensibility.

To target balancing meaning and form instruction in limited instructional time and content-focused DLI classroom, this study suggests inserting CF methods into the daily instruction by using PACE grammar teaching model (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002; Glisan and Donato 2017). The PACE model uses a social constructivist approach in which the teacher provides CF while engaging students in the grammar discussion in a storyline text. The grammar instruction uses step-by-step instructional moves and the teacher explicitly teaches the grammar while constructing meaning with students during the learning activities. After identifying what CF methods are more effective in the Chinese DLI setting, we also need to understand what

factors may interplay with the CF strategies and influence the correction outcome. The study proposed here will use a quantitative methodology to examine the achievability of using CF in content teaching and determine which CF is the most effective method to increase grammatical accuracy. The study results can develop state-level training on integrating effective CF in developing students' grammatical accuracy from elementary to secondary Chinese DLI classes.

Literature Review

The complexity of DLI frameworks related to linguistic development is explored in many DLI studies. Researchers have identified the focus on meaning in the DLI model, along with the constraints of time, 100 % TL usage, and core-curriculum fulfillment required by each state as the main factors that result in linguistic inaccuracy and lack of sociolinguistic appropriateness (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012). Due to these challenges, CF on grammatical accuracy is often neglected or discouraged.

In Utah's 50/50 DLI instructional model, elementary instruction heavily emphasizes subjects such as Literacy, Math, Science, and Social Studies (Utah DLI, 2019) in a hectic schedule of allotted instructional time, leaving no room for instruction that balances form and meaning achievement. Thus, it lacks a solid focus on grammar as the students move on to secondary levels. In secondary school, the DLI instructional time is significantly reduced. The courses switch from a focus on the content to the demands of form acquisition due to AP tests and college-level "bridge" courses (Utah DLI, 2017).

Sheen and Ellis (2011) define CF as "the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral and written production" (p. 593). They divide types of CF into various categories according to different aspects of correction. In oral CF, they state that both

on-line and off-line attempts make learners aware of errors they make in utterance. On-line correction occurs during the expression. On the other hand, off-line correction is made after the expression is completed. Written CF almost always takes place after the written task is finished; thus feedback is not immediate. Sheen and Ellis further describe that CF can be input-providing, where the feedback is directly given to the learners, or output-providing, in which the correction is drawn from the learners. An implicit strategy is used in oral CF when the instructor requests clarification in the utterance. Explicit correction refers to directly correcting the learners and involving metalinguistic explanation in response to the error. Many scholars have made the claim that recast is the most common form of CF (Lyster & Ranta,1997; Sheen, 2006). When offering a recast, the instructor restates the incorrect order or usage of linguistic form in the correct linguistic form. This is just one strategy that can be used in oral or written error correction.

Sheen and Ellis also analyze two CF theories. In cognitive theory, they argue that CF strategies are based on "form-meaning connection," which is vital for second language acquisition (SLA). This theory emphasizes when the learners focus on meaning, their recognition of form correction through real contexts contributes to language acquisition. By contrast, the sociolinguistic theory focuses on the involvement of the participants in the process of CF through interaction. In other words, the development of correct grammatical forms is constructed through a series of scaffolding, with the proper use of structure provided by the instructor when incorrect grammar occurs during instruction.

Aside from theories, researchers have also identified a series of CF strategies that language teachers often use to correct grammar errors (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Because CF is such a complex phenomenon that involves aspects of timing, process, consistency, and unique components of literacy skills, researchers have drawn different conclusions on how to use CF

(e.g., single method or mixed methods) to gain the best outcome (Ellis, 2009). Each technique or combination of methods seems to yield different results in different linguistic development and skills tested.

As mentioned above, the challenges that hinder the CF instruction in the DLI classroom including the limited instructional time that focuses on the meaning construction. The complexity that various factors intersect with the implementation of different types of CF methods also add more difficulty to balance meaning and form instruction. For these reasons, the present study uses the PACE model to encourage language production from students, maximize time, and balance meaning and form instruction. To deconstruct the complexity of CF that involves, Glisan and Donato (2017) examined the effect of CF with a focus on meaning in a content-based DLI context. They presented two instructional practices related to form-meaning connection listed in High Leverage Teaching Practice (HLTP), the essential teaching practices presented by them that lead to the best outcome in FL education, are considered in this literature review. These two instructional approaches demonstrate the instructional moves that support learner's language development. The first is explicit grammar instruction focusing on dialogic context through the PACE model (Adair-Hauck & Donato, 2002). The other is providing oral CF to improve learners' performance (Glisan & Donato, 2017). Because DLI is heavily focused on using the TL as a medium for teaching content, grammar teaching must be embedded in meaningful context. The PACE model teaches grammar as a concept through meaningful contexts such as storytelling and task-based activities. TL instructors and learners collectively co-construct grammar elements through the PACE model to gain their significance negotiate meaning. The following are the four steps of the PACE model:

1. Presentation:

The teacher solicits students' attention by repeating target forms in the proper text, focusing on meaning. This strategy involves putting the grammar in storylines, using multiple contexts connecting with students' prior knowledge, and relating to their personal experiences.

2. Attention:

In this stage, the teacher isolates the grammar structure by highlighting it from the text and leading students to notice its grammar patterns.

3. Co-construction:

The teacher and students collaboratively co-construct the grammar structures and forms found in the text and explain their meanings in the text. Subsequently, through scaffolding, the teacher assists students in practicing the appropriate use of grammar in various literacy activities.

4. Extension:

The learners will complete a task or project, highlighting targeted grammar structures. This stage provides an opportunity for students to use learned grammar forms in a communicative setting.

The four steps of the PACE model can be feasibly integrated into a regular Chinese literacy routine. During each phase, instructors can use oral CF in various CF methods to scaffold correct grammatical use in the context. Based on the above assumption, this research proposal is designed to integrate CF in regular Chinese DLI lessons and aims to answer the following questions:

1) Is it achievable to implement form-focused CF in Chinese DLI content teaching?

