

MELISSA BOWLES

Melissa Bowles is Associate Professor of Spanish, Linguistics, and Educational Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She and her students conduct research on language testing/assessment, research methods, and instructed second- and heritage-language acquisition, particularly the ways that instruction differentially affects the two populations. Her research has been published in such venues as *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *The Heritage Language Journal*, and *The Modern Language Journal*. She is regularly invited to contribute to journals and edited volumes on issues of bilingualism and language maintenance and Spanish as a minority language in the United States. Her current single-authored book project is *Instructed Heritage Language Acquisition*, under contract with Oxford University Press. Over the past decade, she has also been a regular consultant to the U.S. Department of Education's (DOE's) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), providing guidance and advice about instruction and assessment for English learners.

Insights into learner processing of 3 types of written corrective feedback from think-alouds

Melissa Bowles & Kacie Gastanaga

Think-alouds have long provided a valuable window into learners' writing processes. Recently, they have started to be used to understand how learners process L2 written corrective feedback (WCF) (Caras, 2019; Willey & Tanimoto, 2015), enabling researchers and instructors to gain insight into not just *what* revisions writers make as a result of WCF but *why* they do so.

However, think-alouds have never been used to compare the feedback processing and revision behavior of L2 and heritage language learners (HLLs) of Spanish, to our knowledge. HLLs' naturalistic, early exposure to Spanish has been shown to impact the way they process linguistic input (Jegerski, 2018) and WCF is likely no exception.

As deeper processing of feedback is often associated with greater learning gains (Leow, 2019), evaluating the depth of processing that feedback promotes is important. This within-subjects study compares the efficacy of three types of written corrective feedback at promoting deep processing and leading HL and L2 learners to revise their errors successfully. Participants are 44 university students of Spanish recruited from a range of grammar and content courses. Seven are Spanish HLLs and 37 are L2 learners. For this study, participants wrote and revised three short essays and received corrective feedback for each essay in the form of underlining, direct corrective feedback, or an error coding system in a counterbalanced fashion. They revised their essays during live think-aloud revision sessions recorded using Zoom due to COVID-19 protocols.

The think-aloud comments will be coded for depth of processing and errors will be coded by type as in Kim and Bowles (2019). The analysis of think-alouds and error revision will determine whether one type of feedback promotes higher depth of processing, whether this is mediated by error type, and how this interacts with language background (L2 or HLL) and proficiency.

DISCUSSANT

SEMINAR 3. INVESTIGATING L2 WRITING, L2 WRITING PROCESSES & FEEDBACK PROCESSING IN PEN & PAPER AND DIGITAL ENVIRONMENTS. RESEARCH INSIGHTS FROM CLASSROOM-BASED STUDIES