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When Language Instruction and Second Language Acquisition Meet: An Interdisciplinary Approach
Diana Patricia Botero, Western University

SUMMARY
There exist misconceptions regarding the objectives of language instruction and those of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Many language instructors teach the grammar rules of the target language expecting students to internalize knowledge and produce immediately. But research on SLA shows a different picture; there are different stages of language acquisition that should not be changed deliberately through instruction of some grammar rules before or instead of other ones (cf. Van Patten, 2010). It is not the case that all language instructors are aware of or familiar with linguistic research on SLA. Another major concern is that standardization of models on teaching meets the objectives of the institution, but not always the needs and demands of each learner. Each classroom can count on a diverse audience, different types of learners and therefore diverse expectations. This workshop is intended for language instructors, and could be adapted for instructors of other disciplines since the main principles acknowledged here apply in other learning scenarios (i.e. boost the amount of practice of the most complex issues, recognize the diverse audience). This workshop combines the situations described above – considering what research shows us about SLA and a diverse audience in a language classroom (e.g. Foreign language learners vs. Heritage speaker learners). It adapts a practice activity integrating SLA research, and two instruction approaches: one for a diverse audience, and the other focused on form.

KEYWORDS: second language acquisition, second language instruction, heritage speakers, second language learners, diverse audience

LEARNING OUTCOMES
By the end of this workshop, participants will be able to:
- identify two major problematic issues regarding the outcomes of linguistic research on Second Language Acquisition and those of second language instruction;
- explain two different approaches related to the implementation of practice activities in a second language instruction classroom; and
- apply practice material that integrates and benefits different audience demands, and uses approaches from both Second Language Acquisition and second language instruction.

REFERENCE SUMMARIES
VanPatten, B. (2010). Some verbs are more perfect than others: Why learners have difficulty with ser and estar and what it means for instruction. Hispania, 93(1), 29-38.

This article on language acquisition is relevant for this workshop since it shows us how important the high frequency of practice for more complex language grammar is in language instruction. For example, VanPatten (2010) shows that the acquisition of a language is not governed by the same mechanisms that govern the learning of other content material. There are internal processes in the acquisition of languages that are not usually taken into account by many instructors. In his study, VanPatten confirmed successive stages where children were acquiring the verb “to be” in Spanish (i.e. a hierarchy for order of acquisition of ‘ser’ vs. ‘estar’) and adjusted them through his findings. If teaching grammar rules does not determine the language acquisition, what should the role of language instruction be? VanPatten presents some alternatives, and one of them is giving relevance to the teaching of more complex structures in language acquisition that are also acquired at a later stage (e.g. more practice of the verb to be ‘estar’ than the verb to be ‘ser’). Although the instruction of a language does not overpass the
natural process of language acquisition, Van Patten acknowledges that continuous practice and amount and frequency of input may accelerate this process. This is exactly what the paper contributes to this workshop: the relevance of continuous practice and amount and frequency of input for more complex language structures that may be acquired later during the acquisition and learning process of a language.


On the same line of reasoning regarding the structures/pieces of the language that should receive more attention for practice within the language instruction classroom, Slabakova & Mayo (2010) state that it is not necessary to teach the meaning of a language. This is because the meaning is assumed to be universal in the sense that all languages share and are able to express meaning. What is different though, is the way each language expresses meaning. For example, in English the past is expressed through the verbal paradigm of regular and irregular verbs in past tense (e.g. ‘walk – walked’ ‘eat – ate’), whereas in languages like Mandarin Chinese the past is expressed through the context and the verb does not change. The challenge for learners is to learn all the necessary specific structures or pieces of the language that expresses those meanings. As we just saw with the example of past tense in English and Mandarin, the task becomes difficult as not all languages express meaning in the same way. Thus, the difference between languages is not with respect to meaning but with the forms that each language uses to express one meaning or another.

