Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-2016

Second Language Teaching in the ESL Classroom: The Role of the Teacher

Ariel Serrell Finlinson
Utah State University

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

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons

Recommended Citation

SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE ESL CLASSROOM:

THE ROLE OF THE TEACHER

by

Ariel Serrell Finlinson

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

_____   _____
Dr. Joshua J. Thoms   Dr. Karin DeJonge-Kannan
Major Professor   Committee Member

_____   _____
Professor Nolan Weil   Dr. Bradford J. Hall
Committee Member   Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2016

ABSTRACT

Second Language Teaching in the ESL Classroom:

The Role of the Teacher

by

Ariel Finlinson: Master of Second Language Teaching

Utah State University, 2016

Major Professor: Dr. Joshua J. Thoms

Department: Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies

This portfolio covers what the author believes to be important teaching practices

for a teacher in the English as a Second Language classroom, with a specific emphasis on

the role of the teacher. The first section of the portfolio contains the author's teaching

philosophy which describes the author's beliefs of what constitutes good teaching. The

beliefs include the importance of using meaning-bearing and comprehensible input in the

classroom, the use of task-based activities to facilitate language learning, and

understanding the role of the teacher in the classroom. Following are three artifacts that

the author wrote during her time in the Master of Second Language Teaching (MSLT)

program. First, the language artifact examines the use of feedback in the classroom.

Second, the literacy artifact evaluates principles of teaching used in Dual Language

Immersion and how these principles are useful for teaching in an English as a Second

Language setting. Third, the culture artifact discusses research about request making in

the English as a Second Language classroom and explores the most effective teaching

methods to teach requests to second language learners. Following these artifacts is an

evaluation of the author's own teaching and how it compares with the author's beliefs

stated in her teaching philosophy. At the conclusion of the portfolio, the author includes

three annotated bibliographies covering what the author learned in her research of

different topics throughout her time in the MSLT program.

(134 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is impossible to express adequate gratitude to my professors for all of the work and effort they put into helping me finish my portfolio. I would first like to thank Dr. Karin DeJonge-Kannan for her endless support, encouragement, and tutelage. She was patient with me when I made mistakes and was always there to listen and give me guidance about my concerns. Next, I would like to thank Dr. Joshua Thoms for his understanding and flexibility. He was willing to work with my individual needs and was flexible in the timing of deadlines for my portfolio. Finally, Professor Nolan Weil, for his advice and guidance throughout my first semester of teaching in the Intensive English Language Institute at Utah State University.

I also want to thank my family, and especially my husband Kyle, for their support and encouragement throughout the program. I could not have done it without Kyle's constant belief in me, and his help in watching our new baby, Ladelle, so that I could work on my portfolio and classwork.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This portfolio includes the highlights of what I have learned during my time in the MSLT program. It includes my teaching philosophy, along with three artifacts that support different aspects of this philosophy. Central to this portfolio is my teaching philosophy, because it contains teaching methods and beliefs that govern what I believe are needed in a successful language teaching environment.

My teaching philosophy is composed of three main beliefs. First, I talk about the role and importance of meaning-bearing and comprehensible input in the classroom, which allow students to make connections between the words they hear and their meaning. Second, I cover the use of task-based activities (TBAs). These activities give students the chance to practice their second language (L2) in scenarios they may encounter while using their L2. Lastly, I define what I believe is the role of the teacher in the classroom.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY

APPRENTICESHIP OF OBSERVATION

My dad was a 4th grade teacher at my elementary school, so I would often go to his classroom after school. I remember my time there because that was when I first knew I wanted to be a teacher. For those brief moments my dad stepped out of the classroom, I would stand in his place at the white board, with a dry erase marker, and teach my imaginary class math, history, or some new and exciting concept. The students were, of course, all eager to learn. Even though this desire to be a teacher has waxed stronger and waned at times throughout my college career, my imaginings and dreams in that 4th grade classroom have remained, however dim, a constant reminder of what I wanted to do most: be in a position to help people improve their lives through learning.

My view of teachers changed as I moved from elementary school to junior high and then high school. In elementary school, my teachers were fun and engaging. I felt like they were my friends, and they all seemed to be relatively similar in their characteristics. As I moved to high school, I realized that there wasn't a stereotypical teacher. Some of my teachers knew how to engage with students and get us excited about the topic, while others seemed bored of teaching. They'd been teaching for who knows how long (50 or maybe 60 years), and it was tedious to sit through their classes. I realized that not every teacher was an engaging teacher.

In high school, I took Latin for several years. People would tell me, "It's a dead language." Frankly, I agreed, because I felt like I was being taught by a dead teacher. I dreaded going to class and sitting through an hour and a half of monotonous drills and lectures. Our class never even thought of conversing in Latin. The only work I did with the language was on a piece of paper. Maybe through this experience I learned a little

about paying attention to structural details of language, but I honestly remember little if anything from this class.

Besides my Latin experience, my first exposure to language learning was when I entered college. As I was walking through the bookstore, I saw the textbook for the German class, and suddenly felt a strong desire to study German. I joined the class, and that was the beginning of my language learning adventures. Even though my teacher Julian did not quite teach according to the Communicative Language Approach, as defined by Lee and VanPatten (2003), he had an enthusiasm for language learning that I had never seen before. His love of German culture and language inspired me to love it and encouraged me to look for opportunities to stretch my language abilities.

Following his encouragement, I took a semester to study abroad in Vienna. Looking back, this is where I realized how communicative language learning is much more effective than memorization drills. While in Vienna, I studied German at a language institute. I did the homework and in class we talked about grammar. For one of my holiday breaks, I went to visit some Swiss friends who lived in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. We spoke only German for the whole week I was with them. I found myself acting things out, asking questions, and using context to understand as much as I could. I was exercising my strategic competence to communicate (Savignon, 1998, as cited in Lee & VanPatten, 2003). During that one week in Switzerland, I learned more German than in my 3 months studying at the institute in Vienna. I realized then that if I wanted to learn a language, I needed to speak! Communication was the key.

My next language learning experience immediately followed my adventure in Austria. This time, however, I better understood the importance of speaking in the target

language as much as possible in order to successfully acquire that foreign language. Even though I spent about 11 weeks studying Russian in the Missionary Training Center (MTC) before being sent to Russia, I felt like I had reached a dead end in my language learning until entering the country. During my time in the MTC, I learned the Cyrillic alphabet, simple sentence structures, and how to say some basic sentences in Russian. By the time I entered the country, I was able to say some memorized sentences and create several of my own sentences, but I had only had limited opportunities to practice non-rehearsed conversations. Studying the grammar and memorizing phrases could do only so much for my language learning process. I needed to get to the country and be able to listen to and interact with Russian speakers in a non-controlled environment.

When I got to Russia, I could barely understand anything, and I could not communicate in a meaningful way. During my first 9 months in Russia, I rarely had a native English speaker with whom I could converse. This forced me to speak Russian in all kinds of situations. After countless hours of listening, observing, and making many linguistic mistakes, I reached a proficiency level that enabled me to comfortably communicate with anyone on a large variety of topics. During my 18 months in Russia, I learned grammar principles more from hearing them than from actually studying them or knowing the correct term that defines them. It was freeing and exciting. The world of Russia opened up to me, and I was able to explore it to a depth that would not have been possible without my acquisition of the language.

Language not only opens doors to cultural understanding, but greater possibilities for travel, friendships, and job opportunities. It was painful, lonely, and exhausting to acquire proficiency in Russian, but it was well worth the cost. I formed deep friendships,

made many connections, and now have greater opportunities for travel, work, and friendships.

Upon return to the USA, I realized that many people come here not knowing English, but to make friends, work, and live comfortably in our country, it is vital for them to speak the language. I recognized that English teachers are needed here in the USA and around the world. Not grammar drilling, memorization type classes, but classes where teachers create an atmosphere that simulates real-life experiences and situations that enable English language learners (ELLs) to negotiate meaning and figure out how to function in a country where they are surrounded by English speakers. This, in turn, helps L2 learners practice using the tools they need to study or work in English-speaking countries.

I decided that I wanted to be an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher to help ELLs gain the English language tools they need to achieve their dreams that are conditional upon their English language proficiency. This realization fulfilled my desires that began to grow in my dad's fourth grade classroom years before. I can help students get through some of the pain and loneliness in learning a language while they are in my classroom, so they are more equipped than I was to communicate with others in a meaningful way when they enter English-speaking societies. Teaching English to second language learners will allow me to not only teach English but help students gain the proficiency they need to improve their lives through learning a L2.

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Earlier in my life, I wanted to teach young children. However, based on my teaching experiences at Utah State University, I now realize that I want to teach English to adults who have immigrated to the USA, or students in other countries who want to learn English so they can study or work in an English-speaking country. These students are usually very motivated to learn English, as they need this language proficiency to survive and thrive in an English-speaking country. I want to help them reach their goals for their new life in a new country. My plan to help them achieve these goals is not only to help them understand the cultural norms and manners of the USA, but to help them learn to use English in ways that will enable them to be successful in their endeavors.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Introduction

Many of my observations and opinions about language learning were formed early on as a student. These opinions not only affected my view of how languages are learned, but also the way that I believed languages should be taught. As I have studied about methods of teaching in my college career, some of my beliefs have been supported and strengthened by what I have learned, while others have changed. My teaching philosophy is the beginning of a life-long journey to find out who I am as a teacher, and what kind of teacher I want to become. This journey will never end because I have come to see that teaching is a process that must be continually analyzed and critiqued (Freire, 2005).

Teaching Philosophy

As I have come to comprehend that I will never reach an end of perfection in teaching, I have realized that each class I teach will bring new challenges. Most of my teaching experience thus far has been in an ESL classroom, and because this is most likely the area in which I will teach in the future, I will focus on this teaching context. Due to the diversity of students' backgrounds in ESL classes, it will be necessary for me to make changes to meet the needs of the specific students in my class. To make the needed changes, I must continually evaluate what is really happening in the classroom and strive to respect the vast array of differences present there. One way I will measure what is happening in the classroom is by using the ACTFL *Can-Do Statements* (2013).

Even though I will be teaching in an ESL setting, I have found the ACTFL *Can-Do Statements* (2013) more helpful for me in planning lessons than the Teachers of

English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) standards. Both sets of standards focus on helping students reach prescribed goals, but I found that the ACTFL standards were more explicit about what students should be able to *do* when they have reached a certain goal. ACTFL organizes its standards according to levels of proficiency and specifically states what each learner should be capable of doing with the language at that specific level.

As a beginner teacher of ESL, I was given a class to teach that had never before been taught. Due to this, I was required to create my own curriculum for the class. I was so overwhelmed with the new responsibilities and planning that I did not utilize the ACTFL standards as well as I should have done. Looking back on planning my class, I believe that if I had implemented the standards into my teaching, it would have been easier for me to plan for my classes, because I would have had specific goals to work towards. In the future I hope to use the ACTFL standards in planning goals and lessons for my classes, which will help me to measure my success as a teacher, and my students' language proficiency

My Teaching Philosophy covers a variety of principles, which fall under the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach. This approach is the center of my teaching and focuses on communication as the goal and means of language learning. Even though CLT is sometimes referred to with varying definitions (Littlewood, 2011), I refer to CLT as a teaching method that requires students to actively use the language throughout the class period in order to communicate (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). I do not believe that as a teacher I should have a lecture style class, but one that relies on my students' use of the language to reach the class period's goals. In the following sections I

will go further in depth with examples of such goals and activities, and how I encourage students to use the language communicatively in order to learn the language.

While some teachers may refer to CLT as instruction in which students must always be communicating (Littlewood, 2011), I have found that it is important to plan time during lessons for students to participate in individual activities. I believe that giving them time to read, write, or brainstorm alone better prepares them to have meaningful communications with their classmates later on in the lesson, instead of simply letting them loose to immediately start communicating. Another aspect of CLT, that I think is important to mention, is that communication in the classroom does not and should not only be oral communication. It is important for students to not only learn oral communication, but be able to communicate through writing and reading (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1999). Through CLT, I strive to help my students practice all of these types of communication.

Included in this category of CLT is Content-Based Instruction (CBI). This approach emphasizes using content to learn language, and focuses not only on language learning, but also on learning the content (Stoller, 2008). As more language is learned, it is believed there is wider access to content (e.g., referring to school-like subject matter that does not focus on language learning, or content chosen due to the interests of, or job relevance for, the students) (Stoller, 2008). CBI not only allows teachers to help students gain access to a wide variety of content, but also brings culture into the classroom through the use of these texts (Sederberg, 2013).

Due to the nature of the class I taught, most of the discussion and examples in the following section will cover content that was of interest to my students. I believe that

using CLT, along with CBI, adds a depth to language teaching as teachers can help students learn to communicate through the study of content that sparks communication and covers topics in which the students are interested.

Under the categories of CLT and CBI, I have found several principles that I believe are the most important in shaping me into the teacher I want to become. The next sections will focus on the following three principles: the use of meaning-bearing and comprehensible input, task-based activities, and understanding and utilizing the role of the teacher in the classroom.

Meaning-bearing and Comprehensible Input

From my own experience in school, I noticed that students are usually expected only to regurgitate facts and specific themes from a text, and, sadly enough, I have noticed that this often happens in the L2 classroom as well. Teachers often have students participate in drills that require them to repeat words or phrases that the teacher says. This type of repetition causes students to pay attention "to a phonological code rather than a semantic code" (Brown, 2007, p. 43) and the student repeats the sounds "without the vaguest understanding of what the sounds might possibly mean" (Brown, 2007, p. 43). Although 'echoing', or the imitation of sounds, does play a role in "phonological acquisition" (Brown, 2007, p. 43), it is only helpful when students can connect meaning to the sounds they are making. Repeating an unknown dialogue will do nothing for students, which is why comprehensible input is important. When students learn the language in a context that they understand and relate to; that is when language comes alive.

Before moving on to discuss meaning-bearing and comprehensible input, it will be beneficial to define input. "Input is *the language learners hear that is meant to convey a message*; that is, the learner's job is to attempt to understand what is being said" (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 16). As such, in language teaching, it is important that learners are not simply exposed to a stream of language that is impossible to follow or comprehend. Teachers can make input more accessible to learners by modifying or enhancing it.

Comprehensible Input

According to Lee and VanPatten (2003), two aspects of input can make it easier for the learner to understand. The first type is comprehensible input. That is, "the learner must be able to figure out what the speaker is saying if he is to attach meaning to the speech stream coming at him" (p. 26-27). Nation and Newton (2009) emphasize the need for "meaning-focused input" (p. 1), and suggest that one way to make input meaning-focused, or comprehensible, is to engage students by talking about a topic that is familiar to them.

As mentioned above, in the course I currently teach, I have the freedom to create my own curriculum. This allows me to ask students what topics they would like to cover during the course of the semester. Due to the fact that my class consists of students from several different countries with differing native languages, there is a diverse range of interests and topics the students would like to cover. Giving them the option to pick topics for the class helps to keep students more interested and enthusiastic about what they are learning. It also allows students to draw on background knowledge when talking about topics with which they are already familiar. Without background knowledge, students will struggle to understand new words and phrases because when students

negotiate the meaning of an oral communication or written text, they rely on previous knowledge of the subject in order to understand (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). Previous knowledge also helps them make accurate inferences of meaning that otherwise would be lost if they did not already have background knowledge of the subject.

One important way to help students to utilize their background knowledge of a subject is by encouraging them to share their personal experiences and stories that relate with the content being covered. Hooks (2010) highlights the importance of allowing students to share in this way. This allows students the chance to learn to express and think critically about their views and beliefs. It also gives the teacher a glimpse into the progress of the students' learning, opening up doors to investigate what needs to be done further to help these students take the next step along their journey of learning (Hooks, 2010).

In reflecting back on my own school career, I can remember feeling annoyed when my classmates would share personal stories in class. I did not see how their personal story was relevant to what we were talking about in class. Now, as a teacher, I realize that I can miss an opportunity for my students' growth and deeper understanding of the topics that we are covering if I do not allow or encourage them to share personal stories. According to Freire (2005), I also lose out on an opportunity to hear my students. He claims that in listening to students, teachers increase the chance that students will also listen to them. I want to be more attentive to students' personal stories because this will also help me better understand their culture(s) and home life. It is important for them to draw on their personal stories to relate to each other and to the context we are covering while also using this background knowledge to work to understand each other.

Along with background knowledge, context is a crucial part of negotiating the meaning of interaction. In my own classroom, I help make input comprehensible through a variety of methods using different contexts. I use visuals, teaching aids, and body language. For example, one day my students requested that we cover the vocabulary for makeup. In order to make the input comprehensible, I would show a picture of the type of makeup, and then tell them the corresponding word. Using the pictures helps put the topic into the correct context for the students. Without the picture of a familiar item, saying the name of the item would have been meaningless to the students.

Showing the picture of the item also negates the use of the first/native language (L1) equivalent of the vocabulary word. It would be almost impossible for a teacher to give the equivalent of the word in the L1 anyway because so many different languages are represented in most ESL classes. However, using pictures along with words is an example of comprehensible input because students are able to correlate the new vocabulary with a picture of an item with which they are already familiar. This is known as "binding" (Terrell, 1986, as cited in Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 39).

Meaning-bearing Input

Good input for SLA is not only comprehensible, but also meaning-bearing. Meaning-bearing input "*must contain some message to which the learner is supposed to attend*. Thus, meaning-bearing input has some communicative intent; the purpose of the speaker is to communicate a message to a listener" (Lee & VanPatten, 2003, p. 27, italics in original). One condition that is vital for meaning-bearing input is that the interest of the learner is engaged through the interaction, and that he/she desires to understand what he/she has read or heard (Nation & Newton, 2009). In order to 'attend' to a message, it

must be interesting to the student, or the message must require something from the student (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). In other words, after the student has heard and understood the message, they will need to recall and use that information again for some kind of an activity, discussion, or assignment that allows the teacher to see that the student has 'attended' to the message.

To make the information interesting to the students, it is important for me, as the teacher, to find out about their interests and hobbies. This gives me a chance to integrate students' interests into the curriculum. Finding what the students already like to do on a regular basis and connecting that with the curriculum, I can make learning engaging for them. I have seen this in my own class as I have tried to cover topics that my students find interesting. When they enjoy the topic and can relate to it, they participate enthusiastically and contribute more to the group and class work.

It is important for students to be able to get past the basic information presented in the curriculum and be able to move to making personal connections with and critically analyze the material (Escamilla et al., 2013). It is through the analysis and connections that they will learn the most because, as they are able to make connections to the material, learning will come more naturally. When students are interested in the topic and feel that they are in a safe environment, their motivation to learn about the subject will also increase (Lightbown et al., 2006).

One method I use to encourage students' attentiveness to the message is providing a handout or worksheet for them to record information that they have gathered or learned. Having students turn in these worksheets also gives me an opportunity to assess if

students have 'attended' to the information and have understood the message or information to which they were exposed.

Receiving input is vital to achieve proficiency, but doesn't "ensure that the outcome will be native-like performance" (Swain, 1985, p. 236). Students need opportunities to practice the language and produce output (Swain, 1985). For most students, learning another language means being able "to know other people and [learn] about new cultures through those personal connections" (Ballman, Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001, p. 9). This means that as a teacher, I need to focus on teaching what friends, family, colleagues, classmates, and acquaintances talk about, and the language skills students need to form these personal connections with people from other cultural and language backgrounds. I have found that task-based activities are the most effective way for me to help students produce more output and practice talking about these topics.

Task-Based Activities

Task-based activities are those that help students practice L2 vocabulary and grammar principles they are learning through oral communication, writing, and reading. As students are given the chance to discuss what they have heard, read, or written with their classmates, they will be able to "use and hear new language" (Escamilla et al., 2013, p. 149). As such, TBAs provide students with opportunities to not only "communicate with their existing knowledge of the language but actually extend this knowledge" (Littlewood, 2011, p. 548).

