THE DEVELOPMENT OF GRAMMATICAL COMPETENCE THROUGH SYNCHRONOUS COMPUTER MEDIATED COMMUNICATION

A Thesis in
Spanish
by
Melissa L. Fiori-Ağören

© 2004 Melissa L. Fiori-Ağören

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

August 2004
The thesis of Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren was reviewed and approved* by the following:

James P. Lantolf  
Professor of Spanish and Applied Linguistics  
Thesis Advisor  
Chair of Committee

Steven L. Thorne  
Assistant Professor of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies  
Assistant Professor of Communications Arts and Sciences

Celeste Kinginger  
Associate Professor of French and Applied Linguistics

Nuria Sagarra  
Assistant Professor of Spanish and Applied Linguistics

John M. Lipski  
Professor of Spanish and Applied Linguistics  
Head of the Department of Spanish, Italian and Portuguese

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School
ABSTRACT

This study examined whether consciousness-raising (C-R) in synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) fosters grammatical development; specifically, development of *por/para* and *ser/estar*. In order to determine the efficacy of C-R in SCMC, two groups were analyzed; one group was designated as form-and-meaning focused while the other was meaning-focused. Each group engaged in weekly chats and addressed the same discussion topics. Three pre- and post-tests (Elicited Imitation/Sentence Repetition Testing, Grammaticality Preferences Component, and oral examinations) were administered.

It was determined that: 1) there were statistically significant differences on the outcomes of the EI/SRT and GPC post-tests in favor of the FFMF group, 2) the FFMF group produced greater quantities and more accurate quantities of language, 3) the FFMF group demonstrated higher levels of syntactic maturity with statistically significant results, did not employ a default form of the copular verb, and actively engaged in corrective feedback strategies, 4) the FFMF and MF groups performed equally well, statistically, on both the post-test orals and in terms of semantic range but the social dynamic that surfaced in each group were distinct, 5) the MF group did not ignore form but employed *ser* as a default, 6) the instructor exercised the same feedback practices for both groups.

It was concluded that C-R on *por/para, ser/estar* in SCMC most likely fostered the development of those grammatical features to a greater degree than in chat without specific instructions to focus on form. When held responsible for its own C-R in SCMC, consciousness was raised for the FFMF group but students were unable to limit the scope of their focus to *por/para, ser/estar* alone. Overt evidence reveals that they did focus on *ser/estar* but there is no such evidence for *por/para*. However, the global approach to C-R assumed by the FFMF positively impacted development, *por/para* included. In terms of the MF group, it is concluded that the lack of focusing on *por/para, ser/estar* did not impede upon development, and that unintentional focus on form was insufficient to facilitate growth to the same degree as deliberate focus, although the MF participants demonstrated awareness to form in SCMC.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

With the advent of the personal computer and the wide-spread access to computers by the population at large, language learning has entered new terrain. Today a language learner can access exchanges in the language of study through either asynchronous or synchronous formats. Today, a plethora of information, articles, graphics, sound-bytes, video, and real-time viewing via the World Wide Web, email, MOOs (Multi-user domains Object Oriented), MUDs, Chat, Bulletin Boards, and Messengers are available. Chat is text-based computer-mediated interaction that occurs over a local area network. Chat, termed from the verbal activity of making chit-chat type of conversation, is text based, and a chat is the text-based conversation that occurs over the local area network.

There has been much doubt about the efficacy of Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication (SCMC) as a tool for grammar acquisition. While SCMC has been established as a tool for increased participation (Beauvois 1992, Kern 1995; Pratt and Sullivan 1996; Warschauer 1996, 1997ab; Chun 1998) and student-directed learning (Peterson 1997, Abrams 2000; Kern 2000; Warschauer 1997ab) few agree that it fosters grammatical acquisition. Most agree that formal accuracy suffers since participants tend to respond to this environment as an informal arena for information-exchange in which abbreviations, casualness, and speedy communication have priority over grammatical accuracy (R.G. Kern 1995, 1998; Blake 2000, Lee 2000; Sotillo 2000). Two studies examined grammatical development in terms of negotiation of meaning, task type, feedback (Blake 2000; Pelletieri 2000) and modification devices (Lee 2000), while a study by Salaberry (2000) reported greater evidence of morphosyntactic development for past-tense verbal endings in L2 Spanish more clearly evident in the synchronous computer mediated dialogues than in the face-to-face dialogues. Finally, Sotillo (2000) examined syntactic complexity in the discourse functions that surfaced in synchronous and asynchronous communication.
1.1 Purpose and Rationale

While the benefits of SCMC in terms of the quantity and quality of learner output have been established, and although the benefits concerning student-centeredness of the environment have been determined, what remains uncertain is the extent to which SCMC fosters grammatical development. This study will examine the role that SCMC plays in grammatical development through the introduction of consciousness-raising on specific L2 forms. In particular this study sets out to determine whether consciousness-raising in chat conferencing assists in the grammatical development of *por/para, ser/estar* in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than in either face-to-face interaction with consciousness-raising or in SCMC chat without consciousness-raising. However, the lack of data on the form-and-meaning focused face-to-face group, explained below, obligated the researcher to limit her focus to the SCMC environment alone. Taking that into account, the researcher hypothesizes that consciousness-raising in the SCMC environment assists in the grammatical development of *for (por/para)* and *to be (ser/estar)* in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than chat without consciousness-raising. In order to investigate this, the study will address first whether or not deliberate grammatical consciousness-raising assists in the emergence of *por/para, ser/estar* over the course of the semester. Next, it will address whether the lack of grammatical consciousness-raising hindered development of the aforesaid L2 forms. Finally, it will examine the role of consciousness-raising in development.

1.2 SCMC as a Facilitator of Grammatical Development

In order to determine the utility of SCMC in facilitating grammatical development, deliberate attention to form must arise. In order to for this to take place, learners must consciously, purposefully and intentionally place attention on formal linguistic features. The SCMC environment is well suited for such undertakings because students can tend to form and meaning in the midst of conversation, and are in the right
environment for preparation of and reflection on the language produced in the forum. By introducing consciousness-raising in an environment which already encourages preparation-time, think-time and reflection, learners have a better means by which to focus on the target language, because when a learner is focused he can pay attention to a linguistic feature, and in so doing raise his consciousness on that feature. If this process of noticing occurs and the participant has opportunity to employ the noticed feature in the midst of a communicative event, there is a greater chance that the learner will link form and meaning, and process language for learning. Consciousness-raising has been operationalized in a number of ways, ranging from that of language learning strategies (Redfern and Weil 2002), to religious studies (Fotos 1998), to C-R activities in the classroom (Melles 1997), and to empirical studies on C-R and language acquisition (Fotos 1994, 1993; Leow 2000, 2001; Nagata and Swisher 1995). Given that learners will address discussion questions thematically related to the course-readings, students must take responsibility for their own consciousness-raising in the face-to-face and chat sessions. However, the instructor can facilitate this process through her participation and feedback practices.

The literature on corrective feedback has reported recasting to be a popular and common corrective strategy L2 classroom. Some studies label the recast as an ambiguous corrective measure typically unrecognized by learners in highly communicative environments (Lyster and Ranta 1997; Lyster 2001). What’s more, if the social environment is not characterized by social harmony, learners may fail to notice the corrective intent underlying the recast (Morris and Tarone 2003). On the other side of the issue are Doughty and Varela (1998) and Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998) who report positive results for recasting treatments. It is imperative that the instructor adopt corrective strategies that will facilitate the communicative flow typical to SCMC while still nurturing grammatical C-R (FFMF) without raising the suspicions of the MF group.

In order to determine the utility of SCMC as a facilitator of grammatical development, and in consideration of the need for grammatical consciousness-raising and proper corrective measures, three groups were originally selected for the study. One group was a form-and-meaning focused group which met in the traditional classroom for
small group, face-to-face discussion. Another group was also a form-and-meaning focused group but its discussions took place over the chat client. The final group was a meaning-focused group who also chatted. Matriculation determined student grouping. It is important to note that there were problems collecting the data for the face-to-face discussions of the first group. Although three groups were designated for the study, and the study’s structure, research questions and intended analysis reflected this plan, the researcher did not have the proper recording equipment to capture each participant’s utterances and for that reason data on the face-to-face interactions of this group were unattainable. Consequently, the lack of data on the peer and the instructor-to-student interactions during the face-to-face dialogues precludes analysis since the neither the pre/post-test scores nor the face-to-face dialogues can be interpreted in terms of grammatical consciousness-raising. Therefore, this group was removed from the analysis and the study focused on the data from the two chat groups. The researcher was obliged to adjust the research questions, hypothesis and analysis. The study set out to determine whether consciousness-raising in chat conferencing assists in the grammatical development of por/para, ser/estar in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than in either face-to-face interaction with consciousness-raising or in SCMC chat without consciousness-raising and hypothesized that SCMC with consciousness-raising would be the environment most facilitative to grammatical development. The adjustment required by the lack of data on the face-to-face, form-and-meaning focused group forced the researcher to consider whether consciousness-raising in chat conferencing assists in the grammatical development of por/para, ser/estar in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree in chat with consciousness-raising or in chat without consciousness-raising and hypothesized that SCMC with consciousness-raising would be more facilitative of grammatical development than SCMC without consciousness-raising.

Background and exit questionnaires were prepared to determine the characteristics of the participating population. Pre-tests were issued to examine the abilities of the three groups to affirm that their abilities are alike at the onset of the study. Post-tests were administered as a means to determine improvement and to supplement the findings in the weekly chats. Three pre/post tests were administered so as to gain a
comprehensive picture of the participant’s abilities from beginning of the study until its end. An elicited imitation test, also known as sentence repetition test, was administered to measure linguistic proficiency. In sentence repetition testing, learners rely on their underlying grammatical knowledge to process a language sample for the most accurate repetition of that phrase as possible. This opens a window for viewing linguistic proficiency because learners must decode, process, and interpret the input for reproduction. A grammaticality judgment component was introduced also. Its purpose was to examine student judgments of grammatical accuracy and form. Finally, an oral exam was administered as yet another measure by which to gain a comprehensive examination of the participants, this time from the viewpoint of production in spoken form. These pre-and post-tests served as a means by which to gauge development, and as a device for assisting in the analysis of the chat transcripts. The Elicited Imitation/Sentence Repetition Test needed to be generated and tested, and the Grammaticality Preferences Component needed to be reviewed by the participating instructor for authenticity.

Raising grammatical consciousness needed to be operationalized and discussion topics needed to be written. Operationalization of consciousness-raising rested in the hands of the participants. They were reminded to focus on *por/para, ser/estar* before each chat/discussion, respectively, and were given pre-chat/discussion questions which provide the L2 forms in context. These questions were thematically related to the course readings and as such provided both content and structure to participants before each chat and consequently modeled the expectations for the chat/discussion. Discussion questions, significant for all three groups, probed the stories for deeper meaning and analysis.
1.3 Main Objective and Hypothesis

The main objective is to determine if SCMC is a useful and effective tool that facilitates grammatical development. It is hypothesized that grammatical consciousness-raising in the SCMC environment does indeed assist in the development of for (por/para) and to be (ser/estar) in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than chat without consciousness-raising.

1.4 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 2 presents a brief history of computer assisted language learning and immediately directs its focus to the literature pertinent to synchronous computer mediated communication. It covers SCMC in terms of learner-centeredness and increased participation, reviews the findings on the quantity and quality of language produced in this environment, addresses studies on negotiation of meaning in SCMC and briefly addresses the work completed on literacy. Next, the chapter introduces consciousness-raising, provides definitions and highlights former C-R methodologies. It then discusses C-R in terms of SCMC and moves on to address corrective feedback. Decisions about how to operationalize C-R in the chat room are not void of considerations of corrective feedback, and thus corrective feedback is addressed as it pertains to this study.

Chapter 3 outlines the structure of the study. The pilot testing procedures for the pre-tests, especially the EI/SRT, are presented in detail. Preparation of the pre-chat/discussion and chat/discussion topics is addressed. Descriptive lab manuals are next; they identify Black Board and Web-4M, explain how to obtain a computer lab account, and outline the expected weekly procedures. Training and preparation on the chat client is also addressed before moving on to the components of the main study. The procedures for carrying out the main study are listed, issues of administration and scoring are covered, variables are identified, and materials and equipment are noted.
Chapters 4 and 5 display the data collected and obtained throughout the course of the semester for the chat sessions and the pre-and post-tests. Descriptive statistics and the results of subsequent statistical analyses are posted, followed by statistical analyses on the post-test scores. Activity in the chat forum is posted in terms of syntactic maturity and lexical density, with supporting analyses in relation to the significance of the syntactic maturity and lexical density levels, and is followed by a qualitative and quantitative assessment of *por/para, ser/estar*. The chat activity in one group versus the other prompted different behaviors, and the dynamic that surfaced is reviewed.