If a learner is acquiring a language that significantly differs from his/her first language, the process becomes more difficult especially with those complex forms that vary between the two languages. This difficulty is another issue that language instructors should be aware of for their teaching. As VanPatten (2010) states, the more complex forms of a language should receive more attention with respect to the frequency of exposure and the amount of practice. Like VanPatten, Slabakova & Mayo also give an important role to the practice of those forms that differ the most between languages. Practice can increase the automaticity and interpretation of the structures. That is, practice can increase the subconscious condition that allows learners to “perform a complex series of tasks very quickly and efficiently, without having to think about the various components and subcomponents of action involved” (Dekeyser, 2001, p. 125). In a speculative way, I would assume automaticity could occur in other scenarios or types of language from other disciplines after learning has taken place (e.g. Applied mathematics and computation, Logic, Physics, Chemistry, etc.).

In this respect, these two articles give us some necessary ingredients for this workshop. The findings from some language acquisition research show that increasing the amount of practice would benefit learners with respect to their greatest difficulty.

But what could those difficult aspects or structures of language be? The one that I consider in this workshop is a complex structure that requires different types of learning and also involves implicatures where the context of use is relevant. Because Slabakova & Mayo (2013) are interested in semantics and pragmatics in this article, they argue that one of the structures that should receive attention in language instruction is implicatures, which play an important role in successful human communication. Implicatures are briefly defined as what is suggested in an utterance, even when it is not expressed explicitly or strictly implied by the utterance that speakers produce. A basic example is:
Speaker 1: Do you have children?
Speaker 2: I have two daughters.

Speaker 2 is not explicitly answering, “Yes, I have children” but he/she is giving the number and gender of his/her children. This response does not explicitly answer “yes” to the question but implies an affirmative using another utterance.

What is more, the authors also suggest different ways to approach language instruction: One of the methodologies mentioned is the “focus-on-form” approach that can be adapted depending on the audience. Another alternative of practice is auto-correction and audiotaping, which was effective according to other previous studies. Finally, Slabakova & Mayo (cf. Alegria de la Colina & Mayo, 2009) recognize the importance of evidence-based practices that have given social interaction and group work a great relevance for the internalization of knowledge.

In this order of ideas, this workshop integrates second language research findings (e.g. VanPatten [2010] and Slabakova & Mayo [2013]) with respect to: i) the increase of frequency and continuity of practice in language instruction; ii) the increase of frequency and continuity of practice focused on the most challenging pieces of language found in language acquisition research; iii) that some complex structures could include implicatures, which is the specific example that I include in this workshop (but it could be adapted depending on the topic the instructor wants to teach); iv) a practice-based instruction that includes the focus on form approach, the auto-correction and audiotaping, and group exercises.


This is another valuable article that gives us insight into the importance of social or group interaction, as well as other effective practice activities such as self-repairing through self-audio/videotaping. In Bouffard & Sarkar (2008), we can find evidence that children can develop metalinguistic awareness through group interaction and self-video/audiotaping activities for self-repairing. By developing such metalinguistic awareness through successive practice sessions, children were able to identify and correct their own errors. In that exercise, they improved the ability to recognize linguistic features and develop grammatical analysis skills on such errors. They also negotiated on form in the sense they managed to solve communication breakdowns and addressed their errors that could become persistent. During these activities they received corrective feedback on different domains: lexical, phonological, and grammatical.

Three key elements of this article are considered in this workshop: 1) the importance of the instructors’ feedback as it can help students improve the metalinguistic terminology after each activity. Students have more tools available to them for future classes; 2) the importance of group work or social interaction for the negotiation of form and feedback from their peers; and 3) the use of self-repairing to reflect on their own process of learning and on the language itself so they can reprocess their output.