2) Which type of form-focused CF is the most effective for developing Chinese DLI students' grammar accuracy?

Method

Setting

This research proposal is designed to collect natural samples from a Utah Chinese DLI school where the researcher works as a state and school district coordinator. Since the researcher has been working with administrators and teachers in this school and is familiar with the required core contents, it will provide convenient access to the classroom. The experiments will be conducted in the regular Chinese DLI Literacy lesson routine to integrate selected CF methods. This setting will allow students and teacher to perform naturally and ensure the result will represent genuine language production after each treatment.

Participants

There will be 50 participants from the 5th-grade taught by the same teacher in this study. Half of the participants attend morning class, and the other half attend the afternoon section. All participants have been in the same program in the past four years. Before the experiment, the participating teacher will join professional training in the PACE grammar instruction model described in HLTP and CF approaches. This training is to ensure that the teacher is competent with HLTP and CF knowledge.

Three CF Approaches

Explicit correction recasts and metalinguistic clues will be used for the experimental design. The teacher will exclusively implement only one CF approach and focus on different sets

of grammar rules in an entire school term (three months) for each lesson. In the first term, when a student's grammar error occurs, the teacher will immediately supply the correct form on the explicit correction method. In the second term, the instructor will use the recasts method, which will require the teacher to actively pay attention to students' responses. In response to students' grammar mistakes, the teacher will repeat the student's utterance while supplying the correct form in place of the student's error through a series of scaffolding cycles in meaningful contexts. For example,

Student: "我教我的妈妈唱歌在中文(I taught my mom to sing a song in Chinese)."

Teacher: "好棒！你用中文教你的妈妈唱歌（Awesome! You used Chinese to teach your mom a song)".

This method will expose students to correct forms in the appropriate contexts to maximize learning without directly explaining the correct grammar form. In the final term, the instructor will use metalinguistic clues as the experimental CF approach. The teacher will provide hints from students' prior knowledge and make connections with current learning. This method will allow students to be involved with their own cognitive and sociolinguistic skills in making self-corrections. It will also enhance students' awareness of their grammar productions.

Measure

Students will take a 5th-grade Chinese Language Arts grammar standards pre-test in speaking and writing at the beginning of each term as a baseline. The teacher will focus on a new set of grammar standards for each term while using only one CF approach. At the end of each period, a post-test will be administered to measure the grammar production in speaking and writing tasks after implementing one CF method. Through statistical comparison of the six test

scores (three pre-tests and three post-tests), a determination can be made as to which type of CF contributes to the highest ratings. Therefore, the results will indicate which type of CF is the most effective for the acquisition of grammar.

Implications and Future Studies

After a year of study, the results will not only indicate which type of CF is the most effective in speaking and writing, but also demonstrate whether it is feasible to balance form and meaning in the Chinese DLI classroom. Besides, the results may yield suggestions for pedagogical effect, in terms of which treatment is better for speaking or writing. Findings from this study will inform recommendations for the state-wide teacher training program on how to implement CF during content teaching within the core standards effectively. In the future, mixed CF methods should also be included in the research because studies have established the benefits of combining CF strategies on different language skills (Li & Vuono, 2019; Sarré, Grosbois & Brudermann, 2019). Furthermore, each CF method may fit each student differently (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). In addition to the study outlined above, should be further research conducted investigating student variables that may interfere with the results of the CF method. These variables can include students' attitudes, preferences, and prior learning experiences in the Chinese DLI setting. Lastly, the student-student interactive CF method should also be considered to maximize communicative development through CF.

Conclusion

Many studies have shown that content-based language classrooms often focus on meaning and task completion and pay little attention to forms. Yet, evidence shows that grammatical accuracy is essential for linguistic development. The results from this study will help determine whether there is a significant progression in students' grammatical performance

on speaking and writing after one school year of the CF treatments. This study will address the

significance of effective CF strategies on forms during instruction in the Chinese DLI context.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Implementing Corrective Feedback in Chinese DLI Writing Context

Introduction

To the best of my knowledge, at the time of writing, no peer-reviewed publications exist on implementing corrective feedback (CF) in L2 Chinese writing in the Dual Language Immersion (DLI) K-12 classroom context. However, substantial research on CF in EFL and ESL contexts has consistent results across the studies. Some of the studies available in other foreign language settings also reveal comparable results and may be applicable to teaching Chinese DLI. In this annotated bibliography, I will examine a selection of recent studies on various CF methods and their effectiveness in different pedagogical approaches. I will also discuss broader implications regarding these studies' applicability in the Chinese DLI context, in particular based on the connections between the other CF practices with L2 writing development and second language acquisition (SLA).

The selection of CF studies presented here, though not exhaustive, demonstrates my interests in CF as a Chinese DLI practitioner and teacher trainer. In recent years, a few CF scholars have begun to explore topics related to CF in Chinese as a second language but not specifically Chinese DLI. The literature in this annotated bibliography illustrates a range of essential issues related to CF in L2 settings, including in EFL and ESL classrooms with different language proficiency levels and age groups. The analyses and arguments presented in these studies relate to CF perspectives in L2 writing at large and may have some applicability in the Chinese DLI classroom. This bibliography intends to provide a useful overview of a wide range of CF in different strategies, such as direct and indirect strategies, and techniques, such as direct change, metalinguistic, coded correction, teacher or student as a responder, and teacher conference, etc. Not forgetting the crucial role that technology and remote learning play in CF on

L2 writing in today's classrooms, technology can provide a ground for composing and feedback from teachers or fellow students. Moreover, technology aids in detecting errors in characters, collocation, and grammar. More specifically, a couple of the CF articles studied explore students' perceptions of computer-generated corrective feedback. Below, I provide an overview of studies such as these from a broad range of institutional contexts.