An analysis of the results is presented in Chapter 6. Chapter 7 offers a review of the study, its findings, and the conclusions drawn. It addresses the weaknesses of the study and lists a number of areas for future investigation.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

The body of the chapter focuses on the findings of the studies on Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication (SCMC) honing in on the chief claims to date. It begins with an introduction into computer learning environment and then moves to the principal studies on SCMC, which were conducted in an effort to determine the role that network based computers could serve in the overall development of language. These studies determined SCMC conferencing as a valuable collaborative, dialogic, primarily meaning-focused, language-learning tool valuable in the restructuring of classrooms’ social dynamics. However, much work remains to be completed on SCMC conferencing as a tool for enhancing grammatical competence. Emphasis is given to work completed on the quantity and quality of language in synchronous computer mediated environments and in studies on negotiation as they pertain to grammatical development. A discussion on the remaining work ensues.

The chapter continues with an introduction to Consciousness-raising (C-R). The purpose is to introduce C-R in order to link this body of research with that of the SCMC camp. The chapter discusses C-R in relation to form-focused-instruction, and the consequences of C-R for the present study, and moves to a discussion on corrective feedback before closing by addressing the framework implemented in this study.

2.1 Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication, Technology, and Second Language Acquisition

Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) comes in many forms and has a rich history. Each technological advancement in society cultivated a new way of conceptualizing the learning process; language learning included. The method-oriented approaches such as the audio-lingual and grammar translation methods relied on the technology of the times to initiate, advance, and test their theoretical and pedagogical
underpinnings. As the clocked ticked, and as alternative methods became available, naturalistic approaches such as the communicative approach generated a need to interact in and become producers of the language of study. Working with and expanding upon Warschauer’s work (Kern & Warschauer 2000; Warschauer 1997a; Warschauer and Healey 1998) Bax (2003) proposes three stages of CALL, historically: restricted, open, and integrated. Restricted CALL is characterized by drill and practice, single-answer exercises in which students minimally interact with one another, if at all. The instructor’s role is that of a monitor who also provides corrective feedback and who implements technology in the curriculum as an “optional extra” (p. 9). Open CALL tasks include simulations, games, and computer-mediated-communication and come in the form of student-to-computer and student-to-student interaction. For Open CALL the instructor is more of a monitor or facilitator and the focus is on linguistic skills development. The paradigm for open CALL is more open and flexible than restricted CALL, however technology is frequently not an integral part of the syllabus and is an optional component that precedes the syllabus and learner needs. That is, technological components and their content, structure and organization are predetermined, static, built-in elements of instruction, as opposed to being a flexible learning component reflective of students’ interests and needs. Further, both Restricted and Open CALL tends to assume a whole-lesson approach in which one class, typically situated in a separate language lab, is dedicated to a given activity being carried out through the technological medium. Integrated CALL includes computer mediated communication, email, etc., and unlike the paradigm presented by Warschauer and his colleagues, Bax’s adaptation is not yet common practice. That is, until technology is implemented in every classroom, on every desk, and is a standard, ordinary, and customary practice in part for every lesson, used for stimulating thought, dialogue, interpretation and active learning among participants, CALL will not be fully integrated (23-24).

One component of CALL is Computer Mediated Communication (CMC). CMC is the exchange of information via network based computers and may be communicated in a real-time, synchronous, manner, i.e., synchronous computer mediated communication (SCMC), or in a delayed, asynchronous (ACMC) manner. Email,
elements of the World Wide Web, Newsgroups, Bulletin Boards, and Threaded Discussions are examples of ACMC, while audio-, video-, and chat- conferencing, MUDs/MOOs, whiteboards, and some World Wide Web environments are examples of SCMC. These varied and diverse mediums have sparked interest in terms of their role in and effect on language learning.

There has been much speculation about the effectiveness of Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication (SCMC) as a tool for grammar acquisition. While SCMC has been established as a tool for increased participation and student-directed learning, few agree that it fosters grammatical acquisition. Most agree that formal accuracy suffers since participants tend to respond to synchronous conferencing as a medium for engagement in activities that are primarily meaning focused (R.G. Kern 1995, 1998; Blake 2000, Sotillo 2000). That is, participants tend to treat this environment as an informal information-exchange environment in which abbreviations, casualness, and speedy communication have high priority. Such observations on the SCMC environment are not unlike observations made about the predominantly communicative environments which prompted form-focused research—that entirely meaning-focused language learning environments produce learners for whom grammatical development of some forms never reaches target-like levels. In view of that, it is appropriate to investigate the role of consciousness-raising in computer assisted language learning (CALL), especially SCMC, because the SCMC’s communicative yet written environment is ripe for allowing students to simultaneously tend to form, meaning, and function; which is fundamental to L2 development.

While much work has been conducted on CALL, work on SCMC is still in its infancy. Research on the potential that SCMC offers the language learner has focused on a number of topics associated with the nature of the environment. These topics cover: 1) Participation, 2) Learner-Centeredness, 3) Quantity and Quality of Language, 4) Literacy, and 5) Negotiation. Only a few studies have addressed SCMC in terms of any sort of grammatical development (Blake 2000; Lee 2000; Pelletieri 2000; Salaberry 2000; Sotillo 2000). As this thesis is directed at contributing to whether or not SCMC may
facilitate grammatical development, the focus of this chapter is to review the findings in CALL as they pertain to SCMC.

### 2.1.1 Increased opportunity for Participation

Kern (1995) investigated the issue of the equality of opportunity to communicate in the second language is in his study of two groups of French students in which he compared an SCMC group with a group that engaged in traditional oral discussion. Kern found that students in the synchronous group had twice as many communicative opportunities, or turns, as those in the oral group. Pratt and Sullivan (1996) reported that student participation doubled in the computer classroom from fifty to one hundred percent, while Warschauer (1996) also reported significant increased participation in CMC groups.

The nature of CMC lends itself to more equal participation because physical and extra-linguistic cues are absent, which may allow more introverted students to assume the floor, consequently preventing more extroverted students from dominating the conversation. Similarly, students may participate whenever they feel compelled to contribute to the dialogue. That is, the dialogic protocol of turn taking, listening, responding, and rebutting is eliminated in the SCMC environment, offering all students enhanced opportunity for production. Furthermore, issues of race, handicap (Warschauer 1997a; Kern 1995), gender (Chun 1998) and the like are not immediately apparent in learner exchanges (Beauvois 1992). Finally, Smith (2002) evaluated communication and compensatory strategies in SCMC for students engaged in a warm-up exercise before engaging in the experimental jigsaw and decision-making tasks. After twenty minutes a post-test was administered to examine lexical items. He concluded that learners’ communication strategies varied widely, with substitution, politeness, framing and fillers being the most common. He also determined that in terms of compensatory strategies they relied on a single strategy, concept-analytic, i.e., engaging in circumlocution where the participant describes features of the specific object in order to convey meaning, in the face of communicative breakdown.
2.1.2 SCMC is Learner-Centered

Kern (1995, 466) reported a "higher level of direct student to student interaction" for the SCMC group due to the fact that they took two to three and a half times more turns than their face-to-face counterparts. Peterson (1997) contends that learner-centered interaction moves the instructor to the periphery thus placing the learner at the center of course content and discussion. In this environment students “write to read,” and they “read to write” and the floor is “equally allocated to everyone at all times” (Kern 2000, 241-242), thereby reducing teacher authority and generating greater student autonomy. Warschauer (1997a, b) underscores this idea of greater student autonomy by emphasizing that the students may “construct knowledge together by expressing themselves in print and then assessing, evaluating, comparing and reflecting on their own views and those of others” (p. 6). Thus, the teacher becomes a facilitator in an environment in which learners are actively responsible for constructing their own knowledge. Abrams (2001) investigated the roles participants must assume in language learning through collaborative-journal writing with that of SCMC dialogues. She set out to determine if SCMC would offer greater opportunity for role expansion and concluded, upon inspection of the journals and transcripts, that learners adopted a larger variety of role in the SCMC environment because while roles such as speaker, respondent, and scolder surfaced in both environments, roles such as attacker, challenger, and joker additionally surfaced in the SCMC environment. It follows that a benefit is that learners are in an environment which permits, and perhaps requires, use of authentic language in authentic communicative situations. Further, the exchange of information is quick-paced (Warschauer 1997a). Participants must read messages, process the information, and reply relatively quickly to the message, which may or may not have contributed to the additional roles that surfaced in Abram’s (2000) study. This quick-paced nature of SCMC assists students in learning to read for the global message, rather than in a disjoined word-for-word manner (Kelm 1992), and it extends the notion of participation to the manner in which learners are engaged in the activity (i.e., are they active publishers or are they continual and/or thoughtful readers with fewer published remarks?).
Nonetheless, the SCMC medium is a social environment and the form that surfaces reflects this.

2.1.3 Quantity and Quality of Language

Kern (1995), and Pratt and Sullivan (1996) report that a greater variety of discourse was evident in CMC. In the latter study Sullivan and Pratt also report student participation as 50% oral to 100% computer-assisted, with 65% teacher-attributed turn taking in the oral class to 15% for the computer-assisted class (496). Kern also reported that while all basic verb tenses and moods were represented, the density of complex structures was actually lower in the InterChange sessions, however. Warschauer (1996) reported that learners used significantly more complex language in electronic discussions. Warschauer (1997ab) and Kelm (1992) reported that students were more expressive and open-minded, while Warschauer, Turbee and Roberts (1994) claim that greater opportunity for student expression results in language for authentic communication which in turn leads to student centered discussion and control over diverse topics generating enthusiasm, creativity, and self-directedness.

The fact that communication takes place in written form may heighten learner-awareness of the structures underlying their communication since they can distance themselves from the dialogue to review the exchanges visually for consideration and reflection (Kern 1998, 2000; Warschauer 1997). What is more, learners have more time to plan their productions before they publish them for the group; the text-based nature of CMC generates opportunity for more reflection in the midst of interaction (Kroonenberg 1994/1995). Language learning requires higher order thinking processes of synthesis and analysis to contend with input. Opportunity to reflect on interaction in the midst of interaction is critical for these cognitive processes and SCMC dialogues offer such opportunity (Warschauer 1997b, 472). Beauvois (1992) hypothesizes that the increased input and intake possibilities in the synchronous environments assists in proficiency levels in the L2. Salaberry (2000) reported just that in an analysis of past-tense verbal
endings in L2 Spanish where he found evidence of morphosyntactic development more clearly evident in the synchronous computer mediated dialogues than in the face-to-face dialogues and bases his conclusions on the fact that section one and two participants used present-tense morphology in place of past-tense morphology in the face-to-face discussions but did not do so in the SCMC environments. Furthermore the third participating section began to mark stative verbs in both preterite and imperfect in the SCMC environment, suggesting that moving from reliance on one single verb form (preterite versus imperfect) to both past options (preterite and imperfect) is more evident in SCMC than in face-to-face interaction.

Despite the opportunity for reflection, self-expression and open-mindedness, the SCMC medium is criticized for its social attribute since the desire to communicate many times overrides the need to pay attention to form. Kern (1995) reported diminished grammatical accuracy and lack of coherence resulting from the rapidity of real-time electronic discussions. Lee (2000) supports this with reports that participants were more interested in idea exchange than linguistic accuracy. Werry (1996) examined both synchronous and asynchronous discursive properties characteristic of the mediums and reports on the almost “manic tendency” (p. 58) to generate paralinguistic elements in SCMC environments in which orthographic reduction, omission, and language play are employed and integrated for emphasis, expression, and for communicative flow, stating that: Internet Relay Chat (IRC) “is shaped at many different levels by the drive to reproduce or simulate the discursive style of face-to-face spoken language.” (p. 61). It follows that sentence structure is abbreviated and very short in length although Herring (1999) suggests that these shortened forms are a means by which students “hold the floor” in order to compensate for the absence of extra-linguistic cues. Often times, though the synchronous dialogues lack coherence (Kern 1995), participants manage to make sense out of a medium thick with disrupted adjacency, overlapping exchanges, agrammaticality, and topic decay, and because, as Herring (1999, 1) reports, the enhanced opportunities for language play and intensified participant interactivity bring order to the seemingly incoherent nature of this interactive medium.
In the spirit of investigating the role of SCMC conferencing in the development of grammatical competence, Sotillo (2000), stating that “asynchronous and synchronous CMC have different discourse features which may be exploited for different pedagogical purposes” (p. 1), sets out to determine how discourse functions surfacing in asynchronous communication compare with those of synchronous communication both qualitatively and quantitatively, and which approach to CMC has greater prospect for the production of syntactically complex language. Her participants were two groups of undergraduate ESL students enrolled in an advanced-placement writing course. The nature of the course was such that students’ interactions in the traditional classroom setting consisted of both full-class discussions and small-group collaboration, supplemented by ninety minutes of synchronous group discussion. Asynchronous communication took the form of a message board like forum in which students would both post their personal reactions to class topics, and respond to their classmates’ postings.