Once we have reflected on some of the SLA research findings with VanPatten (2010), Slabakova & Mayo (2013) and become aware of the importance of practice, social interaction, and successful focus-on-form activities such as the self-audiotaping / self-videotaping (Slabakova & Mayo, 2013; Bouffard &
Sarkar, 2008), it is equally important to pay attention to the type of audience we are teaching. We can apply these findings to our instruction, but it will be far from promoting successful students’ learning if we do not match our methodology and objectives with their needs and outcomes. In their classroom, instructors can find students with different needs, different strategies of learning, different linguistic backgrounds, different expectations, and so forth. This is one of the motivations that lead to designing the present workshop. Thus, the workshop is intended for instructors that encounter a diverse audience and different types of learners with different expectations. In the particular case of language instruction, the diversity of learners not only stems from their different first language backgrounds but also whether they are second/third language learners or heritage speakers. That is why I consider the webinar by Kagan & Carreira (2015). It contextualizes language instructors about the two main types of learner they may encounter. It also presents an approach for these two types of learners, which is one of the approaches on teaching I include in the workshop.

As mentioned above, Kagan & Carreira (2015) can familiarize us with one of the types of audiences we usually encounter in our language classrooms: the heritage speaker learners (HSL). In this webinar, the authors conceptualize the heritage speakers’ type of audience in contrast with their needs as language learners and the needs of second language learners (SLL). They also clarify some of the myths about what is understood by HSL in language instruction, that is, when HSL are either considered native speakers or SLL. This type of misconception has some implications in language instruction because the audience is not the same — they have different capabilities, knowledge, and learning expectations.

Kagan & Carreira suggest some strategies to overcome this type of diverse audience situation. For example, in the case of HSL, it is necessary to increase the practice of vocabulary and pragmatics with the clarification of certain grammar topics, and cultural enrichment. Likewise, the application of the curriculum foundation should consist of five “from – to” principles: 1) From aural to reading; 2) From spoken to written; 3) from home-based general to general/academic; 4) From everyday activities to in-class activities; and 5) From motivation + identity to content. Kagan & Carreira suggest that these 5 principles can be implemented through the micro/macro approach. These activities should assist in determining the different kinds of needs from the different types of learners, HSL or SLL, and are introduced in the first theoretical background session of the workshop.
## CONTENT AND ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (min)</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15             | Introduction, and Icebreaker: 1-Minute Mixer | 1) Introduction, socializing and results of a pre-assessment online poll (~6 minutes). Prior to the day of the workshop, participants take part in an online poll on surveygizmo.com by answering two questions: a) What do you think are the two major concerns of language instruction? and b) Share a teaching strategy that you have usually used in groups that include native speakers and heritage speakers.  
   The workshop leader introduces himself/herself, the workshop and the learning outcomes, and shows survey responses.  
   2) Possible solution: Individual (~3 minutes).  
   After socializing and reviewing the survey responses, participants will have three minutes to propose a possible solution that deals with those situations listed above under question a, and keeping in mind a varied audience mentioned in question b.  
   3) Minute Mixer Icebreaker (~6 minutes). Each participant will pair with another peer to share their possible solution(s) for 1 minute, then each person will move on to the next person, and so on. This activity has the same logic as speed dating, and has the same characteristic as the active learning technique “Think-Pair-Share”. | Pre-assess participants’ pre-knowledge of instructional implications of language learning and second language acquisition, and their current strategies for teaching groups with diverse needs. Give participants the opportunity to introduce themselves, and learn from the other persons’ perspectives, ideas or solutions to a specific problem. |
| 20             | Presentation on Theoretical Background and Approaches to Language Instruction | 1) The workshop leader presents on:  
   (a) What second language acquisition research demonstrates.  
   (b) What language instruction does.  
   Provide Handout #1 (Appendix A) to the participants.  
   2) After the theoretical background, the workshop leader will briefly present two | 1) Recognize the main objectives of second language instruction and the two important findings from research on second language acquisition. Identify the two major areas where language instruction and language acquisition diverge, and the |
approaches:
(a) Focus-on-form and negotiation of form. The focus-on-form as well as the negotiation of form approach has been largely applied in second language instruction.
(b) Micro/macro approach based on five “from-to” principles. The micro/macro approach has been recently proposed for classrooms that have different types of learners (i.e., foreign language learners and heritage language learners).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Brief Discussion</th>
<th>Open discussion session for comments, opinions and questions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Context Creation Through Self-audiotaping</td>
<td>The participants of this workshop will play the role of students and apply this activity themselves. This activity integrates the inclusion of a context, personal experience or imaginative example, if preferred. In a regular instruction class, the activity can be modified integrating more ‘fieldwork’, that is, real life scenarios outside classrooms. Participants are requested to create a context that allows them to talk about any topic of preference from imagination or from their personal experience that expresses regret, nostalgia, wishes etc. Whatever the topic is, it has to be something that must/should/would have happened in the past but never occurred; and what would have been the result or consequences in the hypothetical scenario if it had happened. Here the participants are expected to use conditional sentences in past tense, which are also known as past counterfactuals, for example: “If I had left home earlier, I would have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reasons why.
2) Demonstrate to participants two approaches that can benefit different types of learners with different needs.

