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The phonetic-phonological reinforcement of Spanish-L2 in students with Learning Disorders through CLIL methodology

Elvira Graziano¹
University of Calabria

Luciano Romito²
University of Calabria

Abstract

This paper outlines the results of research in which we have analysed the advantages of CLIL methodology for people with dyslexia and learning disorders who learn languages. The participants were divided into an experimental group of students who have dyslexia and other learning disorders and a control group who have not. Analysis of the phonetic-phonological level and the investigated morphological and syntactic patterns revealed that participants of both groups use more and better the foreign language because they focus their attention on the contents of the non-linguistic subject. After showing the efficacy of the methodology over a month, we have tried to understand if the students keep the improvement in the phonetic-phonological area after a year. Parts of (semi)spontaneous speech have been analysed, students were asked to recount what they remembered about the contents learnt the previous year. In conclusion, we have underlined the improvement achieved by all the experimental groups by comparing the results.

Keywords: CLIL, dyslexia, learning disorders, phonetics, phonology

1. Introduction

The reason for this research can be found in the definition both of the methodology taken into consideration and of the learning disorder that has been analysed.

CLIL methodology consists in learning in which the contents of a non-linguistic subject and those of a foreign language have the same importance. But, while the contents of the non-linguistic subject are taught for the first time, the observations on linguistic skills often concern what the students have already learnt during a foreign language class.

Developmental dyslexia is a Specific Learning Disorder with a neurobiological basis (Meazzini 2002; Scala 2011; Stella 2011) related to the phonological level of language. In dyslexic people the conversion from graphic units to phonological ones is slower and their reading is inaccurate.

In general, dyslexia is joined with other learning disorders such as dysgraphia, dysorthographia and dyscalculia. This results in the sufferer’s reading being also characterized by a confusion of similar phonemes (b-d; v-f) or phonemes with the

¹ Bio: PhD Student in "Politics, Culture & Development", specializing in Linguistics. Laboratory of Phonetics, University of Calabria – Italy. Corresponding author: elvira.graziano@unical.it

² Bio: Chairman of the Master of Science in Education, Associate Professor in Experimental Phonetics, Phonetics Laboratory University of Calabria – Italy. luciano.romito@unical.it

Content Language and Integrated Learning.

4 In the case of study, the foreign language is Spanish.
same manner or place of articulation but different as far as the voicing is concerned (p-b; k-g) and by words segmented in an incorrect way. Therefore, since the reinforcement of the already learnt skills is essential and necessary for dyslexic students, in CLIL one of the most useful methodologies of language learning has been found. The analysis has involved only the linguistic aspect and not that of the curricular contents. The attention has been focused on the Spanish phonemes which do not belong to the Italian inventory so that it could create more difficulties in the Italian-speaking learners (Calvi 1995; Carrera 2007). The project involves investigating the production of the fricative allophones (/β; δ; γ/) for the set of the Spanish voiced plosives (/b; d; g/) when they are in an intervocalic context (Colonna 2005; De Dominicis 1999; Frangapane 2008; Martínez Celdrán 1991; Saussol 2008; Sola 2011).

\[
\begin{align*}
b &\rightarrow \beta \\
d &\rightarrow \delta \\
g &\rightarrow \gamma
\end{align*}
\]

Native speakers of Italian reproduce these sounds with their corresponding voiced plosives.

The present study proposes the results of the research based on the firm belief that CLIL methodology can help the learning of an L2/FL\(^5\) in students with dyslexia and other Learning Disorders.

### 2. Methodology

The research consists of two experimental sections. The first was carried out on a sample of 13 Calabrian students\(^6\) with the same level of linguistic competence in Spanish\(^7\).

Students were divided into 2 groups: the first, named by convention P\(_{1-8}\), is formed by 8 students with dyslexia and other learning disorders; the second, named S\(_{1-5}\), consists of 5 students who do not have any learning disorder and who have taken part in the study as a control group.

A didactic unit, specifically created and containing three lessons, was put to both groups (P\(_{1-8}\) and S\(_{1-5}\)). At the end of each of these lessons, there was half an hour to let the students speak in the foreign language (the didactic unit is made up of oral and written exercises).

Apart from the phonetic-phonological level, morpho-syntactic structures were also analyzed. However, being deeper levels of language than the phonological one, we are aware that they need a longer and more exhaustive investigation. Morpho-syntactical results have to be considered only as indicative.

As far as phonetic-phonological aspect is concerned, it was supposed that Italian informers would have improved at the end of the lessons, if they focused their attention on the articulatory gestures which contribute to the realization of the phones, which are the object of the present study.

---

\(^5\) Second Language and Foreign Language

\(^6\) Calabria is a region of southern Italy

\(^7\) A2 level of CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages)
The morphological and syntactical phenomena which were studied through a contrastive analysis are reported as follows:

a) The process of forming negative adjectives through the use of prefixes, with particular regards to des- (similar to the Italian form dis-) and in- (identical to the Italian one but with different assimilation rules);

b) The differences in use of the verbs ser, estar and haber that the Italian speakers do not internalize at the early stage of learning, extending the use of the forms of the verb ser, as happens in Italian language for essere/esserci (Cotillas, 1993; De las Nieves Muñiz Muñiz 1998);

c) The difference in the use of auxiliary verbs in the perfect tenses. In fact, while Spanish uses the forms of the verb haber, in Italian forms of both the verbs essere and avere are employed. So, an Italian speaker could mistakenly use both haber and ser;

d) The use of some verbal periphrasis with the infinitive in Italian (e.g. continuare a+infinitive) and with the gerund in Spanish (e.g. seguir/llevar+gerund). So the Italian speaking informers could incur in the phenomenon of linguistic transfer (Luque 2008).

For all of these four points just described, an improvement, during the three CLIL lessons was supposed, for the Italian speaking informers. Focusing attention on what to say and not how to do that, they would use the foreign language and the grammar to speak about the contents they have learnt.

In the second part of the study, it was decided to check if the improvement reported by the dyslexic students would be retained after a year. But, while the first investigation was about the three aspects of linguistic production (phonetic-phonological, morphological and syntactical ones), in the second the analysis involved only the phonetic-phonological level. In fact, this is the first to be learnt but also the least firmly fixed, especially by students with dyslexia who have a deficit in the phonological component of the language.

The analysed data was elicited through (semi)spontaneous speech, obtained by an informal interview using a qualitative technique. Students were asked about what they remembered and to discuss about the contents they had learned the previous year. The same variables of the first investigation were taken into consideration.

While in the first section there had been supposed an improvement in the way in which the informers articulated the sounds which are the object of the study, in the second it has been supposed that these sounds would be produced in the correct way but with a smaller or similar error percentage than in the first investigation.

