

Spring 2018

# Increasing Target Language Input For L2 Students: Strategies For Success In Classroom-Based Language Acquisition

Katie Schmidt  
*Hamline University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse\\_cp](https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Schmidt, Katie, "Increasing Target Language Input For L2 Students: Strategies For Success In Classroom-Based Language Acquisition" (2018). *School of Education Student Capstone Projects*. 166.  
[https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse\\_cp/166](https://digitalcommons.hamline.edu/hse_cp/166)

This Capstone Project is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Education at DigitalCommons@Hamline. It has been accepted for inclusion in School of Education Student Capstone Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Hamline. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@hamline.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@hamline.edu), [lterveer01@hamline.edu](mailto:lterveer01@hamline.edu).

INCREASING TARGET LANGUAGE INPUT FOR L2 STUDENTS :  
STRATEGIES FOR SUCCESS IN CLASSROOM-BASED SECOND LANGUAGE  
ACQUISITION

by

Katie Schmidt

A capstone submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Art in Education

Hamline University

Saint Paul, Minnesota

May 2018

Capstone Project Facilitator: Susan Manikowski  
Content Expert: LeeAnne Godfrey

“Aprender un idioma es tener una ventana más desde la que observar el mundo.”  
-Proverbio chino

To my husband, for all the ways you supported me throughout this masters program.

Your love and understanding of my passion for education has made this possible. Thank  
you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Introduction.....	5
Fundamental Question.....	6
Rationale of the Study .....	6
Context of the Study.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	10
Conclusion.....	11

## CHAPTER TWO: Literature Review

Introduction.....	12
What is Language Input.....	13
Language Input Theory.....	13
Input and Interaction.....	16
Language Output.....	20
Output and Feedback.....	22
Input and Output Together.....	24
Input and Classroom Implications.....	27
Conclusion.....	30

## CHAPTER THREE: Capstone Project

Introduction.....	32
Project Description.....	32

Rationale.....	34
Setting.....	37
Participants.....	37
Timeline.....	38
Conclusion.....	38
CHAPTER 4: REFLECTION	
Purpose of the Project.....	39
Key Learnings.....	40
Summary of the Literature Review.....	41
Project Description.....	44
Project Implications.....	45
Project Limitations.....	46
Author’s Reflection and Future Research.....	47
Conclusion.....	48
References.....	49

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

In any new skill, activity, or hobby that we begin, the success we find is often dependent on the amount of time we put into mastering that given skill. If I wanted to be a world class gymnast who never spent a day in the gym, it would be impossible to realize my goal. With nearly everything in life, if we want to achieve mastery of a skill, it is imperative that we put the time and effort forth to reach our objective.

In Gabriel Wyner's (2014) book, *Fluent Forever*, he described the strategies he employed to make "language stick" and how he taught himself to become a polyglot, or person who knows and is able to use many languages. One of his most useful approaches was to constantly be surrounded by the language. For example, he would label his entire home with vocabulary of items in the target language. He was always exposed to the language he was learning. He was using it, thinking in it, and living it daily.

For seven years, I taught Spanish to secondary high school students in a small community in Minnesota. I saw the same group of students every day for ninety minutes. Many students took four years of Spanish in high school and by the time they graduated, their proficiency and ability were very impressive.

I was recently teaching Spanish in Australia where I saw my students once a week. The biggest difference I noticed between my American students and my Australian students was their ability to maintain and remember the language. Many of my Australian students had been studying Spanish since they were in kindergarten. However, by the

time they had reached me in ninth grade, they had very little memory and ability to use the language. I recognize that there are several factors which influence classroom-based language acquisition such as age, motivation, and learning style. However, the most prominent difference in the two contexts I described is the amount of input students received. Therefore, I am choosing to focus on input and how teachers can extend input beyond the classroom especially when there are challenges that restrict input. In order to extend input, I will be creating a curriculum project, based on the project-based learning framework, that requires and encourages students to interact with the language outside of the classroom.

My experience has led me to my research question, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students in classroom-based second language acquisition?* I am eager to study strategies and techniques that extend language input beyond the classroom. In this chapter, I provide a rationale and context for my research. I also explain the significance and its greater impact to all those involved with language acquisition.

### **Rationale of the Study**

I have been connected to language acquisition both as a student and as a teacher. I have been able to live and experience the characteristics of what contributes to mastery of the target language. Most of my interest for this research question has been influenced by time as a classroom teacher. I have been able to identify where students have deficits in their learning process. Due to my current work as a Spanish teacher where my contact

time with students is very limited, I am passionate about sharing strategies that may support people in my similar situation - both students and teachers.

Some of my concerns related to language acquisition have also led me to choose this topic. I believe that not enough time or preference is given to the teaching and learning of second languages in the average high school. Precedence is typically given to core subjects such as mathematics, science, and reading in both the United States and Australia, as those are the subjects required to graduate and also being tested at national levels. However, for second languages, it is common to only be a suggestion if a student's schedule allows for it. It also may be encouraged depending on what the students plans are after graduation. Given the importance that gets placed on other subjects, second languages tend to be the first areas cut or where contact time is reduced.

Through pursuing this topic, my goal is to explore the role of input in classroom - based second language acquisition. Then, to take the information and create useful and applicable curriculum for language teachers that may be facing similar challenges.

### **Context of the Study**

Languages have always fascinated me. When I was in ninth grade, I had my first opportunity to take a foreign language class. I quickly decided that Spanish would be the most practical and easy to learn. I never expected how drawn I would become, not only to Spanish, but to languages in general. Spanish came naturally to me and I loved learning more each year in high school. I continued to study, travel, and use my language through college. It was not only the language that drew me in, but the cultures and places that identified with Spanish. I felt immense pride when I was using my Spanish and was able

to communicate with local people without the use of translators and dictionaries. I take any opportunity to converse with Spanish speakers. I love the challenge that new conversations, unknown words, and new information brings.

During my studies at Hamline, I took a course on second language acquisition. The process in how language is learned, inspired new interests. Much of the inspiration for this project comes from the discussions we had in that course. We explored many characteristics of successful language learners. One of the areas we looked at was exposure and input and how it affects overall success in language acquisition. When I refer to input, I am referring to the exposure that students have to authentic language. This can come from a variety of sources, such as input from reading language or listening to language. Most often, in the classroom, language input comes from the teacher. Sources of input will be discussed further in chapter two.

I thought about the role of input and exposure in my own journey of language learning. Obviously, motivation is an impactful contributor which influences the amount of time spent learning something. Due to my interest, I spent significant time exposed to the language with input from a variety of sources which included written text (newspapers), media sources (television and movies in Spanish), and living abroad with a Chilean family. The role of exposure was paramount to achieving proficiency and confidence in the language.