Provide a space for any questions, comments, or opinions that participants might have about the content material contrasted with their own experiences as instructors.

1) Facilitate social integration for the purpose of the group activities and discussions. 2) Acknowledge the pros and cons of language instruction from the student’s perspective 3) Stimulate creativity and imagination. 4) Enable participants to experience the activity for themselves in order to better evaluate it for future uses or adaptations.

The participants of the workshop can use the same strategies for their students since this activity has two purposes if it is applied to language learners (based on mixed audience in a language classroom):

For an audience of foreign language learners, the activity will allow them to use the pre-knowledge of a
"caught the bus."

The complexity of this sentence in language learning relies on different forms that learners have to acquire in the target language. If Spanish is the target language, the grammar construction of the sentence above differs from English in terms of the presence-absence of the grammatical form of the Spanish subjunctive.

Also, this sentence involves pragmatic knowledge due to the implicature of assuming what and when events took place in the real world. For example, “If I had left home earlier” implies “I did not leave home earlier” in a given context in the past. This knowledge can vary from participant to participant in terms of the form they choose to express the meaning of the sentence in the relevant context and time.

Participants can audiotape themselves with their own phones, iPads, tablets, or laptops. For sound quality purposes, they can leave the room to a quiet space if they prefer. Participants will use the handout #2 (Appendix 2) for this part of the activity.

| Break | 10 | Self-correction Activity | Participants are asked to critically observe their own audiotaping, paying close attention to their production. They need to identify possible mistakes, and find possible solutions to correct their own mistakes. In real scenarios, the students will be required to bring their headphones in order to listen more effectively to their own recordings. | Critically analyze speech in a personal recording by recognizing mistakes, reflecting on them, correcting them, and coming up with possible solutions. |
| 20 | Interaction and Peer-review Activity: Let’s Negotiate, | In this 20-minute session, participants will observe, identify, correct and propose a solution. They will have the opportunity to listen to each member’s recording and specific structure and put it into oral practice. | Facilitate group interaction from a discourse-based context (audiotaping). |
and Move the Pieces Around!  
observe the possible mistakes. Then, they need to correct them and propose the correct form or any other way to say it. Finally, they give the feedback to the person who made the audiotaping. Have participants work in groups of three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Creative Micro/Macro Activity</th>
<th>Participants will be asked to create an activity using the Micro/Macro approach that takes into account the 5 principles mentioned in the initial presentation. They can be found on the handout #1 and #3 as well. Have participants work in groups of three.</th>
<th>Foster grammar correction specific from their own production. This activity allows individuals to practice through social interaction. It has been demonstrated that through activities that involve group discussions, learners can identify problematic language features (Bouffard &amp; Sarkar (2008); regulate or restructure their knowledge (in this case metalanguage knowledge); increase problem-solving capacities (Alegria de la Colina &amp; Garcia Mayo, 2009); and “benefit from their complementary perspectives and experiences” (Kagan &amp; Carreira, 2015: 46). This activity is a good example of the negotiation of form approach, and the micro/macro approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assess participants’ instruction skills after completion of the workshop. Since in-class practice is an important aspect of the process of learning a language, it is crucial that participants will be able to apply what they learned in the workshop by creating an activity themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing Comments and Peer-assessment</td>
<td>Participants will share their activities with the rest of the workshop audience, and comment on them or ask any questions in general. The other groups will have the opportunity to assess the activities using the rubric in the handout #3.</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity to borrow activities and ideas from their peers as well as to share their own perspectives and listen to other people’s opinions. Peer-assessment of the activities to make sure the participants of the workshop applied the content material integrating the strategies for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/tips/v06/i01/6
PRESENTATION STRATEGIES
The participants engage in role-play activities presented during the workshop. This is the workshop’s main presentation strategy in order to: i) facilitate social integration for the purpose of the group activities and discussions; ii) facilitate the ability to acknowledge the pros and cons of language instruction from the students’ perspective; iii) stimulate creativity and imagination; and iv) experience the activity themselves in order to evaluate it for future use or adaptation. Thus, the workshop leader should continuously support and assist workshop participants by answering their questions and addressing concerns throughout practice activities. In this role, it is important that the workshop leader constantly provide participants with oral feedback as she/he goes around and supervises all teamwork and individual work. The feedback may include “corrective feedback” as used by Bouffard & Sarkar (2008) to ultimately help workshop participants (instructors) to use this type of approach with their own students to help the learners improve their metalinguistic awareness.

