<論文>

Making It Happen Through Reflection:
Instructed Second Language Acquisition

Harumi KIMURA

Introduction

Language teachers make efforts to make their second language (L2) instruction more beneficial for students. However, these efforts may not always be as effective as teachers expect, and students might not be learning what their teachers teach in the L2 classroom. In this article, I first describe what the academic discipline of instructed second language acquisition (ISLA) aims to understand and how the theories of second language acquisition (SLA) inform ISLA. I also refer to social aspects of classroom learning that past ISLA research has not explored enough. Second, I discuss two issues in relation to the Multilingual Workshops that the Miyagi Gakuin Women's University foreign language teacher team held in the 2015 academic year. Although the workshops covered a variety of ISLA issues and L2 class management, I limit the scope of this paper to the following two. One issue is how to achieve a good balance between explicit and implicit instruction in L2 classrooms; the other is how to promote learner collaboration in teaching L2s. In so doing, I invite teachers to engage in reflective teaching practices in relation to these two issues so that they can restructure their teaching routines.

Setting the Stage

The Aims of ISLA

ISLA is concerned with L2 acquisition in classrooms and is often contrasted with SLA in natural contexts. It is defined as application of the findings in the larger field of SLA. The basic question ISLA researchers ask is (a) whether L2 instruction is beneficial and (b) if so, how L2 instruction can be effective (Loewen, 2015). Some researchers believe that learning L2s in classrooms is qualitatively different from acquiring them in natural contexts. They take the position that SLA is largely implicit (unconscious) and it occurs without intention or awareness. The researchers also argue that classroom learners learn L2s explicitly (consciously) and do not acquire them (Krashen, 1982) the same way we learn our first language (L1) in natural settings.

Other researchers, however, do not agree with this learning/acquisition dichotomy and take a

developmental view. Researchers who endorse skill acquisition theory, a general theory of learning, think that classroom learners are taught explicitly how a new language system works. Starting out with this declarative knowledge, learners gradually procedualize the knowledge by means of receiving a large amount of L2 input, effective instruction, and plentiful opportunities for practice (DeKeyser, 2007). For example, a grammar rule is taught explicitly in class. Learners will be able to state the rule, but they cannot use the rule in spontaneous language production at the beginning. It is effortful and time-consuming to produce language based on a newly learned rule. With practice, though, the knowledge gradually becomes implicit knowledge, the kind that is ready and free to use in communication.

It is mostly agreed that implicit knowledge is hard to teach, to say the least, and it takes a huge amount of time to develop. However, class time is usually quite limited. To make the most of classroom learning, L2 learners should be provided with a combination of implicit and explicit instruction. In other words, ISLA should be made up of explicit instruction plus rich and ample implicit learning opportunities (Hulstijn, 2002) so that learners can develop implicit knowledge and become able to communicate with other L2 speakers with relative ease.

The good news is that recent meta-analyses have demonstrated that ISLA is beneficial. For example, Norris and Ortega (2000) combined 49 studies and concluded that explicit instruction contributed to L2 learning. Mackay (2007) collected empirical studies that provided the benefits of conversational interaction and concluded that conversational interaction has educational values. Spada and Tomita (2010) investigated the interaction between types of instruction and types of target language features to demonstrate some specific conditions in which instruction is beneficial. Shintani and Ellis (2013) compared comprehension-based and production-based instructions to explore L2 learning gains. These studies confirmed that instruction is effective for L2 development.

What SLA Theories Tell Us

As previously seen, the ISLA aims sound reasonable and past research has provided such evidence. However, what research has demonstrated should be translated into what ordinary classroom teachers can practically do in class. It is a general understanding that the accumulation of grammar and vocabulary knowledge alone cannot make a user fluent or accurate in a language. Traditional focus on accuracy in classroom teaching still remains, especially in test-oriented cultures like Japan. Too much concern for accuracy often makes learners anxious in classrooms (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986) and hinders their active participation in interaction. This does not contribute to fluency development, again especially in cultures in which face-saving has greater importance (Kitayama,

Markus, & Kurokawa, 2000).