As I think about my interest in this topic professionally, I use my most recent experiences teaching language, both distinctly different in how students are exposed to Spanish. When I taught in Minnesota, I saw my students for 90 minutes daily. Some of

them I saw for the entire year if they took Spanish I and Spanish II consecutively. I noticed that their retention was best when they took the courses one right after the other. Students who chose that path and started in ninth grade were finished with language by their junior year. Many of them would take the college level course again so that they could stay engaged with Spanish in hopes of continuing in university. By the time these students arrived at their senior year in their last year of Spanish, the entire class was conducted in the target language. Students were traveling in the summers to visit their host families in Spain. They created strong, emotional bonds to the language and the cultures that accompanied it. Because of the input from authentic speakers of Spanish, combined with the intrinsic motivations, students excelled to an incredible level of understanding.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, was my most recent teaching situation in Adelaide, South Australia. I saw students in seventh to tenth grade. Many of these students, depending on when they started attending the school, had been taking Spanish since they began their education. I saw my seventh and eighth grade students for 90 minutes a week. My ninth and tenth grade students I saw about 120 minutes a week. Most of them have one day of Spanish a week. In the Australian curriculum, only seven percent of their subject selection needs to be studying a language other than English. In other words, second language learning is not a large part of the Australian curriculum, which results in less class time and low exposure. Due to the lack of contact I had with my students, I found it incredibly difficult to build a foundation of skills when much of the time each week was spent reviewing concepts from the previous week. The other

contributor was the lack of motivation to learn a second language. I think due in part to Australia's location and lack of Spanish speakers, students found it difficult to connect and realize why it was important to study Spanish. However, I strongly believe that if students were interacting with and exposed to the language daily, I would see tremendous strides in their abilities.

### **Significance of the Study**

Through my research, I hope to explore input and how it contributes to classroom based second language acquisition (SLA). As I develop my understanding of the research and information pertinent to this topic, my goal is to create a curriculum that supports classrooms with limited exposure to the language they are studying. As I think about this question, I see its potential for outreach to more communities and groups than just high school students. In the 2014 TESOL (Teaching English as a Second Language) Conference, Knagg commented that “the number of English language learners worldwide is up to 1.5 billion” (2014). It seems that in recent years, the importance of being able to communicate in more than just your native language is being recognized by many. By exploring this characteristic of language exposure and developing ways to extend language input beyond the classroom, it can be useful to students in a classroom, teachers with limited access/resources, and adults teaching themselves. I am curious as I begin my literature review in chapter two to learn more about the research in this area. For example, what do we already know? Where are their gaps? What still needs to be developed?

The information that is found through conducting this research could also be significant to policyholders and those that create and decide curriculum choices. If there is enough evidence that shows a strong correlation between exposure time and achieving proficiency, the way in which courses are allocated and preference is given may change.

### **Conclusion**

The objective of this chapter was to explain my connection to this research question. My intention was to outline the rationale, context, and significance of this study. In this chapter, I sought to explain the foundation of my interest in this topic, why I believe it is important, and how it may impact teachers, students, policy holders, etc. In my research I hope to answer the question, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students?*

In chapter two, I look at the research that already exists surrounding this topic. I review the literature and determine how my topic fits into previous findings and developments. Chapter three describes my capstone project and chapter four describes my findings and results.

## CHAPTER TWO

### Literature Review

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study is to investigate the role that input has on language development in secondary students. The goal of exploring this is to better equip teachers in the foreign language classroom with strategies that will enhance classroom input, but also offer strategies to extend the input beyond the classroom. The question I will seek to answer is, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students?*

Language input has been closely studied since the early 1970s in an attempt to learn how people acquire language. Research has found that input from a variety of sources is necessary for language acquisition to occur. The studies that have been conducted in foreign language classrooms by Gass and Torres (2005), Lapkin and Swain (1998), and Philp and Tognini (2009) have demonstrated a need for more than just language input. There are multiple other factors that lead to language acquisition, which include, but are not limited to age, motivation, and learning styles. While I recognize the diversity of factors that impact language development, this literature review focuses on input and why it is important for acquisition to occur.

This literature review explains how language input is defined, the most prominent theories, the various sources of input, as well as how input looks in a foreign language classroom. It also focuses on what studies have been conducted in the classroom to understand how input affects student language output.

It is imperative that interaction and language output are also discussed as they provide opportunity to receive language input. The various factors that influence a learner's acquisition should shape how classroom practices are developed. This review focuses on the studies that have been conducted about language acquisition in a classroom setting and how the results impact my research question.

### **Language Input**

It is generally understood in the world of second language acquisition (SLA) that input from a variety of sources is necessary for language growth and development. There have been numerous studies that have explored key features related to input. The most notable studies have been conducted by Gass and Torres (2005) and Lapkin and Swain (1998). These include what source of input is most effective for second language students and whether input alone can lead to acquisition. As stated by Gass (2013), "The concept of input is perhaps the single most important concept of second language acquisition. It is trivial to point out that no individual can learn a second language without input of some sort (p. 11). Simply stated, input refers to any exposure to the target language. The source of input can take several forms, such as from reading or listening to language. Often, most input that students receive is produced by the teacher.

### **Language Input Theory**

Krashen, a key researcher in the field of SLA, described his theory, known as the Input Hypothesis (IH). "The Input Hypothesis (IH) assumes that we acquire language by understanding messages. More precisely, comprehensible input is the essential environmental ingredient - a richly specified internal language acquisition device also

makes a significant contribution to language acquisition” (Krashen, 1989, p. 440).

Krashen believed that language is acquired rather than learned and that language acquisition should occur naturally, rather than be taught. “Language is subconsciously acquired - while you are acquiring, you don’t know you are acquiring; your conscious focus is on the message, not on the form” (Krashen, 1989, p. 440). Due to the belief that language is subconsciously acquired, Krashen believed that language focus should be on the meaning instead of the grammatical form.

An important pillar of Krashen’s theory is his idea of comprehensible input.

Comprehensible input is the belief that what students are receiving should be able to be understood. If the input is not understood by the learners than it will not be acquired or remembered. Krashen also stated that “when communication is successful, when the input is understood and there is enough of it,  $i+1$  will be provided automatically” (as cited in Payne, 2011, p. 420). “ $i+1$ ” is providing the learner with input that is just above their level. The assumption is the learner has enough language from context that they will be able to reach the next level or stage of language acquisition.

The Input Hypothesis (IH) predicted that more aural and written input will result in language acquisition. This claim is also supported by Chomsky’s Universal Grammar Hypothesis, which argued that learning language is an innate process (White, 1989, p.2). Krashen referenced a study conducted by Saragi, Nation, and Mesiter that shared supporting evidence for the IH. Adult learners were asked to read the novel, *A Clockwork Orange*. The novel contained words that were Russian-based slang known as *nadsat*. The learners were given a copy of the book without the Russian dictionary at the back. In the

study, learners were told they would be given a comprehension test, but were not told anything related to memorization of the *nadsat* words. Once finished reading the book, the learners were given a multiple choice test that covered 90 of the *nadsat* words (Krashen, 1989, p. 446).