According to Swain (1985), allowing students to practice the language gives them the chance to test out some hypotheses about the language and see what actually works. Using the language also pushes them "to move from semantic processing to syntactic

processing" (Swain, 1985, p. 249). As such, using the language is a critical source that will cause learners to recognize the grammar rules and help them to gain a more native-like proficiency. Even if there are no native speakers in a class, TBAs will help students naturally acquire knowledge about the language as they interact with each other, listen to recordings of fluent speakers, or read authentic texts.

In addition to "a long period of regular interaction with people speaking the language," Garrett (2006, p.133) stresses that students also need "help with making sense of what's going on linguistically" (Garrett, 2006, p. 133). This is an integral part of TBAs because in fulfilling these communication activities, it is vital that students are required to *do* something contextualized with the language to fulfill the class period's specific objective or communicative goal. As will be discussed more in depth in the following section, this allows teachers the chance to explain what students need to know linguistically to fulfill the task. Instead of focusing on drills and memorization, TBAs equip students with the tools they need to successfully communicate in the real world.

TBAs are designed to foster communicative interaction, which leads to language acquisition because language is learned, "not as a series of separate discrete items but as an integrated system" (Brown, 2007, p. 29). Using TBAs allows students to see how the language works as a whole, as they participate in activities encouraging them to solve problems, discuss articles or books, share ideas, tell stories, explain cultural differences, etc.

TBAs are more than just activities designed to get students talking, however. In addition to communication, Slavin's (1995) research shows that there are "strong improvements in student learning when students work in groups that have structured

objectives" (as cited in Grabe & Stoller, 1997, p. 8). Group work should require specific outcomes and cover topics that are meaningful for the students.

TBAs allow students to practice communicating in a variety of ways in a group setting that resembles communication they normally would have in their L1. Ortego (2009) says that, "in characteristically human behavior, we use language not only to communicate to specific audiences, but sometimes to address ourselves rather than others, as in self-talk, and other times to address collective, unknown audiences, as when we participate in political speeches, religious sermons, internet navigation, commercial advertisements, newspaper columns or literary works" (p. 1). Teachers should use TBAs to stretch students' abilities to interact in the L2 as they characteristically would in their L1. For example, a contextualized goal of a TBA would be for students to work with a committee in determining the pros and cons of a given controversial issue. Then, as a group, they would write a persuasive speech to try to convert the other groups in the class to their views. An example of a topic would be why it is good/bad for mothers to work outside of the home. As the teacher builds up to this end goal, students learn how to discuss their opinions of an in issue in the L2, determine the pros and cons as a group (which may require compromise), use persuasive language, and prepare a speech to perform in front of an audience. There are many such examples of TBAs.

As I have watched my class work in groups during TBAs, I've noticed that group work requires students to participate in conversation, and students who may usually act shy are more actively involved during group work. Shy members are especially engaged when each member of the group has some of the information needed to fulfill the task. Folse (2006) addresses this type of task, known as a two-way task.

In order to explain two-way tasks, let me first describe one-way tasks. Folse (2006) explains that one-way tasks are those in which information is simply shared. For example, students may be asked to share their favorite childhood memory. Even though both partners share their stories, the information is not used or recorded in any way, which does not produce the communicative interaction that is most beneficial for students. This type of task can be adapted and become a two-way task by having the students record certain facts about the story on a handout, which will encourage the use of negotiation of meaning (Long, 1996). Negotiation of meaning occurs when another student, or the teacher, is able to clarify the meaning of a phrase or word that a student does not understand through different negotiation techniques. These techniques consist of repetitions, confirmation checks, reformulations, or clarification requests (Long, 1996). Requiring students to record information from their interaction with their partner will necessitate active participation from each partner as they ask for clarifications so that they can understand and record the needed information requested by their teacher (Folse, 2006).

In research that looked at the effect of one-way and two-way tasks, Pica and Doughty (1985a; 1985b) state that, "when [the students] used two-way tasks, in which information exchange was required, [the authors] did find statistically significant differences" (as cited in Folse, 2006, p. 49), compared with one-way tasks. Thus, using two-way tasks in language teaching is more likely to enhance students' communication in the real world as they gain the ability to negotiate the meaning of the input they receive orally or through written work. Clarifying questions students may use to negotiate meaning include such phrases as *Could you please repeat what you just said?*, and *What*

does the word _____ *mean?*, and *Did you say___?*, or *Did you understand the last paragraph of the story to mean* _____*?*

When compared to fill-in-the-blank exercises, memorization drills, rote repetition, or other such teaching methods, lessons designed around TBAs are better able to meet students' needs because TBAs give students the chance to practice communication that is similar to what they will need to use in everyday life when speaking in a L2. These types of activities also prepare students to effectively communicate in L2 situations that they have not previously experienced because of the language strategies they have learned while participating in TBAs. It is not enough to simply give students the chance to talk together (Christian, 2011). Teachers must use TBAs as an opportunity to 'design the task' that will help students use "strategies that will promote language development" (Christian, 2011, p. 15), as they proceed through the task.

The classroom can imitate real-world environments and social interactions (Walsh, 2006), and using TBAs helps the class to transform and take on these different scenarios and contexts. These activities also encourage greater interaction between students, which is believed to lead to more L2 acquisition (Long, 1996). This is important because gaining oral proficiency is the motivation of most students for learning a language, and the success of a course, or their personal ability to learn a language, is often judged by this aspect (Lee & VanPatten, 2003; Richards, 2006).

Even though students primarily desire oral communication, TBAs can also give students practice in reading and writing. In today's classrooms, there is rarely, if ever, room for students to use their imaginations to expand on the text, but Hooks (2010) discusses how talking about the research or text within an open classroom dialogue will

actually deepen students' understanding of the text and how it connects to the world. TBAs provide opportunities for students to discuss and expand the text, as good literacy activities not only include reading and writing, but discussions about what has been read or written (Escamilla et al., 2013). These types of discussions are important because, "engaging in dialogue provides students with ample opportunities to use and hear new language that helps them interact with the text and take part in metalinguistic discussions to help them meet the literacy and oracy objectives" (Escamilla et al., 2013, p. 149).

According to Hooks (2010), conversation is the "key to knowledge acquisition" (p. 44), and I believe that TBAs play a vital role in the L2 classroom in creating an environment conducive to conversations. Through TBAs, students are able to discuss what they have read, written, or heard with their classmates. These discussions increase not only their oral and literacy skills, but also help students deepen their understanding of the input they have received. Conversations such as these do not just happen "in an acquisition rich classroom, [it] is instigated and sustained by the teacher. While learners clearly have a significant role to play, it is the teacher who has prime responsibility" (Walsh, 2006, p. 19).

The Role of the Teacher

I view the teacher's role in the classroom as that of an architect or facilitator (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). It is their responsibility to not only plan, organize, and conduct lessons that encourage interaction, but also to create a classroom environment that is conducive to learning. A teacher can affect the mood of a classroom, allowing for new and original thought, and inspire students to question and investigate ideas, thoughts, and

beliefs. As learning a language takes a lot of time (Garrett, 2006), it is a teacher's role to help students get as much meaningful practice as possible inside the classroom.

Planning

The teacher, as the architect, designs detailed lesson plans based on a specific communicative language goal or "terminal objective" (Brown, 2001, p. 150). According to Brown (2001), objectives are specific knowledge or skills that students should master by the end of the lesson or unit (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). This ultimate goal or objective should be contextualized as a real-life situation or problem. In his article, Brown (2001) discusses the formation of a lesson plan. Each day should have "an overall purpose or goal" that students should be able "to accomplish by the end of the class period" (p. 149). In planning to help students reach this terminal objective, teachers use "enabling objectives" (p. 150). These "are interim steps that build upon each other and lead to a terminal objective" (p. 150).

It is the teacher's task to design activities to help students meet the enabling objectives. Thus, the specific language skills and knowledge needed to meet the ultimate goal for the unit or lesson should be determined ahead of time (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). Then, the teacher can plan activities that focus on using the new words and grammar principles needed to build their language skills so that they can eventually reach the terminal objective or communicative goal, through the smaller activities that help them complete the enabling objectives. When students reach the terminal objective, the teacher can then measure their language progress and abilities (Brown, 2001).

I have tried to implement this method of planning lessons in my own class. Picking the overall objective and thinking about what enabling objectives students would

need to accomplish to reach the overall objective has been helpful in my lesson planning. Thinking about lesson planning in this way encourages me to analyze the overall objective and what parts of the language students need to reach the terminal goal. As students work through the enabling objectives, they gain the language skills they need to fulfill the terminal objective. This has been a successful approach for me because it helps me to be more organized in my lesson planning. Instead of just picking a topic we will discuss in class, I must critically think about the end goal of the class and what language tools my students need to reach that goal. At the end of the lesson, it also gives me a chance to look back and assess whether my students were able to perform the overall objective.

In coming up with these activities, it is important to use TBAs that allow students to do these activities through communication in small groups, with partners, or as a class. As mentioned in Brown (2001), smaller objectives are needed to reach the overall goal of the lesson, and TBAs are an effective way to help students achieve these smaller objectives because as each TBA builds on the previous one, students should gain the needed skills to meet the communicative goal for the lesson. The teacher must carefully plan each activity to focus around that lesson's communicative goal (Lee & VanPatten, 2003), which should be a skill that students will use in real-life communication outside of the classroom.

Planning activities that allow students to practice the language in a contextualized situation is a challenging job for a teacher. According to Folse (2006), teachers must not only be able to point out the grammar rules of the L2, but must know how to "construct a lesson around an important language component…" (p. 23). Besides knowing the

structural rules, teachers need to be able to plan lessons that help students practice using these rules. I do not mean to say that teachers should focus on structuring lessons only around grammar rules, but it is important for teachers to recognize which grammar rules students need to be able to use to reach the communicative goal of the lesson. After the teacher recognizes which grammar rule(s) and patterns are needed to fulfill the goal for the lesson, it is important that the teacher provides activities that help the students learn how to use these new rule(s) and patterns in a communicative context (Ballman, Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). I feel like this area of planning lessons is one of my biggest weaknesses as a teacher, and I hope to be able to practice this aspect of lesson planning more in the future.

In addition to recognizing the need for grammar rule(s), teachers must also pick end goals and enabling objectives that are achievable. While planning and structuring in-class activities, teachers should remember that the goal is for students to be in an environment "in which [they] are stimulated, engaged in activities that are appropriate to their age, interests, and cultural backgrounds, and, most importantly, where students can experience success" (Lightbown, Spada, Ranta, & Rand, 2006, p. 185).

Folse (2006) claims teachers who focus on oral communication should be able "to choose a topic, narrow it down to a more specific subtopic, and then select or design the right kind of task" (p. 27). I think that if teachers can master this skill, and that of planning achievable goals, it will enhance their students' oral abilities and confidence in speaking the language. Designing subtopics about a broader topic, and then specific daily tasks and activities about these subtopics, will increase students' abilities to communicate freely outside the classroom about the topic with which they have been practicing.

In my own class, for example, we covered the broad topic of planning a trip. This topic consisted of many subtopics that were broken down into daily lessons and covered throughout several weeks. Some examples of the subtopics were: budgeting; planning a daily itinerary; learning about the weather; what to pack; sightseeing; etc. To demonstrate how I broke down one of these subtopics into activities for the day, I will use the example of the budget. First, in students' respective groups, they established an overall budget for the trip, or the amount of money they wanted to keep their spending within for the duration of the trip. Then they listed the expenses that they already knew and a list of other possible expenses (e.g., price of flight and accommodations, transportation, food, shopping, sightseeing). Looking at the rest of the money they had left over after subtracting the already known expenses, the groups decided how much of the leftover budget would go to each remaining category. This required negotiation. The groups needed to figure out how many days they would be staying at their destination, estimate the daily costs for food, water, travel, etc., and then decide which sites they would be able to see and activities they would be able to do with the leftover money.

I realized, via the aforementioned trip-planning project, that students benefit greatly from an organized, structured design of topics branching into activities. Narrowing down a topic gives students a specific part of the broader topic to explore. If too much information is given, or the information is not well-focused, students can become confused or frustrated. Giving students a free topic discussion will not benefit them nearly as much as engineering a specific topic to discuss (Yoon & Kim, 2012). It is important for teachers to carefully plan and execute organized lessons on specific subjects (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

Even though planning is a critical part of the role of the teacher, sometimes "good decisions are those that are appropriate to the moment, not ones which 'follow the plan'" (Walsh, 2006, p. 19). As a teacher, it is important to be prepared with a plan, but teachers should also be flexible to adapt plans and change course if the students are showing signs of misunderstanding, boredom, or frustration. One of "the principal [ways] that teachers can influence learners' motivation is by making the classroom a supportive environment" (Lightbown, Spada, Ranta, & Rand, 2006, p. 185).

Classroom Environment

Environment plays a key role in language learning, and teachers have an indispensable role in creating a supportive classroom environment. As learning a language takes a long time (Garrett, 2006), classroom environments should be a place where students feel comfortable to make mistakes and struggle.

I believe that to create a safe and comfortable classroom environment, teachers and students need opportunities to get to know each other. Hooks (2010) stresses that there must be interaction between the teacher and the students so that learning can take place. She continues that it is important to find out students' interests and what they already know and are interested in learning. In a study by Hermann, Foster, and Hardin (2010), they discovered that simply having a reciprocal interview (one in which the teacher and students gather information about each other (Case et al., 2008)) between the students and the teacher at the beginning of the semester created lasting effects on the students' satisfaction of the course. Students felt more supported by the teacher and reported understanding course expectations better than students in classes where a reciprocal interview had not taken place (Hermann et al., 2010). Understanding students'

interests will allow me to plan the curriculum around what students enjoy. Thus, the classroom needs to be a space where the teacher and the students are well acquainted with each other because this type of relationship will allow for more open dialogues and encourage a more comfortable classroom environment (Case et al., 2008; Hooks, 2010).

I also believe that to promote a comfortable classroom environment, students should be able to tell personal stories in the classroom. Personal stories are just as important as research and facts because they allow us to connect to the facts and research about which we are learning (Hooks, 2010). According to Connelly and Clandinin (1990), "One theory in educational research holds that humans are storytelling organisms" (p. 2). Thus the belief exists that, "education and educational research is the construction and reconstruction of personal and social stories" (p. 2). If this is the case, it follows that my students will better connect with the text as they are able to relate their own personal stories to that which they are learning. As students share personal stories, it enhances the open dialogue and discussion in the classroom. When this occurs, the students and teacher learn to trust each other with personal insight into each other's lives, and the classroom will become a place where students can discuss issues that are important to them (Hooks, 2010).

In learning about my students' personal stories, I must be aware enough to accept the fact that in my adult ESL classroom there is a great variety of backgrounds and cultures, and the way I teach may be a challenge to my students. Many of them have gone through school with teachers and professors that may have assumed the role of being the ultimate authority or may have simply been lectured to and have never been required to participate in group work or discussions. I must constantly try to find a balance as I work

with international students to make the learning environment comfortable, but still conducive to learning. As Freire (2005) stressed, "No one knows it all; no one is ignorant of everything" (p. 72).

In recognizing this principle from Freire (2005), I must realize that I am not a perfect teacher. My teaching needs to be under my constant scrutiny. After all, my teaching is not about me showing what I know, but helping the students to expand and increase their understanding. In realizing this, I also need to remember that my students know more than I do about certain topics or fields of study, as I may know more than they do in others. Students may doubt me, but recognizing their doubts and uncertainties will help me to evaluate what I can do better and will also help me to learn from them.

As a teacher, I have set ideas about how I should teach and how students should behave in the classroom. These notions were formed long ago by the way that I was taught and was expected to behave in the classroom. According to McLaren (2007), however, requiring that students conform to teachers' methods or ways of teaching can actually cause students to lose their racial or cultural identities. Sometimes, when the pressure to conform is too much for students to handle, they drop out of school, or, it could be inferred, get pushed out due to the pressure (McLaren, 2007). This is not what I want to happen in my classroom. Squashing the diversity and culture out of students takes away the chance we have to learn from each other in a diverse atmosphere. This is especially important to remember in the ESL classes I teach because there will most likely be a wide range of languages and cultures represented. I want my students to learn from each other's diversity and differences. If everyone was the same, there would be nothing new to be gained from interactions with each other. As Meyer (2008) stated,

"What we have in common is our difference" (p. 220). Our differences are what make us unique and allow us to learn from each other.

Planning, organizing, and facilitating a class takes a lot of work and effort. It is my responsibility, as the teacher, to carefully plan lessons that will give students the chance to contextually practice the L2, but also develop flexibility to meet the present needs of my students. When planning lessons, it's important to think of the ACTFL *Can-Do Statement* (2013) and what students should "be able to do with language… after one semester, after one year, or after several years [...]" (p. 2). The lessons that I teach today will affect my students' language skills and motivation for language learning in the future. No longer should students sit idly in a classroom expecting the lectured knowledge of the teacher to simply, by osmosis, become a part of them. Students need to be active participants in the classroom. Using the language in meaningful ways today will give them skills to use it meaningfully outside of the classroom tomorrow. Making this type of classroom a reality, where students are engaged in taking responsibility for their own learning, and comfortable enough to make mistakes and share their personal stories, will take a lot of effort on my part, but I am up for the challenge.

Conclusion

These three principles guide my work as a language teacher. Meaning-bearing and comprehensible input are vital for students to be able to increase their vocabulary and comprehension of the language while also finding the information that they are learning to be meaningful and relevant to them. As new topics, vocabulary, and grammar principles are introduced, it is vital that students have a chance to contextually utilize this information through TBAs. To help students improve their oral communication abilities,

these activities must be carefully planned and constructed by the teacher around specific themes and sub-topics that help students reach specific communicative goals.

In planning the curriculum, I must make sure that it is relevant to the students. They need to learn the language that they will want to use in everyday life. Thus, it is important that I acknowledge the interests of my students and make these interests part of the curriculum. And perhaps the most important role of the teacher is in helping to create a classroom environment that is comfortable for students to make mistakes and conducive overall to language learning.

In my multi-cultural classroom, I plan to give students the chance to speak with their classmates and learn from each other's different perspectives. The analysis and talking they do after the reading and writing will be what students remember in the long-run. Rather than a system for grades or memorization, I hope my classroom will be a place for students to learn and improve. As Meyer (2008) said, "It's not about how well you can quote theory; it's whether those ideas affect how you *act*. How will you feel encouraged to go forth into the world" (p. 221) and make a difference? I hope that my students will not leave my class simply listing memorized vocabulary or grammar charts, but that as they have studied a new language they will have also gained an appreciation for the other languages, ideas, cultures, and beliefs that surround them in the world. Learning is not about remembering a list of facts, but allowing what we have learned to change our behavior. What we learn should affect our view of the world and encourage us to go out and do good in it.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHING OBSERVATIONS

Introduction

Observing other teachers while in the MSLT program has given me insight into my own teaching philosophy. I have been able to see how my teaching principles and beliefs are put into practice by other teachers, and it has also allowed me to see some of the challenges that may be present when trying to implement these strategies for teaching. From my observations, I have learned what I can do to better implement my own beliefs into my teaching practice(s).

Comprehensible and Meaning-bearing Input

Several of the teachers that I observed did well at making the input comprehensible and meaning-bearing, while others did not. One teacher used pictures and posters of different objects with which the students were familiar to make sure that the context was understandable to the students. They were able to briefly talk about the weather and dates through this method. He did not, however, require students to DO anything with this knowledge after their initial introduction to it. This did not make the new information that they were learning meaning-bearing.

In another class, I observed a teacher use a similar method to teach vocabulary. She, however, required her students to use the new vocabulary in several activities following their initial encounter with it. She used a slide-show presentation to teach the vocabulary words associated with certain food items. Her students seemed to catch on quickly to the meaning of words and sentences due to the pictures she used. The pictures helped students recognize the new vocabulary and integrate it into their discussions and activities that followed. In each of the activities, students were able to use the new

vocabulary to talk about themselves and their likes and dislikes. This gave them the chance to personally use and relate to the new information, which made it meaning-bearing.