New approaches also seem to have some alleged drawbacks. Communicative language teaching, which promotes meaning-focused approaches, often falls short of contributing to a well-balanced knowledge building because communicative needs tend to take priority over learning. In some way, attention must be paid to both meaning and form in order to nurture optimal learning conditions for the purpose of attaining healthy L2 learning outcomes in accuracy, fluency, and complexity in the long term.

In task-based language teaching, teachers try to create a good balance between two distinct focuses: on meaning and on form such as specific linguistic items, grammar, and pragmatic rules. An L2 language task is characterized as follows (Ellis, 2003). It is a communicative activity that resembles a real life task and has both linguistic and non-linguistic expected outcomes. In the process, learners are supposed to use their linguistic knowledge, either to be newly acquired or to be procedualized. In the explicit/implicit terms, tasks are constructed to support implicit learning, sometimes with explicit instruction on form.

Focus on form, "which occurs when learners briefly pay attention to linguistic items within a larger meaning-focused context," (Loewen, 2015, p. 56) can be either preplanned or incidental, but either way, I think, requires expertise on the side of the teacher. When the instruction is too implicit and the target form (either structure or item) is not salient, learners may not notice or pay attention to it. Corrective feedback through recast—i.e., error correction in the form of spontaneous feedback during the interaction—may also go unnoticed. In other cases, learners often do not want to take risks in using the new target structure or item; they can easily avoid it to make meaning across. In such scenarios, learning may not occur. On the other hand, when the instruction is too explicit or takes a long time, focus on meaning may be lost. Furthermore, other ways of providing corrective feedback can easily interrupt the flow of interaction. For example, teachers can request clarification when they want their students to reformulate their utterances by saying, "Excuse me?" or give suggestions for reformulation using metalinguistic (grammatical) terms such as "past tense." These interruptions may not only undermine meaning-making but also discourage students from expressing themselves further.

Another obstacle comes from the learners themselves. They often do not feel that they have learned something in implicit L2 instruction. Learners want to be taught, at least in some cases, explicitly. It is ironic that researchers and informed teachers know the limitations of explicit instruction in classroom L2 learning for developing L2 knowledge and skills, but that learners ask for it.

Furthermore, I would argue that much of the past ISLA research has yet to fully investigate the

social aspects of L2 learning even after the so-called social turn of SLA (Block, 2003). Block called for more socially sensitive and context-dependent models of SLA by challenging the mainstream SLA that is biased toward information processing models. He argues that the concerns of cognitive SLA are too individualistic. For example, in cognitive SLA, it is often said that the output of one learner becomes another learner's input in peer interaction, and that the learning outcome is theoretically formulated as two individuals are each learning in their own way—i.e., providing and receiving information. However, "mental processes are social as they are individual and as external as internal," Block (2003, pp. 6–7) claims. Learner interaction in L2 classrooms goes beyond information exchange and involves collaboration and knowledge co-construction among learners (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). By engaging in the task, learners create a joint goal of linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes that are interdependent. Furthermore, it is not possible or appropriate to separate motivation to learn the L2 and motivation to interact with others in the L2. Future ISLA research should take into account the social side of classroom learning as the sociocultural researchers advocate and explore L2 learning in participating in interaction and negotiating membership within the learner community in the language classroom.

This brief overview of the ISLA field has presented two issues to consider with regard to the workshops in order to provide classroom teachers with practical ideas to make a small but significant change in their teaching practices for the purpose of their students' L2 development. The issues are formulated as follows: (a) focus on form should be incorporated in meaning-focused activities in which input/output opportunities should be secured to promote implicit learning, and (b) it is meaningful to create shared goals, both linguistic and non-linguistic, to cultivate a cooperative classroom culture in which such goals scaffold each other and both communicative and linguistic outcomes can be appreciated.