Results showed that considerable vocabulary acquisition had taken place. Scores ranged from fifty to ninety-six percent correct, with an average of seventy-six percent. Subjects had picked up at least forty-five words simply by reading a novel! Saragi also observed some relationship between frequency of occurrence and acquisition, noting that words that appeared less than ten times were typically not consistently acquired. (Krashen, 1989, p. 446)

One of the factors of input that this study is supporting is the idea of an “input flood”. “Input flood, which consists of providing learners with lots of instances of a particular target structure in oral or written form, thereby, saturating the input with the form to be acquired” (White, 2015, p. 267). In the case of the Clockwork Orange study, students were more likely to remember the words that occurred most often, also known as *salience* in SLA.

The Input Hypothesis from Krashen does not come without its criticisms and competing theories. Two of the theories that rival with the IH are the Skill Building Hypothesis (SBH) and the Output Hypothesis (OH) by Swain. The SBH says that “we first learn rules consciously and then practice them in output until they become ‘automatic’: In other words, consciously learned knowledge becomes “acquired” knowledge” (Krashen, 2011, p.1). The SBH believes that learning becomes acquisition.

The SBH would focus on learning vocabulary by introducing and learning words one at a time. It may also include breaking down each word and analyzing them further (Krashen, 1989, p. 440). The SBH is likely to be seen in most foreign language classrooms.

Typically, teachers present a grammatical rule and the students practice it.

Another widely recognized theory, which will be discussed later in the review, is the Output Hypothesis (OH). “The Output Hypothesis proposes that through producing language, either spoken or written, language acquisition/learning may occur” (Swain, 1985, p. 159). The OH argues that production of the language allows learners the opportunity for practice. The requirement to produce encourages learner to learner and learner to teacher interaction, which will require students to receive additional L2 input.

### **Input and Interaction**

Much of the research available on language input is coupled with language interaction. Swain (1998) hypothesized that language requires input from interaction. She argued that the learning takes place in the communicative interaction between learners. “Unlike the claim that comprehensible input leads to learning, we wish to suggest that what occurs in collaborative dialogues is learning. That is, learning does not happen outside performance; it occurs in performance” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 321). Swain tested her hypothesis in a study with bilingual French students. She proposed that the learning will take place from feedback and talking about their learning, also known as metalinguistic awareness or *metatalk*.

The study involved French immersion classes and was focused on two eighth grade students. The learners had been studying French since kindergarten. The pair was

given a jigsaw task and their dialogue was recorded. Both learners were given a pretest and posttest that included elements from the jigsaw task. The teacher chose the pairs based on ability. “Listening to the taped interaction, however, suggests that neither student dominated during their pair work and that both contributed in important ways to the collaborative activity” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 325). The students’ task was to put together a jigsaw activity in the target language. In the transcriptions of the dialogue are language related episodes (LREs). “A LRE episode is defined as any part of a dialogue where students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 326). Most of the LREs are uttered in English. Swain and Lapkin (1998) suggested that the LREs that occur throughout the dialogue will improve their post test score. Vocabulary that was unknown in the pre test was found as learned in the posttest results. For example, in the interactions, the lower level learner struggled to find the correct word for “alarm clock” in French. His partner provided feedback to ensure he chose the correct word. In the posttest, it was found that the student had correctly identified the word for “alarm clock” after the attention to the word in the jigsaw activity.

The source of his learning is not only input, although Kim used ‘reveille-matin’ 17 times during their entire conversation. Nor was the source of his learning only output, although it may have been Rick’s attempt to write it that focused his attention on his own uncertainty about which term to use. We wish to argue that it is the joint construction of knowledge that resulted from Rick’s questions and

Kim's responses that, in part, accounts for Rick's shift from incorrect to correct usage. (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 330)

The improvement that Swain and Lapkin observed supports the argument that input is necessary when combined with opportunities to talk about the language that is being produced. In this study the primary interaction was between considered student - student. Different types of interaction will be discussed further in this literature review.

Gass and Torres (2005) also examined the relationship between input and interaction. Their hypothesis focused on negotiation, attention and intake and how these factors affect interaction. "Our goal was to investigate the effects of (a) an input focus, (b) an interaction focus, (c) an input focus followed by interaction and (d) an interaction focus followed by input" (Gass & Torres, 2005, p. 8). The study is comprised of L2 learners of Spanish. "Eight learners reported knowledge of another language and were thus excluded, leaving a final pool of 102 learners, all monolingual speakers of English. There were 32 males and 70 females, ages 17-36 years, with an average of 3.5 years of Spanish instruction" (Gass & Torres, 2005, p. 8). The grammar that was the focus of the study was the Spanish verb "estar". Gass and Torres (2005) found that although the use of *estar* is often salient in Spanish learning, it is rarely acquired. "However, evidence suggests that despite their frequency in the input, learners of Spanish fail to acquire these forms" (Gass & Torres, 2005, p. 8). Gender agreement and vocabulary were other grammatical structures that were included in the study. There were five groups of learners which consisted of a control group, an input only group, an interaction only group, an input followed by interaction group, and an interaction followed by input group (Gass &

Torres, 2005, p. 14). All groups worked through the verb *estar*, gender-adjective agreement, and new vocabulary. The difference was how the activity was executed. In the input only group, the learners only received language from written work (packets), pictures, and listening activities. There was no collaboration with other learners. The interaction group had a jigsaw and information gap activity, which was designed to be a communicative task (Gass & Torres, 2005, p. 13). The other two groups got both interaction and input, in different orders.

Gass and Torres (2005) hypothesized that “when both input and interaction are involved (input followed by interaction and interaction followed by input), performance will be better than when only one type of presentation is available” (p. 15). Gass and Torres also hypothesized that due to learner interaction in diverse areas of language that each situation would provide different results (p. 8). The results varied from group to group, but found that the most interesting information came from looking at each language group independently. It was found that the most growth happened within their vocabulary, yet all groups improved with interaction and input.

Much of the recent research acknowledges and supports the idea that interaction is necessary to language development. Gass is a key researcher in the relationship between interaction and input. She has found that learners need the opportunity for “metatalk” or being able to talk about the language they are producing. Metatalk, feedback, and output will be discussed in the next section.

To summarize, input was once believed to be the key contributor to language acquisition. Krashen claimed that the only thing learners required to acquire language

was comprehensible input that was just slightly above their level of understanding ( $i+1$ ). He believed that as long as learners were presented with quality input in the L2 that interaction and output were not necessary. Krashen posited that students will still acquire language without having to produce it and the production was more a result of the learning than part of the learning. As researchers continued to study second language classrooms, they found that input when combined with communicative interaction resulted in greater language gains. Researchers were able to validate their hypothesis with pre and post tests that proved with interaction and *metatalk*, students were able to correct mistakes they had previously made. The research discussed in this section helps to explain and understand language input and why it is an imperative part of the learning process. Even more, it is input WITH interaction that yields the best results. We know that when authentic input and interaction work together, language growth is likely to occur. This is informative to my research question as it reminds me of the importance of creating curriculum that will support the extension of input beyond the classroom. In the next section, the role of output with a focus on feedback is discussed. Feedback from peers and teachers allows students the space to correct mistakes and adjust their output, which leads to learning.