3. Findings

After identifying the variables to analyze and the relative hypothesis to check, the analysis of data and their findings will be introduced.

3.1 Phonetic-phonological level

With the help of a model, used as datum and purpose-created, data have been analyzed distinguishing the plosive sounds from fricatives ones and from the allophones on the basis of the values of their intensity.
The software PRAAT\(^8\) has been used to tag all the recorded sound signals and some phonemes which could be definitely considered as plosives, fricatives or as allophones. They have been worked out from the speech of each Italian speaking informer. The sound spectrogram\(^9\) and the oscillogram\(^10\) have been studied. As an example, fig.1 shows both spectrogram and oscillogram for the word *crucificado*, in which appear respectively the phonemes: voiceless velar plosive /k/; voiceless interdental /θ/ and labio-dental /f/ fricatives and the voiced interdental fricative\(^11\) allophone /ð/.

*Figure 1 Spectrogram and oscillogram of the word *crucificado*

Being a voiceless plosive, it is simple to observe in the occurrence of /k/ a moment of silence, followed by a burst. On the spectrogram, the first is marked by a white zone, while the burst by vertical stripes; furthermore, the intensity curve, with values of dB close to the lowest level of the scale, shows the manner of plosive articulation.

On the contrary, /θ/ and /f/ are fricative sounds. Therefore, these are graphically shown as irregular stripes of different frequencies like the rustling produced when the air passes through a narrow channel. In the case of the allophone /ð/ often produced as approximant sound or *frictionless*, on the spectrogram it is not possible to observe the phase of silence (because the sound is not plosive), nor the phase of rustling (because the sound is produced as approximant) but there is always a higher value of intensity than the plosive sound (Romito 2003).

Measuring the values of intensity of each phone, it has been created the following table\(^12\) (Table 1):

\(^8\) P. Boersma; D. Weernink, 5.2.18 version.  
\(^9\) The graphic representation of time variation of frequencies" in a sound.  
\(^10\) The graphic representation of time variation of intensity in a sound.  
\(^11\) See also Sola Prado 2011  
\(^12\) The recordings have not been made in a silent room but in a usual room with the possibility of noise (even if very little) so that these values have to be considered relative.
Table 1.  
Intensity values of reference for the analysed phonemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANNER OF ARTICULATION</th>
<th>INTENSITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>45 dB &lt; x &lt; 50 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>55 dB &lt; x &lt; 62 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative allophones</td>
<td>62 dB &lt; x &lt; 68 dB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the first part of this study, in the three lessons, 144 fricative intervocalic allophones were produced by the group P₁₋₈ and 90 by the group S₁₋₅.

As far as the group P₁₋₈ is concerned, as can also be seen in fig.2, all the students have shown an improvement:

![Phonetics Group P₁₋₈](image)

Figure 2. Error percentage during the three lessons for each student of the group P₁₋₈

The data show how the didactic unit thought for students with Learning Disorders have led to an average progress of about 30.5%.

Also the group S₁₋₅ presents an improvement for all the students estimated at about 33% (fig.3).

![Phonetics Group S₁₋₅](image)

Figure 3. Error percentage during the three lessons for each student of the group S₁₋₅
3.2 Morphological level

Also in the morphological area, both the group P\textsubscript{1-8} and the group S\textsubscript{1-5} show a progress in the application of the grammatical rules. They were asked to produce the negative form of some adjectives through use of the aforementioned prefixes. However, the analysis has involved only the productions whose eventual errors could be related to an uncertain knowledge of the prefixation rule, which is the object of the study: the errors due to possible negative transfer\textsuperscript{13} from the Italian language have been excluded. Therefore, 64 productions for the group P\textsubscript{1-8} and 40 for the group S\textsubscript{1-5} were analysed. While the error percentage of the first group (P\textsubscript{1-8}) passes from 38.5\% in the first lesson to 19.2\% in the third one, in the group S\textsubscript{1-5} it passes from 45.4\% in the first lesson to 27.3\% in the third.

3.3 Syntactical level

In regard to the syntax, the analysis has been more complex. Similar to the morphology, only the productions that, certainly, could be assigned to the knowledge or not of the rules proposed to them and that had been not influenced by transfer from Italian language were analyzed. In the following table (Table 2) are the occurrences of each verb the learners produced.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>First lesson</th>
<th>Second lesson</th>
<th>Third lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ser</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haber</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perifrasis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that the number of the occurrences is very similar in the last two lessons and, for this reason, it can be supposed that the possible progress happened then.

Figures 4 and 5 show how the error percentage falls in both groups: in the first group (P\textsubscript{1-8}) the error percentage passes from 28\% in the second lesson to 17.5\% in the third. In the group S\textsubscript{1-5} the error percentage passes from 34.4\% to 14.4\%. The results confirm that there is a progress of about 10.5\% for the first group and about 20\% for the second.

\textsuperscript{13} Transfer due to the lexical affinity of the adjectives between the two compared languages and that, as a consequence, would have produced the correct forms.
Figure 4. Error percentage of the group P_{1-8} in the last two lessons

Figure 5. Error percentage of the group S_{1-5} in the last two lessons

3.4 Comparison of collected data

After taking into account the collected data from both groups separately, they were compared. In the phonetic-phonological area, while the group P_{1-8} progresses at first and then it stabilizes, the group S_{1-5} advances gradually in a marked way from the first to the third lesson (fig.6)

Figure 6. Error percentage of both groups in phonetic area
In regard to the morphological area, unlike what happens in the phonetic one, the group $P_{1-8}$ progresses in the last two lessons, after a short standstill between the first and the second lessons. After an early progress (in which it passes from 45.4% to 27.3%), the group $S_{1-5}$ stabilizes and the error percentage remains about 27.3% in the last lesson (fig.7)

![Comparison on morphology](image1)

Figure 7. Error percentage of both groups in the morphological area

The results can be explained considering that the morphological and the syntactical levels, as will be discussed afterwards, are less direct than the phonetic-phonological one. Consequently, they need a longer observation on the patterns studied by students in order to be absorbed.

Also in respect of the syntax, in fact, there is a progress for both groups between the second and the third lessons. In the group $P_{1-8}$ the error percentage passes from 28% to 17.5% whereas in the group $S_{1-5}$ from 34.4% to 14.4% (fig.8)

![Comparison on syntax](image2)

Figure 8. Error percentage of both groups in the syntactical area

3.5 **Phonetic-phonological analysis: a year later**

In the second part of the study, the analyzed sample\textsuperscript{14} consists of 386 phonemes produced in an intervocalic context.