Another teacher would write new words down and have her students do the same. After she had her students write down the new word, she would act the word out until they could guess what the word meant. After students comprehended the meaning of the word, she then gave them an opportunity to create a new sentence using that word. Her actions helped students to understand the meaning of the word, but an even deeper understanding was gained as students had to work to use this new word in a coherent sentence.

I observed these teachers using some of the same methods of conveying comprehensible input that I talked about in my TPS. Using pictures and actions to create comprehensible input seemed to be effective in all of these situations. From these teachers, I saw that it was also important to allow students to relate to the topics and connect with the new information that they were learning in a meaningful way by holding students accountable for using the new words or input that they were hearing (i.e., making the information meaning-bearing).

Task-based Activities

Along with using comprehensible input, I observed the use of TBAs in several classes that I watched. One class performed a task where they pretended that they were journalists gathering information for an article that they would be writing. This teacher had students come up with interview questions to ask a classmate in order to get information for their article (which they would need to write and turn in the following

class). This class required students to talk together and gather needed information from each other, which held students accountable for the information they gathered from their classmates. Even though the ideas were good for this class, the execution of the ideas was lacking, due to the fact that students were often off-task and talking to each other in the L1. In this situation, I think that the teacher needs to find ways to enforce the proper respect that she deserves from her students so that the students will remain focused and on-task.

In one classroom, I saw a very effective example of a TBA. This teacher had prepared her students with the vocabulary and sentence structures they would need to fulfill the communicative goal for the activity, talking about types of food that they like. Students needed to interact with several different students to fill out the handout that they had been given, and it was evident to me that the students were engaged; they were using the target language (TL) and enjoying the interaction and activity. The vocabulary and language structures they were using were also relevant and important for students to learn so that they could use them in everyday life.

Another good example of TBA occurred in a class that was learning about the word *advice*. Students were paired and then received a problem with which their partner struggled (e.g., their partner had an addiction of some kind). Then the other person in the partnership would give the first person advice according to their 'problem'. After giving them a little time to practice, the teacher gave them each a new set of problems. I liked how the students were learning new vocabulary from the slips of paper that she gave them, but at the same time they were able to practice the grammatical structures needed

for giving advice. This TBA also helped students practice language structures that they will come across in the language either as they give or receive advice from someone else.

These TBAs that I observed engaged the students and covered real-life situations and topics. Students had ample opportunity to talk with partners or in groups, which allowed them to practice the language skills that they were learning. They also were held accountable for the information they had gathered. As in the first example, however, I noticed that there are challenges to implementing TBAs in different situations. In this example, there were over thirty students in a cramped classroom, which made the dynamics harder to handle. The activity the teacher had planned was good, but watching this class reinforced my belief that there is more to being a good teacher than being able to plan good lessons.

Role of the Teacher

Planning, organizing, and facilitating effective TBAs for a class is an important role of a teacher, but being able to create an atmosphere that is comfortable and conducive to learning is also essential. In a couple of the classrooms that I observed, the atmosphere was too laid back and comfortable. Students in these classes often talked in the L1 and did not fully engage in the activities that had been planned by the teacher. Both of these teachers were patient, kind, and tried to engage their students in helpful and fun activities, but the students were often rude and irresponsive.

One of these teachers, in my opinion, simply did not organize a lesson plan that was fluid and built on itself. For the 30 minutes of class that I observed, students jumped from a math assignment, to learning to say dates, to talking about the weather, and finally to learning inches. He tried to use fun activities, but did not utilize TBAs. In this

situation, I think that TBAs and being more firm on class rules would have helped him produce a comfortable classroom atmosphere for students, but one that was also more conducive to language learning.

The second of these teachers used TBAs in her class and was well prepared. Her classroom atmosphere was comfortable but did not encourage students to participate as much. I think that there were several possible reasons for this. As mentioned before, there were simply too many students crammed into one classroom which made it hard for the teacher to observe and keep an eye on all of them, and she seemed to have little to no rules in her classroom. From observing the success of other teachers to keep students engaged and on-task, I think that if she were more firm in requiring students to only speak the L2 in her classroom and staying on-task, students would respond and be more attentive and engaged.

Compared to these last two examples, I saw teachers who still had comfortable classroom environments, but their students spoke in the L2 and fully engaged in the TBAs. One classroom I observed was at an elementary school. The teacher moved from one task to the next very quickly to keep the students engaged, but each task built on the previous one, which allowed students to continue practicing what they had learned. Students were excited about learning and were not afraid to make mistakes or be corrected even if they said something wrong.

In another elementary school classroom, I observed the same type of atmosphere. The lesson was organized and encouraged students to fully participate while only speaking in the L2. Even though students were reminded to speak in the L2 if they slipped into their L1, I could tell that the students felt comfortable enough to ask

questions. They also did not seem to get frustrated if they said something wrong because the atmosphere conveyed the sense that it was better to try to speak in the L2 than the L1 even if things were not said perfectly.

I think these teachers obtained a comfortable environment that promoted learning by focusing on students' interests. They planned activities that were geared toward the age of the students, their language level, and what they would enjoy talking about. Each TBA also had achievable goals that helped the students to feel successful as they practiced new vocabulary and sentence structures. In addition to these, I noticed that some rules had been established. If students failed to speak in the L2, they were firmly reminded that they would only speak in the L2 in this class.

Conclusion

Observing the teaching of other teachers has helped to solidify my ideas about teaching. Teachers who utilize meaning-bearing and comprehensible input, TBAs, and actively encourage a comfortable environment and well-planned lessons seem to me to be the most successful in their language teaching. These teaching strategies promote active participation from the students which, in turn, affords them more practice to use the L2 in meaningful ways. As I have seen these strategies work in other teachers' classrooms, I hope to find ways to implement them well for the benefit of the students in my future ESL classes.

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

It was very informative for me to watch myself teach, especially after getting feedback from Dr. DeJonge-Kannan, as I was better able to analyze if I had achieved the goal of my lesson plan during the class period. After watching the video of my class, I was also able to analyze the parts of the lesson that didn't go quite as I had planned, and think about ways to improve them.

My class is an Audit-only ESL class for the spouses of graduate students attending Utah State University. As a result, my course had students from several different countries and represented a wide variety of language proficiencies, ranging from students who only knew a few words in English to those who were fairly proficient. As such, lessons needed to be structured in a way that those with limited proficiency could participate but also allowed for students with higher proficiencies to improve their language skills.

The lesson (see Appendix for lesson plan) was the beginning of a series of classes on the topic of relationships, which would cover friends, dating, marriage, and family. The goal of the lesson was to have students describe their best friend to a classmate. Leading up to this goal, I wanted students to discuss with partners, and as a class, the qualities they thought were important to have in a friend. Then, as they discussed their best friend, they could not only talk about how they met, what they liked to do together, etc., but could also articulate the qualities of their best friend. I planned the lesson so that the students would learn to recognize the types of words that could be used to describe people's qualities, in conjunction to learning to talk about their best friend.

Overall, the lesson went as planned, but several things happened that did not go as expected. The first mingling activity that we did focused on people's hobbies. I should have reiterated and described the directions better because the students forgot that they needed to find a different person who enjoyed each hobby, instead of writing down the same person's name for several of the hobbies on the worksheet. Even though we had done the activity before, I needed to restate the directions more thoroughly and demonstrate what I meant for them to do. I missed out on an opportunity to use comprehensible input when I did not demonstrate the directions for my students.

Another aspect of the class that did not go according to plan occurred during the video that I played for them. The lower-level students had a sheet of paper with several phrases from the video intermingled with phrases that were not contained in the video. I realized I had not given my students good enough instructions about the video, because they did not know what they were supposed to do with their handouts. Thus, their handouts were left blank, which did not allow me to check if the input they were receiving was meaning-bearing.

The students did very well negotiating meaning in their groups as they discussed qualities of friends in pairs, and as a class. According to plan, the students were able to talk about their best friend with several different partners. Even though some of the lower-level students have a very limited vocabulary, they still participated and were able to share their ideas about their best friends. This TBA went very well and I thought that each one of the students was able to improve their speaking skills as they practiced telling different partners about their best friend.

The question, "What did the students learn, and how do you know that they learned it?" is something that I have not previously thought about that much. In this class period, I honestly did not have a way to know what they learned. The plan was for them to learn about qualities of friends, and be able to describe their own best friend. However, I did not have a way to check that this learning had occurred. I heard several of their descriptions about their best friends, but these descriptions did not include the qualities that we had discussed earlier in class. Since the course under observation is an Audit class, I did not give tests. However, assessment is still important. One aspect of my teaching that I will need to think about is the following: What kinds of assessments can I use to know if the students learned the material we covered in class?

I think that I could have held the students more accountable for the information. They were held accountable for the qualities they thought were important in a friend, because they wrote them down and then shared their ideas with a classmate. While sharing about their best friends, however, the students were not held accountable for any information. I think that I could have made a handout that required students to record what they learned about their classmates' best friends. This handout could have included the 3 qualities that they were supposed to list about their best friend and several other important details of their story (i.e., how they met, how long they've known each other, favorite things to do together, among other details). In many of the students' conversations, I think that the three qualities they were to list about their best friend were left out. This was due to my lack of emphasis on their best friend's qualities in the directions I gave, and that I did not have a way to hold the students accountable for the

information they gathered from their peers. This was an example of where my preparation and lesson planning fell short as a teacher.

In the future, I will use handouts, or other devices, to hold students accountable for the information they gather. I also think it would have been helpful after the exchange of information about the students' friends, if I had then had some of the students present to the class the qualities of their classmates' best friends. After the presentations, students could have made a collective chart of the top three most common characteristics that were mentioned. This would have been a form of assessment to know if they were able to recognize and gather information about the qualities of their classmates' friends during their conversation.

Throughout this lesson, however, I did notice that students felt comfortable in the classroom. They were able to ask questions, make mistakes, and share their opinions in a comfortable atmosphere. I think that this is one aspect of my role as a teacher that I have done well. My students all seem to feel comfortable and supported in the classroom. They ask me questions when they do not understand, and they feel comfortable enough to share personal stories and experiences from their lives.

Observing myself teach, and contemplating the goal of my lesson plan, was very informative. Instead of just realizing things had not gone according to plan, I was able to think about what I could do better to remedy these problems. I was also able to think about how I could hold the students more accountable for the information they learn in each class period. I know that I will never reach perfection in teaching, and with each class, there will be new challenges, and I will need to make changes to meet the needs of that specific class. Evaluation must be a continual process where I strive to humbly see

what is really happening in the classroom and work to respect the vast array of

differences present there. Through continuing evaluation of my teaching, I hope to keep

improving and to grow into the communicative teacher I want to become.

LANGUAGE ARTIFACT

Corrective Feedback: Prompts vs. Recasts

INTRODUCTION

Haitao Zhao and I originally wrote this paper for the Second Language Acquisition: Theory and Practice class. I have since made revisions to our paper on my own. This paper is a literature review that investigates which types of oral corrective feedback (CF) are the most effective to use in the classroom. It specifically focuses on which types of CF have a positive effect on the acquisition of vocabulary and grammar. This artifact also briefly covers types of CF that promote student uptake and language acquisition overall.

I was interested in writing about giving CF in the classroom because my students have asked me to give them more feedback. I realized that I did not know how to give them CF or which type of CF would benefit them most in their language learning. As I thought about my role as a teacher, I realized that it is important for me to know how to give my students feedback. It is my goal to give my students the best education that I can, and I believe that learning to give them helpful feedback is an important part in helping them to improve their language proficiency.

From writing this artifact, I learned about the types of oral CF that have been observed in the classroom. Previously, I did not even realize that so many variations of CF existed. Of the types of CF observed in the classroom, I learned that CF that prompts learners to fix their own mistakes is the most effective in acquiring vocabulary, grammar, and overall language acquisition. It was important for me to consider, however, that there are certain challenges in using the most effective type of CF. One such being that class time is always limited, and using CF in the classroom takes extra time away from the material that I wish to cover over the course of the lesson.

Even though using CF that prompts students to correct their own errors is not the most time-effective type of CF, I believe that it is worth the time sacrifice. In my own classroom, before learning about the different types of CF, I often used CF in the form of recasts. This seems to be the most time efficient type of feedback, but it is also the least effective in terms of it leading to students' realizing they committed an error. As such, in the future, as I teach in various ESL settings, I plan to use prompting feedback in my classroom. This will be a big adjustment to my teaching style, and will take extra time away from my lessons. I believe, however, that by implementing prompting CF into my classroom, I will help to improve my students' second language acquisition. For this reason, the sacrifices are worth it.

Abstract

For several decades, educators have been working to understand how interactions in L2 classrooms ultimately affect second language acquisition (SLA). Researchers have found that only receiving comprehensible input is not enough to develop a L2 (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yang & Lyster, 2010; among many others); students also need to produce output (Swain, 1985). However, in producing output, students need sufficient and consistent feedback to make certain aspects of the language more noticeable to them (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Providing feedback has been found to help improve "learners' grammatical accuracy" (Yang & Lyster, 2010, p. 236), and lexical competence (Dilans, 2010). As such, studies have been conducted to investigate which types of corrective feedback (CF) are more effective in making lexical and grammatical principles salient to students.

Introduction

As a teacher in an ESL classroom, I have also found myself wondering how to help my students improve their grammatical and lexical competence. Many of my students have shown a desire for CF, but I have been unsure how to give them feedback. Following is an analysis of research articles I have read to increase my knowledge of CF and which types of CF will benefit my students most.

In analyzing types of CF, which refers to teachers' responses to learners' incorrect utterances (Choi & Li, 2012; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Rassaei, 2013), as well as its various levels of effectiveness in the L2 classroom, Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified CF into six categories: explicit correction; recasts; clarification requests; metalinguistic feedback; elicitation; and repetition. Most of the researchers split these 6 types of CF into 2

overarching categories: prompts and recasts. Prompts aim to point out the error

implicitly, allowing learners the opportunity for self-correction. Prompts include

metalinguistic feedback, repetition, elicitation, and clarification requests. A recast, on the

other hand, is the teacher's reformulation of a learner's incorrect utterance, which

includes the corrected utterance in the feedback. This is an implicit form of CF because

of its unobtrusive nature (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Several studies highlighted below were carried out to examine the types of

corrective feedback that elicit student uptake. For these studies, uptake is defined as a

student's utterance in response to receiving corrective feedback. Lyster et al. (2013)

caution that one may not conclude that a case of uptake is "an instance of acquisition (p.

11)." However, it seems that CF may play a role in language acquisition (Lyster et al.,

2013). Accordingly, most of the empirical studies in this review have found that prompts

were more efficient in leading to higher learner uptake and long-term retention in the L2

classroom than recasts. I chose to focus my research on studies concerning L2

grammatical accuracy and vocabulary because I believe that these are two of the most

important areas students need in order to communicate. In further understanding which

types of CF will enhance students' acquisition of grammar and vocabulary, I hope to

increase students' abilities to communicate.

Literature review

Starting with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) seminal study that first determined and

categorized the various types of CF used in the L2 classroom, many researchers have

continued to look at a number of aspects related to the effects of CF on L2 learning.

Specifically, researchers have focused on which type of CF leads to a higher rate of

uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), repair (Kennedy, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster et al., 2013), and grammatical and lexical competence (Dilans, 2010; Yang & Lyster, 2010). Uptake in this review refers to a student's utterance that occurs immediately after a form of CF, and is in response to the teacher's CF. Uptake demonstrates a student's efforts to use the feedback just received (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In this literature review, I aim to investigate these topics in more depth, so as to determine for myself the most beneficial CF to incorporate into my pedagogy.

CF for lexical development

Lexical competence is one of the most important elements of language learning and has therefore attracted researchers' attention in the SLA field for decades (Henriksen, 1999). Studies show that learners must know at least 98% or more of a text's vocabulary to be able to read it without support to sufficiently understand it (Hsueh-Chao & Nation, 2000; Laufer, 2005; Nation, 2006). Given the determinant role of lexical competence for the learners' success of acquiring an L2 (Alcon, 2007; Henriksen, 1999; Laufer, 2005), many studies focus on finding effective ways to develop lexical competence. CF has been found to play a crucial role in lexical development (Dilans, 2010), and it will be further analyzed in this part through a review of several empirical studies.

Examining whether prompts lead to both a greater short-term and long-term increase in lexical competence than recasts for adult ESL learners, Dilans (2010) compared the effectiveness of prompts and recasts on the development of lexical competence. Twenty-three university-level ESL learners were divided into three groups. One group received prompts, another recasts, and the control group did not receive feedback. Each group met twice each week for 90 minutes. The study employed a pre-

test, post-test, and post-test-delayed design. In addition, the tests addressed three dimensions of lexical development: (1) partial vocabulary knowledge (to show partial understanding of the headword and be able to put it in the right category); (2) precise vocabulary knowledge (to gain the meaning of the words through multiple-choice); and (3) depth of vocabulary knowledge (to show the correct usage of the words) (Henriksen, 1999; 2008).

The results showed that only the prompts group performed significantly better on all of the lexical development dimensions, while the recasts group made progress on the first two dimensions but not on the third. Meanwhile, the control group showed significant growth over time on the depth dimension, but no significant development on other dimensions (Dilans, 2010). In addition, the output-oriented prompts did not lead to a greater short-term (post-test) increase, but the technique of using prompts generated a greater long-term (i.e., delayed post-test) increase in lexical development than did the input-oriented recasts and control groups. The results also indicate that the prompts and recasts groups performed equally well in short-term L2 acquisition, but the prompts group performed better in the long-term. The prompts group was the only one that significantly progressed in all dimensions of L2 vocabulary development, whereas the recasts group did not achieve significant increase in the long-term. The findings of this study support the notion that prompts are more effective than recasts for lexical development on a variety of dimensions.

Even though prompts are more effective for lexical development, Yoshida (2008) determined that teachers may struggle using prompts in the classroom due to limited class time. In this study, Yoshida (2008) explored how learners in three Japanese classes at a

university in Australia develop lexical competence via CF. In this study, teacher and student classroom discourse was audio-recorded. This discourse included the private speech between the two teachers and between seven learners in three different classrooms. The audio-recordings were analyzed by the author who focused on five error types that triggered teacher CF: lexical errors; morphosyntactic errors; phonological errors; semantic errors; and reading errors.

Yoshida (2008) reports that lexical errors occurred seven times, and constituted 9% of the total errors. When lexical errors appeared, the teachers were inclined to use recasts due to the limitation of class time and their desire to not intimidate the students. However, recasts did not seem to help learners notice the need for repair. Prompts on the other hand, such as metalinguistic feedback and elicitation, allowed the learners to self-correct. This study shows that although teachers prefer to use recasts to correct lexical errors in the classroom, they are not as effective as prompts.

The research reviewed above has shown that certain forms of oral CF increase learners' uptake in the L2 classroom (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Rassaei, 2013). Overall, prompts are a more effective type of CF than recasts in developing L2 lexical competence (Carpenter, Sachs, Martin, Schmidt, & Looft, 2012; Choi & Li, 2012; Dilans, 2010; Lyster, 2004; Yoshida, 2008) when they are used appropriately in vocabulary instruction. Prompts have been shown to be more effective than recasts not only in lexical development, but also in reference to grammatical development in the L2 classroom.

CF for grammatical development

While students are learning vocabulary, it is important for them to acquire skills to form grammatical sentences using this vocabulary. CF has been shown to provide the needed support for grammatical development (Ellis et al., 2006; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Russell & Spada, 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010). Several studies highlighted here examined the types of CF that improve students' performance in grammar production. Russell and Spada (2006) performed a meta-analysis of 31 studies about CF. They coded 56 studies in all, but found only 31 that would be suitable for analysis, and of those 31, only 15 would work to calculate broad and inclusive results. Overall, this meta-analysis led them to conclude that CF is effective in helping learners acquire L2 grammar. However, the authors do not take a stand on which type of CF is the most effective in grammar learning. Lyster et al. (2013) agree that CF may play a role in language acquisition, but Ellis et al. (2006) adds that CF causes learners to notice their error and requires them to think about the error, which results in higher performance in oral and written grammar tests. In this section of my literature review, I attempt to assess which type of CF is most beneficial in grammar learning.