### **Language Output**

Soon after studying the effects of language input on overall language development, researchers felt there was something missing. Learners require more than just input and exposure to the target language. Swain (1993) was one of the first researchers to propose that output (production of language) is also necessary for second

language development. Swain (1993) argued that learners need the opportunity to produce language for three reasons, (1) it allows students to understand how they process language, (2) gives the opportunity to move towards fluency, and (3) allows students to realize where they have gaps in their language or what they still need to learn (p. 159). Swain supported Krashen's idea of input as she posited that input and output are most effective when interwoven together. Although my focus in this research is language input, it is necessary to understand language output or production, as it is the output that supports the realization for the need of input. For example, if two learners are communicating and they realize they lack a specific term, they would need to seek input to find their answer. The input that they require may be provided by a teacher via feedback or from a peer.

As researchers described language acquisition, often the term *interlanguage* is used. *Interlanguage* refers to a learner's developing language. A learner's *interlanguage* has elements of the learner's native language; it changes and develops as the learner moves closer to L2 (second language) proficiency. *Interlanguage* is often the cause of over generalization and simplification of grammatical structures and rules (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 35). For example, many native speakers of Chinese struggle to learn the past tense in English because they do not have marked past tense in the same way English does. It is important to understand how interlanguage affects a student's output, particularly with errors in the target language.

As *interlanguage* develops, students realize there is a gap between what they need (input) and what they have learned. According to Swain (1993), when learners notice

they have a gap they can decide to ignore it, search their own knowledge to create new knowledge, or use their input closely to identify what they need (p. 159). Output allows learners to practice, play, and test what they know about their language.

### **Output and Feedback**

As learners begin to produce language, errors will occur. A natural occurrence after learners make errors is the opportunity for teachers or peers to provide corrective feedback. Feedback is a source or type of input, which is why it is significant to my research question. Studies by Weiss and Revesz (2012), Adams, Nuevo, and Egi (2011), and Coyle and Roca de Larios (2013) investigated error correction in the classroom and how learners reacted to feedback. Several facets of feedback have been investigated including the different types and how it impacts learner output. Also, feedback has been analyzed with a special focus on what it looks like between two learners and between learner and teacher. It can be understood that feedback has an effect on modified output. Modified output has been changed typically due to the other interlocutor providing corrective feedback. According to Adams (2011), “modified output is considered an important learning process because it forces learners to reprocess their original output often leading to syntactic processing and noticing” (p. 43).

Before a learner can receive feedback and apply it to their output, they must notice. Schmidt proposed the noticing hypothesis that suggested “nothing is learned unless it has been noticed” (Lightbown & Spada, 2006, p. 115). Different approaches to feedback have been explored in order to find which approach encourages students to “notice” and will lead to intake. Corrective feedback is understood in two ways, explicit

and implicit feedback. Explicit feedback are overt corrections, whereas implicit feedback are more subtle, given in the form of a recast. Recasts reformulate the error to make it correct. Feedback can also be classified as input-providing or output-prompting.

The majority of research has focused on teacher to learner feedback. An area which has offered inconclusive findings is what happens when feedback is communicated from learner to learner or two non-native speakers working together. A study conducted by Adams (2011) intended to investigate the relationship between feedback and non-native speakers (NNS). Adams wanted to know if NNS feedback could affect output. The participants in the study were 71 ESL (English as a Second Language) learners, mostly native Spanish speakers. Through communicative activities, she found that there were not significant gains in production after feedback had been offered. One of the possible solutions she offered was that learners are less likely to acknowledge and use feedback to modify their output from NNS.

Unlike the study by Adams (2011) where the focus was on learner-learner interaction and feedback, Weiss (2012) conducted a study that analyzed how feedback presented itself in a university classroom setting between teacher and learner. The participants were intermediate Spanish students between the ages of 18-22. Weiss' study intended to find what the relationship was between feedback in task versus non-task work, focused vs unfocused tasks and whether feedback is supplied pre-task, during the task, and post- task. Another important piece of this study looked at the opportunity given to students for modified output (MO). In each type of task investigated, Weiss looked for the opportunity for modified output as a reaction to the teacher feedback. The conclusion

included that instructors offered significantly more opportunities for MO during focused tasks or tasks that are designed to practice a certain linguistic feature. This would make sense as the pedagogy of this course was a communicative approach. Teachers were encouraged to give feedback during a focused task, which allowed for student production. Unlike Adams' study where feedback between learners was unlikely to lead to output, Weiss found that across all tasks, student - teacher interaction produced feedback and modified output.

As my research question focuses on input and how it leads to language development, it is important to look at the research conducted on how feedback can encourage language growth. Coyle and Roca de Larios (2012) studied the effect of error correction in children's L2 development. They found that the learners' attention to language was different based on the type of corrective feedback they received. Although they found that error correction led to the production of more output, Coyle and Roca de Larios (2012) concluded that the act of writing and engaging with the L2 encouraged the language processing to happen. All of the studies discussed above have found that feedback plays a role in learner output. The area of feedback is still developing. Teachers and researchers are eager to know the type of feedback best suited to encourage language growth.

### **Input and Output Together**

Russell (2014) explored the other pillar of Swain's Output Hypothesis, which was how output leads to language acquisition. While feedback helps learners to fill in the gaps, output encourages a deeper processing of language. The study conducted by Russell

(2014) sought to answer two questions (1) How does the production of output, enhanced input or a combination of both affect the learner noticing component of Swain's hypothesis? (2) How does the production of output, enhanced input or a combination of both affect how learners process input (p. 29). The inclusion of this study is for the interest in the relationship between output and input in the second question. The language feature that Russell was examining was the third person singular future tense. The participants were beginning Spanish students in university. More than half of the input texts the students were given consisted of the target verb form. The vocabulary was not new to students as the goal of the activity was the verb form, rather than inundating students with unknown vocabulary. The study included four groups plus a control that modified the language and activity to test the hypothesis. From the cloze test and grammatical judgment exercises included in the post test, they found four significant findings. "The two output groups in the present study outperformed the two non-output groups and the control group. This finding was highly consistent with Izumi's (2002) study, where the output groups demonstrated significantly learner gains than the non-output groups" (Russell, 2014, p. 39). The study did not find significant support for textual enhancement.

Izumi and Bigelow (2000) argued that output activities encouraged noticing of the L2 features and also that input-output activities led to greater gains in production. The study was a follow up to a similar one conducted by Izumi in 1999. The participants were ESL learners in a university writing class. Izumi and Bigelow's (2000) focus was on the past hypothetical and conditional in English. For example, "If Anne had traveled to Spain

in 1992, she would have seen the Olympics” (example cited in Izumi & Bigelow, 2000). Earlier pretests had shown that students had been exposed to this grammatical form before, but that in writing they used it incorrectly. The participants were broken into two groups, the experimental group (EG) and the control group (CG). After each phase of the study, four students were selected and interviewed to gather information about their cognitive processes (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000, p. 249). The difference between the EG and CG groups was in the output. The EG group was given opportunities for output immediately after input, whereas the CG group was given comprehension questions relating to the input. Their findings were not supportive of the hypothesis. There was not a significant difference between the EG and CG group to show support of all three of their hypothesis. “Although the results demonstrated no unique effects of output, extended opportunities to produce output and receive relevant input were found to be crucial in improving the use of the target structure” (Izumi & Bigelow, 2000, p. 271). They found that the comprehension task given to the CG also prompted noticing. Therefore, their research did show the importance of variability in the language classroom. The study offered pertinent information to the varied language tasks that would be useful in the language classroom. It proved that there is not only one task that contributes to learner noticing and uptake.