\textsuperscript{14} Also in this case with the software *Praat*
In table 3 it can be noted that the interdental (/ð/) was used 289 times, followed by the bilabial (/β/) and by the velar (/ɤ/), produced respectively 63 and 34 times.

**Table 3. Phonemes occurrences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interdental phoneme /ð/</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial phoneme /β/</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velar phoneme /ɤ/</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis shows that it is the velar phoneme that has the highest error percentage (about 61.7%), while the bilabial is produced wrongly in 41.3% of occurrences. The interdental /ð/ is the phoneme produced more correctly with an error percentage of about 29% of the occurrences (fig.9).

![Error Percentage](image)

**Figure 9. Error percentage for each phoneme**

Afterwards, the productions of each student was analyzed. Each informer is indicated with the letter P and with a number from 1 to 5 (which had been assigned to them in the first part of the study). It can be observed that the error percentage is very low in all the five cases. In figure 10 we can observe that the best students are P₁ and P₃, who show respectively 7.2% and 8% of errors.
The average error percentage of the all the P_{1-5} group is about 15%.

3.6 Comparison with the data collected in the first part of the study.
At the end of the second section of the study, the results were further compared with the error percentages that the same informers had been reported the previous year. Here, there is again the graph of the error percentages during the three lessons of the first part of the study, reported only by the five informers who took part in the second part of the research after a year (fig.11).

Comparing the figures 10 and 11, it can be pointed out that, after a year, the error percentage reduces for four of five students clearly: P_1 passes from 24% in the last lesson of the year before to 7.2%; P_2 from 25% to 23%; P_3 from 28% to 8%; P_4 from 23% to 16.7%.
The progress shown by P_1 is about 17%, that noted by P_2 is about 2%, whereas in P_3 and P_4 the improvement is reduced but significant at any rate (about 20% and 6.3% respectively).
A more detailed observation has to be addressed to P_5.
As can be noted, there would seem to be a worsening of linguistic skills: P5 passes from 17% of errors made during the third lesson of the first part of the study to 19.75% after a year.

Nevertheless, if we consider the first two lessons of the first part of research, it can be observed that there are higher error percentages at the beginning of the study. The starting point shows that P5 makes about 67% of errors in the first lesson and 16% in the second.

As consequence, while for P1, P2, P3 and P4 a gradual improvement can be seen, for P5 we cannot speak of a real worsening, but of a stabilization of what s/he has learnt. Compared with the starting point, in fact, a year later, P5 shows an error percentage which differs only by about 2.75% against an overall progress which is about 43%.

4. Conclusions

From the data of the two parts of the study, collected a year apart from each other, we can infer how much CLIL methodology is useful for teaching and learning of an L2/FL for students with dyslexia and other Learning Disorders. They manage to assimilate what is taught them without slowing the didactic activity planned for all the class group.

In fact, in the first part of the study, the progress has not involved only the experimental group but also the control group with very similar percentages.

Furthermore, a year later, the students who participated in the second part of the investigation have shown not only that they remember the contents of the subject (which has not been object of the analysis in this paper) but also to have built up the phonetic-phonological aspect of the language with the help of a time dedicated to the development of speaking skill at the end of each lesson.

The students are active elements in a CLIL lesson: they are led to compete and speak, using the L2/FL taught them. Since their attention is focused on the contents they have to talk about, they aim to use the language they are learning more with no fear of making mistakes, unlike what happens in the ordinary L2/FL lessons.

In this way, the linguistic skills are developed. And it explains why, a year later, there is a further progress which invites us to reflect again and more consciously on the potentials of CLIL methodology also as a strategy of an inclusive teaching of the students with Learning Disorders.

These students would be able to follow the educational plan designed for all the class group and would not need individualized educational plans different from that of their schoolmates.
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Approaches to Supporting Heritage Speakers of Spanish in the Portuguese Language Classroom in the United States
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Abstract

In the United States post-secondary education context at those institutions where Portuguese is taught to adults as a second language, it is common for a separate track of study to be offered for Spanish-speakers. This paper reports demographic data from the US Census Bureau and online job posting data which together highlight the economic and educational value in offering Portuguese instruction in communities such as Miami Florida with a high percentage of Spanish-speakers and emphasizes the need to give special consideration to Spanish-speakers of varying linguistic backgrounds in designing and implementing Portuguese language programs. The paper concludes by offering policy suggestions for language program managers and human resource officials.

Keywords Portuguese, Spanish, heritage language, closely-related languages, multilingualism, hiring

1. Introduction

This paper explores how the needs of Heritage Speakers of Spanish differ from those of native and L2 speakers of Spanish in the context of the U.S. Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers classroom. The importance of teaching Portuguese to Spanish-speakers and the role of Portuguese and Spanish language skills in the job market of the Miami Florida region are highlighted through an analysis of language requirements published in online announcements on Indeed.com, a popular resume website. The paper reviews relevant research on teaching Portuguese to Spanish-Speakers, Heritage learners of Spanish and third and multiple language acquisition. The paper concludes by making suggestions for teaching practice and policy in this context.

The Portuguese language has been taught in the United States since at least 1658, and although it remains a less commonly taught language in the broad context of foreign language teaching in this country, the importance of Portuguese continues to increase. Portuguese is listed among those languages considered critical to U.S. National Security and Defense, has been given “critical” status by the U. S. Department of Education (Tesser, 2004) and, despite the current economic and political crises, Brazil remains an important international economic partner for the U. S. and perhaps the most important international economic partner for the port city of Miami.

1 Bio: Thomas Stovicek received his Ph.D. in Hispanic Linguistics from The Ohio State University. He is an Assistant Professor at the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center and Site Director in Miami, Florida. His research interests include Applied Linguistics, Language Policy, and Language Change and Variation. Contact: twstovicek@gmail.com
Supporting heritage speakers

Florida (Miami Herald), where a large percentage of the population identifies as Hispanic and where the Spanish language is widely spoken. Among U.S. colleges and universities which offer instruction in the Portuguese language, it is not uncommon for there to be a separate, accelerated track for learners who have some level of proficiency in Spanish which is the most commonly taught non-English language in the United States and the native or heritage language of a large and increasing number of U.S. citizens and residents. Given the geographic proximity of the Spanish and Portuguese languages in the Americas and in Europe, not to mention the typological proximity of these two Ibero-Romance languages, it should be of little surprise to anyone that instruction in Portuguese is most often sought out by or prescribed to those whose interests in the Hispanic and Lusophone worlds intersect.