Workshops

Overviews

The first Multilingual Workshops were held on the afternoon of January 9, 2016. Thirty-nine people attended the workshops. The participants included 10 full-time teachers, 11 part-time teachers, 17 students, and one private language school owner. The workshops had three components: a workshop for teaching English, a model lesson of teaching French, and a discussion among the participants.

Prof. Marc Helgesen (Miyagi Gakuin Women's University) gave a workshop titled "English in 3D—Rethinking Traditional Tasks (Drills, Dictations & Dialogs)." Prof. Helgesen is a renowned re-

searcher in the field of SLA and he applies research findings in positive psychology and neuroscience to teaching L2s. He often gives workshops and shares ideas for brain-friendly teaching. Obviously, 3D has two meaning: to take *a fresh look* at traditional *activities with initial Ds* and make them more communicative and collaborative.

Dr. Takahiro Kunieda (Keio University) gave a model lesson of French for beginning learners. He taught eight students who he had just met before the model lesson. He was a former instructor of NHK TV and a radio French program and has published self-study books of French. In this model lesson, Dr. Kunieda nicely combined building vocabulary knowledge and learning grammatical structures and later incorporated a cultural understanding exercise using web-based material. He also shared ideas for conducting alternative assessments and encouraging learning outside of class.

The topics covered in the discussion varied from cooperation among full-time and part-time teachers, (the difficulties in and significance of) promoting foreign language learning other than English in this increasingly multilingual world, diverse teaching objectives, and issues in formal assessment to L2 identity.

Focus on Form in Meaning-Focused Activities And Implicit Learning

English

In an activity entitled "If you bring A, I'll bring B" that Prof. Helgesen introduced as an ABC Drill, paired participants took turns repeating the "A" that their partner will bring, for example, to a party, and think of a new item, "B." The items should continue in alphabetical order, that is, *apple, banana, citrus, dragon fruit, Easter egg*, and so on. It seemed to be a simple repetition activity, or a substitution drill, but the participants had to come up with items for the alphabetical order; thus, it was a good repetitive activity with changes for fluency development. Although the activity was meaning-focused, the pattern included a grammar rule of the first conditional in a conditional sentence—a rather difficult grammar rule to learn. The participants did not receive explicit instruction on sentence construction or the tense rule in the workshop and were supposed to develop implicit knowledge by practicing the same pattern many times in a meaning-focused context.

French

The model lesson by Dr. Kunieda started with reviewing the last class. Students collaboratively made a list of food items with an appropriate choice of the article (partitive articles plus masculine or feminine nouns) such as "*du pan*" (bread) and "*de l'eau*" (water), which they had supposedly learned in the previous class. Next, students formulated sentence such as "*Je prends du riz pour le petit déjeun-*

er." ("I eat rice for breakfast.") The verb, *prendre*, had been already taught with another meaning, "take" (plus transportation), and the new meaning, "eat", was explicitly taught and followed by plenty of practice with different noun phrases for fluency development. The class activity started at the phrase-level chunks and the introduced chunks were later put into sentence constructions. Every time a new construction was introduced, learned items were used, thus learning was accumulative.

Optimal Degree of Implicitness/Explicitness on the Continuum

Explicit and implicit teaching constitutes a continuum (Loewen, 2015). Teachers should choose from a more explicit approach or a more implicit approach depending on the teaching/learning goals, the learners, and the particular teaching context. For example, in the English activity, Prof. Helgesen did not mention any grammar rule mainly because the rule is not easy for pre-intermediate learners to use in spontaneous speech. The activity was meant for implicit learning of a complex sentence with appropriate tense choices. On the other hand, Dr. Kunieda occasionally provided metalinguistic feedback using grammar terms to have his learners—beginning learners of French—choose the appropriate article for the food item the learner regularly eats for breakfast. The learners modified output according to his feedback. Choosing the correct article for a particular noun is a combination of rule-learning (different types of articles) and item-learning (types of nouns), so the explicit focus on the target structures in the meaning-focused activity facilitated opportunities for accuracy. Teachers are to choose explicitness/implicitness for their activities accordingly.