Similar to Izumi, Toth (2006) compared two different language groups when he wanted to investigate the role of output in L2 morphosyntax acquisition. Toth compared output-free instruction with instruction where input and output occurred in meaningful teacher interaction. One of the central questions he was seeking to answer was will

requiring output from learners during interaction “come at a cost for acquisition or ‘putting the cart before the horse’ or whether they play a facilitative role independent of the one played by input processing” (Toth, 2006, p. 324). The main difference between the two groups is one was required to use output. The participants were 55 native English speakers in a beginners Spanish course. Toth assured his understanding of the benefits of both input processing and output production, independent of each other. However, the conclusion of his findings found that output with appropriate support offered greater gains than when processing input was independent from output.

The important takeaway from the studies based on output and production help to strengthen the argument for output in conjunction with input. The studies by Izumi and Bigelow (2000), Russell (2014), and Toth (2006) supported the need for production in language. When compared, the groups that were given the opportunity to produce performed better.

The studies by Adams (2011) and Weiss (2012) relating to feedback is significant as it provides evidence of how input and output work best together. Feedback allowed students to modify their output based on input from the feedback. Feedback is a vital component to the research of input.

### **Input and Classroom Implications**

Much of the research related to language acquisition centers around input and output. In my opinion, the research is only useful to teachers if it can be applied in a practical manner that impacts daily classroom practice. This section of the literature review focuses on more practical aspects of how the information gained from research on

input and output can lead to effective classroom strategies. The themes of this section include the importance of remaining in the L2, strategies for bringing comprehensible input in the classroom, the teacher's role in the foreign language (FL) classroom, and practical application of Krashen's Input Hypothesis.

The Input and Output Hypothesis would both support the use of the target language (TL) as much as possible in the classroom. Krashen argued that comprehensible input was the key contributor to language acquisition. He also urged teachers to maintain instruction at "i+1", providing students with language just above their current level. In order to do this, a high importance is placed on conducting classroom instruction in the TL as much as possible. According to Crouse (2012), "Today's language classrooms increasingly reflect ACTFL's recommendation that communication in the target language comprises at least 90% of instructional time" (as cited in American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, p. 23). He described the traditional language classrooms, which were referred to as "drill and kill" practices. This has changed with more of a focus on communication, rather than accuracy. Crouse described some of the challenges of providing comprehensible input in the classroom. He cited issues such as student comprehension, teacher's lack of planning time, and the belief that the TL is too difficult (Crouse, 2012, p. 23). However, Crouse argued that with so little time devoted to language teaching that, "you don't have time to NOT teach in the target language" (Crouse, 2012, p. 23). Students' only source of input may be the classroom. Therefore, it is crucial that instructors provide as much input as possible as well as offer students the opportunity to produce. Crouse offered advice to providing input and output

in the classroom. He stated that in a classroom where English is limited, it is important to do frequent checks for understanding. He also encouraged authentic, relevant language, and proper use of technology. In order to encourage output or language production, students need to set reasonable goals and be pushed to reach the next stage of acquisition.

As Crouse offered relevant tips to bring comprehensible input in the classroom, Payne (2011) criticized the practicality of applying Krashen's "i+1" into the classroom. He argued that due to the many limitations of today's FL classroom, providing "i+1" to 30 learners was not realistic. His goal was to see how Krashen's hypothesis would function in a classroom where the teacher only sees the students twice a week for an hour lesson. The study consisted of a five week classroom intervention of 25 year seven students learning French. The intervention took place during regular classroom time with their normal teachers as not to bring up any anxiety which would negatively affect their ability. In the beginning of each lesson students were taught one new oral and one new written instruction. According to Payne (2011), written production proves the skill has been acquired. He considered written output to be conscious acquisition, rather than subconscious (p. 426). By the end of ten weeks, 22 of 25 students were able to orally produce the new structures and 21 of 25 were able to understand orally and reproduce. He concluded that not all learners progressed at the same rate - some learners could complete the task after a few weeks, whereas others needed the full ten weeks. Although Payne was very skeptical before he tested Krashen's hypothesis in the classroom, he did find that "i+1" was realizable and successful.

Polio and Duff's study (1994) focused on teacher language in the university classroom. Similar to Crouse's position, which stated that for many students the only source of input comes from the classroom, Polio and Duff (1994) hypothesized that teachers were not providing enough TL input. Their study was to investigate different FL teachers, all who were native speakers. They analyzed the teachers' classroom practices and their use of English. They found that only one teacher out of three never used English. The goal of the research was to gain more insight into the reasons or situations that led teachers to use English rather than the TL. They found that the use of English fell into the following scenarios, providing comfort and to establish student rapport, grammar instruction, classroom management, unknown vocabulary, lack of student comprehension (Polio & Duff, 1994, p. 317). They found that teachers resorted to English, despite them having a strong command of the language as native speakers.

Without situating the research related to language input within the classroom, it is irrelevant to language teachers. The central takeaway from this section of the literature review is to put into perspective the significance of language input in the classroom and the current challenges associated with maintaining use of the TL. It is also important to recognize how the research aligns with what is being found in practical contexts.

### **Conclusion**

In the literature review, I explored and analyzed the relevant research on the topic of language input and its related themes. The role of input within the field of second language acquisition (SLA) is ever changing and constantly evolving. The field of classroom - based SLA is relatively new, which means that in comparison to other areas,

there are fewer studies available. This review has described input theory, input and interaction, the role of output and input together, and classroom implications and practice. Notable studies by Swain & Lapkin, Gass, and Krashen have supported my original thoughts and have contributed greatly to my understanding of my research question, *How can teachers enhance language input in classroom-based second language acquisition?* In the next chapter, I will take the research and apply it to my project design.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Project Description

#### Introduction

Throughout my eight years of teaching Spanish, I have realized the importance and challenge of creating an environment that encourages target language use. Conducting instruction in Spanish is even more crucial when the amount of time students exposed to language is very limited. I found that in my most recent setting, students' ability to use and apply language was restricted. I wanted to investigate the relationship between input and exposure to student's ability to use and apply language they have been taught and hopefully, learned. This curiosity led to my research question, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students in classroom-based second language acquisition?* For my project, I created a curriculum project using the project-based learning (PBL) framework where students are required to use and interact with the language in a variety of ways, with the focus remaining on input. The project and all required resources are housed in Google Drive, organized into Google Folders. This chapter will describe my project, the rationale and research that supports my choice. It will also explain the setting, participants, and timeline of my intended project.

#### Project Description

Through the research, I have learned that there are two critical pieces to language acquisition in the classroom: (1) teachers should provide as much authentic input as possible, and (2) students need the opportunity to produce language. The activities that I

developed bear those things in mind. The curriculum supports language teachers in providing high levels of input in the target language (TL).