In their 2014 article, Bateman and Oliveira explored the motivations of both Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish speaking students for choosing to study Portuguese at Brigham Young University. They found that the non-Spanish speaking students “were often influenced by spouses, in-laws, siblings, or friends who spoke Portuguese, by interests such as soccer or religious missions, or by a general appreciation for the beauty of the language. Spanish-speaking students of Portuguese, in comparison, tended to be more motivated by career-related reasons as well as by confidence in their ability to learn the language due to its similarity to Spanish (p. 275).”

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, as of July 2014, 66.2% of the residents of Miami-Dade county FL identified as Hispanic or Latino, and 72.2% of persons over the age of five were reported to speak a language other than English at home. Clearly, without even counting L2 speakers of Spanish, we can infer from these census data that the population of Spanish-speakers in Miami-Dade is sizeable, even formidable. Given these demographics and the prominent role that Brazil and Brazilians play in the economy of Miami, this might look like a gold mine from the perspective of anyone trying to attract students to a Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers program.

2. Methodology

In order to explore, at least superficially, the link between Spanish and Portuguese language skills and career opportunities in the Miami region, I performed a series of searches on the job and resume website Indeed.com. Indeed describes itself as “the #1 job site worldwide, with over 200 million unique visitors per month.” The website is available in more than 60 countries and 28 languages. Indeed claims to cover 94% of global GDP. The objective of searching for data in online job postings was to get a relative sense of how many employment opportunities require or desire (typically stated as “Portuguese a plus”) Portuguese language skills, and how these needs intersect with the need for Spanish language skills in the Miami area.

On April 4, 2016 a search for the keyword “Spanish” within 25 miles of Miami, Florida for jobs published anytime returned 4,787 results. An equivalent search using the keyword “Portuguese” returned 435 results. With respect to those search results for Portuguese, I wanted to know more about the relationship between Spanish and Portuguese language skills as
portrayed in the online job advertisements. As a sample, the first 50 results (collected from a search performed on March 29, 2016) were analyzed with attention to their descriptions of language skill requirements. Of the 50 job descriptions, only 44 actually contained the word “Portuguese” in the body of the ad. The other 6 were not considered.

3. Findings
One job ad (2%) listed Portuguese as “a plus” and made no reference to Spanish. Four job ads (9%) required both Spanish and Portuguese. Six ads (14%) required either Spanish or Portuguese. Eight ads (18%) required Portuguese and made no mention of Spanish. Eleven ads (25%) listed either Spanish or Portuguese as a plus, and 14 ads (32%) listed Spanish as a requirement and Portuguese as a plus. It seems clear that for Portuguese-speakers looking to leverage this skill in seeking employment in the Miami area, a lack of Spanish language skills represents a significant disadvantage. By the same token, Portuguese seems to represent an advantage for Spanish-speakers when applying for jobs that require foreign language skills.

Figure 1
Job search results containing the keyword “Portuguese” within 25 miles of Miami, Florida from Indeed.com on March 29, 2016; categorized by the language requirement description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Requirement</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Percentage of total jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese required</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese a plus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese AND Spanish Required</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese OR Spanish required</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish required, Portuguese a plus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish OR Portuguese a plus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It would seem a strong argument then that offering Portuguese language instruction, and especially Portuguese instruction designed with the Spanish-speaking population in mind, directly supports the particular needs of the job market and workforce in the Miami area.

2. Discussion
This snapshot of the need for Portuguese language skills in the Miami area provided by the job data presented above suggests that there is a strong need for individuals who speak both Spanish and Portuguese, to at least some degree, in the local job market. If public and private schools, colleges and universities wish to serve this growing need in their community, they must not only include Portuguese among the world languages taught, but must also carefully consider how Portuguese courses should be taught and administered to best meet the needs of the populations they serve. As I argue below, doing so may be a more complex endeavor than adding Portuguese 101, or Basic Portuguese for Business to the course catalog.
In his 2004 publication, Keith Johnson poses the question “What is a Spanish Speaker?” in the context of teaching Portuguese to learners categorized as such. The present paper will echo his affirmation that the Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers classroom frequently contains three distinct sets of Spanish-speakers: native Spanish speakers, heritage language Spanish-speakers, and L2 speakers of Spanish. These groups can be defined not only by their background with the Spanish language, but also by the types of linguistic errors they make in their Portuguese interlanguage. He concludes that “[f]rom a pedagogical standpoint, it could be the case that not enough attention is being paid to the needs of certain learners owing to a possibly flawed assumption of homogeneous competence among learners”, and suggests that in this case “teachers and program directors will likely want to design materials, courses and methods accordingly, so as to better meet the needs of different groups of learners gathered under the same roof (p, 63).” My intention is to address some of those concerns below.

Several studies have been published which shed light on the complex range of considerations that educators must make when approaching the mission of teaching Portuguese to Spanish-speakers. First of all, it must be recognized that there is a high degree of mutual intelligibility between the two languages. John B. Jensen reported Spanish and Portuguese to be 50% to 60% mutually intelligible on a test of passive listening to electronically recorded voices, but recognizes that results may differ in a face-to-face conversational setting (1989). Elsewhere Spanish speakers with no previous knowledge of Portuguese have been estimated to understand around 50% of spoken Portuguese and up to 94% of written academic texts in Portuguese (Carvalho, Freire and da Silva 2010). This means that Spanish-speaking students will be able to comprehend more complex, higher level texts early on in their efforts to acquire Portuguese. It also suggests that simple, simplified or lower level texts such as those in the introductory chapters of many Portuguese textbooks not written with Spanish speakers in mind may not be adequate to challenge or fully engage students who are proficient in Spanish.

As language educators, we recognize that the receptive skills (reading and listening) tend to surpass the productive skills (writing and speaking). With respect to structural accuracy and precision, this can certainly be said of the Spanish speaker beginning to study Portuguese. However, in terms of communicative competence, due to the mutual intelligibility of the two languages, the Spanish-speaking student may encounter little to no difficulty completing information gap or other communicative learning activities in the classroom, even before much if any control of the target language is acquired. For this reason, authors such as Carvalho and Silva (2008) suggest that these closely related languages pose a difficulty for purely communicative methods of instruction. The very strong tendency for negative transfer has been highlighted in Carvalho, Freire and da Silva (2010). Scaramucci and Rodrigues (2004) and Almeida Filho (2004) refer to the likelihood of fossilization if insufficient attention is given to form in the Portuguese for Spanish-speakers classroom. In fact, the need to emphasize grammatical accuracy or metalinguistic awareness in general is a common theme across the works cited in the present paper.
The role of metalinguistic awareness in the acquisition of Portuguese by English-speaking L2 speakers of Spanish and native Spanish-speakers has been explored by several researchers. Carvalho & Silva, adopting Schmidt’s “noticing” hypothesis, investigated the role of attention in the exercise of control over the crosslinguistic transfer of knowledge between Spanish and Portuguese. “In their study, native speakers of English who learned Spanish in the classroom had higher levels of metalinguistic awareness than Spanish-English bilinguals who learned both English and Spanish naturalistically early in their lives; they also outperformed the latter in their acquisition of Portuguese as their L3 because native Spanish speakers more frequently attempted to apply Spanish grammatical rules to Portuguese (Carvalho, Freire and da Silva 2010, p72).” The implication here is that native English-speakers who acquired Spanish as adults tend to consciously apply their explicit knowledge of grammar to the task of learning Portuguese whereas native Spanish-speakers exhibit a preference for applying intuitive knowledge, in the form of analogy and generalization, to the same task (Carvalho & Silva 2008).