Sotillo reported that asynchronous communication sparked greater syntactic complexity and length; that the nature of SCMC facilitates learner output in the midst of the learners’ collaborative efforts; and finally ACMC tended to resemble formal written discourse. On the other hand, she claims that the text-based nature of SCMC is not enough to overcome the incessant urge for fluency and rapidity, and thus results in syntactic reduction and diminished accuracy. This difference may be attributed to two issues. First, learners tend to address the bulletin board writings as more formal documents, and they have more planning and revision time before submitting a finalized version of their document. Secondly, SCMC in its quick-paced nature is more conversational and learners tend to address it with the mind-set that message, not form is of greater importance. An observation reported by Sotillo bears mentioning because it emphasizes the need for further research on SCMC’s utility in the development of grammatical competence. Sotillo reports that her results support previous claims that formal grammatical accuracy suffers in the SCMC environment, but also reports that one group’s synchronous interactions revealed fewer errors than the other group’s asynchronous productions. She attributes the difference to the fact that the instructor
assumed a more active role in the activities (Group B), while the instructor-researcher did not. She wrote,

> These results partially confirm previous findings by Kern (1995), who reported loss of grammatical accuracy and lack of coherence because of the fast pace of the discussions taking place in real time. However, as shown in the results section, despite the cognitive processing time constraints and effort involved in tracking a discussion thread in the synchronous discussions…there were significantly fewer errors found in the more informal synchronous exchanges of group B than in the asynchronous discussion texts produced by students from group A. (104)

### 2.1.4 Literacy

A main topic addressed in CMC work centered on text comprehension and literacy. Noblitt (1995) discussed how to introduce technology into language departments, language programs, and to the graduate and undergraduate student body. He suggests that literacy in the computer mediated environment demanded an amplified perception of literacy because the streams of images, sounds, and formatting of the various medium require the perceptual basis for interpretation and comprehension of these materials through this medium. Chun and Plass (1997) looked at technology in terms of L2 reading comprehension and text comprehension in multimedia environments. They considered individual differences in the field of L2 reading and text comprehension and proposed an interactive model from which they set a broad research agenda. Kern (1998) addressed three social uses of technology in the form of Internet conferencing, email, and MOOs. He compared and contrasted the three social, technological environments against traditional classroom arrangements of face-to-face conversation and journal entries and concluded that networked computers foster development of literacy and cultural literacy through contact with geographically distant peers, through the possibility of negotiating meaning and cultural norms, and thus enhancing communicative skills while gaining knowledge of their own and the other culture, and through the possibility of increased awareness of classroom discourse conventions. Kern (2000) reemphasized that the concept of literacy is “intimately tied to technologies of
writing” (p. 223) and focused on the importance of being familiar with the procedural conventions of the computer itself, its operating system, text display and the like, and with the conceptual framework for text arrangement and presentation. From a linguistic perspective Crystal (2001) supports earlier reports on the electronic medium in language literacy by stating that it “presents us with a channel which facilitates and constrains our ability to communicate in ways that are fundamentally different from those found in other semiotic situations” and “many of the expectations and practices in the spoken and written medium no longer obtain” (p. 6).

### 2.1.4 Negotiation

Blake (2000) and Pelletieri (2000) focused on corrective feedback, negotiation, and task-type in their studies. While Pelletieri seeks to correlate synchronous CMC with the development of grammatical competence, Blake remains skeptical. Pelletieri seeks to answer 1) if negotiation of meaning transpires in task-based synchronous network-based communication as it transpires in oral exchanges, 2) if negotiation of meaning facilitated mutual comprehension, and 3) if target-like forms resulted from the negotiation process.

Twenty volunteers participated in five tasks each approximately thirty minutes in length. These activities varied in nature but ranged from open conversation to jigsaws, with two of the five containing sub-tasks, and three with multiple outcomes. Pelletieri observed that greater negotiation of meaning, and thus greater attention to form, were fostered in the single/minimal outcome tasks. Based on this observation, Pelletieri concludes that task-based SCMC cultivates negotiation of meaning. She also observed that students negotiate about all levels of discourse, which compels them to focus on form so that mutual comprehension is attained. She argues that the structure of SCMC environments allows for the “think time” that in all probability plays a significant role in the development of grammatical competence:

Our data suggests that because in NBC (network-based communication) students have more time to process language than in oral conversations, and because they can view their language as they produce it, they are more likely to focus on language form and “monitor” their messages, all of
which can result in even more “quality” interlanguage than there would be in a nonelectronic environment. (p. 83)

Blake (2000) in his study of L2 Spanish interlanguage in SCMC investigated topics not unlike those in Pelletieri’s study: 1) to document the language modifications typical of face-to-face dialogues also occurred over the networked system, 2) to linguistically categorize the modifications upon documentation, 3) to gauge whether or not jigsaw and information-gap tasks assist in negotiation of meaning. Blake reports that well designed tasks (especially jigsaw but excluding information-gap and open ended tasks) persuade students to focus on form as they notice the gaps in their lexical interlanguage, but that most negotiations are lexical in nature with the largest part of all negotiation arising from misunderstandings of the lexicon. Syntactical negotiation was not only less frequent but also incidental. According to Blake:

While the positive impact of negotiations on vocabulary development seems fairly obvious from the examples presented here and elsewhere in the literature, it is not at all clear that incidental negotiations will ever suffice for supplying all the types of evidence needed to come to grips with the many syntactic difficulties still plaguing the intermediate learner’s grammar. This present study yielded only a handful of grammatical negotiations and many of them did not constitute negotiations of meaning in the classical sense, but rather direct questions about linguistic form (133).

Lee (2002) scrutinized modification devices as they surfaced in SCMC environments in a third year, university-level Spanish class. She reports that the most common modification devices (help requests, clarification checks, and self-correction) facilitated comprehension of input and output, and enhanced the negotiation of both meaning and form. While some students were aware of their linguistic performance and sought assistance, others were not interested in correcting linguistic mistakes, preferring to ignore these errors (10). She also reports simple sentence structure due to the rapidity of the medium and also considers SCMC environments to encourage fluency rather than accuracy. As a result, she suggests that: “students should be advised of the need to write correctly to maintain a balance between function, content, and fluency” (p. 7-8).
2.2 Benefits and Shortcomings

The studies on SCMC have generally show positive effects in the following areas: 1) SCMC promotes student-centered/learner-directed learning, 2) SCMC incites increased written production of the L2, 3) its text-based medium encourages reflection and interaction, 4) it is discursive and tends to mimic verbal conversation, 5) it facilitates learner output, 6) offers a less stressful environment for L2 practice, 7) it promotes collaboration, 8) it fosters negotiation of meaning.

On the other hand it is still unclear the extent to which SCMC fosters grammatical development. The early studies sought to identify this technological medium and to view it in terms of its utility and potential in the L2 classroom. All researchers agree that the identifying feature of SCMC is its social nature, but there is little consensus on SCMC’s role in the development of anything other than fluency. In the studies to date, there are contrasting reports.

Blake’s study on L2 Spanish interlanguage in SCMC (2000) reports very few grammatical negotiations in his work and notes that “many of them did not constitute negotiations of meaning in the classical sense, but rather [were] direct questions about linguistic forms” (p. 132). Further, he emphasizes that because the grammatical negotiations were *incidental* they were not influential enough to evidence development. Pelletieri (2000) reports that SCMC “can play a significant role in the development of grammatical competence among classroom language learners” (p. 83) because a) it fosters negotiation of meaning, b) learners negotiate all aspects of discourse, c) this negotiation promotes form-focused linguistic modifications, d) the corrective feedback that arose within such interactions reinforced focus on form and resulted in the incorporation of target like forms, and e) students have time to process and reflect on their productions. Sotillo’s work rests in between that of Pelletieri and Blake. While Sotillo supports Blake’s claims that SCMC environments often result in syntactic reduction and diminished accuracy, her data support Pelletieri’s findings in that there were significantly fewer errors found in the more informal synchronous exchanges for one group, than in the asynchronous discussion texts produced by students from the other
group. Lee (2002) reports negotiation of both meaning and form but maintains that grammatical accuracy falls to the wayside. Salaberry (2000) evidenced morphosyntactic development more clearly in SCMC dialogues that in face-to-face dialogues based upon data which revealed that students maintained present-tense forms during face-to-face dialogues but employed a variety of forms during SCMC dialogues. In consequence, it is clear that further research must be conducted on the role of SCMC conferencing on the development of grammatical competence.

Another limitation of the SCMC research also involves contrasting results because of task-design. While Blake and Pelletieri both conclude that jigsaw/single-outcome tasks are the tasks that best spark negotiation, Sotillo found that negotiation was most prevalent when students were free to discuss topics interesting to them.

A further shortcoming of these studies resides in the fact that although each researcher recognizes the value of learner output for language acquisition, not one study explicitly focused on form. Each researcher inspected only the incidental occurrences of form-focused attention that arose during the respective studies. Along those same lines, a disadvantage of Blake and Pelletieri’s studies is that they base their evaluation of grammatical development on negotiation of meaning alone, i.e. there are no follow-up protocols issued to measure the effect of the negotiated items. Both studies assume the viewpoint that negotiation triggers modified output by calling learners’ attention to the differences in their productions compared with the standard form (“noticing the gap”), and as a result assume that development came about. While Blake only attests that negotiation lead to lexical development, Pelletieri perceives the type of negotiation that occurred in her study as evidence of grammatical, as well as lexical, development. However, evidence of the occurrence of negotiation in this medium is not evidence of development—negotiation and development are not one in the same, and other measures must have been taken to substantiate these claims. Directly correlating negotiation with development is not surprising since much recent research conducted on L2 learning (Blake, Pelletieri and Sotillo’s work included) has been conducted from the standpoint that acquisition results from input that is (made) comprehensible, and that if input is not comprehensible at the point of production, it may be made comprehensible through
negotiation. In the act of negotiation, interlocutors rephrase, repeat, reiterate, and/or rearticulate with the purpose of reaching comprehension. While negotiation does lead to enhanced comprehension it remains to be determined whether or not negotiation itself leads to any sort of development. Additional measures which would corroborate the observations they formed from the data would help to strengthen their cases.

2.3 Remaining Work in SCMC Research

Clearly further research needs to be conducted to determine whether or not SCMC conferencing encourages grammatical development. The investigation must raise students’ awareness of form. In addition, and in view of the fact that Sotillo’s study yielded some potentially interesting results regarding grammatical accuracy among groups for synchronous versus asynchronous activities, future research ought to follow the same line of investigation (i.e., open-ended tasks in which students are free to lead their dialogues according to their personal interests). There is a need to investigate the development of grammatical competence though SCMC and thus, the purpose of this study is to contribute to the existing body of research through open-ended work in the synchronous computer mediated communication conferencing environment in which learners’ consciousness of specific L2 features is raised.

The focused element introduced into the SCMC environment will take place via consciousness-raising of the L2 verb forms ser/estar (to be) and the L2 prepositions por/para (for, by, to).

2.4 Consciousness-raising

Consciousness-raising, in general terms, is assisting a student in the learning process by drawing attention to features of the L2. Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1985) contend that consciousness-raising, “the deliberate attempt to draw the learner’s attention specifically to the formal properties of the target language” (p. 274) facilitates language learning. Rutherford (1987) defines consciousness-raising as increasing the
salience of the principle grammatical structures. Schmidt (1990) explored the role of consciousness in second language learning and concluded that, while formal instruction indirectly facilitates acquisition, subconscious learning in the L2 is impossible because noticing is a necessary element for recognizing, interpreting, and processing input, so that it becomes intake. It follows that consciousness-raising (raising awareness or sensitivity to a feature) is important because it is what leads to noticing (mental concentration, conscious attention). While Ellis (1998) agrees with Schmidt that communicative input which contains the L2 feature is important in the process of consciousness-raising, Ellis contends that consciousness-raising through formal instruction allows learners to remain aware of that L2 element so as to notice it in the input, and subsequently process the information for uptake and eventually output. According to Yip (1994) consciousness-raising allows learners to discover grammatical rules independently through focusing on facets of the L2, while Woods (1995) reports consciousness-raising to be an exploratory process by which learners may examine language in use. While this study was conducted from the vantage point that raising awareness or sensitivity to a feature is what leads to noticing, i.e., mental concentration, conscious attention, it is important to note that there is debate about whether or not attention is conscious or subconscious. There is agreement, from the psychological standpoint, that attention 1) is limited, 2) is selective, 3) is partially subject to voluntary control, 3) controls access to consciousness, 5) is essential for action control, 6) is essential for learning (Schmidt 2001; Tomlin and Villa 1994). However, while researchers such as Schmidt hold that subconscious attention is an impossibility, researchers such as Van Patten (1990, 1994) and Tomlin and Villa (1994) hold that attention can be conscious or subconscious.

Consciousness-raising is a suitable model for introduction in the SCMC environment. According to Fotos and Hansen (1999), “many linguists see consciousness-raising as critical to the language acquisition process because it leads to noticing (p. 3).” Noticing is important because it is believed by psychologists to be the mechanism that dictates access to awareness (Schmidt, 2001) and paying attention, which encompasses “alertness, orientation, preconscious registration (detection without awareness), selection (detection with awareness within selective attention), facilitation, and inhibition”
(Schmidt 2001, 3)--all necessary for information processing and hypothesis testing. Some element of input is attended to by working memory while working memory in conjunction with previously internalized information work together to process, analyze, and compare the input with the long term memory’s cognitive store. (See Doughty 2001; N. Ellis 2001; MacWhinney 2001; DeKeyser 1998; Schmidt 1990, 2001; for detailed discussions of cognitive processes). When a learner focuses, he places attention on an item, and thus if his consciousness has been raised about that item and he is invited to employ that item in the midst of a communicative event, the learner has the opportunity to link form and meaning, and thus process language for learning. Through experiential communicative interaction in which learners must exercise comprehension and production skills they may notice gaps in their knowledge and that of the L2. C-R may facilitate the connection of known and unknown, which eventually leads to restructuring of the learner’s interlanguage and ultimate L2 attainment.