Research demonstrates that the backgrounds and attitudes of students and teachers matter a great deal in effective CF. An exploration of students' views, attitudes, and motivations related to CF is also essential to consider in effective teaching in the Chinese DLI classroom. In addition, it is important to recognize that teachers' unique background may influence their choice of corrective feedback methods and their attitudes in handling the students' reaction to the CF and revision process. For example, many Chinese native-speaking teachers may come from China or other Chinese-speaking regions. Some of their belief in CF may be deeply rooted in how they themselves experienced foreign language learning in their home country and their own culture.

Developing writing skills in the Chinese DLI setting is a daunting task for teachers who need to balance content and language objectives. Understanding basic pedagogical approaches to CF and student variables that intersect with them during the composition process can help teachers plan instruction more effectively. The following literature will first be summarized for each study's background and findings, then analyzed to consider any possible broader implications in the Chinese DLI context. This bibliography invites further conversations on the suggested CF implications for the unique issues in the Chinese DLI classroom. More L2 scholars may be encouraged to study writing CF in the Chinese DLI context in the future.

Fang, M., & Wang, A. (2019). Feedback to feed forward: Giving effective feedback in

advanced Chinese writing. In N., Yiğitoğlu & M., Reichelt (Eds.), *L2 Writing Beyond*

English (pp. 95–114). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923132-

009

Fang and Wang (2019) examined teacher feedback and student writing ability. This study

investigated the teacher's CF on the students' revision in an advanced Chinese writing context.

The authors compared the Chinese teacher's direct, indirect, and comprehensive feedback

pedagogies with the current studies on CF in L2 writing. Their findings demonstrate that

straightforward and comprehensive approaches were successful in their case study, which, in

part, contradicted the previous studies that supported indirect and focus corrective feedback for

students' language accuracy development.

First, the participating instructor focused mainly on the language accuracy in her

feedback. Thus, she used the comprehensive approach, and students' revisions showed

improvement in their final drafts. The authors argued that the pedagogy implied that the

instructor's direct feedback is essential corrective input for the learners in Chinese writing. Also,

some studies supported the dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) language accuracy for

the advanced L2 writers. Second, the instructor used the pedagogical sequence of indirect

feedback then direct comprehensible feedback. This choice of feedback order was intended for

developing students' self-correction. The students were first allowed to self-correct their errors,

then the instructor gave direct suggestions or options. In conclusion, the authors suggest that the

corrective feedback in L2 writing is "contextual pedagogical activity" (pp. 110-111). In sum, the

study suggests that L2 teachers should consider CF-related, learner-related, and language-related

variables when making CF pedagogy decisions. They must also be conscious of the context for their feedback.

Although many recent L2 CF studies indicated that indirect and focused CF promotes self-correction and language accuracy, I agree based on my own teaching experiences that more aspects and variables should be considered when choosing a CF treatment. For example, the students' proficiency levels and the CF's intention in different stages of the writing process can impact the effectiveness of the feedback. To generalize, when students are at lower levels, many need balanced support for content development and language use. Therefore, focusing on certain target words or grammar is more feasible than comprehensive feedback. On the other hand, some advanced students may be able to accomplish accurate revisions from extensive feedback. Since Chinese DLI learners rarely encounter feedback on their writing beyond the classroom, the instructor's direct feedback is the only resource.

Developing Chinese writing competence differs from ESL/EFL in that it involves character construction and character retention for the novice writers in my classes. Also, the students' L1 often influences their sentence structures. Therefore, the writing activity that I provide for my students is usually a daily writing exercise that requires one to two sentences. Each task only targets a few vocabulary items, and one grammar rule or sentence structure. This activity also provides a foundation for developing content-focused writing. Thus, I provide my students with a combination of written and oral directions and focused CF approaches. I have found the combined method to be the most effective CF for developing my students' accuracy.

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations.

      Journal of English for Academic Purposes, *38*, 1–13.

      https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003

      This study investigated Chinese EFL students' academic emotions as the learners reacted to teachers' WCF. It aimed to analyze the range of situated academic emotions provoked by WCF and how they affected learners' attitudes, emotions, and perceptions in the revision process. According to Pekrun (2006), academic emotions may be defined as learners' mental states related to the classroom and learning in educational settings. Although some studies I reviewed indicated that WCF could lead to negative academic emotions, Han and Hyland's research found in the L2 environment, students' emotional reaction toward WCF is very situational and needs to be examined from contextualized angles. Again, most research I looked at showed that context is key.

      For the purposes of this 2018 study on perceptions, the participants, including two ESL/EFL instructors, had two different language backgrounds and teaching experience. Two college students in the study had distinct proficiency levels and language learning history. The survey interview questions were designed to rate and analyze various academic emotions toward teachers' WCF and their perceptions of their writings in different stages of writing. The study found that WCF can lead to students' positive and negative responses. The negative emotions sometimes can result in motivation for accuracy. Students' previous learning experiences also are a significant factor in the feedback and revision process. For example, students who had negative learning experiences may be predisposed to negative feelings toward the teacher's feedback and react indifferently in the revision of their rough drafts.

This study pointed out that L2 writing teachers should embrace learners' complexity of feelings and reactions in the WCF and drafting process. Teachers need to be aware of the dynamic of students' proficiency levels, self-perceptions, attitudes, and learning goals to implement better corrective feedback strategies to feed individual students' needs.

In the Chinese K-12 DLI classroom, as I have experienced it, writing is a slow and challenging process. First, the writing system is entirely different from students' native language-English. Secondly, writing within a given state's core curriculum or standards in various subject areas may pose another challenge. Considering integrating different types of WFC mentioned in the previous literature is often not sufficient. Chinese teachers also need to understand each student's learning history, aptitudes, goals, and learning styles (as discussed further elsewhere in the present portfolio). Understanding the learner's self-perception and learner views of the learning process tends to be undervalued among many Chinese teachers whose teaching philosophy may be more traditional and teacher-centered.