The notion of “noticing” in the context of SLA was defined by Robinson as “detection with awareness and rehearsal in short-term memory (1995, p. 318).” He affirms that “[in] the domain of grammatical knowledge, familiarity with the basic metalinguistic principles for describing structural patterns and structural analogies would probably aid hypothesis testing by directing attention to relevant features of the input to be noticed (p. 320).” Ironically, the very high degree of mutual intelligibility between Spanish and Portuguese which allows Spanish-speakers to develop their comprehension of Portuguese very quickly may be detrimental to their ability to hone their attention on structural differences between the languages in such a way that their observations can be translated into rules applied to the task of producing speech or text in the TL. Furthermore, fossilization in the development of one’s interlanguage may be more likely to occur if the learner feels satisfied with his or her ability to communicate with TL interlocutors, and sees no reason to continue improving grammatical accuracy (Carvalho & Silva 2008, Leaver 2003).

Having highlighted some of the salient challenges for the teacher and learner in the Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers context, let us review some observations about that subgroup of Spanish-speaking learners which may be categorized as heritage learners or heritage speakers of Spanish. Heritage speakers of a language are generally characterized as bilinguals who grew up in families with one or more immigrant parents or caretakers and who are learning or have learned the ethnolinguistic minority language in question primarily within the context of family and/or the greater ethnolinguistic minority community. These speakers are exposed to and acquire the ethnolinguistic majority language from an early age via formal schooling and their participation in the ethnolinguistic majority speech community (Montrul 2011, Hedgcock & Lefkowitz 2016, Silva 2011, Yanguas 2010). It should also be kept in mind that there is a great range of variety in heritage language (HL) proficiency among heritage speakers, and although there are certain shared characteristics, heritage speakers cannot be treated as a homogenous group (Montrul 2011). With respect to heritage speakers of
Spanish in the United States, a large number of heritage varieties of Spanish may also be present in any given learning context, further necessitating a consciousness of individual differences between heritage learners’ linguistic backgrounds.

The vast majority of heritage speakers fail to acquire full native competency in their home language (Montrul 2011). For heritage speakers of Spanish several specific linguistic tendencies have been identified in the literature. These include the omission of the preposition a of dative experiencers with gustar-type verbs, the confusion of aspectual distinctions between perfective and imperfective forms, poor control of the subjunctive mood in both the present and past tenses and errors in inflectional morphology especially with respect to overt marking of gender and number (Montrul 2011).

Heritage learners of Spanish frequently share Spanish language classrooms with their native English-speaking colleagues throughout the United States, but several important differences in needs, perceptions and expectations between these groups have been identified. When compared with native English-speaking L2 learners of Spanish, heritage learners excel in oral proficiency, but struggle more with metalinguistic terminology and grammatical accuracy in written tasks. Heritage learners report reading and writing skills which are weaker than their oral-aural skills, whereas the opposite is generally true of L2 learners. Due to this, heritage learners report a greater desire to improve their Spanish writing skills, whereas L2 learners are more focused on improving their speaking skills (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz 2016). Heritage speakers are often familiar with the colloquial spoken registers, but may have little to no experience with formal or written registers (Montrul 2013). It is clear that in the Spanish language classroom, heritage speakers of Spanish and native English-speaking L2 Spanish speakers have very different needs, and approach their learning in different ways. They may even interact differently with instructional materials, as suggested by a study of heritage and non-heritage Portuguese learners (Silva 2011).

Let us now return to the question of the heritage speaker of Spanish in the Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers classroom. I would argue that this group of learners is indeed a third and distinct group with different needs than both the native English Speaking L2 Spanish speakers and the fully native speakers of Spanish with whom they may share their Portuguese classroom. It has been established that an emphasis on metalinguistic awareness and a contrastive analysis of Spanish and Portuguese grammar are important for minimizing early fossilization of the Portuguese interlanguage of Spanish speakers (Jordan 1991, Carvalho & Silva 2010). It has also been demonstrated that heritage speakers of Spanish are less confident with metalinguistic terminology and an explicit understanding of Spanish grammar than their native English-speaking colleagues (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz 2016, Montrul 2013). They have also been shown to have a weaker command of Spanish grammar than their native Spanish-speaking counterparts (Montrul 2011, 2013). Despite their readiness to comprehend authentic Portuguese-language speech and texts early in their efforts to acquire Portuguese, heritage learners may be at a distinct disadvantage with respect to metalinguistic knowledge in comparison to their native English-speaking and native Spanish-speaking classmates. They may be prone to
greater anxiety when faced with written tasks and may be more vulnerable to early fossilization.

Given the demographics and economics of places like Miami Florida, where we should expect an increasingly significant percentage of heritage speakers of Spanish to enroll in Portuguese language courses, and where the need for both Spanish and Portuguese language skills seems to permeate various sectors of the job market, the needs of this group of learners should not be ignored, and quite arguably deserves special attention. Although enrollment in Portuguese language courses may have increased significantly over the past three and a half centuries (Tesser 2004), few language departments in South Florida or elsewhere in the United States are likely to find themselves any time soon with the resources to create and maintain such a robust Portuguese language program that separate (and fully populated) courses for non-Spanish speakers, native Spanish speakers, L2 Spanish speakers and Spanish heritage speakers can regularly be offered. Instead, it is probably more practicable to focus on policy and practices which allow these learners to come together under one roof to learn the Portuguese language without any group being unfairly disadvantaged with respect to their learning or assessment.