The key to development from the C-R vantage-point is the learners’ opportunity to add structure to their knowledge base so that they may process input for building the connections which lead to development. Examining language in use assists the learners in discovering grammatical rules for themselves as they attempt to use the language for communication. From this viewpoint language serves as a tool and the learner as an operator of that tool. Note that according to Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith (1985) C-R is not directly tied to achieving communicative objectives or attaining fluency, but rather is a piece of a larger pedagogical framework under which raising one’s awareness to the formal features of the L2 is but one component.

C-R is a worthy candidate for introduction into the SCMC environment also due to SCMC having been established as a highly communicative environment where the urgency to communicate may negatively impact grammatical development, although it may positively impact both the quantity of language produced and the student-teacher dynamic. Thus, an environment which already assists in fluency and communicative flow is a ripe environment for introducing C-R. Moreover more language is generated than in the traditional classroom setting and the written environment within which the
dialogue ensues in SCMC is ideal for C-R; greater quantities of the L2 in written, yet dialogic form will offer many opportunities for reflection amidst production.

2.4.1 Studies in C-R

Consciousness-raising is a multifaceted pedagogical device with broad applications. While reviewing the myriad of studies conducted from the C-R perspective is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is pertinent to address the manner in which C-R has been addressed to date. This review is not exhaustive, but rather is intended to draw attention to the diverse manners in which C-R has served as a framework in SLA research. The ultimate goal is to connect what has been accomplished in the C-R camp with what needs to be accomplished in the SCMC environments. Studies range from that of Redfern and Weil (2002) who advocate C-R for introducing language learning strategies as a means by which to initiate learners into the realm of L2 learning, to applying the linguistic principles of C-R to religious studies of spiritualization (Fotos and Hansen 1998), to papers on the implementation of C-R activities in the classroom (Melles 1997), to empirical studies on C-R and language acquisition (Fotos 1993, 1994; Leow 2000, 2001 a b; Nagata and Swisher 1995). A synopsis of the abovementioned studies follows.

Redfern and Weil (2002) generated two activities designed for consciousness-raising of language learning strategies. Their stance is that learning strategies are tied to personal beliefs and attitudes about language learning, and if learners’ consciousness is raised regarding the ways in which language learning may be approached they will experience greater efficacy in their L2 endeavors. The researchers devised activities which probe learner beliefs and attitudes toward language learning, and suggest implementing them through small group work, followed by larger class discussion.

Fotos and Hansen (1998) explored the model of consciousness-raising in terms of spiritualization. She outlines five components of C-R and draws a parallel between linguistic C-R and spiritual C-R. Those five components are: 1) formal instruction on a language point, 2) consciousness raising and continued awareness of the new point, 3)
repeated acts of noticing the new point in communicative input, 4) unconscious processes of restructuring the implicit knowledge system, processes which are dependent upon interaction with others, and 5) the appearance of the new point in the learner's own speech (p. 4). That is, as language learners’ consciousness is raised in response to formal consideration of linguistic items, the adoption of learning strategies, such as attention and effort, along with personal motivation, help to generate successful language learners. Likewise, an individual’s desired spirituality can be met if an awareness of those characteristics is raised so as to recognize how to acquire them.

Melles (1997) explores grammatical consciousness-raising and offers three exercises as examples of carrying out C-R tasks. His models consist of activities for verb phrases with the infinitive, preterite versus the imperfect, and present. Essentially, each task requires that past knowledge be stimulated by asking students about what they already know about the topic. Next, the instructor offers insight as to the topic’s content and has students list items associated with the topic before commencing the main activity. After that, the grammar underlying the exercise is reviewed in greater detail through the examples in the sample, and finally written and oral exercises which elicit personal responses conclude each exercise. Essentially, Melles examined books which separated grammar from communication in order to find ways to re-introduce grammar into those contexts suggesting that “if we fail to tend to grammar in our quest to promote communication in the classroom, we nourish verbal fluidity which will never know how to overcome the difficulties of fossilized linguistic competence” (p. 857).

Fotos (1994) reports on word order through examination of three, grammar consciousness-raising tasks; planned language with a single solution, information-gap with a single-solution, and information-gap with planned language. The results of these tasks were compared to those of a teacher-fronted grammar instruction class. Significant gains at the post-tests and maintenance of those gains after a two-week period, and comparable quantities of L2 negotiation that surfaced for the same task without the grammar treatment, lead Fotos to conclude that grammar consciousness-raising tasks are pedagogically useful for grammar instruction in the communicative classroom.
Leow (2000) investigated the effects of awareness versus lack of awareness in L2 learners of Spanish for third person, singular and plural of stem changing –ir verbs in the preterite. First, learners were introduced to the forms in class. Next, they went to the computer lab where they were recorded completing crossword puzzles which targeted the L2 feature, answered “probe” questions to detect awareness of the L2 feature, and completed an immediate post-test. Follow-up interviews were conducted with the unaware students to determine, definitively, their choices on task, so as to assist in drawing conclusions about the participants’ performance based on the feedback that the participant provided the researcher. In this study, learners were grouped as aware or unaware according to their think aloud protocols, in conjunction with their task scores. Thus, the student’s performance placed him or her within a category based on evaluation of the speech that surfaced while on task. Leow reports that “learners who demonstrated awareness of targeted morphological form in the L2 data were able to take in and produce in writing significantly more of these forms, compared to learners who did not appear to be aware of these forms during exposure” and that “aware learners significantly increased their ability to recognize and produce in writing the targeted morphological forms immediately after exposure to these forms, whereas unaware learners did not” (p. 568).

Thus, minimal improvement of the unaware students from pre-test to post-test compared to significant improvement of the aware students supports the positive connection between consciousness-raising and L2 data processing.

Leow addressed another type of conscious-raising task in his study on written input enhancement in L2 reading (2001). He investigated whether or not learners reading a text enhanced for saliency of the L2 Spanish formal commands were able to notice the augmented features in think-aloud protocols implemented during the study, by immediate and delayed recognition, and through written exercises. He concluded input enhancement to be no better than texts without enhancement in terms of the amount of noticing, comprehension, and intake based upon no statistical difference in the students’ performance quantitatively. Qualitatively, he reports that the level of awareness, i.e., the amount of attention given to the L2 feature, may account for the extent to which learners
paid attention and subsequently the processing that ensued as a result of their focus levels.

Nagata and Swisher (1995) explored the role of the computer as a consciousness-raising device in the acquisition of particles and passivization in L2 Japanese. They drew on the capabilities of a natural language processing program to provide intelligent grammatical feedback and compared the results of this more sophisticated feedback with that of the traditional computer generated feedback which provides minimal, non-guided responses. Based on reports generated by the computer programs, and the responses the students generated according to their respective feedback, Nagata and Swisher conclude that the metalinguistic feedback provided by the intelligent program was much more beneficial than the traditional program, and that this type of consciousness-raising task proved to be superior to a grammar-fronted lesson in the traditional classroom.

Sanz and Morgan-Short (2004) conclude the opposite to Nagata and Swisher (1995). Sanz and Morgan-Short (2004) investigated word order in learners of L2 Spanish through four groups, with and without explanation versus with and without explicit feedback, via a computer generated medium. First and second year Spanish students volunteered to participate in the study which focused on pre-verbal direct object pronoun placement. In the computer lab the practice exercises kept exposure to structured input constant for groups, but the presence or absence of explanation (metalinguistic information given before the task on the structure itself and the correct strategy for its implantation followed by the consequence of applying the wrong strategy) or feedback (metalinguistic information given during the task which was immediate and focused on pre-verbal direct object pronoun placement only) were manipulated. The groups were set up such that: 1) group one received practice and both explanation and feedback, 2) group two practiced only, 3) group three practiced and received explanations, while 4) group four received practice and feedback. Practice exercises consisted of clicking the mouse over still frames which identified either the oral or written cue to which the students were exposed, or decoding exercises at the text level. The pre- and post-tests consisted of interpretation tests, sentence completion tasks in which learners had visual cues and were required to choose which picture matched the
statement, and a written video-retelling task in which students watched the video first, took notes on the second viewing and then retold the story without referencing their notes. They found no statistically significant results in the scores across groups and conclude that enhanced positive evidence, instead of explicit negative feedback is what impacts acquisition.

While the approach to C-R has been multifaceted, the core components of C-R are that a grammatical feature is formally introduced to the learners. While the feature is not expected to appear in immediate use by the learners, nor is its introduction directly tied to communicative objectives or fluency, it is viewed as necessary for consciousness-raising so that the learners may process it in the input over time. As the learner is exposed to input containing the grammatical feature, and he notices the structure in the input, the feature becomes available for internal processing, and eventual modification in the learner’s interlanguage. In order for this feature to surface in the learner’s output, this mental restructuring must occur as a result of social interaction.

Consciousness-raising is not to be confused with research conducted under the body of literature on form-focused instruction (FFI). According to Ellis (2001) FFI needs to be envisaged in terms of whether or not the primary focus of the instruction is on form or meaning, and how the attention is allocated (intensively or extensively). He proposes three types of FFI: 1) focus-on-forms (intensive, form focused instruction), 2) planned focus-on-form (intensive, meaning-focused instruction), and 3) incidental focus-on-form (extensive, meaning-focused instruction).

Form-focused instruction’s expansive history has determined that method-oriented (such as audio-lingual and grammar-translation) and naturalistic approaches (such as the communicative approach) have generated, respectively, strong language producers in terms of grammatical complexity yet weak in terms of communicative fluency and practical communication, and fluent language speakers with notable grammatical deficiencies. These approaches represent opposite ends of the spectrum in terms of the conclusions they have offered to researchers and learners alike, and as such have initiated an interest in FFI on theoretical and pedagogical levels. See Doughty & Williams 1998a; Swain 1998; Williams & Evans 1998; Nassaji 1999; R. Ellis 2001; for
historical overviews. In brief summary, through experimental, interpretative, and hybrid studies researchers began to focus on the specifics of a given form, the history and background of the learners, and the nature of the instructional methods and materials employed in the classroom in response to method-oriented and naturalistic approaches (Ellis 2001; Housen 2002). Due to the variations of research methods employed and the diversity of the forms examined there have been few replications, rendering cross-study comparisons difficult to implement and definitive claims difficult to ascertain (Ellis 2001, 4). The specifics of FFI follow.

Form-focused instruction places great emphasis on determining which forms are suitable for instruction. DeKeyser (1998) offers four linguistic criteria for choosing form: 1) rule complexity, 2) rule reliability, 3) scope of the rule, 4) semantic redundancy. Rule complexity refers to the rules which are easy to learn but difficult to acquire, and DeKeyser marks these as prime candidates for FFI (43). When considering rule complexity, functional and formal complexity, along with form-function relationships, must be considered. Rule reliability refers to the degree to which a rule holds true (i.e., are there many exceptions to the rule?). Scope refers to the number of cases to which the rule applies, while semantic redundancy refers to degree to which a linguistic feature appears or does not appear. DeKeyser reports on his review of the literature that high semantic redundancy is important when production is concerned, while it is not as important for comprehension (45). Williams & Evans (1998, 140) highlight criteria from other studies for determining which form to scrutinize (such as learnability and L1/L2 error) but list criteria as outlined in a 1993 study by Harley which offers four guidelines on which to base form-focused decisions. The forms: 1) should differ in non-obvious ways from the learner’s first language, 2) are not salient because they are irregular or infrequent in the input, 3) are not important for successful communication, and 4) are likely to be misinterpreted or misunderstood by learners.

The criteria for determining which form is suitable for FFI are very broad. This is not surprising because form is a complex notion. Form has been defined narrowly and broadly, and encompasses phonology, morphosyntax, discourse, and pragmatics, and may be broken down into a) form—phonemes, morphemes, lexical items, etc., and b) rules—
devoicing, allomorphy, agreement, etc. (Doughty & Williams 1998b, 211-212). Work in
cognitive psychology emphasizes the importance of not disrupting cognitive
developmental processes when introducing a form and these findings compliment and
augment the linguists’ findings. Both linguists and cognitive psychologists uphold the
idea that the role of FFI is to provide learners with environments conducive to making
cognitive connections between known and unknown taking advantage of opportunities to
draw learners’ attention to their gaps in knowledge through focusing on form and
receiving feedback without interrupting communicative and cognitive flow.