Following observations of four primary level French immersion classrooms in Canada, Lyster and Ranta (1997) described various types of corrective feedback used in the classroom. The teachers' use of CF and students' responses to the interactions were observed, recorded, and identified. Six different types of CF were used: explicit correction; recasts; clarification requests; metalinguistic feedback; elicitation; and repetition. The results of the study show that recasts were the most commonly used form of feedback, but resulted in the lowest percentage of uptake. Elicitation, however, resulted in 100% uptake by the students.

Even though the results of Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study were important in identifying the varieties of CF used in the classroom, further study was needed to determine the effects of different types of CF on the acquisition of various grammar structures. Following this study, other researchers investigated which type of CF is the most effective for learning certain grammatical principles. Yang and Lyster (2010) tested short-term and long-term retention of past tense regular and irregular English verbs. The researchers used three classes of university-level Chinese English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. These students were English literature and language majors and were already well acquainted with English past tense verbs. The study focused on the effects of two types of corrective feedback and their impact on students' use of the past tense. Each class received a different type of feedback: recasts or prompts. Students receiving only recasts were neither discouraged nor encouraged to produce student repair. Students receiving only prompts, however, were given feedback consisting of metalinguistic clues, repetition, clarification requests, and elicitation, which encouraged students to repair their errors. In the third class (the control group), all past-tense errors were ignored, and the teacher focused only on the meaning of student interactions.

Several tests were administered to measure students' accuracy in producing English past-tense forms (Yang & Lyster, 2010). The first test was given before the treatment began, the second immediately following the treatment, and the third was administered 2 weeks after the treatment. Each test consisted of an oral production part (i.e., using several word prompts, students retold a story they had just read), a written production (i.e., students wrote a story on a given topic and had to use 12 provided verbs), and an exit questionnaire (i.e., assessing whether students knew the purpose of the

tests). The results showed that the number of errors made in each class were relatively

consistent. However, 25 repairs followed the 27 prompts in the first class compared to 1

repair in the second class and no repairs in the third class.

Yang and Lyster (2010) found that significant gains were made for all of the

groups from pre-test to post-test, and all three classes equally improved their scores for

irregular past tense verbs on the oral proficiency test, but for the regular past tense verbs,

"only the prompt group made significant gains" (pp. 249-250). The prompt group was

also the only group that made significant gains for regular verbs in the written

production. From this study, it is concluded that prompts are more effective overall for

long-term acquisition of English verbs, especially because of the results in students' use

of the regular past tense and its increase of students' correct use for each of the tests.

Another similar study, conducted by Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), aimed to

test the acquisition of the past tense *-ed* structure. Like Yang and Lyster (2010), Ellis et

al. wanted to test how CF helped students increase their ability to correctly use an already

familiar structure. This study's participants were adult ESL learners (on average, 25 years

old) from a private school in New Zealand, and most of these students identified as East

Asian. Similar to Yang and Lyster's study, Ellis et al. utilized three different classes or

groups to fulfill this study. Group 1 received CF as recasts, group 2 received CF as

metalinguistic clues (i.e., a form of prompts), and group 3 not only did not receive

feedback, but was also not given the chance "to practice the target structure" (Ellis et al.,

p. 350).

To test the effects of CF on the accuracy of students' production of the English

past tense, Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) used several tests, which were given in a

similar order to those of Yang and Lyster (2010). The first test was given before the treatment began, the second was given the day after the treatment, and the third was administered 12 days after the treatment. The three tests were designed to assess students' implicit and explicit knowledge. Students' implicit knowledge refers to learners' performance under a time limit, which would require them to perform in real time, and explicit knowledge means that learners are given more time to draw on acquired knowledge. Each type of test was administered every time. The oral imitation test consisted of 36 short phrases, 12 of which included the need for the past tense *-ed*. After each phrase was administered, students wrote down whether they agreed or disagreed with the sentence and then orally said the phrase correctly. Next, students completed a grammaticality judgment test. This was a pen and paper test with 45 sentences requiring students to say whether or not the sentence was grammatically correct, how certain they were of their answer, and if they determined the answer through feel (i.e., what sounds right) or a specific rule they knew. The final test focused on metalinguistic knowledge. For this test, students were asked to correct 5 ungrammatical sentences and explain why the sentences were incorrect.

Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) found a statistically significant difference between the results of the control group and the recast group, namely that the recast group performed better than the control group. Statistically significant differences were also found between the metalinguistic CF group and the recast group. According to Ellis et al. (2006), CF that causes learners to notice their error and requires them to think about the error results in higher performance in oral and written grammar tests. This study also shows that recast CF is better than no correction. Overall, from Ellis et al. (2006) and

Yang and Lyster (2010), it can be concluded that metalinguistic (or prompts) CF is more effective than recast CF in the acquisition of grammar.

Even though prompts have been found to be the most effective type of CF, it is important to remember that student preferences play a key role in which type of feedback will be most beneficial for their progress. Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) did a review of up-to-date research about CF and students' preferences concerning feedback. Students' background, culture, language level, age, and learning styles all play an important role in students' desires for and responses to feedback. Due to these variables, the authors conclude that teachers need to take advantage of a variety of CF, because, as pointed out by Ammar and Spada (2006), "one size does not fit all" (p. 566). The authors predict that students are more likely to benefit from feedback that encourages self-repair (e.g., prompts), but they also conclude that recasts can be beneficial when shortened and stressed to draw students' attention to the error. In view of these factors, it is important for teachers to take specific situations into consideration depending on the students and classes they teach.

CF and learners' uptake

In accordance with the previous literature review that examines the effectiveness of CF on the development of lexical and grammatical competence, I was interested in researching which type of CF consistently leads to higher learner uptake. With the intention to better understand the effectiveness of CF, Lyster and Saito (2010) reviewed 14 studies of oral CF published in major academic journals to investigate (a) the effectiveness of CF on L2 learning, and (b) to what extent the effectiveness of CF varies depending on the extent to which individual types of CF are used, outcome measures,

instructional setting, length of treatment, and learners' age. In addition, CF types were classified into three categories: recasts; prompts; and explicit correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Of these 14 studies (except for two that focused mainly on recasts and prompts respectively), six of them focused both on recasts and prompts and six on explicit correction.

The studies demonstrated that CF can significantly impact L2 learning, compared to groups that do not receive CF (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Saito). Recasts, prompts, and explicit correction were all effective in certain circumstances when implemented in the classroom. However, prompts yielded the highest learner uptake when compared to recasts and explicit correction (Lyster & Saito). Thus, the authors pointed out that CF in the form of prompts was more effective (Lyster & Saito). By the same token, when implementing CF in the form of recasts, the effectiveness was less significant.

Furthermore, this study identified that younger learners were more sensitive to the impact of CF, and thus benefited more from CF than older learners, because they were more likely to notice the CF and realize that CF could benefit their learning (Lyster & Saito, 2010). Other than that, no significant differences were found for CF effects, the instructional setting, and the length of treatment. Lyster and Saito's review of the effectiveness of CF in learner uptake indicated that prompts were the most efficient type of CF that led to higher uptake rates.

As Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013) predicted, CF that encourages students to self-repair is more beneficial. One reason for this is that CF encouraging self-repair results in an increase of student repairs (i.e., utterances that correct the error). In another study

examining a more effective type of CF for learner uptake by Kennedy (2010), a group of

students was divided into two classes based on their level of language proficiency (i.e., a

mid/high group and a low-level group). Students' uptake and repair were recorded during

the classes. The teacher either gave students the correct form during his CF, or he did not

(prompting learners to correct their mistake). Kennedy concludes that the greater

percentage of prompting feedback received results in a higher percentage of not only

uptake but repair.

  In sum, studies above have shown that CF plays a positive role in learner uptake

(Ammar & Spada, 2006; Kennedy, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010). Through the comparison

of prompts and recasts, researchers found that prompts lead to higher percentages of

uptake, which results in higher percentages of repair. The recommendation emerging

from this review is that teachers use more prompts as CF in their classrooms. They will

find an increase not only in students' grammar and lexical development, but also an

increase in their ability to self-repair.

<div align="center">**Conclusion**</div>

  This literature review shows that overall, CF has a significant impact on L2

learning, and, as pointed out in Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), the use of any type of

CF is better than no corrective feedback. Prompts have been shown to be the most

effective form of CF for lexical and grammatical development (Choi & Li, 2012; Dilans,

2010; Ellis et al., 2006; Yang & Lyster, 2010) for several reasons. To begin with,

prompts are more explicit, and thus promote learners noticing errors in contrast to other

kinds of CF, such as recasts. When prompting, teachers will point out the error, and

provide hints that can trigger learners' self-correction, which can then result in a higher

rate of repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). On the other hand, recasts are more implicit, allowing teachers to reformulate learners' utterances without pointing out the error. Often this results in students not noticing their error(s). In this way, recasts may or may not draw the learners' attention to the error; learners are often not aware of CF when it is given in the form of recasts (Lyster & Saito, 2010). This could be frustrating to students because most learners prefer to be corrected when they make a mistake (Lyster, Saito, and Sato, 2013), and many students report their preferences for receiving prompts (Havranek, 2002; Yoshida, 2008). This is due to the nature of prompts, which promotes long-term retention of vocabulary and grammar, and relies on learners' self-correction more than on receiving reformulations from the teacher (Havranek, 2002; Yoshida, 2008).

Following this literature review, I believe I should use prompts in my own ESL classroom. Even though I have previously shied away from giving oral CF in my classroom, I realize that most of my students likely desire feedback. Some of them have even requested that I give them more CF. After better understanding the benefits afforded to students through prompts, I plan to pay closer attention to errors my students make during class and group discussions. When I recognize an error has been made, I will practice utilizing prompts to help them self-repair. In doing this, I believe I will help to increase my students' grammatical and lexical competence and ability to self-repair.

LITERACY ARTIFACT

Dual Language Immersion & The Benefits of Literacy

INTRODUCTION

I originally wrote this artifact with Jenifer Burk for the Foundations of Dual Language and Immersion Education class, but have since made changes and revised this paper on my own. This class focused on the definition of immersion education with a specific emphasis on the Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program that is currently used in Utah. In this artifact, I cover some of the characteristics of immersion education that have affected the way that I view the teaching of literacy in the ESL classroom. The specific emphasis of this paper is focused on the benefits of literacy that can be achieved through immersion education.

I decided to put this artifact in my portfolio because the immersion principles I learned from this class can guide me in my teaching in my ESL class, with particular emphasis on planning activities and lessons that will help my students improve their literacy skills. In my role as a teacher, I had never before considered the importance of planning TBAs that focus on improving my students' literacy skills. Literacy is a key component of language learning and using texts with meaning-bearing activities will be a great benefit to my students.

One insight I gained from writing this artifact was how successful immersion programs can be in creating literate individuals. The approaches used in immersion classrooms provide a great advantage to students because they help students become literate in another language. I also learned about the exceptional success of dual language immersion due to the immersion model that is used. Most importantly, though, I learned about the many benefits that are/will be afforded to those individuals that become literate in a L2.

This artifact opened my eyes to the importance of stressing literacy for my ESL students. Most of the lessons I have done thus far in my class have focused only on oral communication. However, after researching this artifact, I realize the importance of stressing literacy in my classroom. In order for my students to gain the greatest advantage from learning English, most of them will need to become not only orally proficient but have developed literacy skills in English.

Learning about immersion programs has given me greater insight into what I can do in my classroom to promote literacy learning. Even though most of the research on immersion programs I read was about children, I believe that these same methods can be applied in my ESL classes. What I have learned about literacy within immersion programs has inspired me to want to try some of the teaching techniques used in immersion program settings to further help my students develop their English literacy skills.

Abstract

This paper introduces up-to-date research about literacy education and its benefits in creating a literate population of ESL students. Before addressing the benefits of literacy, I will briefly describe what I learned about literacy through my studies of DLI programs. The last section will cover the benefits of literacy that are available to all literate individuals. These benefits include academic, cognitive, socio-cultural, political, economic, and other advantages for students' futures. Following my examination of the research literature, I conclude that becoming literate gives students the tools they need for a successful future in the 21st Century (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Thus, as an ESL teacher, I must focus my efforts on helping students become literate so that they can succeed in the global market and today's society.

Introduction

In an effort to emphasize the importance of literacy learning and teaching in the ESL classroom, I will present the purposes of literacy education, and the background of literacy education. Following this brief overview, the paper will then focus on the long-term and far reaching benefits of literacy (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). In order for ESL students to acquire the tools they need to succeed in the global market, they must develop literacy (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). This will be the main focus of the remainder of my paper. I will address the academic, cognitive, economic, political, and socio-cultural benefits that are afforded to literate individuals throughout their lives (Geisler et al., 2007; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Juarez, 2015; Lindholm-Leary, 2000; Met, 2008).

ESL Literacy Education

Background

The idea of focusing on literacy education in the ESL classroom came from my study about DLI programs. In these programs, students can gain not only the benefit of learning an L2, which they can use with native like proficiency (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Genesee, 2008; May, 2008), but they also develop reading and writing skills in that L2. These benefits improve students' future opportunities for work, education, and travel (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

As I thought about the added benefits literacy in English would afford my students in the globalized world, I realized I wanted to focus more on teaching literacy in my class. I had previously only focused on teaching oral communication, but I realized that without the use of literacy, my students would not be able to access the benefits afforded to L2 learners who became literate in English. One particular model used in DLI programs gave me insight into ways I could help my students' improve their English literacy skills.

A Model of Bilingual Education

Since the focus of this paper is on teaching literacy in the ESL classroom, I will not spend much time introducing this DLI model that has helped to shape my ideas of how to teach literacy in the ESL classroom. I do think, however, that briefly describing it will be beneficial to this paper. This is the model of two-way immersion, which is considered the most ideal model in bilingual education because at least ⅓ of the students are from each language group (Cloud et al., 2000; Genesee, 2008), and classroom instruction between the students promotes not only L2 acquisition, but also "cross-cultural cooperation and learning" (Cloud et al., 2000, p. 5).

Looking to this model will be a helpful guide in providing my ESL students with greater opportunities to interact with native English speakers. Having a 1/3 classroom setting would be impossible for my classroom, as native English speakers would not be enrolled as students, but I would like to find a native English-speaking study partner for each student in my class. Interaction with a peer of similar age will give my ESL students a chance to not only improve their L2, but learn to cooperate and work with a person from another culture (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). By providing assignments and collaborative projects for my students' to do with their study partner, I believe students' language, reading, and writing skills and cultural awareness will improve. It would, of course, be ideal if the study partner spoke my students' L1 so that they could create a learning partnership and help each other, but this may be hard to find depending on geographic location.

Further Insights from DLI

As I thought more about literacy education for ESL students, I realized that similar to DLI, it works to help students become literate in an L2 so that they will be able to work in the ever-globalizing world market and be able to contribute to the society in which they live. Unlike most DLI schools, however, ESL classes often serve a diverse body of students. In one classroom, there may be students from 5 or more different countries with differing L1s. In my ESL classes thus far, my students have all been very literate in their L1s, but I am sure that in future classes I teach this will not always be the case. It is thus important, especially for students who are not literate in their L1, to try to support students' L1s because poor literacy in their L1 can affect their ability to become literate in an L2 (Canard, 2007; Cummins 1983). Even though I will have little control

over my students' L1 literacy, I believe there are several things I can do to try to support students' L1. Swain and Lapkin (2005) recommend doing projects that allow students to talk about their native country, making dual language books available, and allowing students to write papers in their native language with support from literate speakers of their L1. For my students with high levels of education in their native language, I would mainly encourage them to continue reading academic articles or books in their native language so as to keep a high proficiency in academic language and prevent L1 attrition that may otherwise occur (Isurin, 2007).

Another important teaching aspect I learned from DLI is the importance of studying a variety of topics in the L2. During the course of DLI, students study all of the core subjects (math, science, history, etc.) in their L2. In helping my students become biliterate, I want to include more topics in my curriculum about which they will discuss, read articles/books, and write. Adult students in ESL classrooms often have a professional degree they are working towards, or a specific field in which they would like to work, so I want to include their interests and fields of study into the curriculum so that they can learn the vocabulary and technical terms associated with these fields.

Even though there are many differences between DLI and ESL classrooms, I believe that there is insight to be gained from studying the models of immersion programs. Some of the strategies used in bilingual education that I previously discussed would also be effective if implemented into ESL classrooms. The strategies used to teach literacy are some of the most important that I have gained from studying DLI. Below I discuss the many benefits available to those individuals who become literate in a L2.

Literacy

As the popularity of dual language immersion education has grown, parents have become aware of the benefits of literacy in a L2 that come from DLI and, as a result, seek the opportunity to enroll their children in such programs (Lee & Jeong, 2013; Parkes & Ruth, 2011). They have recognized the academic (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013), cognitive (Haarmann, 2006; Juarez, 2015), economic (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2000), political (Geisler et al., 2007), socio-cultural (Hamayan et al., 2013), and future language and work (Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Webb, 2007) benefits available to children who become literate in a L2. Although literacy requires humans to exert extreme mental energy, a literate population will benefit future generations in the growing global market (Fortune & Menke, 2010; Lindholm-Leary, 2000).

These benefits, however, are available not only to DLI students, but to anyone who becomes literate in a L2. To become literate, students need to not only read and understand everyday speech and popular written texts, but also get the full meaning and depth behind academic texts (Met, 2008). To be considered proficient in a L2 requires more than just being able to speak. Proficiency includes being able to write and read academically (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). DLI is an effective way to reach these literacy goals, but that does not mean that there is no hope for those who did not have the benefit of a DLI program when they were young. There is hope for those who have already passed through adolescence and have not yet become literate in a L2. Even though it is impossible for my classroom to be run like a DLI classroom, now that I understand the benefits of bilingual programs, I can model what I do in the classroom after methods that have proven to be successful. No matter the age at which one becomes literate in a L2, the benefits of literacy apply to all. These will now be discussed.

Benefits of Literacy in a L2

Academic advantages

On average, it takes students a minimum of six years, and up to 8 years, to develop proficiency in the target language (Collier & Thomas 2004). However, proficiency in the target language results in benefits in both languages. While learning a L2, students actually gain a better understanding of their L1 (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013).

In addition to learning about their L1, students in a bilingual program also become fluent in an L2 (Genesee, 2008). Montanari (2014) cites an example of this in an Italian immersion program where students were fluent readers in English and Italian by the second grade. In accordance with Geisler et al. (2007), DLI educates students in a L2 from early elementary school, in the hope of reaching the goal that students will be able to communicate with educated individuals of other countries in their native language. ESL students can gain these same benefits as they learn English. Literacy in a L2 will give them a greater understanding of their native language and allow them to understand and analyze academic texts in their L2.

Cognitive advantages

According to Haarmann (2006), the human brain is ready and able to make new and different connections, and through developing knowledge of another language, the fluency part of the brain is "better developed" (Haarmann, 2006, p. 68). In fact, the better-developed brain of a bilingual/literate person may be a protection against dementia (Bialystok, 2011; Bialystok, Craik, Green, & Gollan, 2009). It may also minimize the

decline in memory that usually occurs with the aging process, and delay the onset of

Alzheimer's disease (Bialystok, 2011; Bialystok et al., 2009).

Knowing and using another language can lead to improvements in a bilingual

person's working memory, allow him/her to be better able to perform tasks when there

are distractions, and allow one to remember information while performing a task better

than people who know only one language (Bialystok, Craik, Green, & Gollan, 2009).

Problem-solving skills and the ability to find patterns more easily are also benefits of

knowing another language (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). Lazaruk (2007) adds to

the already mentioned research that students who are literate in a L2 also have an

"increased linguistic awareness, greater flexibility in thought, and more internal

examination of language" (p. 614).