I have found that since working as a FL teacher, there are a lack of authentic resources that promote communication over grammatical form. Much of the curriculum is based around textbooks and memorized chunks of phrases. I wanted to develop something for the teacher and the student. As much as a need exists for student activities, encouragement and support for the teacher is also necessary.

My central goal for the curriculum project is for it be accessible and used by anyone. I found it to be the curriculum to be most effective if housed in Google Drive, organized within different folders for each part of the project. For example, there is a folder with topic choices and resources for students. Another folder includes teacher resources with rubrics, task sheets, PBL resources and feedback forms. A third folder exists for student use; it includes an infographic with eight tips for student time management, note taking sheet, and preparation for the teacher-student interview. For example, if a student chooses to conduct their project around the concept of *sobremesa*, a cultural investigation of the relationship between food and family, they will be given access to folders that include controlled resources chosen by the teacher. Therefore, I can ensure that the input they are receiving is at an appropriate level and is meeting their needs.

Depending on where I am teaching, I would first begin to implement by sharing with my fellow language teachers. I would encourage them to use it, share it, and provide feedback of how they felt my resources met their needs. Once it has been used and tested,

I would revise as necessary. One resource that will be found in the Google Folders is a Google Form, which will allow teachers to provide feedback and take notes on how students are progressing.

I could evaluate the effectiveness of my approach in multiple ways. First, I will collect feedback from colleagues using the Google Forms provided. Second, I will create self-evaluations for the teachers and students. The self-evaluations will focus on how they feel about their language growth since beginning to use the additional resources. Third, I will track progress of the students before we started with the website and after a few months of using the resources. Has their confidence in speaking and using language increased? Has teacher confidence in remaining in the L2 increased?

### **Rationale**

As I created my project, I used the project-based learning (PBL) framework. Because I want this to be a project that is mostly executed through student-guided learning, I decided to keep the project-based framework at the core of what I create. Project-based learning allows students to be in control of their choices and how they demonstrate their learning. “Project-based learning is a student-driven, teacher-facilitated approach to learning. Learners pursue knowledge by asking questions that have piqued their natural curiosity” (Bell, p.39, 2010). To stay true to the PBL approach, it is important that I allow students to choose their topic so they are able to follow their “natural curiosity” as stated by Bell. There are some essential design elements (Larmer & Mergendoller, 2015), which come from the Buck Institute for Education (listed below).

- **Key Knowledge, Understanding, and Success Skills** - The project is focused on student learning goals, including standards-based content and

skills such as critical thinking/problem solving, communication, collaboration, and self-management.

- **Challenging Problem or Question** - The project is framed by a meaningful problem to solve or a question to answer, at the appropriate level of challenge.
- **Sustained Inquiry** - Students engage in a rigorous, extended process of asking questions, finding resources, and applying information.
- **Authenticity** - The project features real-world context, tasks and tools, quality standards, or impact – or speaks to students’ personal concerns, interests, and issues in their lives.
- **Student Voice & Choice** - Students make some decisions about the project, including how they work and what they create.
- **Reflection** - Students and teachers reflect on learning, the effectiveness of their inquiry and project activities, the quality of student work, obstacles and how to overcome them.
- **Critique & Revision** - Students give, receive, and use feedback to improve their process and products.
- **Public Product** - Students make their project work public by explaining, displaying and/or presenting it to people beyond the classroom.

These design elements were used as I made decisions on how to create the project.

Utilizing this type of framework encourages rigor and student choice. However, it also allows me to make choices regarding the resources they use as I want to experiment with how language will develop when I am able to control the input. By controlling the input, I pre-selected resources written in Spanish that students will be required to use.

When I thought about how I wanted this project to function, it was important to me that it was collaborative in nature. I wanted it to be something that could be shared, edited, and encourage feedback, which is why I chose Google Drive as my platform and mode of delivery.

Google is rated high among educators because of its usability. “Google is a “what you see is what you get” kind of organization” (Stoudt, 2015). With Google, I had the ability to access multiple tools, which will help my site to reach many educators. I can create my site, but also use Google Forms to collect and gather feedback from educators who are using the resources. Many schools have turned to using Google to transform their classrooms and their teaching. Google offers training for educators who wish to learn more about how they can get the most out of what they offer. Sundar Pichai, CEO of Google, said, “technology alone will not improve education, but it can be a powerful part of the solution” (Google for education, n.d., para 5).

Lastly, I thought about how to reach teachers and get them to “buy in” with the amount of work they already have. O’Brien (2014) described the importance of teachers having a voice when being asked to participate in new initiatives. Typically, administration adds to a teacher’s “to-do” list without being able to give their opinions. O’Brien wrote that the best way to ensure teachers will participate in new endeavours is to include them in the decision making and listen to their input. “But too often the rhetoric of change indicates that it is being done to teachers, not *with* them -- particularly change driven by politicians who know little about education and are more conscious of the political realities they face than the best interests of students” (O’Brien, 2014). I think this is important to keep in mind as I approach how I want to engage and encourage teachers to use the website. My goal is to collaborate, listen, inform, and encourage teachers to use and provide honest feedback of how the lessons fit into their daily practice.

### **Setting**

My intended setting for this project is the school that I have had the most experience with and where I taught for seven years.. It is located in a suburb with approximately 6,000 people. It is a small, public school that enrolls students from grades K-12. Many of the students have been enrolled there since kindergarten and have grown up in the community. The community is mostly middle, working class with affordable housing. There is a student population of about 2,470 students and the district employs 370 staff members.

The school community of teachers and staff is very close knit. There is immense pride to attend the school and it shows in the character of the students. In 2013, it was voted by Forbes as “best school for your housing buck” (Star Tribune). Many families move to the district because of its high performing reputation.

### **Participants**

The intended audience would be my students in ninth through twelfth grade who I see for about 90 minutes a week. Most of the students would have started taking Spanish in 9th grade unless they came from a different school. The classes are medium in size, ranging anyway from 24-32 students. Generally, the motivation, interest, and ability among classes is very good. Most students are eager to learn and enjoy Spanish because it is different than most subjects they have been studying since elementary school. Students are typically willing and open to trying new things.

### **Timeline**

The table below outlines my proposed goals in order to complete the capstone project.

Table 1

#### *Tentative Capstone Completion Timeline*

Continue gathering ideas about curriculum implementation	November 2017
Create curriculum resources and write chapter 4	December 2017
Create capstone project	January 2018-2019 school year (Australia)
Finish capstone	May 2018

### **Conclusion**

Chapter 3 described the intended goal of the project. It described the setting, the participants, and its intended outcome. For my project, I created an eight week project-based curriculum, which requires students to choose a topic, explore the research, and ultimately present their learnings to the class. The curriculum was created and will be shared with language teachers to use and to collect feedback. Chapter 4 will describe the creation and implementation of the project.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### Reflection

#### Purpose of the Project

Through my years of teaching Spanish, I realized a lack of relevant and learner-driven and motivated curriculum. I also was observing a lack of language capability, which prompted the focus for my research and my project. My research question is, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students in classroom-based second language acquisition?* To address this question and seek to strengthen language curriculum that focuses on input, I created a student-driven curriculum based on the project based learning (PBL) theory. The curriculum is designed within Google Drive and is created for an eight week timeframe.