Other considerations in the FFI camp are how best to operationalize the form-
focused treatment. Specifically, the concerns are whether or not FFI should be planned
(preemptive/proactive) or incidental (reactive), and whether form should be addressed
implicitly or explicitly. Reactive focus-on-form requires much energy from the
instructor, as he must be able to detect errors amidst communication in order to provide
the necessary feedback to have an effect on learners. Further, he must time feedback
appropriately so as not to disrupt the communicative flow and collapse communication.
A benefit to reactive focus on form is that forms are reviewed extensively providing
breadth, and a limitation to reactive focus on form comes in terms of the practicality of
being vigilant of the myriad of forms, errors, problems, that may arise in a given
classroom session, while all the while taking into account the learners’ developmental
stage. Another limitation is that if such an extensive approach to focusing on form is
assumed, it runs the risk of paucity of the form appearing in the input. That is, there is no
guarantee that the form which needs to be tended to will surface in order to be addressed.
No one form can be addressed thoroughly if it does not surface in the learners’
productions to such a degree that it can be formally addressed and provide ample
opportunity for scrutiny, instruction and consideration. Planned focus on form requires
one to pre-select the forms of focus. Whereas this alleviates the strain of the instructor
being hyper-attentive to all learner-productions, he faces decisions on the nature of the
input that may be introduced, thereby requiring the instructor to devise and implement an
action plan for choosing, implementing, responding to, and evaluating form. Oftentimes,
form focused treatments and in-class activities are structured around the chosen form,
although this depends upon the global approach to FFI that has been chosen. Another benefit to planned FFI is that it offers intensive consideration, exposure, and practice of a given form. Which approach is superior is difficult to determine as work on this question remains for further investigation: “At the present time, there is no definitive research upon which to base a choice of one over the other, rather it seems likely that both approaches are effective depending on the class room circumstances” (Doughty & Williams 1998b, 211).

The decision to incidentally or preemptively operationalize FFI depends, in part, on one’s view of learning as either implicit or explicit by nature. Implicit knowledge is unconscious, intuitive knowledge attained incidentally or unthinkingly while explicit knowledge is conscious, analyzed and intentional. Thus, the manner in which one believes languages are learned will affect decisions as to procedures employed in terms of learning mode.

In sum, in addressing C-R and FFI, it is clear that in C-R effort is made to isolate an L2 feature through focused linguistic attention, preferably with authentic L2 material. This focused attention raises the learners’ awareness of the feature so that they may process it mentally when they are exposed to it in the input over time. This mental processing is believed to facilitate noticing of the linguistic feature, which incites the restructuring of the learners’ interlanguage system. Thus, if a learner is aware of a linguistic feature and is exposed to it through subsequent communicative interactions so that noticing does take place, he will be inclined to notice the feature, undergo cognitive restructuring, and eventually acquire the form. Underlying this approach is the idea that the learner must engage himself cognitively by specifically addressing the L2 forms to which he will be exposed. In C-R approaches, the heart of a communicative task could take the form of resolving a grammatical problem.

In contrast, the priority underlying form-focused instruction (be it focus-on-form or focus-on-formS) is that of communication. In form-focused work (focus-on-form and focus-on-formS), calling attention to a grammatical feature is justified only when there is a communicative need. Attention to form should arise during communication and should never interrupt the communicative flow. Here, the task is to generate mutual
understanding, whether or not such understanding is based upon perfectly generated forms.

One aspect common to both C-R and FFI is that they value input through communicative interaction. Another common aspect is that they recognize the importance of noticing as a psychological interface between explicit knowledge about an L2 feature and eventual acquisition of that feature.

Raising one’s consciousness does not happen through input alone. While it has been established in this discussion that the need for input containing the L2 feature is important if students are to notice the feature, be that noticing through C-R or FFI, what remains to be addressed is the matter of feedback. The discussion now turns to feedback and studies which have addressed it.

2.5 Corrective Feedback in SLA

The role of corrective feedback has been thoroughly addressed in the literature on first language acquisition. Studies have examined the manners in which parents provide feedback to their children in an attempt to determine the role of feedback in acquisition. Studies range from that of Brown and Hanlon (1970) which claim that since parents mostly tend to semantics negative feedback plays a minimal role in L1 development; to studies which claim that parents address grammatical inaccuracies through strategies such as elaboration, clarification requests, and confirmation checks (Bohannon & Stanowicz, 1988; Demetras et al., 1986; Hirsh-Pasek et al., 1984). These diverse viewpoints on L1 acquisition led to myriads of studies addressing this issue, and much of that literature has affected the way in which L2 corrective feedback has been addressed. In the L2 literature studies have been conducted in 1) laboratory settings, 2) NS-NNS interaction, and 3) and in the L2 classroom. An overview of the work on corrective L2 feedback follows.
2.5.1 Studies on L2 Corrective Feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) analyzed approximately eighteen hours of recorded transcripts of nine to ten year-olds in French immersion classes in Canada for whom math, science, and language arts classes centered on course content, rather than form. Of the categories of corrective feedback that surfaced (recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, repetition, elicitation, and explicit correction) approximately 60% of the feedback consisted of recasts for three of the groups while 39% was in the form of a recast for the fourth group. Next, the researchers examined the learners’ responses to the instructor’s feedback in terms of uptake, which was liberally defined. They reported that recasts, the most frequently operationalized feedback mechanism, led to the least amount of overt uptake.

Lyster (2001) expanded upon his 1997 and 1998 studies and investigated a) the type of errors that sparked corrective feedback and b) the type of feedback that lead to immediate repair by the participants. Feedback strategies consisted of recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic cues, explicit correction, and repetition, with the techniques listed in order of frequency as per a previous study. In this previous study he recorded the meetings of four French immersion classes for fourth and fifth graders. The data were transcribed and coded, and Lyster reported the following: 1) the instructor’s tendency was to recast grammatical and phonological errors and to negotiate lexical errors, 2) the learners’ tendency was to repair the phonological error after a recast, and to repair lexical (and grammatical) errors after negotiation of form. These findings suggest that recasting is insufficient for grammatical error repair, but that learners do respond to negotiation of form in addition to meaning.

Doughty and Varela (1998) set out to determine whether and how, without distracting learners from the communicative act, learners’ attention could be drawn to formal linguistic features of past tense in a content-based, whole-language curriculum science class, through intonalational focus and corrective recasting. Only the past tense was addressed through recasts and corrective utterance repetition and the researchers concluded that participants in the focused-recast group improved their accuracy in
production of the targeted structures, when compared to those in the non-recast group. Rising intonation as corrective feedback was also claimed to have been a successful means by which to draw students’ attention to form without distracting them from meaning. They also state that focus on form, be it through recasts, corrective utterances or other such methods should be brief and not directed at individuals; that too much correction may agitate the learner, especially if the correction did not match the learner’s concern; and that students believe they can pay attention to meaning, communication, and form simultaneously.

Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) examined two groups of learners in their study on learner-perceptions of NS-NNS/Proficient Speaker feedback. The two groups consisted of university students learning Italian as their second language and adult ESL learners. Each group was video-recorded during information exchange activities where the native or proficient speaker was instructed to provide corrective feedback wherever they deemed it necessary. The ESL and the Italian participants yielded somewhat different results. Phonological feedback held more importance for the ESL learners where misunderstandings in pronunciation may have inhibited the ability to communicate, and may have hampered the possibility to recast. In contrast, among the Italian learners such communication breakdown did not arise because they did not have as diverse a background as the ESL participants. That is, because the Italian learners were from the same L1, variation in pronunciation did not impact comprehension as it did in the ESL group with where those participants had to content with both the L2 and a variety of pronunciations of the L2 as produced by learners of different L1s. For the ESL group feedback tended to be morphosyntactic or phonological (seldom lexical) and learners perceived this feedback as such 83% of the time for lexis, 60% of the time for phonology, and 13% of the time for morphosyntaxis. The ESL group, in recall interviews aimed at gaining insight about their perceptions on the feedback, reported that they perceived morphosyntactic feedback as semantic feedback rather than as pinpointing a grammatical feature. The Italian group perceived lexical feedback to be about lexis 66% of the time, they perceived phonological feedback accurately 18% of the time, and
morphological feedback was perceived 24% of the time but they also believed this feedback to be lexical.

Morris and Tarone (2003) examined how the social dynamics of an L2 Spanish classroom impact learners’ perceptions of student-to-student generated recasting in order to address whether or not social dynamics can impede or facilitate a peer’s ability to properly process the feedback for cognitive processing. Data were gathered from a tape-recorded in-class activity in which self-selected pairs worked to complete an information gap activity (Steven’s routine) on the third person singular of the present indicative. An individually completed post-test followed the in-class activity and two weeks later a delayed posttest was administered. Shortly after the delayed posttest a recall session was held. The recall session required participants to provide insight as to what they were thinking at the time the data collection took place. Based upon the interpersonal conflict that arose while on task, the subsequent maintenance of the erroneous form, and student’s personal comments upon recalling the session, Morris and Tarone report that when students expected their peers to evaluate them negatively socially, they were less likely to recognize the feedback as constructive and helpful and were unlikely to identify the underlying morphosyntactic structure of the correction. Consequently, failing to perceive the corrective feedback is disadvantageous in terms of developmental potential. The researchers emphasize the importance of considering social dynamics when evaluating the utility of corrective feedback.

Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998) report that recasts (implicit negative feedback) were more effective than modeling (preemptive positive input) with regard to short-term interlanguage development for learners of L2 Japanese and Spanish. Non-native speakers worked with native-speakers in a laboratory setting where their interactions were tape recorded while working on adjective ordering and locative constructions in Japanese, and on direct object topicalization and adjective placement in Spanish. Due to inconsistent performance scores in modeling versus recasting treatments, they report the results as disappointing but “nevertheless provide some evidence in support of the claim that implicit negative feedback plays a facilitative role in L2 acquisition” (p. 367).
Leeman (2000) examined noun-adjective agreement in L2 learners of Spanish. Pre-tests, post-tests, and second post-tests were administered. The treatment consisted of an information-gap task of the type where the participant was first required to produce the target structure and later was required to respond to information provided by the instructor. The pre/post and secondary-post tests consisted of picture-difference tasks in which individuals orally noted the differences. All work was completed individually for each group (recasts, negative evidence, enhanced salience, control. Leeman reports 1) that recasts are beneficial even when there is no communicative breakdown and even when the forms have little importance semantically, 2) she did not find statistically significant advantages for negative evidence and enhanced positive evidence combined in comparison to unenhanced positive feedback alone, 3) that artificial enhancement of the target forms to make them more salient in the input can lead to higher rates of accuracy than unenhanced positive evidence, and 4) that recasts can enhance saliency, thus increasing the possibility that the forms will be noticed, and that this heightened awareness may be sufficient, without negative evidence being provided, to explain the benefits of recasts.

In sum, these studies have reported that recasting is a popular corrective strategy which is quite common in the L2 classroom. However, while Doughty and Varela (1998) and Long, Inagaki, and Ortega (1998) report some positive results for recasting treatments, Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Lyster (2001) report that while recasting may be a very common corrective strategy it is insufficient for grammatical repair because it leads to the least amount of uptake, and because learners do not always recognize the syntactical correction underlying the modification, as in Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000), and may also fail to even recognize the recast at all due to classroom social dynamics, as reported by Morris and Tarone (2003).
2.6 Implications for the present Study

The work on SCMC reveals that its utility as a facilitator of grammatical development still warrants investigation. Such investigation must require learners to consciously focus on form because conscious attention is believed to be a mechanism which allows for the cognitive processing that leads to development over time. Both linguists and cognitive psychologists uphold the idea that providing learners with environments conducive to making mental connections between known and unknown, and the ability to take advantage of opportunities to draw learners’ attention to their gaps in knowledge is fundamental in the learning process. SCMC is an excellent medium for learners because it offers an opportunity for them to plan their productions, to view and review them textually, to process information at a quick pace. Consciousness-raising is an excellent pedagogical tool in this environment because as students are motivated to process the dialogues for meaning, if their syntactical consciousness is raised they may also be able to tend to form, meaning, and function within the same context. It follows that the feedback procedures employed to and by the students may facilitate the process of consciousness-raising, and therefore the instructor must know how to operationalize corrective feedback.

Rather than imposing tasks which require the teasing out of grammatical features, grammatical C-R should allow learners to be responsible for raising their own consciousness in the midst of the SCMC dialogues. If learners think consciously about what they and others are producing, at the time of production, in an environment which allows for think-time and review-time, they are in ultimate control of their awareness or lack thereof. Accordingly, this study allows learners to focus on facets of the L2 in an exploratory process by which they examine their language in use through free dialogues in SCMC. In view of that the form-and-meaning focused groups (FFMF) refers to the groups whose task it is to concentrate on their use of L2 forms while also tending to meaning, while the meaning-focused group (MF) is the group for whom focusing on form is not an explicit task requirement.
Work in the SCMC environment as a facilitator of grammatical development must rely on a number of measures to evidence development. Measures which assist in generating a full picture of the dynamics generated in the chat environments, such as Elicited Imitation, Sentence Repetition Testing, Grammaticality Judgments, and oral exams, must be implemented.

The researcher hypothesizes that consciousness-raising in the SCMC environment assists in the grammatical development of *for* (*por/para*) and *to be* (*ser/estar*) in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than in SCMC without consciousness-raising.