The workshop leader should warn the workshop participants (instructors) about the kind of metalinguistic terminology they will use in their class. Such terminology should be specified at the beginning of the course and should be consistent with the lectures, and content material.

This workshop is intended for approximately 9 to 14 language instructors of any language that may encounter a diverse audience in the classroom (e.g. foreign language learners and heritage language learners).

It would be ideal that the workshop leader set up the room in pod style or open classroom style to facilitate social integration for the activities that require group interaction and group discussion.

In case technological resources in the room fail, the workshop leader should bring the presentation on a laptop, a USB memory in the relevant case, or print the power point presentation and be ready to present without computer. Printing the presentation as a handout can be useful. The workshop leader should arrive at the room at least 10 minutes early to ensure everything is set up properly. If technology fails, he/she could write an outline of the main topics that he/she will present on the blackboard as a visual guide for the participants.

Although this workshop is intended specifically for language instructors, there are three main principles that can be applied to the instruction of any other field or discipline: 1) Recognize that your audience may be diverse, thus with different skills and expectations; 2) Increase practice of the content material; 3) Focus practice on the aspects that represent the greatest difficulty for learners.

| 5 | Workshop Assessment Survey | Participants will assess the workshop and the practice activity that they were able to experience themselves. The workshop leader will provide them with a handout #4 (Appendix 4), which is a short survey on the workshop and practice activity. | Assess the workshop’s usefulness in terms of its content and activities. |

**Total Time:** 120 minutes
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APPENDIX A: Handout # 1

What we should know about Second Language Acquisition Research and instruction of languages (Van Patten, 2010; Slabakova, 2009; Slabakova & Mayo, 2013).

Key ideas to keep in mind:

1. Learning a natural language requires a different process than learning any other content material.
2. There are internal processes inherent to individuals and their faculty of language. Let’s consider the following:
   - Universal grammar
   - Universal semantics
   - ____________ mismatch among languages
3. There are stages of acquisition that are developed according to internal processes.
4. Problematic: Linguistic structures of languages are constantly taught regardless of the order of ____________ and research findings.
5. The explanation of grammar rules does not necessary lead to the internalization of language knowledge; practice does.
6. Linguistic structures are constantly taught regardless of the type of audience. The audiences that instructors usually find in North American institutions are ___________________________________________________________________

Approaches for Language Instruction

1. More form less meaning:

   a) Focus on form: “Focus on form refers to how attentional resources are allocated and involves briefly drawing students' attention to linguistic elements” (Long, 2000: 5).
   b) Negotiation of form: Corrective feedback or metalinguistic terminology can lead to negotiation of form especially with group activities. It works well for vocabulary practice.