Repetition with Change (Iterative Practice)

In both the English workshop and the French model lesson, repetition with change was effectively incorporated into the activities. Repetition may remind us of brainless pattern practices back in the audiolingual era authorized by behaviorist theory, but cognitive psychologists, especially those who endorse skill-acquisition theory, "stress the role of practice in transforming declarative/explicit knowledge into procedural/implicit knowledge" (DeKeyser, 2007, p. 7). Here, practice means repetition of various vocabulary items, grammatical patterns, and pragmatic rules. Furthermore, Bygates (2001) investigated the effect of task repetition and found a positive effect especially in terms of fluency and complexity development of learner language. Through repetition, processing for production likely takes increasingly less amounts of time and effort.

Neuroscientists have also supported the value of repetition by stating that repetition helps make neural connections stronger, so we need to repeat to remember (Medina, 2014). At the beginning of our learning, our newly acquired knowledge is not as stable as we expect and often not ready for

productive use as we hope, but repetition helps to stabilize it for spontaneous use. Furthermore, the scientists believe that the more elaborate, meaningful, and contextual the information, the better it is for learning. For example, in the English activity, one pair chose weird items to bring that had nothing to do with food while another pair chose "nice" food items to bring to the imaginary party. The learners made it a fun activity or a word play. Whether the students made it closer to a real life situation or made it a fun activity, they turned the activity into their own special task. In the French activity, students created sentences about what they regularly eat, thus personalizing the activity. In this way, repetitive practice was done in a creative way.

Larsen-Freeman (2011) also advocates repetitive practice with change. She uses the term iterative practice or task iteration to distinguish it from mindless repetition or mere imitation. Larson-Freeman thinks that learners adapt linguistic patterns to suit their communicative needs. Language development itself is an iterative process in which learners repeatedly experience the same pattern in similar contexts and make minor adjustments during the process. Fully understanding Larsen-Freeman's approach to SLA is beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth noting that researchers in different fields—i.e., one of the mainstream approaches to investigate SLA, hard science, and one of the alternative perspectives to understand SLA—support the significance of repetition in learning.

Creating Linguistic and Non-linguistic Shared Goals

English

English course books usually have a section that provides directions. In another of Prof. Helgesen's activities that he named Blindfolded Directions, participants worked in pairs and guided their partner who is wearing a blindfold. A lot of small colored stones similar to Japanese "*ohajiki*" are put randomly on desks. One member of the pair gives directions such as "turn right," or "go straight" to their blindfolded partner. Partners help each other to collect as many stones of their color as possible and pairs compete. Each pair shares a non-linguistic goal of collecting as many stones as they can as well as a linguistic goal of practicing the target language structures for giving and receiving directions. Not only does this activity fit one of the definitions of tasks, incorporating both linguistic and non-linguistic outcomes, but also it makes learning cooperative because of the shared goal (Jacobs, Power, & Loh, 2002). The feeling of interdependence was promoted because of the competitive nature of the activity.

French

Dr. Kunieda used a website called "Healthy French People Choose to Eat to Stay Fit." The web-

site was for ordinary French people and learners were asked to find vocabulary items they had learned in the group lesson. Students were divided into groups. Each group was assigned to one of the meals, *"le petit déjeuner"* (breakfast), *"le déjeuner"* (lunch), and *"le dîne"* (dinner). The learners found that French people often eat *"fromage"* (cheese) and *"yaourt"* (yogurt) for every meal. It was a task with both a linguistic goal (building vocabulary knowledge) and a non-linguistic goal (cultural understanding). It is also characterized as a cooperative task in which each group was responsible for one meal. Members worked together to share the responsibility so that they could report to the whole class later. In a cooperative task, each member is responsible and members are positively interdependent to achieve a goal (Jacobs et al., 2002).