### 2.7 Chapter Summary

In sum, while CALL research is mature with a variety of studies which address an assortment of topics, SCMC research is still in its infancy. While a number of studies have focused on the nature of the environment and its role in language acquisition, even fewer studies have addressed the role of development, and even fewer studies have addressed the role of grammatical development.

The chapter defined consciousness-raising and examined how it has been envisioned in the current research. The purpose was to bring C-R research into contact with SCMC research. Consciousness-raising complements SCMC because the written medium of such conferencing allows for preparation time, think time, and review time in the midst of communication; all excellent features for assisting in consciousness-raising. For one’s consciousness to be raised, one must focus on grammatical items in the L2. Awareness of those features is believed to facilitate the cognitive processes that lead to development. C-R is not to be confused with form-focused instruction, and this chapter also addresses the difference between the two. At the heart of C-R is resolution of a grammatical difficulty in the L2, through the medium of the L2, for which communication may center on implementation of that form. Raising one’s consciousness on the form resides in introducing the form, exposing learners to it in subsequent input, and exposure to the form in communicative exchange, with the ultimate goal of attaining the form. C-R invites methodologies, such as corrective feedback, that assist in this
process. FFI, on the other hand, focuses on grammatical instruction in the midst of communication and justifies addressing a grammatical point only for cases of communicative breakdown.
Chapter 3
Methodology

The following chapter presents the main purpose of the study. It lists the research questions, addresses the study’s preparation and provides a main study overview. In the main study overview, subject and professor characteristics are reported, investigational procedures and administrational steps follow, variables are presented, and finally, materials and equipment are listed. This chapter does not exclude the procedures followed for the FFMF face-to-face group although its data were unavailable for analysis. The rationale for including this group in the current chapter is to provide a thorough report on the design on the study and the procedures.

3.1 Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine whether consciousness raising in Synchronous Computer Mediated Environments (Internet Conferencing / Chat) assists in the grammatical development of for (por/para) and to be (ser/estar) in L2 learners of Spanish to a greater degree than in SCMC without consciousness raising.

3.2 Research Questions

1. Does the affordance of focusing on por/para, ser/estar assist in the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the form-and-meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the group that engages in consciousness-raising in terms of those forms?
2. Does the lack of focusing on por/para, ser/estar hinder the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the group that does not engage in consciousness-raising?
3. What role did consciousness-raising play in participant development?
3.3 Pre-study Preparation

Laying the groundwork for the study consisted of a number of steps. Pre- and post-test measures (Elicited Imitation/Sentence Repetition Testing, Oral Exams and Grammaticality Preference Component) were generated, pre-chat / pre-discussion questions were developed, chat questions were developed, student and instructor manuals were organized, grammar handbooks for the form-and-meaning focused groups were prepared, background and exit questionnaires were developed, Blackboard course sites were established, chat user accounts were created, and instructor training sessions were held. Each component is described below.

3.3.1 Pre- and Post-Test Measures: Elicited Imitation, Sentence Repetition Testing

Elicited Imitation, also known as Sentence Repetition Testing and henceforth (EI/SRT), is a process in which participants listen to a series of sentences of varying levels of difficulty and attempt to repeat those sentences, verbatim, within a three-second time frame. The purpose of the EI/SRT is considered to be a measure of language development (Radloff 1991; Vinther 2002). An exact repetition of the phrase by the learners reveals their proficiency levels because the learners will only be able to repeat a model for which they have grammatical competency, provided the sentence is sufficiently complex that they cannot rely on memory. That is, the learners must utilize their current grammatical knowledge to process the language sample to which they are exposed, and must make a hypothesis about that information in an attempt to reproduce the language sample in its entirety. If they are able to process the sentence for understanding, they will be able to reproduce that sentence easily. The assumption is that in order for learners to reproduce the sentences accurately they must first go through a series of decoding, processing, interpretation and reproduction. If the sentence is beyond their current cognitive abilities, they will have to make an educated guess about the content/message, which will be reflected in the production uttered. As a result, the language produced by
the learner provides a window for viewing linguistic development because if the phrase-content is within the existing capabilities of the learners they will be able to 1) reproduce the phrase without difficulty, or 2) will reproduce the content of the stimulus sentence with synonyms. EI/SRT thus provides a window for viewing the learners’ developing L2 grammar.

Step One: The preliminary form

In order to gather the material needed for the EI/SRT exercise, the researcher reviewed the course text book and selected a number of possible sentences of varying lengths. All sentences selected were reviewed by the course instructor, a native-speaker of Spanish, for cultural and linguistic authenticity and naturalness. Thematically, the sentences dealt with course material, and the topics ranged from politics, to history, and culture. Grammatically, the sentences contained samples of por/para, ser/estar in context.

Once the possible sentences were chosen and reviewed, they were ordered by sentence-length and the course instructor recorded the preliminary sentences with natural speed and intonation; leaving a three-second pause between each sentence. To ensure natural speed and intonation, and the suitability of the sentence-length, three native speakers from various Spanish-speaking countries tested the recording by repeating the sentences within the three-second time frame. Due to their ability to accomplish this task, the preliminary sentences were prepared for pilot testing, no sentences were discarded, and it was deemed that the chosen sentences represented a wide variety of difficulty and that the preliminary list was ready for testing.

Step Two: The Preliminary Participants

It was necessary to work with participants who were representative of the full range of proficiency levels. The pilot-testing took place at the end of the fall semester, and since the study would involve level-three learners, volunteers from levels two and
three were solicited. The course instructor and the researcher identified learners at various levels of proficiency and the students were asked to volunteer to participate in the preliminary testing.

Step Three: Testing the Preliminary Form

A total of seven learners volunteered for the pilot study. While these learners represented the full range of proficiency levels, they were very few in number due to the fact that the semester was about to end and the University was preparing for final exams.

The volunteers were instructed to report to the language lab. In the language lab the researcher introduced herself, thanked the volunteers for their time, and introduced them to their role in the study. Volunteers were told that they would contribute to the study by recording themselves repeating a series of sentences to which they would listen through headphones at their work stations. They were instructed to repeat the sentences, to the best of their ability, exactly as they heard them on the recording, and that they would have three seconds to record themselves before they would hear the next sentence. Each statement was heard by the volunteers only once. Volunteers were also instructed that once the recordings began it would run until the end, i.e. that no stopping, rewinding, forwarding, or pausing was permitted.

Once the recordings were complete, the researcher and two Spanish-speaking assistants scored the results. Each evaluator had a list of the recorded sentences and marked the list according to what the volunteer generated. An error was considered to be any deviation from exact repetition of the sentence, even if the volunteer was able to generate a synonymous message, and included the following: word substitution, omission or addition, false starts or repetition, change in word-order, and incomprehensible utterances/garble or distorted pronunciation. Students earned a full three points for complete and clear repetition, two points for one error, one point for two errors, and zero points for three or more errors. No more than one error was assigned per mistaken production. For example, if the student began the statement with an inverted word order and then backtracked to begin the sentence again, the error would either be counted as a
false start or as inverted word order, not both. After each recording the evaluators compared their notes to establish consistency with marked errors in tabulating the scores. In terms of the pilot-test, there were no discrepancies in the evaluations.

Step Four: Determining the Final Version of the Form

The discrimination index, a measure which reveals which sentences are most effective in discriminating among participant-performance, was determined by arranging 1) the subjects according to their total scores and then 2) the sentences according to their total score. The absolute difference between these scores was calculated, and this calculated score represents the discrimination index. Next, the difficulty level, a percentage of incorrect responses obtained for a given sentence, was calculated: the total number of correct points for the sentence was divided by the total possible points for a sentence (i.e., number of subjects multiplied by the three possible points per sentence), and then was subtracted from 1.00. The sentences with the lowest discrimination scores, which also represented the full range of difficulty level scores, were chosen for the final form of the EI/SRT. All chosen sentences were arranged according to difficulty level in the order of easiest to most difficult, followed by sentence length. Note that while longer sentences tend to be more difficult in EI/SRT testing, in some cases a slightly longer sentence could be less difficult than a shorter sentence once the discrimination index and difficulty levels are determined. In such a case, Radloff (1997) suggests that each sentence be ordered by difficulty level first, and then by sentence length should a few of the sentences result in equal levels of difficulty. Practice sentences were also added and the course instructor tape-recorded the revised version of the EI/SRT. The final EI/SRT form consisted of fifteen sentences per item examined (por/para and ser/estar), and thus this component was comprised of thirty, three-point, sentences in total, and held a maximum value of 90 points. Appendix D 1EI / SRT the final version of the EI/SRT form.
3.3.2 Pre- and Post-Test Measures: Oral Exams

It is possible to measure linguistic proficiency as demonstrated in the EI/SRT against a reported proficiency evaluation. While the researcher included a reported proficiency evaluation, she relied on this oral examination as an independent measure of language proficiency rather than as a calibration standard for evaluating the EI/SRT results. The rationale for this decision was based on the small number of volunteers available for both the piloting of the EI/SRT form and for the main study itself. Establishing and correlating such a standard requires participation by a considerably larger population than that which was available at Florida State University for the given level; EI/SRTs require a minimum of fifty people to establish statistical significance against a reported proficiency standard. Obtaining such numbers was not impossible, however soliciting such an amount of volunteers for the preliminary testing would have greatly reduced the participant pool for the study itself, and would have prevented auto-group-selection through student matriculation since level-two pilot-participants would have had to be tracked and filtered off into non-participating sections. That is, in order to ensure a range of difficulty, level-two students participated in the pilot study and, thus, great care had to be taken that those participants did not matriculate for the sections designated for the study. For those reasons, the oral exam did not serve as calibration standard from which to evaluate the EI/SRT scores. Instead, both components operated as independent measures of linguistic development, and served alongside the Grammaticality Preferences Test for the purpose of gaining a comprehensive and exhaustive assessment of the participants.

Oral exams were held at the onset and conclusion of the semester. All topics were assigned by the course instructor and were 1) thematically related to the course material, 2) developed according to the needs and interests of the learners. The first oral exam was arranged in groups of four and each person had to speak for a minimum of one minute, a maximum of two minutes, in Spanish. The topic focus was to organize a skit which addressed either the course short-stories or the text-book’s biographies on important figures in the Spanish-speaking world. Students were required to employ the present
indicative in their skits. The final oral exam of the semester was arranged in pairs and each person was required to speak a minimum of two minutes, a maximum of three minutes, in Spanish. They were required to create a Power Point presentation of six slides, three per person, where they were to present on an interesting cultural aspect of a Spanish-speaking country which had not been covered in the text-book. They were required to explain the event using the preterite, imperfect, and subjunctive, and slides were meant to contain images with very little text. During both oral exams reading from note cards or slides guaranteed a failing grade. All sections were held to the same standards and were evaluated with regard to their abilities in the following categories: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. She assigned the letter most representative of the participant’s ability for each category, ranging from a through f, i.e., from least proficient to most proficient with a carrying the fewest points and f carrying the most. More detailed descriptions on the oral exam grading criteria are addressed in the ‘administration and scoring of orals’ section of this chapter.

3.3.3 Pre- and Post-Test Measures: Grammaticality Preferences Component

Grammaticality Preference Tasks are tasks in which students are asked to review a number of sentences for correctness, grammatical well-formedness, and accuracy. Specifically, students reviewed a number of paired phrases in Spanish for which they determined their preference. The grammaticality preference component is a tool useful in exposing learners’ underlying grammatical system because it requires a decision on form to be made between two options. This component balances the EI/SRT in that it helps to expose underlying grammar when observed in a more formal setting, through its observations of students’ choices. The advantage to introducing a grammaticality preferences component, hereafter GPC, is that it enables the researcher to present the learners with a number of sentences centered around specific forms so that the students’ evaluation of those forms could be investigated specifically. Furthermore, a GPC compliments the other pre- and post-test components in that it offers a comprehensive
evaluation of the learners, especially when combined with the results of the chat transcripts.

This component of the pre- and post-tests required that students review a number of paired phrases in Spanish. This revealed the students’ awareness as to meaning differences in choosing one form over another, and to know when both phrases represented viable options for the L2. For each paired phrase they chose among the following options:  

- **a** if they preferred sentence a,  
- **b** if they preferred sentence b,  
- **c** if they preferred neither phrase,  
- **d** if they preferred both, and  
- **e** if they were unsure.  

The GPC consisted of 55 questions which contained samples of *por/para* and *ser/estar* and distracters; see Appendix D 2 GPC. All sentences were reviewed by the course instructor for authenticity and accuracy, and then again for generating the answer key. Students completed this component on both bubble-sheets, to quickly and accurately determine the composition of the participating groups, and on paper, which served as data security in the event that the bubble sheets were damaged or unreadable. While the students were completing the GPC the researcher and the instructor circulated around the room to be sure that both the bubble form and the paper copies were being completed. Before sending the bubble forms to be scanned, the researcher reviewed the two forms for discrepancies. There were no discrepancies in choices marked on either of the forms, for any of the participants. Scores were tallied according to whether or not the learners’ productions matched the professor’s choices, a native speaker of Spanish.