3. Conclusion

With this goal in mind, I would like to suggest the following practices. First of all, teachers need to be equipped with sufficient information about their students’ linguistic backgrounds and differentiate instruction accordingly. This may require linguistic background surveys, language proficiency scores or both. Teachers and learners should work together to develop a learning plan, or a learning contract which addresses the learners’ individual needs and objectives, focusing on the learning process rather than on specific course content (Ismail & Yusof 2012, Kelm 2004). As one of my own Portuguese students shared when I taught at Miami-Dade College, she liked learning Portuguese because it helped her better understand the nature of her own heritage language, Spanish; a worthy learning objective in my opinion. This suggested approach would also require that Portuguese instructors in this context have a certain level of knowledge of Spanish linguistics in order to guide learners through the process of comparative analysis, and help them navigate sociolinguistic tensions that may arise between different groups of Spanish-speakers in the classroom (Lokensgard 2004, Santos & Silva 2004). Courses should perhaps be planned using flexible syllabi, in which there is room for much of the specific course content and many of the milestones to be negotiated between the teacher and the learners to enable greater engagement and buy-in for all learners.

In my opinion, course success should also be based on measured improvement during the course rather than on the achievement of a predetermined end state which may be far more easily achieved by some learners than others. Belpoliti and Fairclough (2016) describe an impressive inquiry-based learning program of instruction in Spanish for heritage learners, which contains many elements easily adaptable to the Portuguese-for-Spanish-speakers context. Finally, I would argue that the value of a target-language-only policy for the classroom should be carefully considered.
in this case, before it is implemented. A Portuguese-for-Spanish-Speakers classroom in the United States implies that the learning objective is not bilingualism, but rather multilingualism. Jessner affirms in his work on Dynamic Systems Theory and multilingualism, that there are qualitative differences between L2 and L3 learning, and concludes that a definition of multilingual proficiency would have to include both crosslinguistic awareness and metalinguistic awareness (2008), neither of which is actively facilitated for Portuguese learners if English and Spanish are both ignored or strictly barred from the classroom.

With respect to educational policy, I would affirm that the cancellation of under-enrolled Portuguese courses should be scrutinized closely, as I believe this practice underserves the needs of places which share similar demographics with Miami. In fact, a smaller student-to-teacher ratio may be favorable in a class where differentiated instruction is practiced. I would also advocate the use of project-based assessment, rather than test-based assessment in Portuguese language courses with highly heterogeneous student cohorts. The highly variable linguistic backgrounds typically comprising the students in these courses does not place them on equal footing to be able to achieve the same results or be equally challenged if all are assessed using the same test. I also advocate that language programs and departments offering Portuguese provide professional development resources to their instructors to ensure they are well equipped to understand and appreciate the diverse linguistic backgrounds of their students.

For those who seek to hire individuals with Portuguese and/or Spanish language skills in both the public and private sectors, I would suggest greater precision in the definition of the skills required. Hiring officials should be aware that tests of listening and reading comprehension in Portuguese are not necessarily indicative of a corresponding level of productive skills, especially for applicants possessing native, heritage or L2 proficiency in Spanish. We are aware that Spanish and Portuguese are highly mutually intelligible, and that meaning can be communicated to a great extent with a little patience and with each interlocutor speaking in his or her respective language. However, one might argue that for individuals charged with representing their organization by means of direct spoken or written communication with Portuguese-speaking partners or clients, spoken and written proficiency in the language should be considered a necessity and not merely “a plus”, as it demonstrates a respect for the cultural, linguistic and national identity of the interlocutors and a dedication to the strengthening of that relationship. This is where we as language educators play a role, and can play an increasingly effective role in enhancing inter-cultural communication if we strive to better understand the needs of each of our Portuguese learners and design and administer programs of instruction which meet them where they are, and carry them forward toward full professional proficiency.
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Abstract
When reflection is defined as a purposeful act of thinking which seeks solution to problems encountered in the process of teaching and learning (Loughran, 1996), it can be considered as one of the important concepts for the improvement of students' self-efficacy and one of the ways to teachers’ development and professionalism. This study tries to find out the impact of acting reflectively on students’ self-efficacy in the classroom. Participants of the study included 20 EFL teachers teaching in Tonekabon language institutes, Iran, and their 100 EFL learners. Reflective teaching and self-efficacy questionnaires were administered to teachers and learners respectively. The results of statistical analysis revealed that those teachers who acted reflectively could significantly affect EFL learners' self-efficacy improvement.
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1. Introduction
There are not many published pieces of research in applied linguistics to indicate that teacher reflection will have any positive or negative effect on L2 learners’ achievement or efficiency of instruction. In fact, reflection on actual practices inside the classroom is the key to teachers’ creativity and professional development. (Aghaii & Jadidi, 2013). In this view teachers should be able to monitor, evaluate and revise their own practice. Many learners believe they cannot succeed in learning English as a foreign language (Brophy, 1998; Pajares, 2003). In other words, their self-efficacy for this purpose is low. Psychologists have shown increasing interest in exploring students’ cognitive process during classroom learning. In fact, they believe that investigating learners’ needs and beliefs is the central component of the teaching and learning process.

Self-efficacy can be defined as one’s belief in one’s ability to perform a particular action, or one’s own personal power to achieve and develop a goal. Moreover, it can be regarded as belief in one’s capacity to effectively use their cognitive skills in order to attain a specific goal (Bandura, 1993). According to Bandura (1993) “people’s level of motivation, affective states, and actions are based more on what they believe than on what is objectively the case”.
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1.1. Literature review

Reflection is a purposeful act of thinking which seeks solutions to problems encountered in the process of teaching and learning. According to Farrell (2008) teachers “collect data about their teaching, examine their attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, and teaching practices, and use the information obtained as a basis for critical reflection about teaching.” Schon (1983) believes that “reflective practitioners continually learn from their experience, reconstructing experience through reflection.”

Al-Jabri (2009) investigated EFL teachers’ attitudes towards reflection through questionnaires and interviews. The finding of the study showed that teachers considered reflection as a tool for professional development, a tool that helped them improve their teaching. The participant also reported a high level of engagement in activities which involved or provided opportunities for reflection.

Teachers generally reflect on their teaching and students’ learning, how effective their instructional decisions are, approaches to teaching, improving practice and cognitive awareness of their reflective processes (McAlpine, Weston, Berhiaume & Fairbank, 2004). For educational improvement teacher professionalism is essential. McAlpine and Weston (2000) suggest that reflection fosters professional growth. Osterman and Kottkamp (2004) define reflection as “a professional development strategy and they believe through reflection professionals will be equipped with opportunities to explore, articulate and represent their own ideas and knowledge”. Teacher’s reflection will definitely affect learners’ self-efficacy too.

Research findings on self-efficacy have demonstrated that self-efficacy, is characterized by its responsiveness to variation in personal experience and attainment and its sensitivity to teaching techniques and instructional strategies (Zimmermman, 2000). Self-efficacy, unlike other psychological constructs that have a trait-like stability, is a malleable construct that could be enhanced through providing students with motivational assistance and guidance. (Schunk, 2003, p. 61)

In a study Akbari and Karimiallvar (2010) investigate the relationship between three teacher-related variables-teaching styles, teachers’ sense efficacy, and teacher reflectivity- and students’ achievement in an English language teaching. They conclude that there is a high correlation between teacher reflectivity and students’ achievement outcomes. According to them, reflection is a teacher’s passionate desire to change problematic classroom conditions into a safe environment for students to learn and grow.