Economic advantages

Because the world is becoming more globalized, the need for literate employees

continues to grow (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). Businesses and other agencies now require

more global involvement from their employees. These requirements will continue to

increase as more high-paying and elite jobs need workers who have competencies in

multiple languages (Fortune, 2012). "In the United States, world language abilities are

increasingly important to national security, economic competitiveness, delivery of health

care, and law enforcement" (Fortune, 2012, p. 12). Due to this need, as students become

literate they will be prepared to succeed in the world's global economy. Many of the

multilingual areas of the world are also economic and business hotspots, for example the

European Union, parts of Asia's Pacific Rim and South Asia, as well as certain areas in

the Americas (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). People who are literate in a L2 are, and will be, needed for this new global market (Fortune, 2012; Lindholm-Leary, 2000).

Genesee (2008) states, "Indeed, individuals and communities who know English *and* other languages will have the real advantages (economic, political, etc.) in the future in comparison to those who know only English" (p. 23, emphasis in the original). Educating students in a L2 and promoting literacy gives them the knowledge to better their circumstances. But Genesee (2008) continues that, "It is biliteracy, not just oral bilingualism, that is important if young people are to thrive in and take advantage of global realities" (p. 24). Students need not only oral skills in a L2, but must be able to write, read, and analyze texts (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). Companies need employees who can write letters, documents, reports, and presentations in a L2.

Increased job opportunities will be available to literate individuals (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000; Lindholm-Leary, 2000). They will be in high demand as companies look for workers with diverse skills (Lindholm-Leary, 2000). According to Lazaruk (2007), students in French DLI programs graduated with the French skills required (determined through oral, written, and reading tests) for work in the Public Service Commission of Canada. From this, it can be concluded that not only oral skills but being a literate person in general will be vital to work in diverse and linguistically challenging jobs.

Political Advantages

Literacy also supports several political advantages. Unger (2001) reports that immersion education battles prejudice and racism, factors that play into the lack of peace in communities around the world. In the process of becoming literate in a L2, students are

exposed to the diversities of different cultures from a young age (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000), and, according to Swain and Lapkin (2005), different cultures should be acknowledged and admired. Understanding those who speak other languages will be crucial for the future, as this ability will aid in helping to dissolve conflicts (Geisler et al., 2007).

Teaching ESL students English will also allow them to see the world through different eyes. As people from cultures across the world take the opportunity to learn other languages, greater understanding and respect for the differences of others will grow. Individuals who are literate in a L2 learn how to "appreciate people from other countries" (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013, p. 46), and develop a "greater intercultural understanding and tolerance" (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000, p. 5) for other cultures. As these doors of understanding open (Cloud et al., 2000; Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013; Parkes & Ruth, 2011), it will encourage peace in the world because more people will work and live together in harmony (Geisler et al., 2007; Lindholm-Leary, 2000).

Socio-cultural advantages

Even though learning a different language will not help students understand *all* cultural differences, it will open their minds to view the world in new ways and be more open to others' cultures, traditions, and differences (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). By becoming literate, another world of speakers, friends, and cultures opens up to them. According to Kenner (2003), learning to write in two different languages is not only a cognitive benefit, but also helps children's cultural development. This cultural development expands a person's world (Cloud, Genesee, & Hamayan, 2000). By reading

authentic texts, students gain a greater depth of understanding of the language and culture of the L2 they are learning (Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud, 2013). They are also able "to communicate with members of other cultural groups, be they members of cultural groups in one's own neighborhood, or groups in other countries or regions of the world" (Cloud et al. 2000, p. 4). In fact, literacy "extends children's learning and enables them to share cultural experiences with their families and communities" (Kenner, 2003, p. 21), uniting, not separating individuals. Through literacy, students are able to make friends around the globe and knowledgeably navigate an increasingly globalized world.

Continued Learning

Even with all of the previously mentioned benefits from becoming literate, arguably one of the greatest benefits of literacy is that of continued learning. According to Fortune and Tedick (2008), large vocabularies in many adults are gained by coming across words in text. L2 learners have this same tendency and incidentally acquire vocabulary through reading text (Rott, 1999), especially when repetition of the vocabulary is present (Webb, 2007). Literate individuals are able to continue a journey of lifelong learning because of their ability to read in a L2. As they read, their lexicon will continue to grow and literacy, therefore, can serve as a tool for continued lifelong learning (Fortune & Tedick, 2008; Rott, 1999; Webb, 2007).

Conclusion

In order for students to keep learning and progressing in a L2 (Fortune & Tedick, 2008), and to succeed in the 21st Century's global market (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), it is crucial for them to become literate. As an ESL teacher, I can use DLI's immersion

techniques to provide my students with opportunities to practice English with native speakers, read and interpret English texts, and develop oral and literacy skills that will allow them to communicate comfortably with educated individuals in English. Utilizing these techniques to increase literacy in my classroom, I can help future generations gain the academic, cognitive, economic, political, socio-cultural, and continued benefits available to them through literacy.

According to Christian (2011), the number of bilinguals in the world outnumbers the number of monolinguals. As such, ESL students often come to the United States specifically to increase their English abilities so that they will be better-qualified candidates to compete in a multicultural economy.

In years past, illiterate individuals were considered to be economically disadvantaged. Those who are literate in a L2, however, will now have many advantages compared with those who do not know another language (Fortune, 2012; Genesee, 2008). As an ESL teacher, it is my job to help prepare students to succeed in the global market. Students that I teach often have a strong desire to learn English because they live in a predominantly English-speaking country and, without the use of this language, they cannot fully participate in society. As a teacher, I will do them a disservice if I teach them only how to speak in English because it is through literacy that they will be able to fully participate and compete in our globalized economy.

CULTURE ARTIFACT

Requests in the ESL Classroom

INTRODUCTION

I wrote this paper for the Pragmatics class. It covers the role of requests in pragmatics and research regarding request making in the ESL classroom. This artifact also describes pragmatic norms of request making for North American English speakers and teaching strategies that have been found to be successful in teaching pragmatics.

Different cultures and cultural norms have always fascinated me. When I started the MSLT program, I had limited knowledge about my own, and others', cultural norms. Throughout the program, I have had an opportunity to interact with and observe colleagues and students from many different cultural backgrounds. I have learned about their cultural norms, and my own, through classroom discussions and observations. Learning about their cultural beliefs and values gave me an even greater desire to understand the role that these norms play in everyday interactions and conversations.

In writing this artifact about requests, I learned that my role as a teacher is much more than helping my students learn to speak English. I realized that I need to acquaint my students with the pragmatic rules that govern North American English speakers so that they will understand and be able to use these rules of politeness when they speak English. As I give my students opportunities to practice appropriate requests, I will help increase their awareness of these cultural norms so that they can successfully and appropriately interact with their acquaintances, friends, and professors.

Writing this artifact helped me to learn that pragmatics play an even bigger role in everyday interactions than I thought. I had never considered all of the small nuances in words and actions that can make a statement either socially acceptable, or completely

rude. I also learned that it is better to teach pragmatics explicitly so that students can learn about the subtle cultural norms of communication.

In my future teaching endeavors, I plan to incorporate more pragmatic lessons into my teaching. Writing this paper made me realize that I have a limited knowledge of the cultural norms that govern my own interactions. Thus, to teach my students how to appropriately interact in my culture, I must be more aware of the cultural norms that shape my interactions and those of my same cultural background. I hope as I teach my students to be more aware of the cultural norms that surround them, I myself will also develop this awareness so together we can learn how to navigate our circumstances with pragmatic competence.

Introduction

Making requests is a crucial aspect of human interaction. It is also a speech act

that is challenging for L2 learners due to the many variables that affect what is

considered appropriate when making a request (LoCastro, 2012). As such, requests made

by L2 learners can often result in pragmatic failure (Glass, 2014). This means that they

make "mistakes in producing and understanding situationally appropriate language

behavior" (LoCastro, 2012, p. 83); for example students may phrase requests in ways that

are perceived as awkward or rude (Amaya, 2008). Whether students need to learn how to

ask for directions, to use the restroom, to receive their check at a restaurant, to borrow

money from a friend, or to request a meeting with a professor, they must learn how to

make pragmatically appropriate requests. Following is an examination of what research

shows about requests and request making by L2 learners.

Literature Review

Making requests can be a challenging endeavor due to the fact that in making a

request, one tries to get another to do something for them (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). In

studying requests, I realized that request making can be even more overwhelming for L2

learners. Their control over the grammar and vocabulary needed to make polite requests

may be inadequate, and they also may not know the way in which native speakers soften

requests and when it is appropriate to do so (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). Besides this, L2

learners must take other variables into account when making requests because

"comprehension of a speech act depends on linguistic, sociocultural, and pragmatic

knowledge." (LoCastro, 2012, pp. 94-95). Thus, polite and appropriate requests are

determined by many factors and an L2 learner must become aware of how these factors influence making appropriate requests in their L2.

Due to the diversity of backgrounds and cultures present in an ESL classroom, it is impossible to study each culture individually and look at the negative or positive transfer that occurs from students' L1. Thus, in this literature review, I will attempt to cover an overview of general observations about request making that are pertinent to the ESL classroom.

Role of Requests in Pragmatics

After looking at research on request making in several different languages, Kim (1995) reports that there is "universal richness available in the modes of performance of a request" and that the form of request making chosen by the speaker carries "high communicative and social stakes" (p. 4). With so much for students to consider when making a request, it is important that they receive formal instruction so that they are able to appropriately make requests (Kim, Louw, Derwing, & Abbott, 2010). Formal instruction is also needed to help learners interpret the subtlety with which native speakers make requests (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010).

To better understand the role that requests play in pragmatics, it is important to first understand the definition of a request. According to Tatsuki and Houck (2010), a request is when one asks someone else to do something for him/her. Even though this may seem straightforward, there are many nuances and variations that occur in request making. LoCastro (2012) splits requests into 3 different parts. There is the head request (i.e., the actual request), alerters (i.e., the way one would begin making a request), and supportive moves (i.e., these are not part of the request, such as an explanation about why

the request is made). Each of these varies greatly depending on the cultural and social

perspectives of those involved. Internal and external modifications also play an important

role in request making (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). Internal modifications are used to soften

the request (e.g., saying *please*) while external modifications come before or after the

request almost as a warning that a request is coming or an apology for the inconvenience

of the request (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010).

Besides the level of awareness needed to determine which types of internal and

external modifiers are needed to make the request appropriate for the situation and

cultural conditions, Tatsuki and Houck (2010) point out three different types of requests:

direct requests (e.g., "Don't do that."); conventionally indirect requests (e.g., "You'll

need to get a new car."); and non-conventionally indirect requests (e.g., "This milk smells

old." [A request to get new milk.]). The use of these varying types of requests also

depends on the politeness norms of the cultural and social setting. Hinkel (2013) points

out that:

> politeness is considered to be a universal feature of language use in social
>
> organizations, but its pragmatic, linguistic, social, intentional, and conceptual
>
> realizations vary substantially across different languages and/or cultures. Even
>
> speakers of the same language or speakers of different dialects may belong to
>
> different sub-cultures and thus have different concepts of what it means to be
>
> polite and how politeness should be realized in speech and behavior (p. 395).

Without knowledge of the pragmatics needed for requests, students may be

misunderstood or considered rude (Kim, 1995; Louw, Derwing, & Abbott, 2010).

Students' misunderstandings of pragmatics could even result in more serious consequences such as loss of friendships or losing one's job (Hinkel, 2013).

Even with these repercussions for students, some teachers still bypass teaching pragmatics because it is easier to just teach grammar (Amaya, 2008). Having a good knowledge of the grammar, however, will not save students from experiencing pragmatic failure (Amaya, 2008). According to Hinkel (2013), there is even more to becoming pragmatically competent than knowing what to say. "Culture may find its manifestations in body language, gestures, concepts of time, hospitality customs, and even expressions of friendliness" (Hinkel, 2013, pp. 395-396). It is also manifest not only in when to say certain expressions or phrases, but when not to say them. Without knowledge of these concepts, students will most likely use the cultural norms from their L1, which may be inappropriate in certain contexts and situations in their L2 (Hinkel, 2013).

In making requests, culture is also evident in several social factors that should be considered to avoid harmful repercussions. According to Tatsuki and Houck (2010), the most important of these are "hearer status, distance, and degree of imposition of the request" (p. 49). Cultures may view relationships and distance between interlocutors differently (Soler, 2013), which greatly influences the formulation of requests. Thus, it is important that students receive pragmatic instruction and sufficient practice with the pragmatics of requests, so that they can enact the pragmatic knowledge that they possess, helping to avoid the damaging results of requests that could potentially be perceived as rude (LoCastro, 2012).

Research on Requests

To better understand the teaching of requests in the ESL classroom, I will cover several studies about students' pragmatic development in learning requests. Kim (1995) investigated how Korean ESL students performed requests, with an emphasis on negative transfer from their L1 that caused non native-like deviations in their requests. Looking at the comparison group of native Korean speakers used for the study, Kim concluded that there was negative transfer from the Korean ESL speakers' L1 and that their requests differed from those of the native English speakers in specific situations. They used more apologies when making requests than the native English speakers and failed to use preparators like "Will…?" and "Can…?" that were often used by the native English speakers. Overall, Kim (1995) noticed that the level of directness and supportive moves for all of the groups was "significantly determined by the sociopragmatic features of the situational context" (p. 3). Thus, it is evident that each culture is run by a set of pragmatic rules that determine speakers' responses to different situations, and these vary depending on the cultural norms of the interlocutors.

After reading the previous study, it was interesting to note studies by Soler (2013) and Felix-Brasdefer (2007) respectively. Soler's study not only acknowledged the differences in the requests made by British English speakers (BES) and international English speakers (IES), but also noted how often direct requests were used. Soler found that overall IES used more direct requests than BES. These findings are similar to those of Felix-Brasdefer, who found that beginner language learners used more direct requests regardless of the situation. In this study, however, it was noted that as students' proficiency improved, the use of direct requests decreased and the use of conventional indirect requests increased (Felix-Brasdefer). In regards to Soler's (2013) observations of

the use of direct requests, the possible explanations are that IES used more direct requests due to their lack of language abilities or knowledge of appropriate pragmatics, that their view of social distance with their interlocutor differed from the views of BES, or their use of direct requests was perhaps determined by the imposition of the request. Another important finding of this study was that the IES used specific strategies (e.g., using a more direct or indirect request) depending on the type of request while BES relied on internal modifiers (e.g., using softening words like "just" and "only") depending on the type of request. This seems to support the hypothesis that the IES may not have had the pragmalinguistic skills needed to make pragmatically appropriate requests, as they had to rely on request strategies, rather than different types of modifiers like the BES, to mitigate the requests.

Beltran (2014), instead of looking at interactions in the classroom, carried out a study to identify how the amount of time on a study abroad affects students' "awareness and production of requests and request act modifiers" (p. 79). The results of the study show that the beginning of the study abroad greatly affected students' abilities to recognize pragmatic infelicities and that spending a longer amount of time on the study abroad seemed to lead to an increased use of internal and external modifiers. It seems that there are definite benefits in improving pragmatic development of request making by time immersed in an L2 culture.

Even though studying abroad has a positive impact on the development of request making pragmatics, not all students will have the chance to study abroad. Thus, I was interested in the findings of another study by Soler (2005) in which she investigated whether instruction can help improve students' pragmatic development. Her study

focused on two types of pragmatics instruction, implicit versus explicit. Explicit

instruction uses direct instruction, explaining and pointing out pragmatic variations in the

language while implicit instruction seeks to draw students' attention to the pragmatic

variations of the language in more subtle ways (e.g., by bolding the sociopragmatic

aspects of requests in printed text). In this study, three groups of EFL students

participated in one of three types of classroom instruction: explicit instruction of requests;

implicit instruction of requests; or no instruction about requests (the control group). The

results of the study showed that both the implicit and explicit groups' awareness and use

of requests improved, but the "explicit group showed an advantage over the implicit one"

(p. 417). This conclusion was drawn due to the explicit group's ability to produce

requests better than students in the implicit group. This study demonstrates that pragmatic

ability can improve through classroom instruction (Rose, 2005; Soler, 2005).

What students should know about requests in English

Knowing that pragmatic knowledge can be improved through classroom

instruction is exciting, but I wondered what type of information my ESL students would

need to know concerning requests in English. As I learned about the cultural norms in

English, I realized that it will be important for students to learn how these norms differ

from their own L1. For example, in Japanese it is more polite to use a negative request,

while in Spanish using the imperfect tense is more polite (LoCastro, 2012). As ESL

learners, however, Japanese and Spanish students would need to learn that the more

polite form in their language may not coincide with the politest way to make a request in

English. In English, the general rule is that, "the longer and more elaborate the softening,

the more formal and polite the request, and a request in a question form is usually less

demanding than one that simply states what the speaker wants" (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010, p. 73). Helping students recognize how to make a request more polite is important, but students also need to understand when and with whom certain politeness strategies are used.

One problem of politeness noted by Tatsuki and Houck (2010) is that, "Some ESL learners believe that North American English speakers are always direct and explicit, and this oversimplification sometimes leads to inappropriately straightforward or overly casual requests" (p. 47). When students believe that native English speakers are always direct, they are prone to offending colleagues, teachers, or friends and will probably not receive what they were requesting (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). This is why it is important to stress to students that the way people make and fulfill requests is completely dependent on their cultural norms (Glass, 2014). It is also important to realize that there may be other factors that influence how a request is made (e.g., mood, personality). Thus, before assuming that all English speakers make direct requests, students should observe and realize that native speakers make requests indirectly and politely even with family and friends. They also usually give a reason for why they are making the request (Tatsuki & Houck, 2010).

Besides understanding the general rules in English for making requests, there are several other things I want my students to know. If I am teaching in an EFL setting, I want my students to know that "learners in the foreign language setting tend to show less sociopragmatic development than learners in the second language environment" (Al-Gahtani & Roever, 2012, p. 43). Exposure to the TL helps learners better understand the culture's pragmatics; in addition, students' perceptions of social status even changes to a

more native-like view (Beltran, 2014). I will encourage my students to study abroad if they are able because exposure to the dominant culture of their L2 has a greater impact on pragmatic development than does simply improving their language proficiency in their home country (Beltran, 2014). For my students in ESL settings, I believe that understanding this principle is also important. I have noticed that many of my students tend to socialize with other international students who speak the same L1, but I will encourage them to make friends with native speakers of their L2 so that they will have authentic situations in which to practice speaking their L2. No matter where students end up studying, however, I want them to understand that their ability to learn is affected by their desire and motivation (Beltran, 2014). Even if students do not get the chance to study abroad, they can still make great progress in improving their language skills if they are motivated to do so.

Conclusions From the Research

From my reading of the research about requests, it is evident that students' request making is affected by their L1. It also seems that students need more than just lectures about what is pragmatically appropriate in different cultures and societies because there is so much variability even between speakers of the same language. I agree with Kim, (1995) that as a teacher, I first need to try to understand the beliefs and cultural norms that govern the way that my students make requests. Then, I believe it is my responsibility to give my students practice using a variety of scenarios that could be appropriately enacted in more than one way. Learning the pragmatics of requests does not include learning a formula that will work every time. I believe that it is my role as a teacher to encourage students to develop their pragmatic awareness. It is impossible to

cover every cultural scenario and teach every cultural norm of a society in the classroom, but going through a variety of scenarios may help students increase their awareness of social norms (Hinkel, 2013). As students are able to research different cultures and practice analyzing the norms of a culture in different scenarios, their awareness of cultural differences will develop, allowing them to be more pragmatically competent (Hinkel, 2013). In the next section I will cover research concerning teaching methods that can be used in the classroom to develop students' pragmatic awareness.

Teaching Strategies

Some researchers have argued that exposure to the TL is enough to learn pragmatics, but after reviewing literature regarding the development of second language pragmatics, Rose (2005) found that "without exception, learners receiving instruction in pragmatics outperformed those who did not" (p. 392). Felix-Brasdefer (2007) also reports that pragmatic instruction is needed because students do not make native-like requests without such instruction, and, as previously mentioned, without the ability to make requests with native-like pragmatics, students' relationships or job opportunities can be jeopardized (Hinkel, 2013; LoCastro, 2012).