There are three central goals I had in mind when I created my project. First, I wanted my project to be driven by the principles that emerged from my literature review. Mainly, that input and interaction were at the core of my curriculum. Secondly, it was important that my project was student-led, to ensure learner motivation was a priority, which is why I used the PBL framework. Lastly, I wanted my project to be accessed and used by any language teacher. Organization, collaboration, and accessibility were essential as I thought about the platform where my curriculum was best suited. All of the curriculum resources are housed in Google Drive so that all teachers can access, copy, share and use them to enhance target language input for L2 students..

This curriculum provides rigorous and challenging tasks for students that pushes them to achieve success beyond the classroom. It is designed so that most of the work is done outside of the classroom or as an extension of their learning. While independent work habits were not my main focus of this project, it will require students to practice time management skills. I look forward to using my project and sharing it with my colleagues so that I can request feedback to continue improving the resources.

This chapter discusses my project, a summary of the literature review and how it connects to the decisions I made in regards to my project. I also describe project implications, limitations and lastly, my reflections and ideas for future research.

### **Key Learnings**

Throughout this process, I have been able to expand significantly on my knowledge of best practice for second language classrooms. One of the most important takeaways from this process is the creativity and ideas I have come away with. Through reading of diverse literature and classroom experiences, I was able to use that to create a curriculum that I believe would best suite other language teachers. I always knew that conducting the classroom in the target language was ideal, but I did not understand the best and most practical ways to do this.

Through the work of designing my project, the importance of student-based enquiry and self-guided learning was made more apparent. I enjoyed intentionally choosing materials and planning in a way that encourages students to take control of their own learning. I believe that my learnings will only become more valuable as I use this

curriculum myself and also seek feedback from other educators who have used it with their students.

I have also learned the importance of educators pursuing their individual interests when related to education. I have learned immensely from my peers and from many instructors. I have been reminded the importance of tapping into wisdom and ideas of people who know more than me. There are many educators who have passionate interests and goals that will directly affect the wellbeing of their students.

### **Summary of Literature Review**

I reviewed research that explored the connection of input to language growth and proficiency. As I knew, and the research solidified, there are many factors that contribute to successful language learning. In this section, I will describe the central themes that emerged from the research and how I connected the learnings when creating my project.

The research begins with Krashen's input hypothesis which includes comprehensible input, or when relating it to the classroom, providing students with language that can be understood, but just above their level. Krashen believed that language learning should be acquired naturally. Therefore, his belief was that students should be flooded with input in multiple modalities. One of the studies conducted by Krashen included providing students with reading in an attempt to acquire new vocabulary. Without an overt attempt at teaching vocabulary, Krashen (1989) found that learners acquired new vocabulary, which was proven by a comprehension test at the end of the novel. This idea of being provided input in the target language that is just above a students' level of understanding, encouraged me to choose readings in Spanish for each

topic. The articles selected are meant to be challenging for students, which will require them to interact with their peers in their group.

Being able to rely on their peers throughout this process was intentional. The research from Swain and Lapkin (1998) indicated that input and interaction together is when the learning happens. “Unlike the claim that comprehensible input leads to learning, we wish to suggest that what occurs in collaborative dialogues is learning. That is, learning does not happen outside performance; it occurs in performance” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 321). This learning came from a study that observed bilingual French children. The study found that the children who were intentionally paired based on ability, learned from each other. From this study, we gained the concept of metatalk, where students talk about the language they are encountering. Metatalk is a crucial part of the learning process, which is why I have included it in the requirement of language journals. While students wrestle with gaps in their language and attempt to learn and remember new language concepts, they will be required to record these LRE’s or language - related episodes in their journals. Swain found that language input is best when students are given opportunities to talk about their language learning process. In an effort to provide this to students, I have included teacher and student interviews where students will have the opportunity to talk about how they feel about their language capabilities. These interviews will be relaxed in nature, but are conducted in Spanish so that students also get the opportunity for feedback and output.

I have accounted for various opportunities for output, or student production of language. Swain (1993) stated that language output is necessary for three reasons, (1) it

allows students to process language, (2) it provides opportunities for students to gain and achieve fluency, (3) it forces students to see where there are gaps in their language or what they still have yet to learn. Students are given numerous opportunities for output in the form of their language journals, note-taking documents, interviews, peer editing, and ultimately, their final presentation.

A theme that runs throughout my project is feedback. In language learning, feedback is crucial in both output and input. Feedback is mostly in the form of input from a teacher, which allows the learner to modify or correct their output. The research showed that feedback is more likely to be noticed and taken from a teacher, rather than a peer. My project accounts for both types of feedback, learner to learner, and teacher to learner.

The research uncovered strong evidence for classrooms with a communicative approach that encourage communication over accuracy. According to Crouse (2012), “Today’s language classrooms increasingly reflect ACTFL’s recommendation that communication in the target language comprises at least 90% of instructional time” (as cited in American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, p. 23). The target language should be the main language of instruction. However, even in doing so, the reality is classroom time is not enough time to realistically achieve proficiency.

My project was designed and driven by the research. The choices I have made reflect the information on input, output, and feedback. The project allows students to continue their work outside of the classroom in an effort to promote language proficiency and confidence.

## **Project Description**

My project begins in Google Drive. Teachers are given a document that includes a description of the project with hyperlinks to every resource. Within Google Drive, resources are organized using folders. In the first folder, teachers and students have all of the topic choices. Once students have chosen a topic, they use the folder to find controlled resources and materials. The articles and information are written in Spanish. Although an important theme is student choice, some of the resources were chosen in order to control the language input the students are receiving. They also have access to a task sheet, which provides more direction and links to required digital resources.

The second folder includes teacher materials. These include a project rubric, project task sheet, student-teacher interview sign - up sheet, and Google Forms that assist in collecting feedback from teachers and students. This folder also has helpful information about project based learning and ACTFL's World Readiness Standards for Learning a Language.

The third folder is for student use. Students will find three resources in this folder. They have access to an infographic that has tips for effective time management, a note-taking document, and the teacher-student interview preparation sheet. Google Drive allows teachers to customize this curriculum to fit the individual needs of their students. Teachers are able to add or copy resources into the students' folders. Students are able to share documents with their groups. I believe that the focus on collaboration, sharing, and feedback is one of the greatest strengths of this project. I urge teachers to modify and adapt it so that it is successful in diverse classrooms.

## Project Implications

In this section, I will discuss the possible future implications of my project. My research question is, *In what ways can teachers enhance target language input for L2 students in classroom-based second language acquisition?* My personal experience of being a Spanish teacher with the research related to classroom language learning, led me to create an eight week curriculum which extends language input beyond the classroom. The majority of the project will be completed outside of the classroom, with the exception of teacher-student interviews. My goal is that this project has positive and valuable implications for those who use it.