Researchers such as Han and Hyland demonstrate that a student-centered WCF pedagogical approach in which the language teacher pays attention to students' academic emotions may affect the learners' revisions and accuracy. Therefore, activities like pre-course surveys, reflection journals, and one-on-one teacher-learner conferences may help address potential negative academic emotions and relieve some anxiety, lower the affective filter, tackle false perceptions, encourage positive attitudes, and determine realistic learning goals. Chinese teachers especially need to bear in mind cross-cultural differences in all their teaching and also incorporate their awareness into their feedback methods when possible and appropriate. The methods of corrective feedback that some Chinese teachers were accustomed to in their native country may not be suitable to North American students.

Hsieh, Y., Hiew, C. K., & Tay, Y. X. (2017). Computer-mediated corrective feedback in

Chinese as a second language writing: Learners' perspectives. *Chinese as A Second*

Language Assessment, 225–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4089-4_11

Hsieh, Hiew, and Tay's (2017) study was conducted in Singapore, where the number of

students learning Chinese as a second language in primary classes is very high. The students'

widely varying levels of proficiency have made it difficult for Chinese teachers to attend to

everyone's learning needs and individual learning styles, identities, and backgrounds. Although

research has shown that giving CF impacts students' writing development and language

acquisition, it is not feasible to provide CF under these circumstances with very large numbers of

students in the classroom. Promoting self-directed learning through a computer-assisted

linguistic error detective system can alleviate such challenges in the Chinese L2 writing context.

Also, it allows teachers to focus on content delivery and other vital elements of the writing

process. Therefore, Singapore Centre for the Chinese Language adopted a computer essay

marking system prototype to provide instant feedback on Chinese characters, lexical

collocations, and grammar.

This research explored the students' views of the computer-mediated CF in Chinese L2

writing in upper primary students' proficiency levels ranging from intermediate low to

intermediate high. The results revealed that in general, most students perceived the computer-

mediated system to be very helpful. They believed that the system had raised their awareness of

grammar forms and improved linguistic accuracy. Most of the students also commented that the

feedback system is instant and convenient. However, the lower proficiency students tended not

to feel as favorably about metalinguistic feedback as higher proficiency students. Some examples

of lower proficiency students' negative responses in survey interviews include inaccurate feedback and the burdens of specific typing requirements.

The study concluded that this type of computer-mediated CF can provide positive experiences and outcomes. However, the computer-generated response did not come without flaws. One of them was the lower proficiency students did not always take advantage of the metalinguistic feedback. To remedy this, it is suggested that teachers provide some explanation to students that have questions and offer some individualized writing assistance.

Moreover, typical writing errors in characters, lexical collocation, and grammar are very time-consuming to correct for Chinese DLI teachers that face time constraints or large numbers of students. Also, in some cases, teachers have not had proper training in grammar rules or in how to give explicit grammar instruction. Thus, it can be challenging to respond to some errors. A computer-mediated approach seems to be a sensible solution to compensate for the lack of CF due to these challenges. However, the limitation of the computer-generated essay correction system, including students' metalinguistic cognition, requires the balance of the teachers' involvement. Moreover, this corrective system shouldn't be the only tool in teachers' WCF strategy. Teachers need to be aware of each student's writing needs, writing content development, and other rhetorical elements.

Based on the above study, a few concerns that I have in implementing a computer-mediated essay error feedback system are as follows: 1) The complicated computer operating system may be discouraging to younger and lower-proficiency students; 2) The metalinguistic response may confuse some students who are not cognitively ready for this strategy; 3) Teachers may rely too much on this form-focused CF and lose sight of other important aspect of writing development. I think that program leadership should further investigate many student and teacher

factors before implementing this type of corrective feedback system. I suppose more research

can be done and limitations could be addressed and adjusted. In that case, the computer-mediated

essay corrective system could be a great asset to the writing instruction in the DLI classroom. In

short, teachers therefore cannot rely solely upon computer-mediated feedback for writing, but

teachers can use it as one of many tools in their toolbox.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective

feedback in system. *System, 84,* 93–109.

https://doi.org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1016/j.system.2019.05006

In Li and Vuono's (2019) written corrective feedback (WCF) synthesis review, they refer

to WCF as "responses and comments on learners' written production in a second language" (p.

100). The WCF consists of written and oral forms in this case study. Written feedback is defined

as the written response to the writer's paper. Oral feedback is verbal communication during the

writing conference or class section. Also, the WCF focuses on both the language and the content

correction. It can target one or multiple linguistic structures. Finally, feedback from the teachers

and peers is commonly utilized in WCF.

This article states that there are skeptics to the effect of WCF, such as Truscott (1996),

who argued that based on Krashen's theory (1982), to effectively achieve SLA, learners must

obtain the correct form through communicative tasks. Based on this mostly Communicative

Language Teaching (CLT) perspective, this kind of WCF may be criticized because it does not

provide meaningful communication associated with the real-world situations; therefore, it wastes

time. On the other hand, some researchers do value a high level of accuracy and believe that the

correct form is important to effective communication. Thus, the study suggests it is beneficial to

embed explicit grammar instruction using WCF pedagogy. The case study presents two written

CF approaches: learning to write (centered on effectively expressing meaning through writing)

and writing to learn (focused on developing linguistic skills through writing).

The authors explain that there are three main categories of the WCF. First, direct

feedback: providing the correct form by replacing the incorrect ones. Second, metalinguistic

feedback: using clues to solicit the proper use of the language. Last, indirect feedback:

underlining or circling the errors without further instruction, just pointing out that something is

wrong but not providing a correct answer or clue at all. The study pointed out that metalinguistic

and indirect feedback "works better for treatable errors," whereas direct feedback is "more

effective for untreatable errors" (p.103).