### 3.3.4 Pre-Chat / Pre-Discussion Questions

The content that would be covered at Florida State University’s level-three courses was evaluated by the researcher and a number of think-questions were developed by the researcher and course instructor to accompany each story. The purpose of these questions was to provide the form-and-meaning focused students with samples of the L2 forms in context in order to remind them to focus on both form and meaning in their sessions. Rather than review discrete grammar points out of context, these pre-chat
questions prepared the students, through examples, for the cognitive demands of engaging in form-and-meaning focused dialogues. Examples included questions such as the following, where the reading was about the expulsion of the Moorish King from Granada, his homeland, by the Catholic King and Queen of Spain:

1. ¿Cómo son los reyes Católicos? Describe el carácter de los reyes.
2. ¿Cómo es el rey moro? Describe su carácter.
3. ¿De dónde son el rey moro y los reyes Católicos?
4. ¿Por cuánto tiempo vivió el rey moro en Granada?
5. El rey moro defendió su reino por sus súbditos (his subjects) pero los reyes Católicos eran más poderosos y por consiguiente el rey moro perdió su reino. ¿Cómo reacciones a esta parte de la historia española? También los reyes Católicos defendieron su reino por sus súbditos, según su punto de vista, así que, ¿quién tuvo más razón? ¿Quién no tuvo razón?

The first two questions ask the participants to focus on the character of the Catholic and Moorish royalty, and this is accomplished not only through the verb forms themselves, but also through the subsequent command to describe their character (Describe su carácter). The third and fourth questions ask where the royalty are from, honing in on the time frame that the Moorish King lived in Granada, so as to combine por and ser in context. Question five introduces various uses of por in addition to an L2 “to be” expression (tener razón—to be right). The questions, along with their translations are available in Appendix H 2.

### 3.3.5 Chat Topics and Discussion Questions

All groups were given the same conversational topics. All topics were thematically related to their course work and were aimed at stimulating discussion of the topics for deeper understanding and analysis, and contained the target forms in context whenever possible. All questions were written by the researcher and the course instructor. Returning to the reading on the Catholic and Moorish Royalty, chat-forum questions were of the sort that follows below. Topics and translations are available in Appendix H 1.
If you spend your whole life in only one place, and one day people come and force you to abandon the only place that you know and have known, How would your react? What would you do?

Do you believe the Moorish King left the country with dignity even though he left crying? Would you cry if you could never return to visit your home town/city?

Is crying a sign of weakness? Can a person cry and still be a strong person? When and under what circumstances is it acceptable to show/reveal our emotions? Do you believe that those expectations are culturally constructed? Explain.

3.3.6 Descriptive Manuals

Descriptive manuals were established to clearly outline the expectations for participation in the study. These manuals covered 1) how to access the university’s electronic learning system, Blackboard (discussed below) 2) how to establish computer-lab accounts, 3) how to access the chat tool, Web-4M (also discussed below) and 4) the rules and procedures on chat/discussion days. The manuals also included the researcher’s contact information. These documents are available in their entirety in Appendix F numbers 1-4.
3.3.7 Blackboard & Web-4M

The researcher prepared three course web pages through Florida State University’s electronic learning system, Blackboard. Blackboard is an electronic learning system that allows content management and sharing. This feature allowed students to have twenty-four hour access to the researcher’s contact information, informed consent forms, and general course materials. It allowed the instructor to have twenty-four hour access to the course documents required for the study with the flexibility of making those documents viewable to students only at the designated time, i.e., pre-discussion questions were posted as “viewable” only within twenty-four hours of the scheduled discussion or chat, and discussion questions were never made viewable to the students. Each web page contained: contact information for both the researcher and the instructor; Informed Consent Forms; Computer Lab Manual or Face-to-Face Discussion Manual; Pre-Chat/Pre-Discussion Questions where relevant; Discussion Questions; Grammar Manual where relevant; course syllabus; and assignments (these documents are available in the Appendix). Also included were links to the Internet conferencing system, Web-4M http://www.ditium.com/ditium-products/jdhtech.html, http://www.ditium.com/ditium-products/Web4MFeatures.pdf, and Blackboard user-support http://company.blackboard.com/Bb5/manuals/Bb5-LevelThree-Student/.

Web-4M was the chat client available for use in this study. The researcher designated usernames thematically related to course content and registered them with the Coordinator for Academic Programs in the Department of Distributed and Distance Learning, who then provided user passwords. Subsequently, each student was assigned an identity, given the corresponding password, and was instructed to keep the identity anonymous until the end of the semester. Extra nicknames and pass codes were established in order to ensure flexibility in the event of technical difficulties.
3.3.8 Instructor Training

First, the participating instructor successfully completed the online Human Participants Research Basic Training Seminar. Next, sessions were held by the Department of Distributed and Distance Learning to learn how to manage all aspects of the Web-4M chat client. The computer lab technician was present to assist with lab protocol, difficulties, and for help with the Blackboard system. Four sessions were held by the Department of Distributed and Distance Learning to ensure that all components were easily managed by the professor. In addition, the instructor manual was reviewed with the researcher: demands and expectations were outlined, and all questions were addressed until the instructor felt comfortable with, and knowledgeable about, the study’s components. Two formal meetings were held, although the instructor was free to approach the researcher at any time about any component of the study.

3.3.9 Questionnaires

A background information form was distributed to both the course instructor (Appendix C 1 Questionnaire Native Speaker) and to all participants (Appendix C 2 Questionnaire Participants). These forms obtained the participants’ history, age, gender, and information about their linguistic background. An exit questionnaire was also distributed (Appendix C 3 Questionnaire Participants: Post Study).

3.3.10 Grammar Handbook—Form-and-meaning Focused Sections

Three Grammar Handbooks were generated: 1) por/para, 2) ser/estar, and 3) additional expressions. All grammatical textbook information on por/para, ser/estar and additional expressions in Spanish was consolidated and placed into a reference manual for the students. While this information was consolidated and distributed to participants
in the two form-and-meaning-focused groups, it is pertinent to note that the meaning-focused only participants also had access to this information through their textbook. The purpose of the manuals was to emphasize and reiterate the students’ responsibility to focus on form as they attempted to express themselves via this communicative medium. Additionally, it provided them with an all-inclusive, concise, and consolidated document, which served as a quick reference for students to consult before each chat, or throughout the duration of the study.

3.4 Study

This study evaluated the production of por/para, ser/estar for learners whose consciousness had been raised to focus on both form and meaning (FFMF) compared to learners whose consciousness had not been raised, i.e., who were instructed to focus on meaning only (MF) in order to examine the effect of consciousness raising in SCMC. The study will be presented first, followed by participant characteristics and instructor credentials. Next, the procedures are outlined and variables are identified. Finally, materials, and equipment are discussed.

3.4.1 Study Overview

Level-three Spanish courses at the Florida State University (FSU) in Tallahassee, Florida consisted of a series of readings on personalities, histories, and writings of the Spanish-speaking world, complimented by a grammar component provided by the text. For the purposes of this study, all students were required to have read the materials prior to coming to class in order to be prepared to participate and lead discussions on this material. At the end of each week students discussed the course material via Internet chat or in the traditional classroom setting. Topics required students to debate, compare and contrast, argue and defend their points of view. This level’s structure followed a basic Spanish program characterized by a task-based, whole language approach under which
students were exposed minimally to grammatical structures and vocabulary due to the structure of Florida State University’s Basic Spanish Program, and thus offered a prime environment to evidence learner growth. Three sections of Spanish III were designated for the study, and with early morning classes and late afternoon classes eliminated, the final participating sections met at §2 at 9:00-9:50, §3 at 10:10-11:00, and §13 at 11:15-12:05.

All participating sections followed the standard syllabus for all level three courses except that once per week §2 remained in the traditional classroom setting to engage in small-group, face-to-face discussion while the other two groups met in the computer lab for the purpose of Internet chat. All groups addressed the same questions in these face-to-face and chat discussions. The course instructor led the course and all its components; she followed the syllabus and participated in each discussion and chat. Each group’s treatment was determined by the hour of matriculation before the semester began. That is, §2 at 9:00-9:50 was designated as the form-and-meaning focused group which engaged in small-group, face-to-face discussions in the classroom, §3 at 10-11:00 was also designated as a form-and-meaning focused chat group, and §13 at 11:15-12:05 was the meaning-focused chat group.

3.4.2 Participants

The participants were all between the ages of 19-25 and all had been passed onto level three through Florida State University’s Basic Spanish instructors or through placement exams. All students reported to have no known disabilities or incapacities to prevent their participation in the study.

Twenty students matriculated into §2. Of those students, four tested into Level III through FSU’s placement test, one student had spent one semester abroad two years before matriculation in this course and had taken previous Spanish courses at the local community college, while a third student had exposure to the language due to family background. All other students in this section had high-school instruction before
completing one to two levels of Spanish through FSU. Twelve learners reported to be matriculated out of interest and seven reported to be enrolled due to the language requirement.

Section 3 had a total of twenty-two students. Of those students three tested into Level III, five took all of their Spanish courses at FSU while a sixth person also took classes at the local community college. Three students had Spanish in both high school and elementary school with one of those students having Spanish-speaking family members. The remaining ten students reported to have studied in both high school and on FSU’s basic program. Of this section, twelve students reported to be enrolled for degree requirements, six were enrolled out of interest and three students reported to be enrolled for both interest and degree requirements.

Section §13 consisted of seventeen students for whom, prior to matriculation in this course, nine had both high-school and FSU Spanish instruction; three had elementary-, high school-, and university instruction, with one of whom had tested into Level III and four whose exposure to the language was through the FSU program only. Twelve of these students reported to be there out of obligation, two were there out of interest, and three were there out of both interest and obligation.

3.4.3 Instructor

The course instructor taught Spanish with the Florida State University for four years prior to this study and had completed FSU’s summer intensive teaching preparation program in teaching methodologies. In addition she held a high-school teaching certificate from the University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain, under which she taught English as a Second Language for a number of years before beginning her doctoral studies in the United States. The instructor was a native speaker of Spanish.
3.4.4 Procedures

The procedures for administering the pre- and post-tests are outlined below and a description of the scoring protocols follows. The routines for the chat sessions are addressed next, followed by the norms for the face-to-face, small group discussions. Finally, the instructor’s class preparation procedures are addressed.

3.4.4.1 Administration and Scoring EI/SRT

Administration of the EI/SRT took place during the second week of classes and was repeated the week before the university’s final examination period. Students were instructed to report to the Language Lab during their regularly scheduled class hour to complete this component of the study. Upon arrival they were instructed to take a blank cassette tape, label it according to name, time, date and section, and to insert it into the tape-deck at a cubicle of their choice. Once the attendance had been taken and all participants were present, the researcher read the following statement:

- Thank you for your participation in this research.

- For this component of the study you will be asked to listen to a number of phrases in Spanish. After each phrase please repeat the phrase out loud, as you just heard it, to the best of your ability in Spanish. Some sentences are easy, some are difficult.

- The phrases you will hear are downloaded on the masterboard. When you are given the signal please activate the recording device at your desk. Once you have set the tape deck to record your responses at your desk, the masterboard will be activated.

- Once the masterboard and the recording device at your desk are activated please do not stop, rewind or forward the recording. Please let the recording run without interruption. You will have 3 seconds between recordings to repeat the phrase as you heard them.
At that point the Audio-Visual Media Coordinator trained the students on how to work the machines, conducted a trial run, and began the recordings. Note that the participants heard each sentence only one time before they were to record their repetitions.

A perfect score consisted of three total points for each sentence and full points were earned if the student correctly repeated the sentence in its entirety. Two points were awarded for one error and one point was awarded for two errors. Errors consisted of word substitution or exclusion, additions of words or phrases, repetitions and false starts, incorrect endings, and incomprehensible utterances/garble. No more than one error was marked for a given utterance, i.e., if the student began the sentence but then backed up to remedy the mistake and repeat the sentence correctly, a one-point deduction was taken for this false start.

Once the recordings were complete, the researcher and the research assistant reviewed and scored the results of the EI/SRT. The researcher and her assistant worked alongside one another in a private office to code all participant utterances. After each recording the evaluators compared their notes to establish consistency with marked errors in tabulating the scores. Discrepancies in scores were addressed by re-assessing the specific phrases in question. Both the researcher and assistant would re-evaluate the production by rewinding the recording in order to listen more carefully to the production to be sure that each person had accurately coded the production. The exact production was reviewed element by element and coded jointly by the researcher and assistant, consensus was then reached and the final scores were tallied.

3.4.4.2 Administration and Scoring GPC

This component was given during the second week of the semester and then again the week before final exams. Students were asked to mark their preferences directly on both a paper copy and on bubble sheets. The paper copies served as data security in the event that the bubble sheets were damaged or unreadable. The answer sheets provided five-options in which the following GPC preference corresponded with the bubble sheet
options: a (a), b (b), neither (c), both (d), or not sure (e). The researcher distributed this component at the start of the class hour and monitored the students’ progress to be sure that all information was thoroughly completed. Participants were allotted twenty-five minutes to answer fifty-five questions.