How to adapt focus-on-form activities that work for both types of learners, heritage and second language learners?

2. Micro/Macro Approach based on 5 principles: 1) From aural to reading; 2) From spoken to written; 3) from home based general to general/academic; 4) From everyday activities to in-class activities; 5) From motivation + identity to content.

Notes and questions:
APPENDIX B: Handout #2

**Assignment topic:**

Talk about any topic (one or more) of preference from your personal experiences (or your imagination if you prefer) that expresses regret, nostalgia, wishes, and possibilities. Whatever the topic is, it has to be something that must/should/would have happened in the past but it never occurred; and what would have been the result or consequences in the hypothetical scenario if that had happened.

Use at least 7 words from the following table (students can ask about their meanings):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sin embargo</th>
<th>Ojalá</th>
<th>Sí</th>
<th>Quizás</th>
<th>Posiblemente</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sí</td>
<td>Aunque</td>
<td>Tal vez</td>
<td>Definitivamente</td>
<td>Nunca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basic self-recording tips:**

1. Think about it: Think about the topic you want to talk about, and the order of ideas of how you want to present. It is not recommended to write down a script; it should be spontaneous speech.

2. Practice: You can practice your speech for 1 minute as a transition through your actual recording.

3. Turn off notifications or sound on your recorder device or anything else in the recording space for the moment you will record yourself.

4. Remember to speak naturally as if you were talking to someone familiar. Speak loudly, and clearly, so your peers in the next part of the activity will be able to hear you, but you don’t need to yell either.

5. Do-overs are not allowed: Since this is an activity to analyze your language reaction and behaviour in natural and spontaneous speech, there is no need to edit or restart the original recording unless there are technical reasons. Don’t worry about your mistakes; we will take care of them later. Keep talking and talking until the time is out!
APPENDIX C: Handout # 3

Guidance and Rubric for the Creation Time activity

The Macro-Micro approach serves to teach diverse audience of second language learners and heritage speakers. The macro approach focuses on heritage speakers, whereas the micro approach focuses on second language learners.

To get to the relevant grammar point considering all students needs:

The macro approach starts instruction from: a) A reading or real-life task, b) Developing functional ability (variety of discourse in their professions, social life, and the community), c) Discourse-based, content-based, genre-based, task-based or experiential, d) Building on global background knowledge. There is no knowledge of meta-language.

The micro approach starts instruction from: a) A reading or authentic task, b) Accessing authentic materials, c) Grammar vocabulary instruction using meta-language

Combining the two approaches to benefit both groups:

Heritage speakers: Teach the meta-language and provide a map of learning.
Second language learners: 1) Start with what the learner notices about the topic; 2) Start with clues picked up from text; 3) Use scaffolding strategies: tapping into background knowledge, pre-teaching vocabulary, pre-viewing material, using graphic organizers, visual aids, etc.


Creation Activity
Create an activity for a diverse audience (second language learners - heritage speakers) combining the two approaches.

Peer Assessment Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Activity:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The activity included:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A grammar structure or vocabulary that involves pragmatic knowledge (context based use).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An introductory teaching of the meta-language with a map of learning for the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real-life task (e.g. experiential) that is motivational and of common ground for both groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of 3 to 4 scaffolding strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space to recognize clues about the topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A space to assist each group with grammar correction or any other needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 methods of Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX D: Handout # 4

FINAL SURVEY

How useful was the theoretical information given on the problematic issues in language instruction?

Very useful      Useful      Somewhat Useful      Not at all useful

Do you agree on the types of approaches recommended in this workshop for language instruction?

Completely agree Somewhat agree Neither agree or disagree Somewhat disagree Totally disagree

How would you rate the practice activity in terms of usefulness, appropriateness and relevance? Scale from 1 to 10.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

How would you rate the creation activity? Scale from 1 to 10.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

How would you rate the workshop in general? Scale from 1 to 10.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

Your feedback is very important to us. Feel free to leave any comments if you have them.

Many thanks!