As I researched about teaching pragmatics in the classroom, one major theme was whether explicit or implicit instruction is more effective in developing students' pragmatic competence. Rose (2005), from his extensive review of the literature, concludes that despite some contradictory findings, overall there is "considerable support for the value of explicit instruction" (p. 396). I found this same conclusion to be true in multiple studies that I read (Bu & Gruangsha, 2012; Nguyen, Pham, & Pham, 2012; Soler, 2005).

Bu and Gruangsha (2012) report that the Chinese EFL learners in their study who received explicit instruction were able to produce more pragmatically appropriate responses than the implicit group. Nguyen, Pham, and Pham (2012), in testing the effects of different types of instruction on pragmatic development, also found that the explicit group outperformed the implicit group on immediate and delayed post tests testing pragmatic competence. Fordyce (2013) discovered that the improvement of the group receiving explicit instruction was much greater than the implicit group not only in the short-term but also the long-term acquisition of the targeted pragmatic forms, and, as was already mentioned in the research above, Soler (2005) concluded that students gained an advantage in learning the speech act of requests through explicit rather than implicit instruction.

From the research reviewed above, it is evident that there is a great advantage in teaching pragmatics with explicit instruction. I was intrigued to find a slightly different approach in a study by Glaser (2013), which she rightly titles "The Neglected Combination." With so much focus on explicit versus implicit instruction, there is little research about explicit-inductive versus explicit-deductive teaching designs. Glaser writes that inductive and deductive teaching has to do with the sequence of instruction. In a deductive lesson the rules are given first, and then students have a chance to practice them through activities and exercises. Inductive lessons consist of language discovery activities that cover language material containing the given linguistic features first, followed by an explanation of the linguistic rules. In a study by Haight, Herron, and Cole (2007) that contrasted inductive versus deductive teaching designs, with a focus on using explicit instruction of rules, the immediate and long-term test scores favored the

inductive approach. According to Glaser, letting learners be part of the discovery engages them actively in the learning process and thus they better retain the information. After reading this article I am interested to try planning some explicit-inductive lessons in my own classroom.

Even though planning may take a longer time, I think that an inductive approach will give my students greater control over their learning. I believe that using this type of technique will also help my students to notice pragmatic forms without having these forms explicitly explained to them because they will learn to search for these forms in class activities prior to receiving formal instruction about them. Glass (2014) provides some strategies for teaching requests in the classroom and seems to support this idea of explicit-inductive instruction. She suggests having students compare requests that would be appropriate in their own culture with examples of those from the L2 culture (Glass, 2014; Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). This allows students to notice the different ways that their own culture makes requests compared to English speakers, compelling students to look at other cultures' norms, which will enhance their pragmatic awareness. Hinkel (2013) adds on to this idea by suggesting that students do their own research outside of the classroom by recording certain cultural habits or ways that speech acts are expressed.

During class I want to give students scenarios to practice determining the imposition of the request, the distance between the student and the interlocutor, and a variety of appropriate ways to make requests in different situations because all of these variables affect how to appropriately make a request (Glass, 2014; Tatsuki & Houck, 2010). Many students struggle to use pragmatic knowledge in everyday speech simply because they are not able to access their pragmatic knowledge automatically (LoCastro,

2012). In my classroom, I hope to give my students sufficient practice with requests through role plays, categorizing requests, gathering their own data, analyzing their data, interpreting requests, and analyzing the relationships of interlocutors so that their pragmatic knowledge can become automatic in their interactions (Hinkel, 2013; Tatsuki & Houck).

One of my important roles as a teacher in practicing pragmatic interactions is to point out when students have made an error and give them specific feedback because many students are not even aware of their mistake when they have made a pragmatic error (Glass, 2014; Hinkel, 2013). In pointing out students' errors, it is also important that I inform them of cultural norms of politeness and how others will perceive them if they do not abide by these cultural norms (Amaya, 2008; LoCastro, 2012). I must remember, however, that it is up to them to choose how to speak or act (Amaya, 2008; LoCastro, 2012). Most importantly, I hope that providing my students with sufficient time to practice will help heighten their awareness to notice pragmatic variations, as this is one of the most important aspects in helping students to develop pragmatic competence (Fordyce, 2013).

Conclusion

Learning to formulate and make requests is a challenging aspect of learning an L2 because this speech act is influenced by many different variables. One must not only consider the social distance between speaker and hearer, but also the imposition of the request and cultural norms that govern how to appropriately navigate the situation so as not to offend or sound rude. Without knowledge of these cultural norms, students will not be able to "make the best of their educational, professional, and vocational opportunities"

(Hinkel, 2013, p.397) and could actually harm them. As an ESL teacher, it is my responsibility to inform my students about the cultural norms that govern the North American English speaking community so that they can be successful in interactions with friends, acquaintances, colleagues, and professors. From my research about requests, I realize that I cannot demonstrate all of the different scenarios and situations that my students will experience, but by practicing and researching cultural norms with my students, I can help to sensitize them to look for and notice pragmatic norms in interactions with those of other cultures and backgrounds (Amaya, 2008; Hinkel, 2013).

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

INTRODUCTION

This section of my portfolio is a compilation of three papers that I wrote throughout my time in the MSLT program. Each paper covers a specific topic and refers to sources I found instructive while studying that topic. Most of the sources I cite in the following papers were also used in my TPS and artifacts. Through reading my annotated bibliographies, however, it is more evident what I learned from each source, and why these sources were important in my study of the varying topics I researched. This part of my portfolio is divided into three sections, each covering a different topic. The first section covers CLT and TBA. Next, I discuss insights I gained from sources I read about biliteracy instruction. Lastly, I explore what I learned about the effect CF has on language acquisition. I originally wrote the annotated bibliography about CF with Haitao Zhao, but I have since made revisions to this bibliography on my own.

Communicative Language Teaching and Task-Based Activities

In this Annotated Bibliography, I explore Communicative Language Teaching and task-based activities. At the beginning of the MSLT program, I learned about CLT and TBA. Many of the sources I read claimed that CLT with TBA is the best way to teach a language. As I have thought about this approach and tried it in my own class, I have seen some of its benefits. To reflect on what I have learned about TBA and CLT, I have compiled this Annotated Bibliography. I hope to use what I have learned when creating lesson plans for my classes.

Growing up in a family of teachers who creatively ran their classrooms, I always had the impression that learning should be an interactive process. After going through elementary school with master teachers, I found myself passively sitting in lecture-style classes in middle and high school. I came to enjoy these, due to the fact that little was required of me. It was hard to remember what I had learned though, because I remember things better when I am actively involved in the learning process. I found myself simply memorizing facts, dates, etc., so that I could pass the tests, but my actual understanding and learning was limited because I never was expected to use or apply what I had learned. The only time I needed what I memorized was for the exams.

As I read Lee and VanPatten's (2003) claims about CLT, it rang true to what I had always thought about teaching. Learning must be interactive, especially for those who want to speak another language. It does not benefit students to simply sit in a classroom and hear a lecture. They must actively participate to apply what they are learning in a real, contextualized way. According to a survey of students learning a L2, as mentioned by **Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001**), the students' greatest

desire was to be able to communicate orally in the L2. Students wanted to have opportunities in the international work field, to travel abroad, and to make new friends in the L2. The only way to develop this type of oral communication is to speak and use the language. Passively sitting in a lecture-style classroom will do little if anything for students' oral abilities.

From **Lee and VanPatten (2003)**, I learned that in CLT the teacher is not the expert or the source of all knowledge, but an architect or facilitator. As the architect, the teacher carefully designs activities for the students to do in small groups, with partners, or as a class. Students do not sit idly by listening to a lecture, but are actively involved in using the language. These communicative activities in the classroom simulate real-life communication by requiring students to use the L2 to solve problems, share information, and explain certain beliefs or world issues. Using TBAs give students the chance to practice interpreting and negotiating the meaning of their interactions, and responding in the L2. This is vastly different from previous language teaching styles, such as the Atlas Complex and Audiolingualism (Lee & VanPatten, 2003), when students learned the language through memorization and drills.

I learned more about TBA as I further explored Lee and VanPatten (2003). They stressed focusing the tasks around a bigger goal or topic. I had tried to plan activities in my classroom prior to reading about TBA, but had lacked the proper framework for how to best plan and implement these activities to benefit the students' oral abilities. Reading Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001) reminded me that the main goal of language teaching is to develop oral proficiency. Not only should teachers use TBA in each class period, but they should plan lessons around real-life conversations and

situations. This will help students achieve their goals of oral proficiency. In planning to teach, it's important to think about what most people talk about with their friends, acquaintances, or strangers they meet. TBA should focus on these aspects of conversation, because students want to be able to get to know and develop friendships with L2 speakers. Without sufficient practice, however, they will lack the needed skills to communicate in such a way.

Picking topics that interest the students and will help them meet "their immediate goals" (Goh & Burns, 2012, p. 183) is also crucial to students' success. Students need to be able to see that what they are learning is helping them to achieve their language goals. They will, in turn, be more enthusiastic and engaged in the learning process because it is interesting and beneficial for them.

Whatever topic the teacher decides to cover, each class period should work toward a communicative end goal. This end goal is something that students will be able to 'do' using the language (Brown, 2001). I learned from **Brown (2001)**, that to reach the overall goal or objective of the lesson, smaller objectives are needed that build on each other. These smaller objectives eventually build up to the overall objective. It is important for teachers to break down the overall objective into smaller chunks that are more accessible and available for students to reach. In reaching the end objective, students are required to actively do something with information that they have gathered. This holds them accountable for the information and also gives the teacher a measurable way to assess what the students have learned and achieved.

After getting an overall view of CLT and TBA, I read an article by **Littlewood (2011)**. This article discussed the term CLT specifically in the sense of its meaning.

Following my reading of Lee and VanPatten (2003) and Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001), I felt that I understood the definition of communicative teaching and TBA very clearly, and I was sure that every teacher should know about and implement CLT in its pure form. I wanted to start implementing these ideas into my own classroom, and I couldn't understand why others wouldn't have the same understanding and definitions of these methods. This article changed my view, because it concluded that the term CLT is not universally understood.

According to Littlewood (2011), people discuss CLT in different ways and it is often unclear to which definition of CLT they are referring. Some people talk about CLT as an overall approach to "achieving communicative goals" (p. 542), while others may refer to it as "a methodology in which students are *always* engaged in communication" (p. 542). Also, other methods may contain some of the same characteristics that are found in CLT, but are not necessarily referred to by the same name. This can cause confusion when trying to understand the exact definition of the CLT approach.

Even though there may not be a specific definition of communicative teaching, Littlewood (2011) claims that speaking about CLT has had an important impact on the L2 teaching world. As stated in the article, "...perhaps the most valuable contribution of CLT is to act not as a specific set of practices and ideas but as a transnational 'ideoscape' [...], that is, as an *ideational landscape* that provides a location for deepening and extending the 'cosmopolitan conversation' about second language pedagogy" (p. 552). Whether or not everyone knows the exact definition of communicative teaching, it has opened up an important conversation about how to improve L2 teaching. Teachers are learning that

'communicative competence' is the goal of learning a language, and that they must be the implementers of activities in their classrooms that will increase this competence.

Even though different terms were used to define communicative competence in this article, the discussion of communicative learning was similar to that addressed by Lee and VanPatten (2003). Some of the topics covered by Littlewood (2011) were: the role of cultural rules and protocol in language learning (e.g., when to use formal and informal types of address), and language formation rules. Exploring the goals of language learning and different definitions of communicative teaching is crucial for language teaching to continue to develop and improve. Studying this information and wrestling with the question of how to improve language teaching will continue to help me shift my teaching methods in a more communicative direction. Even if teachers have not thoroughly studied the CLT method of L2 teaching, it seems that many teachers claim to use some type of communicative method of teaching.

After reading this article, I began to realize that some people have probably written about these ideas, but may not have used the terms CLT or TBA, though the principles of the methods may be the same. This was true in **Folse (2006)**. He did not specifically mention TBA, but spoke extensively about the types of tasks that are beneficial for teaching a speaking course.

In discussing earlier language learning trends, noting especially the grammar and memorization drills, Folse (2006) emphasizes the importance of grammar knowledge in a speaking course. He says that teachers should be able "to (1) construct a lesson around an important language component (e.g., a list of fifteen family words), (2) point out important language components within a dialogue (e.g., the negative of *I go* is *I don't go*

but the negative of *I went* is not *I don't went* but rather *I didn't go*), or (3) do both 1 and 2" (p. 23). Even though teachers should not spend lesson upon lesson drilling grammar into their students, it is a vital aspect of language learning. Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, and Mandell (2001) also encourage "grammar in support of communication" (p. 34). Teachers need to understand the rules of the language so that they can identify the language rules students need to complete certain tasks. Grammar shouldn't be the main object of TBA, but the ability to recognize and pull out the grammar rules needed to complete a certain task and point these rules out to the students is an important skill teachers should develop.

In conjunction with this discussion, Folse (2006) makes the point that when planning a task, there are several different types of languages needed for the task. The two types of languages are "language in the actual task" (p. 22) and "language for the task" (p. 22). Language in the task includes certain terms and language forms needed to understand and interpret the actual task. For example, if during a lesson about money a student must list a series of prices in order from most expensive to cheapest, language in the task would include words such as: more expensive, cheaper, less expensive, most expensive, cheapest, etc. Then, when students must confer with a partner, they would need that language to be able to figure out if they agree with their partner, using language for the task. Language for the task most often utilizes phrases to express opinions and questions to help them negotiate the meaning. Examples of these phrases are: *I thought $125.62 was the most expensive, do you agree? What did you say was the cheapest price? Is $9.25 less expensive than $10.00? I thought it was more expensive.* etc. Before

reading this chapter from Folse (2006), I had never differentiated between these two types of task languages.

As I continued reading, I noticed that Folse (2006) emphasizes the importance of lesson planning by topic, subtopic, and communicative tasks. Special care is needed to pick a task that best complements the topic for which it is planned. Tasks are the "vehicle for conversation" (p. 26), so teachers must plan a task that keeps the teacher talk to a minimum and allows students to do the majority of the conversation work.

While planning conversation tasks, it is important to consider the specific purpose of the task. According to the *The Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* there are three 'modes' that can guide teachers in planning TBA (as cited in **Shrum & Glisan, 2009**, p. 180). They are: "interpersonal," "interpretive," and "presentational" (p. 180). Depending on the purpose for the activity, teachers can focus the TBA on one of these modes. The interpersonal mode involves an exchange of information and negotiation of meaning between individuals. It can be oral or written. The interpretive mode "focuses on the interpretation of meaning in oral and printed texts when there is no possibility of negotiation of meaning with the writer or speaker" (p. 179). This mode sometimes requires some background knowledge about the culture under discussion since there isn't face-to-face negotiation with the person from the culture who is presenting the information. This mode requires the use of inferencing. When reading a text or listening to a talk, students need background knowledge and a deeper understanding that they can expand upon. This involves more than translating a text or understanding the facts presented as, "interpretation of a text also includes predicting, teaching conclusions, giving opinions and explanations, questioning textual

assertions, and relating the text to other texts or life experiences" (p. 181). The presentational mode is "one-way communication" (p. 181) from speaker or writer to another person or a group.

This definition of the three modes made me think differently about CLT and TBA. Communicative language teaching does not mean simply planning activities that have students talking a lot. Within the TBA that a teacher plans, there needs to be more. There must be room for students to state their opinions about certain issues while picking a side and practicing to defend that opinion. Students need a chance to discuss what they have learned about a topic, ask questions about what they don't understand, and analyze different texts together, in a group or with a partner (Shrum & Glisan, 2009). TBAs are not only to practice conversations and the ability to negotiate meaning, but also interpreting oral or written texts together in groups and practicing presentational skills in the L2.

Another article that intrigued me did not specifically mention TBA, but covered some of the same principles mentioned in the three modes. **Richards (2006)** draws on previous research done by Brown and Yule (1983), who presented the notion that different teaching approaches are needed for different "functions of speaking" (p. 2). The three functions of speaking Richards (2006) covers are: "*talk as interaction: talk as transaction: talk as performance*" (p. 2, italics in original). These different points are very similar to the three modes, but added a different aspect for me to think about. As recorded in Richards (2006), talk as interaction incorporates the notion that the focus of this type of talk is not about the information being shared, but about the way the people speaking in the conversation "present themselves to each other" (p. 2). The other two

'talks' resemble what is covered in Shrum and Glisan (2009); namely, the ability to interpret the interaction, and the skill of presenting information before a group of people.

Most sources I have read about TBA focus mainly on the information that is shared, and the students' ability to comprehend that information. This article, however, made me think more about the verbal cues of respect (formal vs. informal, encouraging sounds to show attentiveness, and ways to start/end a formal or informal conversation in the L2), and non-verbal body cues that people from different cultures give each other (e.g., not giving eye contact when they are uninterested, or putting their hand on a doorknob to show that they need/want to end the conversation and leave). I had never thought that much about TBA that would teach these types of skills, but I now realize that culturally appropriate interpersonal skills are vital for the success of a student learning a L2, and these types of talks may need "different teaching approaches" (p. 2).

As I've learned about TBA, I've realized that there are potential problems in implementing this type of teaching method. According to **Tsai (2008)**, teachers have found CLT to be beneficial in language learning, but have also struggled with implementation problems. One potential problem mentioned by Tsai (2008) that affects students is that they are separated into groups based on their language proficiency. This phenomenon, known as the "Double-Curve Distribution Phenomenon" (p. 78), causes the gap to grow even farther at the end of the year between the lower-level students compared to the more proficient students. I was not sure to which classes he is referring, because all of the classes I have observed have different levels of students, but they are not separated. In reading about this phenomenon, however, I realized that I can remedy this problem (if it were to occur in my class) by not only pairing students by their level of

speaking. In my own ESL class, I have found that the higher-level students can help the lower-level students learn in an advantageous way for both of them. The higher-level students learn the material better as they get to teach it, and the lower-level students' language improves as they are helped by their classmates.

Other problems were also acknowledged by the teachers in Tsai's study as they tried to implement CLT. Some of the problems they reported were due to the size of the class, the standards expected for school exams, and the varied abilities and levels of the students. Along with this, some of the teachers did not feel comfortable enough with their own L2 abilities in the English language. This made it hard for teachers to teach communicatively, because it required them to speak more in the L2 than they were comfortable doing (Tsai, 2008).

When I read this article, I could sympathize with the problems these teachers faced. In my own class, I have students with the capabilities to speak English extremely well, while others struggle to understand and respond to simple questions. It's extremely difficult to plan lessons that can include and challenge all of the ability levels, without being too challenging or too easy for some in the class. Planning a lesson like this takes a lot of time and effort, so if a teacher has multiple classes to teach, it can be discouraging and seem impossible to teach using CLT. There is hope, however. In the next article I read, I learned that when teachers are educated in TBA and have a chance to help modify or plan the activities, implementation can be a success.

In comparing two different settings where task-based activities were implemented, **Ellis (2009)** concluded that several factors affected the success of one setting and the failure of the other. Ellis discerned that the challenges of the unsuccessful

school came from the teachers' lack of knowledge about TBA. They did not understand what a TBA should look like, so they didn't know how to implement the TBA curriculum they were given. It was also a struggle for them to teach communicatively with a class that knew little to no English, and to have no say in the way that the course or tasks were organized. Ellis (2009) compared these disadvantages in the unsuccessful school to the successful school. He concluded that implementation was successful due to teachers who were knowledgeable about task-based language teaching, had freedom to change the curriculum, and had students with a higher proficiency level of English.