Collaboration

The field of SLA seems to have a large theoretical and philosophical divide among researchers: (a) researchers in the mainstream SLA who consider L2 learning mainly as information processing and learning through input-interaction-output chain reactions and (b) researchers who take alternative social views of SLA and consider L2 learning as participation in social events, identity reconstruction, and/or whole-person growth. To put it differently, from the former cognitive perspectives, learning mainly takes place in individual, cognitive processes. From the latter sociocultural perspective, learning mainly takes place between individuals in social contexts. Despite the differences, though, researchers in both camps generally believe in the educational value of learner interaction and empirical studies have demonstrated it.

Mainstream researchers, especially so-called interactionists, think that learners acquire new language forms through negotiation for meaning. During conversational interaction, learners receive and provide comprehensible input. However, learner interaction may break down because their language resource is limited. Learners will notice the gap and learn the new language forms to fill it. An empirical study by McDonough (2004) demonstrated that learners who used corrective feedback and modified their output accordingly made progress in accuracy when using conditional clauses.

Researchers who take social views on SLA think that learners scaffold each other in classroom interaction. Storch (2002) examined different characteristics of interactional patterns in terms of equality and mutuality between the pairs—i.e., group characteristics. She demonstrated that collaborative expert-novice pairs improved L2 production and maintained the language gains over time. In sociocultural terms, learners co-constructed knowledge in collaboration with peers during the social interaction.

The results of these two studies, for example, have encouraged L2 teachers to plan lessons to

make better use of collaborative learner interaction that can facilitate language development in the classroom community. The activities demonstrated in the English workshop and French model lesson were abundant with ideas to promote learner engagement in interaction by making use of collaboration between and among learners. The need to work together created opportunities for deeper learning and more robust memory.

Suggestions for Reflective Teaching

I suggest L2 teachers start reflective teaching practices using these two issues as yardsticks in order to make meaningful changes in their routines (Farrell, 2013). One is how to achieve a better balance between explicit instruction and implicit instruction. The other is how to make learning activities more collaborative. It is beyond this article to describe reflective teaching practices and make a case for them, but for the present purposes, it is suffice to say that in reflective teaching it is essential for teachers to reexamine what they do, why they do it, and how they do it in classrooms.

The answers to these questions are closely related to teachers' assumptions, values, and beliefs about how languages are learned and how languages should be taught. These assumptions, values, and beliefs influence teachers' instructional judgments and decisions in complex ways (Borg, 2003). Teachers can keep teacher logs or blogs and use them to uncover their own assumptions, values, and beliefs and realize their biases. They can also compare what they think they have taught and what their students think they have learned. In this way, teachers may find some significant discrepancies and look for ways to reshape their approaches to teaching and learning and modify their instructional choices in terms of the above-mentioned three questions.

Balance Between Implicit Instruction and Explicit Instruction

In this subsection, I introduce three perspectives to achieve a better balance between implicit instruction and explicit instruction. These perspectives are not exclusive or comprehensive, but they will surely guide teachers in conducting reflective teaching practices in their own classrooms and their own instructional contexts.

Implicit/Explicit Continuum and Focus on Form

As discussed above, implicit instruction and explicit instruction constitute a continuum and a range in intensity of implicit/explicitness exists. By definition, focus on form is embedded in a larger meaning-focused context and should not interfere with the communication flow. However, recent studies have demonstrated that more explicit attention to specific language items and structures may

be needed for the development of L2 knowledge (Han, 2008) and explicit focus can be combined with more implicit approaches such as input flood and input enhancement. In input flood, teachers can intentionally put a target form such as different tense and aspects into the input they provide, aural or written, and expect that learners will notice and pick up the target form. When the target form is presented in a special way such as bold type and italics in a written form or with a special emphasis in speaking, the technique is called input enhancement. In either way, the target form is planned beforehand.

Focus on form can also be incidental. Experienced teachers recognize good timing for an explicit focus on form, make use of it, and provide corrective feedback or explanation on the spot. Corrective feedback is a type of error correction or a prompt for error correction in a communicative context. Recast, a teacher's reformulation of a student's utterance is less intrusive to the communication, but the student may not notice it. In more explicit ways, teachers can request clarification or give metalinguistic feedback. In the French model lesson, Dr. Kunieda made use of all these three ways of corrective feedback when reviewing partitive articles at the beginning of the lesson.