I believe that this curriculum will help to raise awareness around the lack of time given to language learning. I hope that by using the materials with the research and information about project based learning, teachers will understand the importance of how much time students are engaged and exposed to the target language. Through conversations with fellow language teachers, I realized a theme of disappointment from teachers that their skills and abilities do not match with the amount of years students have been taking a language. I have learned that language capability requires much more than just showing up in the classroom. This project will encourage teachers to push students beyond their comfort level and place higher expectations on their language capabilities. I believe that normal classroom instruction coupled with the resources provided from this project can result in tremendous improvements.

I would also like to see more student-driven curriculum being utilized in the language classroom. This project using the project based learning theory encourages

student voice and choice. With good results, I hope that teachers will trust themselves to take more risks and put more on their students. This will continue to encourage a communicative and relevant approach to language in the classroom.

Lastly, I believe that this project will save time for many teachers who would like to take on a project like this, but have not found the time to create or investigate the appropriate resources. The project was created with the intention and desire for teachers to make it their own. I encourage teachers to keep what works and get rid of or change materials that do not work. I strongly believe that this project will encourage and excite both students and teachers. I think it can be used in varying capacities, and will yield valuable results if just given the time to try it.

### **Project Limitations**

This section will describe any limitations I faced in creating my project. Fortunately, I did not have many project limitations. I believe one of the most important limitations is the lack of recent studies relating to classroom-based language acquisition. While there has been a good amount of research concerning primary bilingual classrooms, there is less that has to do with secondary language classrooms. It would have been helpful to have more recent studies done to use in preparation of the project materials. As a whole, the study of second language acquisition is a young topic, the bulk of the research not beginning until the 1970s. I think there is still a lot to learn and observe in regards to secondary classroom-based language acquisition.

One potential limitation for educators might be a lack of knowledge using Google Drive. However, from my personal experience and the growth in the number of schools

using Google, I felt it was an appropriate platform. While this may be a limitation for some, the advantage of Google is its accessibility and usability.

Lastly, one challenge was trying to predict what resources would be most useful for all language teachers. It was difficult to know what and how much to include as every teacher's style and preferences are diverse.

### **Author's Reflections and Future Research**

While this process has been extensive and at times difficult, I have come to be attached to my curriculum and I feel strongly about the impact it could have on teachers and students who are willing to try it. I am eager to share the curriculum and receive feedback on how it can be improved.

While I was trying to choose what I would create for my project, I had many ideas, which I would be happy to see come to fruition. One of the other thoughts I had was a website that would include links to offer opportunities for students to extend their learning. For example, if in class students are learning about family vocabulary, they could access the website to find more activities to practice and extend their learning beyond the class time.

Now that I have completed the process of creating a curriculum, I would be open to other ways to address my research question. I think that my topic of research has many possibilities for future research. One potential study that would be interesting is to give students an opportunity to discuss how they feel about their language capabilities before and after completing the project. If a teacher wanted to conduct quantitative research, they could administer pre and post tests or also divide students into groups each provided

with slightly different goals. It would be interesting to observe the language growth of these different groups for eight weeks while using the project resources.

As I stated in my section about project limitations, there is a lack of recent research that specifically targets secondary classroom-based language acquisition. In general, I believe that more outward thinking curriculum needs to be used that will prepare students to use their language in a relevant and realistic future. Without the proper observations recorded in classrooms, it is difficult for teachers to know how to choose their content priorities.

### **Conclusion**

In this chapter, I discussed the purpose of my project and some of the key learnings that came from it. I also reviewed the literature and made connections from the research to the choices I made with regards to my curriculum. I described my project limitations and possible implications for future teachers and researchers. Finally, I discussed some concluding reflections and ideas that could further develop and address my research question.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, R., Nuevo, A. M., & Egi, T. (2011). Explicit and implicit feedback, modified output, and SLA: Does explicit and implicit feedback promote learning and learner-learner interactions? *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 42-63. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01242.x
- Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 83*(2), 39-43. 10.1080/00098650903505415 Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00098650903505415>
- Bentley, J. (2014). Report from TESOL 2014: 1.5 billion English learners worldwide. Retrieved from <https://www.internationalteflacademy.com/blog/bid/205659/report-from-tesol-2014-1-5-billion-english-learners-worldwide>
- Coyle, Y., & Roca de Larios, J. (2014). Exploring the role played by error correction and models on children's reported noticing and output production in a L2 writing task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 36*(3), 451. doi:10.1017/S0272263113000612
- Crossley, S., Kyle, K., & Salsbury, T. (2016). A usage-based investigation of L2 lexical acquisition: The role of input and output. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(3), 702-715. doi:10.1111/modl.12344

- Crouse, D. (2012). Going for 90% plus: How to stay in the target language. *The Language Educator*, 22-27. Retrieved from [https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/TLE\\_pdf/TLE\\_Oct12\\_Article.pdf](https://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/TLE_pdf/TLE_Oct12_Article.pdf)
- Doehla, D. (2011) Using project-based learning to teach world languages. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/world-language-project-based-learning-education-curriculum-don-doebla>
- Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The Modern Language Journal*, 74(2), 154-166. 10.2307/328119
- Gass, S. M., & Torres, M. J. A. (2005). Attention when?: An investigation of the ordering effect of input and interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(1), 1-31. doi:10.1017/S0272263105050011
- Google for education. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://edu.google.com/?modal\\_active=none](https://edu.google.com/?modal_active=none)
- Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Révész, A. (2012). Tasks, teacher feedback, and learner modified output in naturally occurring classroom interaction. *Language Learning*, 62(3), 851-879. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00716.x
- Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(2), 239-278. Retrieved from

<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/tesol/tq/2000/00000034/00000002/art00003>

Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the input hypothesis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 440-464. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/326879>

Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent french immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320-337. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/329959>

Larmer, J., & Mergendoller, J. R. (2015). Gold standard PBL: Essential project design elements. Retrieved from [http://www.bie.org/blog/gold\\_standard\\_pbl\\_essential\\_project\\_design\\_elements](http://www.bie.org/blog/gold_standard_pbl_essential_project_design_elements)

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3 ed.). Oxford [u.a.]: Oxford Univ. Press.

O'Brien, A. (2014). When teachers and administrators collaborate; Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/when-teachers-and-administrators-collaborate-anne-obrien>

Pace, K. (2016). Google for educators: The best features for busy teachers; Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/google-for-educators>

- Payne, M. (2011). Exploring stephen krashen's 'i + 1' acquisition model in the classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 22*(4), 419-429.  
doi:10.1016/j.linged.2011.07.002
- Philp, J., & Tognini, R. (2009). Language acquisition in foreign language contexts and the differential benefits of interaction. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(3-4), 245. doi:10.1515/iral.2009.011
- Russell, V. (2014). A closer look at the output hypothesis: The effect of pushed output on noticing and inductive learning of the spanish future tense. *Foreign Language Annals, 47*(1), 25-47. doi:10.1111/flan.12077
- Toth, P. D. (2006). Processing instruction and a role for output in second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 56*(2), 319-385.  
doi:10.1111/j.0023-8333.2006.00349.x
- White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (Expanded 2nd ed.). Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wyner, G. (2014). *Fluent forever*. New York, NY: Harmony Books.