As in some of the other studies I review here, attitude plays an important part, as does

context and level, and even the language being learned. The authors also found that the teachers'

and students' attitudes about WCF entail the pedagogical approach's effectiveness. They found

that the language learners favored direct feedback over other types of feedback. Moreover,

different language settings and proficiency levels affect students' preference of the error

categories responses. For example, Spanish, German, and French learners preferred to receive

feedback on language-related errors. On the other hand, English learners favored both language

and content feedback.

Although most students trusted teachers' feedback more, they also valued their peers'

feedback. Most of the teachers focused their feedback more on the grammar structures than the

content, although they acknowledged the importance of other aspects of writing. The researchers

found that the instructors' choices of the feedback strategies impacted the learning outcomes in

the classroom. For instance, the instructors who responded just to one or a few grammar features

are more effective than those who commented on multiple grammatical errors. Perhaps this helps the students to focus more on one aspect rather than trying to correct all errors or inaccuracies.

In the Chinese DLI setting, Truscott's concern about WFC should be considered. One of his arguments is that teachers who lack metalinguistic knowledge of grammar rules can jeopardize students' writing habits. Chinese grammar rules have many exceptions, and the teachers may not have formal training on grammar rules. However, some general grammar rules can be embedded in focused feedback that only targets a few grammar structures at a time.

Depending on the purpose and the categories of the errors, Chinese instructors can mix and match the direct, metalinguistic, and indirect feedback on students' papers. The correction strategies should be driven by developing students' awareness of language use and composition components. For the content-based DLI classroom, students can take advantage of both teachers' and peers' feedback in oral and written form. The interactive responses from multiple feedback givers promote language development, whether in the classroom or individual writing conferences. This mixed strategy echoes Krashen's communicative approach to negotiating the meaning through CF.

Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of providing and receiving written corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: does provide and receiving feedback have fair mutual benefit? *Asian Pacific Journal of Second 5*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z

Besides studies on the focused and unfocused, direct, metalinguistic, and indirect corrective feedback, research on the learners' perspectives regarding the teachers' and peers' feedback in L2 writing provide us insight into the efficacy of L2 WCF instructional strategies

(Berg, 1999; Kozlova, 2009; Lee, 2008; Mahfoodh, 2017; Yu & Lee 2016). These studies supported a more significant benefit of peer feedback, compared with teacher feedback. Rouhi, Dibah, and Mohebbi's point out that when teachers' comments were the most frequently used WCF method, there is no significant improvement in students' writing in this case study. In contrast, peer review enhanced students' writing accuracy through interaction in giving and receiving feedback. The following section will further explain the findings from their study on giving and receiving WCF on developing L2 writing accuracy.

One of the findings points to the advantages of peer feedback involvement in the learners' roles in the writing process. This involvement, or to some increased extent learner accountability and agency, raises the students' awareness of the weaknesses and strengths of their L2 writing and promotes reflection during the reading and correction process. The researcher stated that compared to the feedback receiver, the input givers needed to complete the tasks and provide feedback; they actively engage in critical thinking skills to search and locate the errors and provide comments to improve the writing. This created an opportunity for reflection on their own papers and helped them avoid making the same errors.

DLI instructors might prefer to provide teacher-only feedback due to instructional time constraints, academic content within the curriculum, and students' ability to perform the task. However, the DLI setting offers excellent opportunities for task-based learning (TBL) and peer interaction; the peer feedback model can be implemented as part of a writing task, using class time or at home online via a learning management system, like any other peer task. Through interactive communication, students can increase awareness of their own writing, use the language for a purpose, and achieve SLA. The authors suggested utilizing training to establish positive peer feedback classroom culture and familiar with the peer feedback procedures. In that

regard, I refer to Baker-Smemoe (2018), who recommends investing time and effort in modeling and scaffolding that can overcome proficiency challenges, avoiding negative comments, and offering clear guidance through giving feedback. These general suggestions are always applicable in second language teaching.

I suggest that younger learners especially can take advantage of having checklists, guiding questions, and focused feedback targets. The arrangement of the feedback partners also plays a vital role in proficiency differentiation. The instructors might group the students into two to three partners to provide more peer interaction opportunities. Moreover, to ensure the feedback givers provide effective responses, the instructor can add a reflection task to evaluate the students' feedback performance and share what they learned in giving the feedback.

Zhang, Y. (2020). An examination of corrective, reflective, and rule-based feedback in

Chinese classifier acquisition in a CALL environment. *Theory and Practice in

Language Studies, 10*(12), 1558–1565. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1012.07

Zhang's study (2020) investigated the effectiveness of different types of feedback in acquiring a particular Chinese classifier in a computer-assisted language learning (CALL) environment. These days, advanced technology enables computer-based course design to incorporate learners' metalinguistic and cognitive factors to provide interactive feedback and engage students in the learning process. Therefore, with the accessibility of learning a second language through technology, it is crucial to understand how these artificial feedback apps can promote SLA and improve grammatical competence in the self-directed CALL environment.

This study used a classifier as a grammar focus because it is challenging for most learners. In Chinese, a number followed by a noun must have a classifier in between; for

example, "two cats" would be "两只猫." "只" indicates a cat as an animal. Similar perceptions of nouns belong to a group of classifiers, but more rules correlate the classifiers and nouns in some cases. Thus, it requires cognitive skills to group similar nouns and memory to retain the knowledge for the correct classifiers. The three kinds of feedback -- corrective feedback, rule-based feedback, and reflective feedback -- are designed to show how they engage the students in retaining the classifier rules in the learning process. The corrective feedback method shows whether the answer is correct or incorrect. The rule-based feedback provides grammar rule hints to an incorrect answer. Lastly, the reflective feedback prompts students to think about the grammar features when getting answers wrong. This study shows that all three can be implemented effectively in the computer-based learning course. This study shows that all three can be implemented effectively in the computer-based learning course.