Looking at the sources reviewed in this Annotated Bibliography, it is apparent that teachers try to implement CLT and TBA into their classes, even if they do not recognize the method they are using by those names. Students will learn not only oral communication skills, but also interpersonal and cultural skills as teachers implement these methods into their classrooms. I conclude that information about these methods is abundant and available. I plan to continue to research these methods and implement them into my classes to benefit my students' abilities to become proficient in a L2.

Insights from Bilingual Education

When I first heard of DLI, it was fascinating to learn that starting in elementary school, children have the chance to study in two languages throughout their school career. Even though I am not planning to teach in a DLI setting, I was interested to understand how the schools and curriculum are set up and especially how the programs are structured to produce bilingual students. I believe that understanding how these programs are run will give me insight into how I can be a better ESL teacher. In implementing some of this knowledge, I believe I will be able to increase my ability to help my ESL students become literate in a L2.

To better understand the background of DLI, I first read some articles addressing the history of DLI. I was surprised by **Crawford's (2003)** description of the public's distaste for DLI. When I first heard about DLI, it was an exciting new development in education that I thought would help to improve the United States' education and better prepare students to function in the growing global market. My views, however, were far from what most people thought about DLI.

According to Crawford (2003), the media contributed to presenting bilingual education as a bad choice for the U.S. education system. The media portrayed bilingual education as actually preventing minority children from learning English and causing disruptions in the classroom as teachers had to deal with students who did not speak English. Native English-speaking and minority voters believed that bilingual education would cause their children's education to suffer, by denying minority children the chance to learn English or by causing disruptions in the classroom that would disturb learning for all of the children. However, this was not actually the case. Bilingual schools work to

support students' L1 while also developing their English skills. Crawford (2003) claims that eighty percent of U.S. citizens voted against bilingual education simply due to the fact that they did not understand the true purpose and benefits available to all children.

People's misunderstandings about bilingual education were really surprising to me. I wondered why the media would want to portray bilingual education in such a bad light, and it made me want to understand more about bilingual education and the benefits or drawbacks of the system. While reading **Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan (2000)**, I learned that bilingual programs focus on developing academic skills in students' L1 and L2. Students who attend these schools achieve the same proficiency in English as all-English schools, but they get the added benefit of learning another language.

Cloud, Genesee, and Hamayan (2000) stress that as students learn a L2, their growing knowledge of another culture "can lead to greater intercultural understanding and tolerance and, even appreciation and respect" (p. 5). Thus, bilingual schools benefit not only the minority students who are trying to learn English, but also the native English speakers who get to learn a L2. Both sets of students gain greater cultural awareness and achieve the same proficiency in English as students attending all-English schools.

The latter idea was also supported in an article by **May (2008)**, namely that all-English schools, or subtractive programs (where the school's goal is for students to use and learn only English) are not as effective as bilingual education. Students in subtractive programs "performed far less well than their peers in strong bilingual programs" (p. 29). That is, they performed less well in learning English, Reading, and Mathematics (May, 2008). Aside from their performance, however, many more students in subtractive programs end up dropping out of school compared to their peers in additive, or bilingual

programs. May (2008) concedes that many misunderstandings concerning bilingual education remain, but demonstrates that the research shows that bilingual education is far more beneficial than the all-English approach.

While reading an article by **Swain and Lapkin (2005)**, I learned about another benefit of bilingual education. Maintaining and developing minority students' L1 literacy skills actually improves their L2 performance. Many believed that if minority students were to learn English well, then they needed to focus ONLY on learning English. Swain and Lapkin (2005), however, show that taking away opportunities to develop students' L1 can actually harm the development of their L2.

It can be challenging to support students' L1s, especially if there are multiple L1s within one classroom. Swain and Lapkin (2005) suggest several strategies for teachers to help support students' L1s. Teachers can plan projects for students that allow them to talk about their native cultures. It can be beneficial for students to use their L1 to get ready to speak in the L2. Swain and Lapkin (2005) also recommend that teachers find bilingual books for students to read and that they should allow students to write in their L1. Even though this article was focused more on young minority students who are still developing their L1, it was interesting for me to think about preserving the L1 in regard to my ESL students. Even though most of my students are adults who have finished school or even college in their L1, I realize that it is still important for them to avoid attrition of their L1s. It seems that most of my students still read and speak their L1s the majority of the time, but I found this article interesting simply due to the fact that I did not realize that maintaining the L1 had such a significant effect on learning a L2.

In the next article I read, **Genesee (2008)** claims that not allowing students to develop their L1 can harm their ability to learn a L2. This has to do with the transfer of skills that occurs between languages. L1 development can boost L2 development because knowledge or skills gained in one language can transfer to the other language. As I read this article, I liked how Genesee (2008) described the different types of bilingual education. Using both languages as mediums for instruction was evident in the types of models of bilingual education discussed. The first model was that of one-way immersion. Even though most of the students in this model are usually native speakers of the majority language, instruction is still given in the L1 and L2 (usually 50% of the time in each language). The second model, two-way immersion, is a better setting for learning a L2 as half of the students represent each language group. Instruction occurs in both languages but the student body consists of native speakers of both the L1 and the L2. Even though this described situation is ideal, it is not always possible to have a sufficiently large population of minority students in one school program.

Following the example of two-way programs, I would like to help my ESL students interact more with native English speakers. I want to set up some kind of tutoring program where native English speakers volunteer to get together with my students several times throughout the semester. It is not possible for me to have a 50/50 model inside of my classroom, but I think I can do more to promote my students' interaction with native English speakers outside of class, as they often tend to socialize only with those of similar nationalities outside of class. I believe that social interaction in English would promote language learning and cultural awareness for my students.

I was pleased to learn of programs that stress the importance of learning a L2 and using native speakers of both languages to do so. As **Christian (2011)** points out however, it is not sufficient to just have the students speak with native speakers to learn the language. Teachers have an important responsibility to plan activities that will promote language learning. In these activities, it is vital to teach students helpful language learning strategies. When Christian (2011) talks about teaching language strategies, the focus is on teaching the native L2 speakers strategies that will help the non-native speakers better pick up the L2 as the native and non-native speakers interact together. Even though I do not have native English-speaking students in my ESL classes, I realize that I can teach my students helpful learning strategies through the tasks that I design.

I have found that as the semester progresses, I often begin to look for shortcuts to planning easier lessons. Often, instead of thinking about the strategies I would like students to learn, or the conversation goal I want them to achieve, I just plan lessons that will give students a chance to talk in small groups. Christian (2011) points out that, "simply having the opportunity to work in small groups with native speakers will not necessarily benefit language development" (p. 15). I think that just giving non-native speakers the chance to talk together in groups will not necessarily promote language development either. This article helped me realize how much more focused I can be in my lesson planning to make sure that each activity is teaching language learning strategies to my students and helping them reach specific language goals.

In addition to planning specific activities for each day, I learned about planning thematic units as I read **Hamayan (2013)**. Not only should teachers plan specific goals

for each day of class, but they should plan language goals for the entire unit of study. In my own class, I have tried picking themes of study for different sections of my class. I struggled to identify the language skills that I wanted the class to gain throughout the unit, as I often found myself solely focused on the skills I would want them to gain day by day. This is a weakness that I want to work on. In planning my class ahead of time, I want to focus more on planning units that have specific language and communicative goals.

Hamayan (2013) also talks about the importance of using a variety of materials to plan the specific units of study. All students have different learning styles and preferences. Thus, it is important to use a variety of materials throughout the units to meet as many of the students' different learning styles as possible. This can be done as teachers vary the types of activities they use in the classroom and integrate technology to meet the communicative goals for the unit.

After reading this article, I realized that I am not always good at varying the types of activities that I use in the classroom. Along with planning units more thoughtfully, I want to plan different types of activities. I have tried to vary the activities and tools I use, by doing group and individual projects and presentations, and by using videos, powerpoints, etc., but I want to focus on varying the outcomes and assessments of the projects. I often just have students read or watch their individual part and then share what they learned with a partner, but I want to be able to view students' outcomes so that I can assess what they have accomplished at the end of each lesson. This is an area of lesson planning I can definitely work on improving.

Another aspect of planning that Hamayan (2013) mentions is choosing cultural objectives for each unit. I focused more on culture in my lesson plans than anything else, but after reading **Hamayan, Genesee, & Cloud (2013)**, I better understood how important it is to include cultural learning in the classroom. Hamayan et al. (2013) stress that bilingual education will allow students to experience and get to know another culture. Students can come to understand and appreciate other cultures as they are exposed to alternate ways of life through traditions, holidays, food, and language. This is important because not only knowing a language, but also having the ability to understand a different culture will open many doors to bilingual students in the future. Bilingualism also "gives students a head start in language requirements for college" (Hamayan et al., 2013, p. 46), and increases their future job opportunities.

According to **Lindholm-Leary (2000)**, due to the globalization taking place in the world, more companies will be looking for employees who are bilingual, and bilingual education has the potential to prepare students to meet future global needs. She records that even the United States government has recognized the benefits of studying a L2, and a National Assessment Governing Board has even created a framework for students in order to "assess communicative ability through authentic communication tasks required in daily life, school, and work" (p. 7).

Lindholm-Leary (2000) reports that businesses are also noticing the need for more foreign language study in U.S. schools, and that U.S. students are far below the rest of the world when it comes to knowledge of diversity and proficiency in languages other than English. Businesses are realizing that the education system is not preparing U.S. students to work in a diverse global economy because students are offered little to no chance to

interact and work with groups of people who differ from them in language or culture. This isolation will harm students' future abilities to contribute when working with members of a diverse team because they have not learned to respect and work with people who are different from themselves.

After reading these fears of businesses, I have been impressed with how well DLI prepares students to contribute in the globalized world in which we live. Dual language immersion will give students the chance to learn new cultural ways while also helping them gain an appreciation for other cultures in general as they are exposed to differing traditions and beliefs in the cultures connected with the language they are studying. Students will also learn the core curriculum in their L1 and L2 (Lindholm-Leary, 2000), which will prepare them to be in academically rigorous professions in either of their two languages.

Due to the belief that immersion programs will prepare students for the globalized work force in which they will work, **Roberts and Wade (2012)** have found that parents and legislators support the benefits and structure of immersion programs. Looking to the future, Roberts and Wade (2012) believe "it will not be long until our goal will be to eradicate monolingualism, since it leaves our students under-skilled and unrehearsed to star on the stage of a global marketplace where language skills and cultural competence have taken the lead roles" (p. 12).

I found this quote especially interesting because I think that it applies to my goals as an ESL instructor. The students in my class are there to learn a second or maybe a third language, and my goal in helping them to learn English is so that they are competent in the English language and adept at cross-cultural interaction so that they can star on the

global stage on which they want to work. Many of them have come to the U.S. with a desire to further their education, find a new job, gain work experience, or learn English in order to return and work in their home country in a professional context that requires them to speak English. By learning to communicate and collaborate in English, they will be better competitors in the global market.

In studying about bilingual education, I have learned a lot of lessons that will help me to be a better ESL teacher. I want to encourage my students to have more interactions with native English speakers outside of class, as this will give them more opportunities to practice speaking and understanding the English language and new cultural ways. Learning more about unit lesson planning was also helpful for me, as I now want to focus on developing themed units that contain language and cultural goals that will build on each other throughout the entire unit. Through this review of literature about bilingual education, I have learned about some of the benefits of bilingual education, namely those related to enhanced job opportunities for bilingual individuals. After understanding more about these benefits and the bilingual education model as a whole, I hope to implement these teaching ideas into my own ESL class so that my students can reap the same benefits that are afforded to DLI students.

Effects of Corrective Feedback on Language Acquisition

During my time in the MSLT program, I have learned much about the communicative approach to language teaching. As such, I have focused lessons for my class around communication, but I have been unsure how to handle situations when they make grammatical errors or speak incorrectly. Not wanting to embarrass them in front of the class, I have mostly just ignored their errors unless I cannot understand the point they are trying to get across. I realized, however, that feedback was something that students wanted. My students have asked for feedback in their reading pronunciation, and they complain that they do not get enough feedback on their oral communication in class. These requests from my students, along with an article I read about corrective feedback (CF), intrigued me to find out what type of CF was the most beneficial for language acquisition and what I should consider when deciding to give feedback. This led me on a journey of research with my classmate Haitao Zhao to learn about which types of CF are the most beneficial so that I would know which types I should use with my students. We initially carried out this research together, but I have since revised this Annotated Bibliography on my own.

In first beginning my research about CF, I needed to learn what CF is. As defined by **Lyster and Ranta (1997)**, corrective feedback is the response given to the learner after they have made an incorrect statement. After Lyster and Ranta (1997) reviewed previous studies about error correction, they noted that research had been lacking in this area and determined to perform their own study to find out what types of CF are used by teachers and which is the most effective for language acquisition.

Following observations of several language classes, Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified six types of CF that were utilized by teachers. They include: explicit correction; recasts; clarification requests; metalinguistic feedback; elicitation; and repetition. I had never even realized that there were so many different ways that teachers respond to their students' incorrect utterances. In recording data, Lyster and Ranta (1997) kept track of incorrect utterances made by the students and then their uptake following the CF. Uptake "refers to a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance" (p. 49). When the utterance contained a corrected response, it was referred to as a repair. Looking at the results, "recasts accounted for the largest number of repairs [...] but [...] (when) calculated as a ratio, only a small percentage of recasts (18%) led to repair, and all of these repairs involved repetition of the teacher's recasts" (p. 57). The most successful form of feedback for encouraging uptake was elicitation. This type of feedback led to uptake 100% of the time, with 46% of the responses to elicitation containing repair. The percentage of highest repair was closely followed by metalinguistic feedback, following with 45% of uptakes containing repair.

In looking at the results of Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, I realized that elicitation is the most effective feedback to not only encourage uptake but also repair. I also learned that even though recasts are the *least* effective type of feedback, they are the most commonly used. It was surprising to me that recasts were most commonly used when, according to Lyster and Ranta, teachers' goals are often for students to self-correct their own errors. It seemed logical to me that teachers would want their students to be

able to self-correct, but sad that they most often used recasts (which require no self-correction from students) and only a small number of elicitations (which were the most effective form of feedback for student self-correction).

As I moved on to look at more research about feedback, I noticed that most researchers split the 6 original types of CF recorded by Lyster and Ranta (1997) into 2 overarching categories, namely prompts and recasts. Prompts (which most often include metalinguistic feedback, repetition, elicitation, and clarification requests) attempt to point out the error in an implicit manner, which gives learners the chance to notice that an error has been made and try to self-correct it. On the other hand, recasts are the reformulation of the student's incorrect utterance into a corrected utterance by the teacher. This type of CF eliminates the chance for students to self-correct.

In a study conducted by **Choi and Li (2012)**, I found similar results for student uptake as those recorded by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Choi and Li's (2012) study investigated the rate of CF and uptake in child ESOL classes. Six ESOL classes in a New Zealand primary school were observed to explore the relationship between errors, feedback, and uptake. The results show that during eight hours of classroom instruction, 27 lexical errors occurred. Twenty-five of these errors were corrected by the teacher, who used 40% recasts, 28% explicit correction, and 32% prompts when providing corrective feedback. The teacher used 12% of the prompts when correcting grammatical errors and 11% for phonological errors.

The results of Choi and Li's (2012) study show that the teacher used more prompts for lexical errors than for other errors. In addition, the results show that 64% of lexical feedback led to uptake and 44% of that uptake resulted in repair. An important

finding of this study is that elicitation and clarification requests resulted in 100% uptake, compared to 80% uptake for explicit correction and 59% for recasts. I found that this study also supported the idea that prompts are more useful in eliciting student uptake.

Even though prompts are better for initiating student uptake, teachers face constraints that may limit their use of prompts. **Yoshida (2008)** acknowledges the challenges imposed by limited class time. In this study, teacher and student classroom discourse was audio-recorded. This discourse included the private speech between the two teachers and between seven learners in three different classrooms. The audio recordings were analyzed by the author, who focused on five error types that triggered teacher CF: lexical errors; morphosyntactic errors; phonological errors; semantic errors; and reading errors. Looking at the results, lexical errors occurred seven times and constituted 9% of the total errors. When lexical errors appeared, the teachers were inclined to use recasts due to the limitation of class time and their desire to not intimidate the students. However, recasts did not seem to help learners notice the need for repair. Prompts on the other hand, such as metalinguistic feedback and elicitation, allowed the learners to self-correct. Although teachers may prefer to use recasts in the classroom due to limited class time, they are not as effective as prompts.

I could easily relate to the dilemma mentioned in Yoshida's (2008) paper. It seems easier to me to use recasts than prompts in my class. When I use recasts, I believe I am not intimidating my students and I do not take any extra class time as I rephrase the incorrect utterance to make it accurate and move on with my lesson. As I have thought about my attitude about recasts, I have realized that I am not focusing as much on the students' learning as I am on getting through my lesson material. I think that this will be a

constant dilemma for me, fighting against the clock while trying to encourage self-correction through prompts. From the research I have covered so far, using prompts will be worth the extra time spent in class if it helps to elicit self-correction.

After reading an article by **Dilans (2010)**, I was even more motivated to use prompts in my classroom because of their effect on students' vocabulary acquisition. Dilans (2010) investigated the effects of CF (prompts and recasts) on the development of second language vocabulary. The study employed a pre-test, post-test, and post-test-delayed design. Twenty-three university-level ESL learners were divided into three groups. Each of these intermediate classes received a different type of corrective feedback: prompts, recasts, and the third group served as the control group.

Each course met twice a week for 90 minutes and was focused on developing students' comprehension and improving students' speaking and listening skills. The results show that the output-oriented prompts did not lead to a greater short-term (post-test) increase, but the oral output-oriented prompts showed a greater long-term (delayed post-test) increase in L2 vocabulary development than did input-oriented recasts and control. The results also indicate that the prompts and recasts groups performed equally well in short-term L2 acquisition, but the prompts group performed better in the long-term. The prompts group was the only one that significantly progressed in all dimensions of L2 vocabulary development, whereas the recasts group did not achieve significant increase in the long-term. The results of this study support the notion that prompts are more effective for vocabulary development and I was especially impressed with their effects on long-term acquisition of grammar. If I am to promote long-term acquisition, I will need to utilize prompts in my classroom.

According to **Carpenter, Sachs, Martin, Schmidt, & Looft (2012)**, however, the use of prompts is not all that is needed to promote long-term acquisition. Students need to receive immediate CF. In Carpenter et al.'s (2012) study, eighty undergraduate students from introductory German courses at Iowa State University participated in the research project. Twenty of them were randomly assigned to learn new words through a) inferring + English feedback, b) inferring + German feedback, and c) inferring + no feedback. A simplified version of a German children's book was used as reading material. The book had approximately 600 words, 16 of which, according to the pretest, were unfamiliar to the students. The results show that for those who received feedback immediately after the pretest, errors were seldom repeated on the delayed test. On the other hand, the majority of participants in the no-feedback group repeated errors that they had previously made. The results further demonstrated that the likelihood of students correcting errors depended on the type of feedback that was provided, and stressed the importance of immediately giving feedback after a mistake has been made. Giving immediate feedback will decrease the number of mistakes made in the future.

In trying to give my students immediate feedback, I find that it is still difficult to always use a prompting type of feedback. An article by **Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam (2006)** encouraged me to continue giving feedback immediately though, even if it is not in the form of prompts. Ellis et al., (2006) discuss a study used to test the effectiveness of two types of corrective feedback with an emphasis on learning the past tense *-ed* structure. The two types of feedback used were explicit error correction and implicit error correction. Explicit error correction utilized metalinguistic information, while implicit error correction was used in the form of recasts. Three groups of students were used to

carry out the study. One group received only explicit error correction, another only implicit correction, and the third group (acting as a control on the study) did not receive any type of error correction. To test the effectiveness of each type of error correction, three tests were administered to the students. Students received a pretest before any type of instruction, then a posttest 1 day after instruction, and finally, a delayed posttest 2 weeks after instruction. A statistically significant difference was found between the results of the control group and the implicit group. Statistically significant differences were also found between the explicit and implicit group. These results support the idea that explicit error correction (prompting CF) is more effective than implicit (recasts) correction, but implicit correction is better than no correction.