Although each of these strands of research has contributed meaningfully to an understanding of the place of reflection and self-efficacy in teacher education, the focus of this study is a more specific and concrete look at the influence of teachers’ reflection on students’ self-efficacy.
2. Methodology

1.1. Setting and Participants
The participants of this study consisted of 20 Iranian EFL teachers, teaching at elementary levels in English language schools in Tonekabon, Mazandaran, Iran. They were both male and female and had at least one year of experience in teaching. All of them had Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Master of Arts (MA) degrees in English Literature, English Translation or English Language Teaching. The other group of participants included 100 Iranian EFL learners studying at elementary levels from the same language institutes in Tonekabon, Mazandaran, Iran where the teacher participants of the study were chosen. They all were the students of the teachers who participated in the study.

1.2. Instruments

1.3. Oxford Placement Test (OPT)
An Oxford Placement Test was administered to select 100 homogeneous students. The test contained 60 questions (20 grammars, 20 vocabularies, 10 reading comprehension, and 10 writing).

1.4. Reflective Teaching Questionnaire
Reflective teaching questionnaire in this study is a five-point Likert scale which has been designed based on six factors (elements): cognitive, metacognitive, affective, practical, critical, and moral. The five options ‘Never’, ‘Rarely’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Often’, and ‘Always’ give the impression of taking a series of 29 items in a multiple-choice test format. Reliability of the sum scale computed using Cronbach’s coefficient Alpha is 0.90. Moreover, Reliability of each factor of the scale is completely acceptable – all are above 0.7.

1.5. Self-Efficacy Questionnaire
It is a five-point Likert scale which has been designed based on three factors: academic, social, and emotional. The five options ‘Never’, ‘Rarely’, ‘Sometimes’, ‘Often’, and ‘Always’ give the impression of taking a series of 24 items in a multiple-choice test format. Its reliability was estimated to be over 0.7.

1.6. Data Collection and Analysis
The researcher gave reflection questionnaire to 30 teachers to obtain information on the teachers’ attitudes toward reflection and reflective teaching. Through reflective questionnaire 20 teachers were selected. These subjects were divided into two groups of teachers. Group one consists of 10 teachers who acted reflectively very well and group two, 10 teachers who acted less reflectively in their classrooms.

Then, the researcher administered a test of OPT to a number of students and 100 homogenous subjects were selected and they were randomly divided into experimental and control groups. Then, a pretest of self-efficacy was administered for knowing their attitude about their capabilities. Students were assured that the results would be confidential and their teachers would
not see the results of the questionnaire. They were asked to write the name of their teachers and their level on the questionnaire.

After that, the experimental group underwent treatment of those teachers that had high quality of reflection and the control group was taught by those teachers who did not act reflectively during their career. After five terms, the posttest of self-efficacy was administered to the students again and the scores were calculated and analysed by using paired-sample t-Test between the pretest and posttest. In fact, a statistical analysis was used in our attempt to get more generalized understanding of the data obtained and to look for general trends among participants and to find out the answer for our research question: "does teachers’ reflection have any effects on Iranian EFL learners’ self-efficacy?"

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for calculating the data and coming up with the descriptive statistics as well as the inferential statistics to answer the research question. Self-efficacy questionnaires were scored on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 ("never") to 5 ("always"). The “never” response was scored as 1 point and the response “always” was scored as 5 points on all items.

3. Findings

The research question was " does teachers’ reflection have any effects on Iranian EFL learners’ self-efficacy?" In order to answer this question a descriptive analysis of the data has been presented; then, the inferential analysis of the data has also been provided using tables and diagrams. The descriptive analysis of this study consists of a discussion of the mean, standard deviation and the standard error of measurement. Similarly, the inferential analysis of the data in this study consists of calculating the paired-sample t value between the pretest and the posttest of each group.

3.1. Descriptive Analysis of the Data

3.1.1. Findings for Experimental and Control Groups of the Study

The descriptive analysis of the data for different groups of the study has been summarized below. Table 1 summarizes the descriptive analysis of the data of students’ self-efficacy scores for participants in the experimental group whose teachers acted reflectively:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Self-efficacy 1</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.496</td>
<td>1.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 Self-efficacy 2</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.046</td>
<td>1.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 indicates, the mean for students’ pretest of self-efficacy is 83.98 (X=83.98) while the mean for students’ posttest of self-efficacy is 92.00(X=96.80). The higher standard deviation of first self-efficacy group
indicates more variety among the scores from the mean. Finally, the amount of standard error is lower in the scores of the second self-efficacy group. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive analysis of the data between pretest and posttest of self-efficacy scores for participants in the control group whose teachers did not act reflectively:

Table 2
Descriptive analysis of the data for students’ control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Self-efficacy 1</td>
<td>81.34</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.075</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy 2</td>
<td>80.52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.438</td>
<td>1.476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 indicates, the mean for the first self-efficacy group is 81.34 (X=81.34) while the mean for the second one is 80.52 (X=80.52). The higher standard deviation of self-efficacy 2 indicates more variety among the scores from the mean. Finally, the amount of standard error is lower in self-efficacy 1.

3.2. Inferential Analysis of the Data

3.2.1. Findings of research question

The question of this study targeted the extent to which Iranian EFL learners’ self-efficacy could enhance as a result of being the students of those teachers who acted reflectively. The inferential analysis of the data for this purpose has been summarized in the tables below. Table 3 summarizes the inferential analysis of the data of pretest and posttest of self-efficacy scores for the experimental group:

Table 3
Paired-sample t value for experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Self-efficacy 1_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy 2</td>
<td>8.020</td>
<td>6.473</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>8.761</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 indicates, the observed t value for pretest and posttest of self-efficacy scores is 8.761 (tobs=8.761) which is much higher than the critical t value (tcrit=2.021 with the level of significance of 0.05 and degree of freedom of 49 df =49). This rejected the null hypothesis of the study. In fact, Iranian EFL learners’ self-efficacy was affected by Iranian EFL teachers’ reflective ability.
Table 4 summarizes the inferential analysis of the data of pretest and posttest scores for participants in the control group whose teachers did not take part in OJT:

Table 4  
Paired-sample t value for students’ control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2- tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Self-efficacy 1_ Self-efficacy 2</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>3.205</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>1.809</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 indicates, the observed t value for control group is 1.809 (tobs=1.809). By comparing this value and the critical t value (tcrit= 2.021 with the level of significance of 0.05 and degree of freedom of 49 df =49), we come to this conclusion that there is no improvement in students’ self-efficacy between pretest and posttest scores of the control group.