To summarize this case study briefly, the participants were divided into three groups; each group received only one type of feedback during the learning course. A pre-test and post-test were administered to examine the effectiveness of these three types of feedback. Students were given 30 minutes in a training course; then, they performed a post-test and delayed test to see how well they could retain the rules.

The assessment outcome found that students who received rule-based feedback explaining the rules tested better than the other two groups in terms of immediate retention of the rules. However, reflective feedback offered hints until the participants got the answer correct performed better than corrective feedback method. Meanwhile, in the delayed test, the reflective feedback greatly outperformed the other two. This investigation indicated that reflected feedback

was superior because it allowed students to internalize the rules; therefore, students actively engaged in the learning process.

Although this study examined grammar learning with feedback methods in the CALL context, it can provide insight for self-directed computer-tutoring in Chinese writing with interactive feedback. Apps like Grammarly or others use algorithms to provide intermediate feedback while English writers are composing their papers. Like this study, Grammarly offers different types of feedback. It also gives options of corrective feedback, rule-based feedback, and reflective feedback depending on the grammar and rhetoric features. This kind of artificial feedback can encourage L2 Chinese writers to learn autonomously and enhance linguistic competence in a more flexible learning environment.

Technology offers many affordances for teaching L2 writing and providing effective feedback, though it has limitations as we have seen above. In the Chinese DLI context, some computer courseware can be designed to assign writing options to aim for specific grammar accuracy. The courseware would allow students to write Chinese beyond the classroom and maximize grammar acquisition. Chinese teachers can integrate computer writing feedback into lesson planning as a pre-writing activity or assessment practice. The writing feedback in a CALL environment can release some load from the Chinese DLI teachers who face time constraints for writing response and instructional resources. However, as Zhang suggested above, the courseware design should consider learner cognitive variables and metalinguistic ability. Computer-generated accurate feedback can be very beneficial; incorrect responses, on the other hand, can hinder students' writing development.

Conclusions

To conclude this section, instructors should balance the corrective methods between teachers' and students' peer feedback. The studies I explored showed that peer feedback could improve L2 writing accuracy, especially for the feedback givers. When designing the peer feedback task, the instructor should pay attention to the activity structures, provide sufficient training, support the feedback givers, and allow the students to reflect on the feedback process and their writing.

In addition to direct and indirect WCF methods, instructors have many options for effective teacher-student, student-student, and computer-generated feedback strategies. Instructors may choose or combine WCF methods according to their instructional purpose and literacy goals in the different stages of the writing process. The findings from the above literature point out that various factors can interact with the WCF choices and their efficacy, including students' age, proficiency level, perceptions, teachers' background, etc. The Chinese DLI context shares the above factors; thus, the pedagogical implications are applicable in the Chinese DLI context in that we must also consider these individual learner and teacher differences. In particular, language teachers' background impacts CF choices. The types of WCF the instructors use will influence students' attitudes and motivation in responding to the feedback. Therefore, it is imperative that teachers consider these factors as they implement CF methods into their writing instruction.

In addition, CALL has been a popular instructional tool in Chinese DLI classrooms. Whether using technology as a writing medium for composition assignments or form-focused learning activities, computer devices afford WCF with convenient and interactive features. Form-focused and self-directed computer grammar feedback yields instant results, reduces

teachers' workload, and encourages students to work independently. However, technology pre-training and support during the CF process should be implemented for younger and lower proficiency students to avoid negative results.

Teachers can always supplement computer feedback and provide more individualized instruction for increased positive outcomes. Lastly, DLI teachers can collaborate with an English partner teacher. Both teachers can observe and record students' academic emotions reacting to WCF. With two observers and feedback givers, teachers can identify students' feelings and academic emotions throughout the feedback and revision process and develop the best combinations of feedback strategies to improve students' revisions.

LOOKING FORWARD

Yesterday I was clever, so I wanted to change the world. Today I am wise, so I am

changing myself.

--Rumi

The most profound lesson that I learned from the MSLT courses is finding my purpose, what I stand for, and what sparks me in the classroom as an educator. Nothing brings me more joy than hearing students say they love coming to school and cannot wait for more. In the past, I endeavored to make a difference in the Chinese DLI community for external rewards. Much of the time was spent looking for the best formula for perfect performance. Now, I want to turn inward and focus on what matters the most—the students.

These days, our learners have experienced more challenging global events than I experienced at their age. Even though I feel more confident and equipped with the pedagogical knowledge and instrumental tools in various learning situations, I am eager to connect more with students through collaboration with parents and colleagues. In this way, I can help them feel safe in being who they are, becoming in tune with their true potentials and moving forward with intrinsic motivation.

Looking forward, I will continue to teach in the elementary and reach out to my community when called upon. If not all, I want to touch one student at a time, nurture their identity by putting their linguistic and cultural knowledge to use. I anticipate seeking innovative ideas that incorporate modern technology and creativity to connect students with others in the classroom as well as outside of the school community.

References

ACTFL (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. Retrieved from

      https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/public/ACTFLProficiencyGuidelines2012_F

      INAL.pdf

Adair-Hauck, B., & Donato, R. (2002). The PACE model: A story-based approach to meaning

      and form for standards-based language learning. *The French Review, 76*(2), 265–296.

      doi:10.2307/3132707

Aguilar, G., Barr, C. D., Phillips, E., & Uccelli, P. (2020). Exploring the cross-

      linguistic contribution of Spanish and English academic language skills to English

      text comprehension for middle-grade dual language learners. *AERA Open*.

      https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419892575

Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2014). The role of language learning progressions in improved

      instruction and assessment of English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, *48*(3), 480–

      506. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.176

Baker-Smemoe, W. (2018). Peer feedback. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language*

      Teaching. 1-5 https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0540

Bateman, B. (2002). Promoting openness toward cultural learning: Ethnographic interviews for

      students of Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*(3), 318–331.

      https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00152

Berg, E. C. (1999). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and

      writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(3), 215–241.

      https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(99)80115-5

Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language*

instruction. Heinle and Heinle.

Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The

experience of immersion teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, *96*(2), 251–269.

doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2012.01330.x

Cohen, A. D. (2015). Achieving academic control in two languages: Drawing on the psychology

of language learning in considering the past, the present, and prospects for the future.

Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching, 5(2), 336-337

https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2015.5.2.7

Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2005). The beauty of dual language education. *TABE Journal,*

8(1), 1–6.

Colomer, S. E., & Bacon, C.K. (2020). Seal of Biliteracy graduates get critical: Incorporating

critical biliteracies in Dual-Language programs and beyond. *Journal of Adolescent &*

Adult Literacy, 63(4), 379–389. https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.1017

Davin, K. J., & Heineke, A. J. (2018). The Seal of Biliteracy: Adding students' voices

to the conversation. *Bilingual Research Journal, 41*(3), 312–328.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2018.1481896

DeCapua, A. M., & Dunham, J. F. (2007). The pragmatics of advice giving: Cross-cultural

perspectives. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *4*(3), 319–342. doi:10.1515/ip.2007.016

Donato, R. & Adair-Hauk, B. (1992). A whole language approach to focus on form.

Paper presented at the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.),

Motivation, language identity and the L2 self. 9-42. Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003

Durán L., Hikida M., & Martínez, R. A. (2017). Becoming "Spanish learners": Identity and

interaction among multilingual children in Spanish-English dual language classroom.

International Multilingual Research Journal, 11(3), 167–183

https://doi:10.1080/19313152.2017.1330065

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1) 3–18. doi:

10.5070/12.v1i1.9054. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2504d6w3

Fang, M., & Wang, A. (2019). Feedback to feed forward: Giving effective feedback in

advanced Chinese writing. In N. Yiğitoğlu & M. Reichelt (Eds.), *L2 Writing Beyond

English*. 9-114. Multilingual Matters.

https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923132-009

Ferron J., López, L. M., & Ramirez, R. (2019). Teacher characteristics that play a role in the

language, literacy and math development of dual language learners. *Early Childhood

Education Journal, 47,* 85–96 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-0907-9

Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S., Grabe, W., & Stoller, F.L. (2017). Research support for content-based

instruction. In M.A. Snow & D.M. Brinton (Eds.), *The Content-based classroom:

Perspectives on integrating language and content* (2nd ed., pp. 21–35). Michigan

Teacher Training.

Fortune, T. W. (2012). What the research says about immersion. In Asian Society (Ed.) *Chinese

language learning in the early grades: A handbook of resources and best practices for

Mandarin immersion*. Asian Society. Retrieved from

https://asiasociety.org/files/chinese-earlylanguage.pdf

Glaser, K. (2014). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in

teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada journal, 30*(7), 150.

https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v30i7.1158

Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2017). *Enacting the work of language instruction: High-leverage teaching practices*. ACTFL. Retrieved from https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/tle/TLE_MarApr17_Article.pdf

Gómez, D. S. (2013). Bridging the opportunity gap through dual language education. Unpublished manuscript, California State University. Retrieved from http://scholarworks.csustan.edu/bitstream/handle/011235813/658/GomezD%20Summer%202013.pdf?sequence=1

Hakuta, K., Zwiers, J., & Rutherford-Quach, S. (2013). *Constructive classroom conversations: Mastering language for the Common Core State Standards*. Stanford University/Understanding Language online course.

Hall, J. K. (1995). "Aw, man, where you goin?": Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 37–62. https://doi.org/10.5070/l462005217

Hallerman, S., & Larmer, J. (2011). *PBL in the elementary grades: Step-by-step guidance, tools and tips for standards-focused K–5 projects*. Buck Institute for Education.

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *38*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003

Harley, B. (1984). How good is their French? *Language and Society, 10*, 55–60.

Heritage, M. (2007). Formative assessment: What do teachers need to know and do? *The Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(2), 140-145. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.dist.lib.usu.edu/stable/20442432

Heritage, M., Linquanti, R., & Walqui, A. (2015) English language learners and the new

    standards: *Developing language, content knowledge, and analytical practices in the*

    classroom. Harvard Education Press.

Howard, E. R., Sugarman, J., Christian, D., Lindholm-Leary, K. J., & Rogers, D. (2007).

    Guiding principles for dual language education (2nd ed.). Center for Applied

    Linguistics. Retrieved from https://www.cal.org/ndlf/pdfs/guiding-principles-for-dual-

    language-education.pdf

Hsieh, Y., Hiew, C. K., & Tay, Y. X. (2017). Computer-mediated corrective feedback in

    Chinese as a second language writing: Learners' perspectives. *Chinese as A Second*

    Language Assessment, 225–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-4089-4_11

Jackson, F., & Malone, M. (2009). *Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a*

    comprehensive strategy for a national language framework. Center for Applied

    Linguistics. Retrieved from

    http://www.cal.org/resource-center/publications-products/building-foreign-language-

    capacity

Kaufman, D. (2004). Constructivist issues in language learning and teaching. *Annual Review*

    of Applied Linguistics, 24, 303-319. doi:10.1017/S0267190504000121

Kozlova, I. (2009). Ellis's corrective feedback in a problem-solving context. *ELT Journal*, *64*(1),

    95–97. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccp064

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford University

    Press.