The first perspective invites teachers to reflect on their teaching routine using this implicit/explicitness lens. The reflection will uncover the teacher's beliefs on how language is learned and how language should be taught: the starting point of reflective teaching practices.

Accuracy/Fluency/Complexity

In planning classroom activities and tasks, teachers need to decide how much focus they put on accuracy and fluency (and complexity). Accuracy is the extent to which learners use the language correctly and fluency is the extent to which learners use the language with ease. Accuracy and fluency are often a trade-off; thus, it is necessary to decide which to prioritize in planning lessons. Traditional classroom activities such as exercises and drills target accuracy whereas communicative activities such as information gap tasks tend to target fluency. However, Prof. Helgesen demonstrated that traditional activities such as drills, dictation, and dialogues can be more communicative, creative, and fluency-focused. Learners repeatedly recycled the same structural patterns or language features as in the traditional drills, but they used the patterns and features in a communicative context, making personal associations. This made the activities meaning-based and effective for both accuracy and fluency development.

Complexity is another area of language development that should not be missed in teaching, and "accuracy, fluency, and complexity are most likely interdependent" (Nation, 2009, p. 9), but a novice reflective teacher can start with this accuracy/fluency lens for the purpose of examining what they

do, why they do it, and how they do it. Again, this investigation will lead to uncover their beliefs on SLA and ISLA.

Four Strands

A third perspective for a well-balanced approach to L2 instruction is four strands (Nation, 2009). A well-balanced language course is composed of the following four strands: meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development. Nation proposes that roughly the same amount of time should be spent on each of the four strands. Strands stand for long "continuous sets of learning conditions that run through the whole language course" (p. 2). The strand of meaning-focused input is learning through listening and speaking while the strand of meaning-focused output is learning through reading and writing. In language-focused learning, deliberate attention is directed to language features including pronunciation, spelling, vocabulary, grammar, and discourse. In fluency-development activities, learners make use of what they know for quick retrieval for communication. Both repetition of the same patterns and items and task repetition contribute to fluency development as discussed above.

This four-strand lens is easy to use because of its time-on-task principle: By spending roughly the same amount of class time for each strand, teachers can achieve a well-balanced approach. If they have found their teaching practices biased, reflective teachers will want to investigate the reasons and restructure their practices to achieve a better balance.

Making Activities More Collaborative

In this subsection, I introduce three principles to make activities more collaborative. These will be helpful in making better use of interaction in L2 classrooms. I suggest reflective teachers use these principles to reevaluate their teaching practices because L2 learning is, at least partly, social.

Positive Interdependence

Group members are positively interdependent when one member's success depends on the success of the other members (Jacobs & Kimura, 2013). For example, in Blindfolded Directions, if the guiding participant does a good job giving appropriate directions and her partner also does a good job receiving the directions, the pair is successful. This is often called a one-way task: the information only goes from the guiding students to the blindfolded students. However, it is beneficial for both parties: for the guiding participant, it is a productive task while for the blindfolded participant, it is a receptive task. Both sides are responsible for successful completion of the task.

In the French model lesson, when students in groups worked on a reading comprehension task for information on healthy eating habits, the students shared a goal of reading comprehension for better understanding French culture. All of the students had the same information, but they worked on the challenging task together. Sharing a common goal helps create positive interdependence.

Reflective teachers may want to ask whether their students are positively interdependent when working together. If the answer is negative, it is worth trying to generate a shared goal that will take cooperation to achieve.

Equal Participation

Active participation in classroom activities is a key to learning (Jacobs et al., 2002). However, it is not uncommon that only some students are active and doing the talking while others are left out and silent. Reasons for unequal participation may vary, but one way to help equalize participation is to structure interaction. For example, in the ABC Drill, students alternate generating a new sentence of the same pattern using a new word in the alphabetical order. Speaker and listener roles rotate in this activity. Although it may seem unnatural, arbitrary arrangements such as turn-taking and role assignment are useful in providing everyone with an equal opportunity to participate.