Even though I have not done well at giving prompting CF in my class, this article gave me some hope that at least giving recasts was better than giving no CF. Another study by **Yang and Lyster (2010)** supported these same findings and gave me even greater resolve to use prompts in my class. In this study, three classes of Chinese EFL learners were used. The study focused on the effects of two overarching types of corrective feedback and their impact on the number of student repairs for the past tense.

Each class received a different type of feedback. One class received only recasts, and student repair was neither discouraged nor encouraged. The second class received only prompts. Prompting feedback consisted of metalinguistic clues, repetition, clarification requests, and elicitation. In the third class (the control group), all past tense errors were ignored, and the teacher focused only on the meaning of student interactions. Similar to the previous study, students received several tests to measure their accuracy in using the past tense. The first was administered before the treatment, with the second

given immediately following the treatment, and the third was administered 2 weeks following the treatment. The results showed that the number of errors made in each class were relatively consistent. However, there were 25 out of 27 repairs following the prompts in the first class compared to 1 repair in the second class and no repairs in the third class. From this study, it is concluded that prompts are more effective for language learning in the classroom, not only in the short term, but also in the long term (Yang & Lyster, 2010).

Along with learning about the effectiveness of prompts, I was also interested to know if preferences of CF played a significant role in which type of CF was most effective. **Lee (2013)** investigated types of CF and learner repair in advanced-level adult ESL classrooms, especially in regard to teacher and student practices and preferences regarding feedback. Sixty advanced-level students who enrolled in the ESL Spoken English program at a public university participated in the study. The participants came from diverse countries and were all doctoral students who planned to teach college courses in their respective fields. The results indicated that teachers in this class utilized recasts most frequently, at a rate of 48.94%. Other types of feedback were used as follows: explicit feedback (38.38%), clarification requests (11.27%), repetition (1.06%), and elicitation (0.35%). The teachers did not use metalinguistic feedback at all. Post-feedback student repair occurred 100% of the time after elicitation and repetition, but the frequency at which these types of correction were used was much lower than other types of CF. Meanwhile, recasts resulted in 92.09% repair, clarification requests led to 90.63%, and explicit corrections brought about 85.32%. Furthermore, the study shows that the sixty students strongly preferred that their teachers correct all of their errors. Thus, this

may be the reason that recasts resulted in high repair, while most other studies indicate

that recasts usually promote low student repair. This study is important in showing that

CF can be helpful in L2 learning, especially if the students are motivated to be corrected,

because high learning motivation leads to high repair.

Following this article by Lee (2013), I read another article discussing students'

preferences for CF. **Lyster, Saito, and Sato (2013)** cover up-to-date research about

corrective feedback and students' preferences concerning feedback. Students'

background, culture, language level, and learning styles all play an important role in

students' desires for, and responses to feedback. Due to these variables, the researchers

conclude that teachers need to take advantage of a variety of CF because, as pointed out

by Ammar and Spada (2006), "one size does not fit all" (p. 566). The authors predict that

students are more likely to benefit from feedback that encourages self-repair, but they

also conclude that recasts can be beneficial when shortened and stressed to draw

students' attention to the error. This article was helpful for me in the application of what I

learned through my research about CF because it acknowledges the reality of learner

preferences and classroom dynamics. It supports the idea that different students,

classrooms, and instructional contexts benefit from a variety of feedback styles.

I think that this is important to keep in mind. Even though it seems like prompts

are overwhelmingly the CF of choice for L2 acquisition, I must keep in mind that all

students are different and their preferences and motivation may affect which types of CF

are most helpful for them. In the future, I hope to integrate more prompts into my

classroom to encourage students' self-correction, but I also realize that it is important for

me to include some of the other types of CF in my teaching. In doing this I want to be

attentive to the specific needs of my individual students with the aim to meet their needs

for CF that will best benefit their L2 learning.

LOOKING FORWARD

I have learned so much during my time in the MSLT program. One of the highlights of the program was the chance that I had to teach an audit-only class in the IELI department. This opportunity gave me real teaching experience in an ESL classroom. Due to this experience, I want to continue finding opportunities to teach ESL. I am not positive about what type of institution I will teach at, but I can see myself teaching in the community in which I live, or finding a position at a local university (similar to the IELI department at Utah State University).

No matter where I end up, and how much teaching I do, I am grateful for the opportunity I had to study in this program. Even if I do not teach at a formal institution for a while, the MSLT program has given me the drive to continue learning, researching, and teaching, even if in informal ways.

REFERENCES

Al-Gahtani, S., & Roever, C. (2012). Proficiency and sequential organization of L2 requests. *Applied Linguistics, 33*, 42–65. doi: 10.1093/applin/amr031

Alcón, E. (2007). Incidental focus on form, noticing and vocabulary learning in the EFL classroom. *International Journal of English Studies*, *7*(2), 41–60.

Amaya, L. (2008). Teaching culture: Is it possible to avoid pragmatic failure? *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 21*, 11–24.

American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2013). NCSSFL-ACTFL can-do statements: Progress indicators of language learners. Alexandria, VA: ACTFL.

Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all?: Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *28*(04), 543–574. doi: 10.1017/S0272263106060268

Ballman, T., Gasparro, J., & Mandell, P. (2001). *The communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle/Thomson Learning.

Beltrán, E. (2014). Length of stay abroad: Effects of time on the speech act of requesting. *International Journal of English Studies, 14*(1), 79–96.

Bialystok, E. (2011). Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *65*(4), 229–235. doi: 10.1037/a0025406

Bialystok, E., Craik, F., Green, D., & Gollan, T. (2009). Bilingual minds. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *10*, 89–129. doi: 10.1177/1529100610387084

Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy,* (2nd ed.) White Plains, NY: Longman.

Brown, H. (2007). First language acquisition. In *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.) (chap. 2). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.

Bu, J. & Gruangsha, Z. (2012). A study of the effects of explicit and implicit teachings on developing Chinese EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *International Journal of Language Studies*, *6*(3), 57–80.

Canard, J. (2007). *Relationship between levels of literacy in Spanish (L1) and English (L2) of adult students in ESL programs* (Doctoral dissertation, UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS).

Carpenter, S., Sachs, R., Martin, B., Schmidt, K., & Looft, R. (2012). Learning new vocabulary in German: The effects of inferring word meanings, type of feedback, and time of test. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, *19*(1), 81–86. doi: 10.3758/s13423-011-0185-7

Case, K., Bartsch, R., McEnery, L., Hall, S., Hermann, A., & Foster, D. (2008). Establishing a comfortable classroom from day one: Student perceptions of the reciprocal interview. *College Teaching, 56*, 210–214. doi: 10.3200/CTCH.56.4.210-214

Choi, S., & Li, S. (2012). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in a child ESOL classroom. *RELC Journal*, *43*(3), 331–351. doi: 10.1177/0033688212463274

Christian, D. (2011). Dual language education. In E. Hinkel (Ed.) (2011) *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Vol. II. New York: Routledge.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). Introduction. In *Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education* (pp. 1-7). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, *2*(1), 1–20.

Connelly, F., & Clandinin, D. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(4), 2–14.

Crawford, J. (2003). *Hard sell: Why is bilingual education so unpopular with the American public?* Tempe, AZ: Language Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University.

Cummins, J. (1983). Bilingualism and special education: Programs and pedagogical issues. *Learning Disability Quarterly* 6(4), 373–386.

Dilans, G. (2010). Corrective feedback and L2 vocabulary development: Prompts and recasts in the adult ESL classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, *66*(6), 787–816. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.66.6.787

Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical

structures. In Mackey, A. (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339–360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 221-246. doi: 10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*(2), 339–368. doi: 10.10170S0272263106060141

Escamilla, K., Hopewell, S., Butvilofsky, S., Sparrow, W., Soltero-González, L., Ruiz-Figueroa, O. & Escamilla, M. (2013). *Biliteracy from the Start: Literacy Squared in Action*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. (2007). Pragmatic development in the Spanish as a FL classroom: A cross-sectional study of learner requests. *Intercultural Pragmatics, 4*, 253–286. doi: 10.1515/IP.2007.013

Folse, K. (2006). *The art of teaching speaking: Research and pedagogy for the ESL/EFL classroom*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Fordyce, K. (2013). The differential effects of explicit and implicit instruction on EFL Learners' use of epistemic stance. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(1), 6–28. doi: 10.1093/applin/ams076

Fortune, T. (2012). "What the Research Says about Immersion". In *Chinese Language Learning in the Early Grades: A handbook of resources and best practices for Mandarin Immersion*, ed. Vivien Stewart, (pp. 9–13). Asia Society, Partnership for global learning.

Fortune, T., & Menke, M. (2010). Struggling Learners and language immersion education. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota. (CARLA).

Fortune, T., & Tedick, D. (2008). One-way, two-way and indigenous immersion: A call for cross-fertilization. In Fortune T.W. & Tedick, D. J. (Eds.) (2008). *Pathways to Multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education*. (Chapter 1). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Freire, P. (2005). *Teachers as cultural workers*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Garrett, N. (2006). What does it take to learn a language well? In E. M. Rickerson & B. Hilton (Eds.) (2006.) *The Five-Minute Linguist* (chap. 30). Oakville, CT: Equinox.

Geisler, M., Kramsch, C., McGinnis, S., Patrikis, P., Pratt, M., Ryding, K., & Saussy, H. (2007). Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World: MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. *Profession*, 234–245.

Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune and D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Glaser, K. (2013). The neglected combination: A case for explicit-inductive instruction in teaching pragmatics in ESL. *TESL Canada Journal, 30*(7), 150–163.

Glass, M. (2014). Teaching strategies to get the tone right: Making requests and gaining compliance. *TESL Canada Journal*, *30*(7), 125–134.

Goh, C., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. In M.A. Snow & D.M. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content* (pp. 5–21). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Haarmann, H. (2006). How does the brain cope with multiple languages?. In Rickerson, E. M., & Hilton, B. (Eds.). (2006). *The 5 minute linguist: Bite-sized essays on language and languages*. (Chapter 15). Oakville, CT: Equinox Pub.

Haight, C., Herron, C., & Cole, S. (2007). The effects of deductive and guided inductive instructional approaches on the learning of grammar in the elementary foreign language college classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 40*(2), 288–310. doi: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.2007.tb03202.x

Hamayan (2013). Teaching Academic Content. (Chap. 4). In *Dual language instruction from A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). *Dual language instruction from A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Hamayan, E., Genesee, F., & Cloud, N. (2013). The First Steps: Planning a Dual Language Program. (Chapter 2). In *Dual language instruction from A to Z: Practical guidance for teachers and administrators*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International*

Journal of Educational Research, *37*, 255–270. doi: 10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00004-1

Henriksen, B. (1999). Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 303–317. doi:10.1017/S0272263199002089

Henriksen, B. (2008). Declarative lexical knowledge. In Albrechtsen, D., Haastrup, K. & Henriksen, B. (Eds.), *Vocabulary and writing in a first and second language: Processes and development* (pp. 22–66). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hermann, A., Foster, D., & Hardin, E. (2010). Does the first week of class matter? A quasi-experimental investigation of student satisfaction. *Teaching of Psychology, 37*, 79–84. doi: 10.1080/00986281003609314

Hinkel, E. (2013). Culture and pragmatics in language teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & M. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.) (pp. 394–408). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Hinkel, E. (Ed.) (2011). *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Vol 2. New York: Routledge.

Hooks, B. (2010) *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. NY: Routledge.

Hsueh-Chao, M., & Nation, P. (2000). Unknown vocabulary density and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *13*(1), 403–30.

Isurin, L. (2007). Teachers' language: L1 attrition in Russian-English bilinguals. *Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 357–371. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00585.x

Kennedy, S. (2010). Corrective feedback for learners of varied proficiency levels: A teacher's choices. *TESL CANADA Journal*, *27*(2), 31–50.

Kenner, C. (2003). Biliteracy benefits. *Literacy Today, (37)*, 21.

Kim, J. (1995). "Could you calm down more?" Requests and Korean ESL learners. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 11*(2), 67–82.

Laufer, B. (2005). Lexical frequency profiles: From Monte Carlo to the real world: A response to Meara (2005). *Applied Linguistics*, *26*(4), 582–588. doi: 10.1093/applin/ami029

Lazaruk, W. (2007). Linguistic, academic, and cognitive benefits of French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*, 605–28. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.63.5.605

Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL

students. *System*, *41*(2), 217–230. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022

Lee, J., & Jeong, E. (2013). Korean–English dual language immersion: Perspectives of students, parents and teachers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 26*, 89–107. doi: 10.1080/07908318.2013.765890

Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Lightbown, P., Spada, N., Ranta, L., & Rand, J. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lindholm-Leary, K. (2000). *Biliteracy for a global society: An idea book on dual language education*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. http://www.ncela.us/files/rcd/BE021333/Biliteracy_for_a_Global_Society.pdf

Littlewood, W. (2011). Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept for a changing world. In E. Hinkel (Ed.).*Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2) (pp. 541–557). Florence, KY: Routledge.

LoCastro, V. (2012) *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Louw, K., Derwing, T., & Abbott, M. (2010). Teaching pragmatics to L2 learners for the workplace: The job interview. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66*(5), 739–758. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.66.5.739

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *26*(03), 399–432.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37–66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 265–302. doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990520

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, *46*, 1–40. doi: 10.1017/S0261444812000365

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

McLaren, P. (2007). Class & reproduction of class. In *McLaren's Life in School: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Met, M. (2008). Paying attention to language: Literacy, language and academic achievement. In T.W. Fortune & D.J. Tedick (Eds.) (2008). *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 49–70). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Meyer, M. (2008). Indigenous and authentic: Hawaiian epistemology and the triangulation of meaning. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 217–232). Los Angeles: Sage.

Montanari, S. (2014). A case study of bi-literacy development among children enrolled in an Italian–English dual language program in Southern California. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*, 509–525. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2013.833892

Nation, I. (2006). How large a vocabulary is needed for reading and listening? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *63*(1), 59–82. doi: 10.3138/cmlr.63.1.59

Nation, I., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking*. New York, NY: Routledge.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1999). *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.

Nguyen, T., Pham, T. & Pham, M. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics, 44*(4), 416–434. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.01.003

Ortega, L. (2009). Introduction. In *Understanding second language acquisition* (pp. 1–11). New York, NY: Routledge.

Parkes, J., & Ruth, T. (2011). How satisfied are parents of students in dual language education programs? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14*(6), 701–718. doi: 10.1080/13670050.2011.577762

Rassaei, E. (2013). Corrective feedback, learners' perceptions, and second language development. *System*, *41*(2), 472–483. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2013.05.002

Richards, J. (2006). Developing classroom speaking activities: From theory to practice. *Guidelines-Singapore-Periodical for Classroom Language Teachers Then: Magazine for Language Teachers, 28*(2), 3–9.

Roberts, G., & Wade, O. (2012). Utah's quest to mainstream dual language immersion for all students. In *Soleado: A Publication of Dual Language Education of New Mexico* (pp. 9–12). Fall 2012.

Rose, K. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System, 33*, 385–99.

Rott, S. (1999). The effect of exposure frequency on intermediate language learners' incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*(1), 589–619.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A metaanalysis of the research. In Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 133–164). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sederberg, K. (2013). Bringing the museum into the classroom, and the class into the museum: An approach for content-based instruction. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 46251-262. doi: 10.1111/tger.10144

Shrum, J., & Glisan, E. (2009). *Teacher's handbook* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, *33*, 1–24.

Soler, E. (2013). Pragmatic variation in british and international english language users' e-mail communication: A focus on requests. *RESLA, 26*, 25–44.

Stoller, F. (2008). Content-based instruction. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 4: Second and Foreign Language Education; pp. 59–70). New York, NY: Springer Science/Business Media.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving sociopolitical context of immersion

education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(2), 169–186.

Tatsuki, D. & Houck, N. (Eds.) (2010). *Pragmatics: Teaching speech acts*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Tsai, T. (2008). *Taiwanese educators' perspectives on the implementation of the new English education policy*. ProQuest.

Unger, M. (2001). Equalizing the status of both languages in a dual immersion school. *The ACIE Newsletter, 5*(1), 1, 2, 8, 12, 13.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. London: Routledge.

Webb, S. (2007). The effects of repetition on vocabulary knowledge. *Applied Linguistics, 28*(1), 46–65.

Yang, Y., & Lyster, R.(2010). Effects of form-focused practice and feedback on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular past tense forms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*, 235–263. doi: 10.1017/S0272263109990519

Yoon, B., & Kim, H. (Eds.). (2012). *Teachers' roles in second language learning: Classroom applications of sociocultural theory*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teacher's choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, *17(1)*, 78–93. doi: 10.2167/la429.0

APPENDIX

Sample ESL Lesson Plan

Friends

Goal: to describe their best friend to a classmate.

Objectives:
1. Students will list qualities and examples of a friend;
2. Students will collaborate with classmates to make a master list of qualities of a true friend;
3. Students will list the qualities of their best friend.

Warm-up Activity:
- Students will have a handout that lists hobbies. They will walk around to find students that have these hobbies. Then they will write the name down of the student next to the hobby that matches their interests.
- Have them all come back to the group and discuss which classmates they found that enjoyed certain activities.

Activity #1 (objective 1)
- Introduce the idea of qualities/characteristics. Give an example of some qualities (i.e. friendly, kind, athletic, energetic).
- Have students fill out a sheet listing the qualities they think are important to have in a friend.

Activity #2 (objective 1)
- Show a movie clip about true friends.
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JPwd4DbDp38 (watch from 0-33 sec., 40-1:04, 1:29-1:50, 2:09-2:20.
- Stop after each section and discuss which quality the speaker mentioned. Do they agree with the examples that he showed?
- While students watch, have them fill out a handout asking some questions about the clip. (Answers to the worksheet: a true friend is someone you can trust, someone who is willing to make sacrifices for you, and friends give each other moral support)
- The good examples were: telling him his pjs were ugly, telling him his haircut was great. The bad examples of a friend were: telling him his ugly pjs were fabulous.

Activity #3 (objective 2)
- In pairs, have students discuss what qualities were discussed in the video. Did they agree that these were good qualities for friends to have?
- Have them fill out a Venn diagram with the qualities that they both wrote down. They can add the ones from the video if they think those are important qualities also.
- If there is enough time, as a class, make a master list on the board of qualities they think are important in friends. This list should be taken mostly from the middle section of the Venn diagram so we can see what most people agree on for qualities of friends.

Activity #4 (objective 3 + goal)
- Have students write about their own best friend. Have them write down at least 3 qualities of their best friend.
- In pairs, have students share about their best friend. They can tell how they met, how long they've known each other, what qualities they have, what they like to do together etc.
- Give students about 1 minute each to share about their best friend. Then have them switch partners several times, so they have a chance to describe their best friend to several different people.
- If there is extra time, allow several to share with the class about their best friend.

Find someone who: Name:

Find someone who:	Name:
enjoys playing sports	
prefers to be outdoors more than inside.	
likes to cook.	
likes to read.	
enjoys photography. (taking pictures)	
likes to dance.	
enjoys cleaning.	

Video Questions

List 3 things the speaker said made a true friend?

-
-
-

Do you agree with the example of a bad friend? Was that what a bad friend would do in your culture?

Do you agree with the example of a good friend? Would a good friend tell you that in your culture?

<div align="center">Video Questions:
(Revised version for lower proficiency students)</div>

1.   Circle the sentences you hear the speaker say. What makes a true friend:

someone you can trust

isn't going to lie to your face

gives you money

makes sacrifices

give each other moral support

has similar interests

give each other complements

2.   What example did the speaker say was a good friend:

      your haircut looks just amazing

      your haircut is not very good

3.   Do you agree with the speaker's example of a good friend?

List of Possible Friend Qualities

nice	happy	good sense of humor
sympathetic	extrovert	similar interests
athletic	giving	a good listener
energetic	understanding	
funny	interesting	

Qualities of a Friend

-
-
-
-
-