Table 5  
Independent sample t-test for posttests of both groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leven’s Test for Equality of Variance</th>
<th>T-test for Equality of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance Assumed</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td>6.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the students’ self-efficacy between posttests of experimental and control groups. The sig. value for Levene’s test for equality of variance was more than .05 which meant that equal variances were assumed. The value in the sig. (2-tailed) column was .000 which meant there was a significant difference in scores for experimental group (M = 92.30, SD = 8.02) and control group (M = 80.52, SD = 10.43), meaning that experimental group outperformed the control group.

4. Conclusions and Discussion
The results seem to indicate that students were interested in developing their identity as a learner and becoming aware of how they learn and their assumptions. In the Influence of belief about self and self-efficacy, learners believed they needed to put their own needs as priority. This would imply that they may have the self-efficacy that helped them be active practitioners which could in turn help them take on personal responsibility to develop themselves. This would be in line with the findings of Sezer (2008) who
claimed that learners need to know how to bridge the gap between what they know and what they need to know in order to develop their personal ability. Generally, based on the results, there is a great relationship between teachers’ reflection and their students’ self-efficacy improvement. Highly reflective teachers who believed they were responsible to take control of their teaching tried harder than those with lower levels of reflection, and they had more effect on students. In fact, according to the data those teachers who acted reflectively were able to reorganize and apply theory in the classroom through reflective engagement. There was also evidence that these teachers were able to better identify the nature of the learning process and ways to utilize more appropriate learning tasks and strategies.

As a conclusion, reflective teaching gives teachers an opportunity to develop their teaching lives and helps them overcome the problems encountering in the class much faster. Besides, it enables teachers to use their knowledge in the real life conveniently. Moreover, the students will believe in their abilities of what they can do both in the classroom and out of the classroom. The results of the study clearly show that we need to develop a reflective approach in our teacher education systems. The fact, however, is that teachers’ reflective behaviors and their effect on the quality of language education are so complex that one cannot easily and confidently generalize the findings from a single study to actual and real learning and teaching situations.

Forming reflective training or teacher development group meetings or courses can be a vital pedagogical implication for EFL teacher education programs. Likewise, another implication is to enlighten the knowledge and understanding of Iranian language teachers as how to provide learners efficient feedback for improvement of their self-efficacy. Finally, the findings of the study may enrich the corpus of reflection and self-efficacy which have been done by Iranian researchers.

5. Suggestions for further research
In addition to replication within a large sample, it would be desirable to study reflection on in-service teachers and its relationship with observed levels in their students’ self-efficacy progress, so for further research it may be more worthwhile to look at how reflective practice impacts teachers improvisation or reflection-in-action. Further research would benefit from the consideration of the advantages of providing reflective practices in a course for teachers. Moreover, teachers’ reflection can be studied through reflective journal which can be written by the end of each semester. The conclusions made in this research need to be validated further by conducting more research on Iranian EFL teachers and learners’ problem with reflection and self-efficacy.
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Appendix I: Reflective teaching questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Teaching Experience: (Years):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree:</th>
<th>No Degree</th>
<th>BA in English</th>
<th>MA in English</th>
<th>PHD in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Degree on Other Fields of Study (Please specify):

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is devised with the aim of looking into your actual teaching practices as a professional teacher. To that end, your careful completion of the questionnaire will definitely contribute to obtaining real data which is crucial for more accurate findings. Therefore, please check the box which best describes your actual teaching practices. The information will be kept confidential and will be used just for research purposes. Thank you very much in advance for your time and cooperation.
EFL Learners’ self-efficacy

Babae and Heidar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1: Never</th>
<th>2: Rarely</th>
<th>3: Sometimes</th>
<th>4: Often</th>
<th>5: Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/failures of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I observe other teachers’ classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dix II: Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Self-Efficacy Questionnaire for Children (SEQ-C)
Brief Survey on Academic, Social and Emotional Self-Efficacy

1 Never:  
2 Rarely:  
3 Sometimes:  
4 Often:  
5 Always:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How well can you get teachers to help you when you get stuck on schoolwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How well can you express your opinions when other classmates disagree with you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How well do you succeed in cheering yourself up when an unpleasant event has happened?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How well can you study when there are other interesting things to do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How well do you succeed in becoming calm again when you are very scared?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How well can you become friends with other children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(قهرم خود را دوی با دیگر به چه حال بازی می‌کنی؟)

(Questionnaire was developed by Babaee and Heidar.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. How well can you have a chat with an unfamiliar person?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر خوب می‌توانید با کسی که نمی‌شناسید ارتباط برقرار نمایید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How well can you prevent to become nervous?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر می‌توانید جلوی عصبی شدن خود را بگیرید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How well do you succeed in finishing all your homework every day?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(تا چه حد در انجام تمرکزی روزانه‌تان موفق هستید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How well can you work in harmony with your classmates?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر خوب می‌توانید هماهنگ با همکلاس‌هایتان کارکنید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How well can you control your feelings?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(تا چه حد می‌توانید احساساتتان را کنترل نمایید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How well can you pay attention during every class?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(تا چه حد می‌توانید حواس خود را در کلاس‌تان جمع کنید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How well can you tell other children that they are doing something that you don’t like?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر می‌توانید به دیگر همکلاس‌هایتان گویی کنید که چکا را نمی‌پذیری؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How well can you give yourself a pep-talk when you feel low?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(زمانیکه ناامید هستید چقدر می‌توانید خود خودانه‌تان و از خود خود دید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How well do you succeed in understanding all subjects in school?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(تا چه حد موفق‌های فهم درس‌های مدرسه‌تان هستید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. How well can you tell a funny event to a group of children?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر خوب می‌توانید به دستگاه‌های خود را برای تبادل نمایید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How well can you tell a friend that you don’t feel well?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر راحت می‌توانید به دوست خود گویی که احساس خوبی ندارید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. How well do you succeed in satisfying your parents with your schoolwork?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(چقدر در رضایت‌بخشی پدر و مادر خود نسبت به تکالیفتان موفق هستید؟)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How well do you succeed in staying friends with other children?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>احکام، می‌توانید به‌ست بوده، ما شناخت که‌ها همه‌ها محقق، نتلاید؟</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How well do you succeed in suppressing unpleasant thoughts?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How well do you succeed in passing a test?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. How well do you succeed in preventing quarrels with other children?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. How well do you succeed in not worrying about things that might happen?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>