It is worth asking whether each student contributes to interaction equally. If the answer is negative, structuring interaction will be helpful. Once a new routine is set up, it will become a norm.

Bonding

In the workshop, I observed participants working on the tasks together by giving hints and praising their partners. They were celebrating their achievements, both linguistic and non-linguistic. They were respectful to each other. The positive affective outcomes cannot be overlooked and should not be underestimated. Research has demonstrated that bonding between pairs, among group members, and in class makes interaction more meaningful because both the quality and quantity of interaction increases and the learning outcomes are maintained (Johnson & Johnson, 2009). It is safe to say that learning in a positive social environment makes individuals stronger. Reflective teachers will want to ask themselves if they have spent enough time nurturing bonding especially when pairs or groups are not functioning. Team building is worth spending time on in the long run and never too late.

Final Reflection

In this article, I offered a brief overview of what past research in ISLA has demonstrated about how and how much classroom L2 instruction can help L2 learners develop their L2 knowledge. I also provided a short report of the Multilingual Workshops in terms of implicit/explicit instruction and collaboration by means of shared goals. Last but not least, I argued that L2 teachers benefit much through reflective teaching practices. Conscious reflection uncovers teachers' assumptions, values, and beliefs about L2 learning and teaching and helps teachers restructure or adjust their teaching routine.

Acknowledgements

References

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington D. C.: Georgetown University Press.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81-109. doi: 10.1017/S0261444803001903

Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic task: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 23-48). Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2013). *Reflective Teaching*. Alexandria, TX: TESOL.

Han, Z. (2008). On the role of meaning in focus on form. In Z. Han (Ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 45-79). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 125-132. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Hulstijin, J. (2002). Towards a unified account of the representation, processing and acquisition of second language knowledge. *Second Language Research, 18*, 193-223. doi: 10.1191/0267658302sr207oa

Jacobs, G. M., & Kimura, H. (2013). *Cooperative learning and teaching*. Alexandria, TX: TESOL.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social independent theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365-379. doi: 10.3102/0013189X09339057

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Kurokawa, M. (2000). Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14(1), 93–124. doi: 10.1080/026999300379003

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (Eds.). (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Loewen, S. (2015). *Introduction to Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. New York, NY: Routledge.

MacKay, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

May, S. (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System, 32*, 207–224. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2004.01.003

Medina, J. (2014). *Brain rules: 12 principles for surviving and thriving at work, home, and school* (2nd ed.). Seattle, WA: Pear Press.

Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417–528. doi: 10.1111/0023-8333.00136

Ortega, L. (2011). SLA after the social turn. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 167–180). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ortega, L. (2014). Ways forward for bi/multilingual turn in SLA. In S. May (Ed.), *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL and bilingual education* (pp. 32–53). New York, NY: Routledge.

Shintani, N., Li, S., & Ellis, R. (2013). Comprehension-based versus production-based grammar instruction: A meta-analysis of comparative studies. *Language Learning, 63*(2), 296–329. doi: 10.1111/lang.12001

Spada, N., & Tomita, Y. (2010). Interactions between type of instruction and type of language feature: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 263–308. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00562.x

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52, 119-158. doi: 10.1111/1467-9922.00179

Making It Happen Through Reflection:
Instructed Second Language Acquisition

Harumi KIMURA

Abstract

The Miyagi Gakuin Women's University foreign language teacher team held the first Multilingual Workshops in the 2015 academic year. The first objective of this paper is to provide a short account of what participants of the workshops experienced and learned. The second objective is to offer an overview of the field called Instructed Second Language Acquisition (ISLA) and its relation to the larger field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and explore issues such as (a) implicit/explicit instruction and (b) collaborative learning conditions using some example activities demonstrated by workshop instructors. The third objective is to invite teachers to conduct reflective teaching practices, become aware of their beliefs about SLA, and reshape their classroom routines.