Lee, I. (2008). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT*

    Journal, *63*(1), 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective
feedback in system. *System, 84,* 93–109.
https://doi.org.dist.lib.usu.edu/10.1016/j.system.2019.05006

Lindholm-Leary, K. J (2007). Effective features of dual language education Programs: A
review of research and best practices. In E. R. Howard, J. Sugarman, D. Christian,
K. J. Lindholm-Leary, & D. Rogers (Eds.), *Guiding principles for dual
language education* (2nd ed., pp. 5–41). Center for Applied Linguistics.
Retrieved from
https://www.cal.org/ndlf/pdfs/guiding-principles-for-dual-language-education.pdf

Lindholm-Leary, K., & Block, N. (2010). Achievement in predominantly low SES/Hispanic dual
language schools. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 13*(1),
43–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050902777546

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.
https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263197001034

Marian, V., Shook, A., & Schroeder, S. R. (2013). Bilingual two-way immersion programs
benefit academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal, 36*(2), 167–186.
https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2013.818075

Medlock Paul, C., & Vehabovic, N. (2020). Exploring the critical in biliteracy instruction.
TESOL Journal 2020; 11: e456. Retrieved from
https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/tesj.456

Menke, M. R. (2010). *The Acquisition of Spanish vowel productions by native English-speaking students in Spanish immersion programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based second language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35–63). Multilingual Matters.

Met, M. (1999). *Content-based instruction: Defining terms, making decisions.* NFLC Reports. The National Foreign Language Center. Retrieved from https://carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/principles/decisions.pdf

Mougeon, R., Rehner, K., & Nadasdi, T. (2004). The learning of spoken French variation by immersion students from Toronto, Canada. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 8*(3), 408–432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2004.00267.x

Mougeon, R., Rehner, K., & Nadasdi, T. (2010). *The sociolinguistic competence of immersion students*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847692405

Pekrun, R. (2006). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications. *Educational Psychology Review, 18,* 315–341. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-006-9029-9

Rezaei, S., & Derakhshan, A. (2011). Investigating recast and metalinguistic feedback in task-based grammar instruction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2*(3), 655–663. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.3.655–663

Rouhi, A., Dibah, M., & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Assessing the effect of providing and receiving written corrective feedback on improving L2 writing accuracy: Does providing and

receiving feedback have fair mutual benefit? *Asian Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 5*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-020-00093-z

Rounds, P., Falsgraf, C., & Seya, R. (1997). Acquisition of sociolinguistic competence in a Japanese immersion school. *The Journal of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, 31*(2), 25-51. https://doi.org/10.2307/489657

Saito, K., Trofimovich, P., & Isaacs, T. (2016). Second language speech production: Investigating linguistic correlates of comprehensibility and accentedness for learners at different ability levels. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 37*(2), 217–240. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0142716414000502

Sarré, C., Grosbois, M., & Brudermann, C. (2019). Fostering accuracy in L2 writing: Impact of different types of corrective feedback in an experimental blended learning EFL course. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *34*(5-6), 707–729. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1635164

Shardakova, M. & Pavlenko, A. (2009). Identity options in Russian textbooks. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 3*(1), 25–46
https: //doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0301_2

Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(4), 361–392. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168806lr203oa

Silbernagel, E. (2015). Investigating the linguistic identity development of dual language learners. *Honors Program Theses.* 155. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.uni.edu/hpt/155

Snow, M., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of

    language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(2),

    201-217. doi:10.2307/3587333

Spicer-Escalante, M. L. (2017). Introduction to Dual Language Immersion. Part One: Dual

    Language Immersion. In K. deJonge-Kannan, M. L. Spicer-Escalante, E. Abell, & A.

    Salgado (Eds.), *Perspectives on effective teaching in dual language immersion*

    and foreign language classroom (pp. 3–15). Utah State University.

    Retrieved from

    https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1370&context=lpsc_facpub

Stewart, V. (2012). Why language immersion? Why now? In Asian Society (Ed.), *Chinese*

    language learning in the early grades: A Handbook of Resources and Best

    Practices for Mandarin Immersion (pp. 3–4). Asian Society.

    Retrieved from https://asiasociety.org/files/chinese-earlylanguage.pdf

Teng, M. (2019). Learner identity and learners' investment in EFL learning: A multiple case

    study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 7*(1), 43–60. Retrieved from

    https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1201791.pdf

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2012). *Dual language education for a transformed*

    world. Dual Language Education of New Mexico/Fuente Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language*

    Learning. 46(2). 327–369.

    https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Utah Dual Language Immersion Program. (2017). *K-16 language immersion*

    program, the bridge program-advanced language pathway.

Retrieved from https://l2trec.utah.edu/utah-dual-immersion/index.php

Utah Dual Language Immersion Program (2019). Fidelity Assurance. Retrieved from

http://www.utahdli.org/images/Updated%20DLIAssurances%20Grades%201-5_6.pdf

Varghese, M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher

identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*,

4(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2

Xu, Y., & Zhu, L. (2019). Online peer feedback in Second language Chinese writing. *Chinese as*

a Second Language. The Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association, USA,

54(3), 257–287. https://doi.org/10.1075/csl.19012.zhu

Yeh, S. (2017). Student-teachers' perceptions of second language teaching in the CBL program:

Identity construction and development. *Advances in Language and Literacy Studies, 8*(4),

21. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.alls.v.8n.4p.21

Youssef, H. Z. M. (2009). The relationship between cross-culture communication activities and

student motivation in studying second language. In Online Submission. Retrieved from

https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED511897.pdf

Zhang, Y. (2020). An examination of corrective, reflective, and rule-based feedback in

Chinese classifier acquisition in a CALL environment. *Theory and Practice in*

Language Studies, 10(12), 1558–1565. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1012.07

Zhou, W., & Zhou, M. (2018). Role of self-identity and self-determination in English learning

among high school students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *17*(3), 168–181

https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1433537