Scores were determined in accordance with how well the participants’ scores matched that of the professor’s. Matching the professor’s scores required the participants to recognize when both the paired phrases were im/possible, and to thus to show some cognizance of the meaning changes inherent to choosing one form over the other. Furthermore, because this component asked them to mark their preferences, it revealed which forms were more natural to the learners at the time they completed it.

The results of this component were tallied with the help of the Office of Evaluation Services. They registered the answer key, ran the student’s sheets against the standard, and provided a detailed summary of the results.

3.4.4.3 Administration and Scoring Oral Exams

Two oral exams were given during class time; the first was given shortly after the semester began, while the other was given shortly before its end. Oral exams were the sole responsibility of the professor and she assigned the topics. All sections covered the same subject matter (skits in groups of four for the first oral; Power Point presentations in groups of two for the second oral) and were held to the same expectations and standards. The students were evaluated on accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension on a range from beginner (a), with a one-point value, to native speaker (f), with a six-point value. The standards utilized in this study, and descriptions provided to the instructor, were borrowed from Radloff (1991), pages 147-151. In sum, an “a” designation meant that the learner was almost entirely inaccurate, unintelligible, extremely weak and impossible to understand. A “b” designation was better than an “a” designation because at the “b” range the learner can be understood at times, although with great care on the part of the listener. Under a “b” designation the learner can only
express simple topics and may be asked frequently to makes new attempts to be understood. A “c” designation is one in which the learner has gained fluency, although his speech may be marked by poor pronunciation, but makes enough mistakes that speaking with this learner can be frustrating and many misunderstandings may occur due to the lack of vocabulary of the “c” for conversing about a variety of topics. A “d” designation depicts an intermediate learner who understands naturally spoken, educated L2 speech with normal speed and intonation. A “d” learner may need to ask the NS to repeat a few things but is able to follow, and contribute to, NS dialogue. While a “d” still commits errors, they do not impede upon comprehension. Likewise, the non-standard accent doesn’t hinder communication either. An “e” designation describes a learner who is beginning to understand colloquial language. An “e” has a slight accent, almost never makes the same error twice, has a broad vocabulary, speaks without difficulty and only has comprehension problems on rare occasion. Finally, an “f” designation is one in which the learner is the closest he will come to being a native speaker.

3.4.4.4 Chat and Face-to-Face Procedures

Chat procedures:

Students in sections 3 and 13 met once weekly throughout the semester in the computer lab for the purposes of chat. Each chat session was approximately fifty minutes for the meaning-focused group, and approximately forty minutes for the form-and-meaning focused group, for a total of 350 minutes (5.83 hours) and 280 minutes (4.67 hours), respectively. Discussion questions were posted on an overhead projector during the chat sessions for easy reference during the conference. Each set of discussion questions required the students to debate, compare and contrast, argue and defend their views as they pertained to the course material. Again, the main difference between the chatting activity was that that §3 was reminded to focus on both form and meaning for each chat session, and §13 was asked to concentrate on meaning alone.
Specifically, §3 and §13 met in the computer lab on Thursdays. All students in these sections were responsible for obtaining an account specific to that lab, and the procedures for doing so were outlined in their lab manuals, as previously mentioned. See Appendix F, numbers 2-4 for supporting documents. Students in §3 were requested to: come to class on time and log on immediately; have prepared their pre-chat questions before coming to the chat session; to have reviewed por/para, ser/estar. They were to maintain Spanish for the entire session, to be respectful of one another, to concentrate on the discussion questions and related themes, and to not use the hour as a social hour. They were encouraged to work together to develop and explore their ideas in depth and detail, to express and defend their opinions, and to focus on grammatical forms and accuracy especially with regard to por/para, ser/estar. Their instructions were presented as follows:

For each chat-based discussion your professor will post the themes and topics to be addressed. The purpose of these discussions is to provide you with a forum in which you may explore the course material for deeper meaning and understanding, in an environment conducive to a comprehensive, in depth, and more profound appreciation of the story’s content and message.

- Please address these questions during your chat session, and work together to explore your ideas and opinions on the subject matter.
- Please pay particular attention to your use of ser/estar and por/para.
- If you do not understand something, or if something needs clarification, do not hesitate to seek assistance! The purpose of these sessions is to practice working through such difficulties!
- When seeking clarification, please be sure to indicate whether or not you are seeking clarification of content or clarification of grammatical form. Also, pay attention to your instructor’s clues and feedback. She will be actively assisting you in generating accurate forms throughout as you explore the discussion questions.
- Take advantage of the opportunity to work through questions for both meaning and content AND for the accuracy of your productions of por/para, ser/estar.
Students in §13 were also requested to come to class on time and to log onto the network immediately, and were also required to adhere to the same set of rules. No mention of form-focused attention was ever made; rather, emphasis was placed on the students’ responsibility to address the topics posted. Their instructions were presented as follows:

For each chat-based discussion your professor will post the themes and topics to be addressed. The purpose of these discussions is to provide you with a forum in which you may explore the course material for deeper meaning and understanding, in an environment conducive to a comprehensive, in depth, and more profound appreciation of the story’s content and message.

- Please address these questions during your chat session, and work together to explore your ideas and opinions on the subject matter.

- If you do not understand something, or if something needs clarification, do not hesitate to seek assistance! The purpose of these sessions is to practice working through such difficulties! Take advantage of this opportunity.

- Please remember—keep the dialogues in Spanish.

**Face-to-face Discussions**

Students in FFMF §2 also met once weekly throughout the semester for the purposes of small-group, face-to-face dialogue. Each session was approximately fifty minutes for a total 320 hours after the pre-chat questions had been reviewed. Discussion questions were posted on an overhead projector during the discussions for easy reference. Each set of questions required the students to debate, compare and contrast, argue and defend their views as they pertained to the course material. In terms of the face-to-face groups, the professor would determine the groupings each week, and at times allowed the students to self-select their groups depending on the dynamic and needs of the groups at a particular point in time. Groups could contain as few as three or as many as five participants. The instructor then reviewed the Pre-Discussion Questions, reminded the students to focus on *por/para, ser/estar* as they addressed the posted subject matter, and
then allowed the students to begin their group work. The discussion questions were posted on an overhead projector for participants in this section, and as the students worked, the instructor circled around the room to assist with comprehension, analysis, and grammatical structures. Their instructions were identical to those presented to FFMF §3, with accommodations made for the change of setting. Again, the main difference between this activity and that of the chat groups was that FFMF §3 chatted, while §13 was meaning-focused and chatted. Table 3.1 summarizes the overall organization of the study.

### Table 3.1: Summary of Participating Group Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hour</td>
<td>9:05-9:55</td>
<td>10:10-11:00</td>
<td>11:15-12:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Form / Meaning</td>
<td>Form / Meaning</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Standard Classroom</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Chat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Castro-Vázquez</td>
<td>Castro-Vázquez</td>
<td>Castro-Vázquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab Manual</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Form / Meaning</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-face Manual</td>
<td>Form / Meaning</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-chat Questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat Discussion Questions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Manual</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Questionnaire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Questionnaire</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre &amp; Post EI/SRT, GPC, Oral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.5 Variables

In order to evaluate the effects of consciousness raising in the communicative environment of SCMC this study set out to examine the performance of two chat sessions, one FFMF, and one MF, and a third group which met in the traditional
classroom for small-group, face-to-face FFMF dialogues. Recall that in the final analysis only data for the chat groups was available for examination.

In order to insure internal validity one instructor taught all three sections. This assured consistency of course content and presentation, and language exposure in terms of dialect, accent and vocabulary. Further, the instructor completed and passed the Basic Training Course provided by the Office for Research Protections Pennsylvania State University (which covered both Penn State University and Florida State University’s requirements for working with human participants in experimental procedures), was trained on the use of the chat client, and was trained on the required student feedback practices by the researcher. Also, the instructor assisted in the generation of the pre- and post- tests.

All sections utilized the same textbook and accompanying resources and thus were exposed to the same course materials during the regularly scheduled class meetings. While the form-and-meaning focused groups had access to a grammar manual, this grammar manual was a consolidation of the grammar points presented throughout the textbook into one neatly organized manual, and they were not permitted for use during chat sessions. Although the form-and-meaning focused groups had this manual available to them, the meaning focused group also had the same access, albeit spread throughout the course text.

Participation in the study was based on enrollment as determined by the hour for which each student elected for his/her schedule and matriculation. That is, no students were recruited so as to simulate a natural learning environment. The courses met during the morning hours. All students were presented with the same discussion questions for their weekly chat/face-to-face discussion, respectively, identical pre- and post- tests were administered, and all students faced the same criteria and demands for oral exams. All students were between the ages of 19 and 25 and all had earned a 70% or better at FSU, an equivalent at a comparable institution, or tested into Level III from high school. All students reported to have no known disabilities or incapacities to prevent them from participation.
All sections received the same treatment by the instructor with regard to learner inaccuracies, except that the instructor was told to focus on misunderstanding of course content for §13, and focused on both misunderstanding of course content and grammatical structure for the other two groups. Specific strategies for grammatical correction, in the L2, included the following: recasts (restating all or part of a learner’s production without restating the error), clarification requests for both form and meaning, explicit correction, and metalinguistic feedback (for example, “the past tense usually ends in –ed but the past tense of “to eat” is irregular…so, what would “to eat” be in the past tense?). Strategies for inaccuracies in the meaning focused group consisted of recasting and clarification or elaboration requests, but at no time would the instructor engage in explicit correction or provide metalinguistic feedback to this meaning focused group. Please find that document in Appendix F 1, Spanish 2200 Instructor Manual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Feedback Options</th>
<th>FFMF §2</th>
<th>FFMF §3</th>
<th>MF §13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:05-9:55 Standard Classroom</td>
<td>10:10-11:00</td>
<td>11:15-12:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-and-Meaning</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Form-and-Meaning</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:05-9:55 Standard Classroom</td>
<td>10:10-11:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:05-9:55 Standard Classroom</td>
<td>10:10-11:00</td>
<td>11:15-12:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-and-Meaning</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form-and-Meaning</td>
<td>Form-and-Meaning</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request (Content and Structure)</td>
<td>Clarification Request (Content and Structure)</td>
<td>Clarification Request (Content only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.6 Instructor Preparation

Before the students arrived, the professor initiated the chat conference and prepared the forum for recording. The medium utilized was Web-4M. As the students logged on she would invite them to a conference, which the students would accept, and the forum was prepared for the chat session. As a precautionary measure the instructor would save the dialogue throughout the session.

Prior to commencing the chat session the instructor would quickly review the Pre-Chat questions with the FFMF groups. She verbally reviewed these questions with the students, who had prepared them before class, while circulating around the room to determine who had and had not come prepared. The same procedure was followed for §2 with regard to reviewing and assigning credit to the Pre-Discussion Questions, and the initiation of the face-to-face discussions. In addition, the instructor would remind the students of the expectations, rules, and areas of focus for the form-and-meaning-focused groups. With regard to MF §13, the instructor simply reminded the students of the expectations and initiated the conference.

3.4.7 Background and Exit Questionnaires

At the start of the semester the researcher visited the participating classrooms to explain the study, address questions or concerns, and to distribute and collect the informed consent documents. A background information questionnaire was distributed the second week of classes. The purpose was to profile the learners with regard to age, language experience, technology experience, learner attitudes, and their objectives behind foreign language study. Please refer to Appendix C 2. An exit questionnaire was also distributed by the researcher at the close of the semester. Please refer to Appendix C 3.
3.5 Materials and Equipment

3.5.1 Materials

A background and an exit questionnaire were developed and distributed. As part of the instructor training, an Instructor Manual was developed to outline the role and responsibilities of the instructor. Accordingly, Computer Lab Manuals were distributed to the students, and made available to them via Blackboard, outlining the procedures for establishing lab accounts, expectations for each chat session, and the like. Likewise, §2 received a Face-to-face Group Work Manual delineating like information.

Discussion Topics, written by both the researcher and the instructor, reflected the textbook material. They were posted in Blackboard for the instructor only, who had the liberty to make them electronically available for viewing during the chat sessions. Nonetheless, the topics were copied to overhead transparencies for constant display during the conferences. Please find the discussion topics in Appendix H 1.

Operationalization of Form Focused Affordances—Pre-Chat Questions & Face-to-face Discussions were also written by the researcher and course instructor and also reflected the course material with an added concentration on the uses of por/para, ser/estar in context. These questions were posted in Blackboard with limited accessibility, i.e., the course instructor made them visible to students only one day before the scheduled chat session so that the students had ample time to complete the assignment and prepare for the next day’s chat.

Three Grammar Handbooks were generated. All grammatical textbook information on 1) por/para, 2) ser/estar and 3) additional expressions in Spanish was consolidated and placed into a reference manual for the students. Again, this consolidated information was available to all students throughout the course text book, but presentation of the consolidated materials into a grammar manual for the FFMF groups served as a consciousness raising device. Essentially, the manual consisted of a series of tables which contained a list of L2 phrases, L1 translations, and a description as to when and how to use the form. Samples follow, but the full documents are found in

Ser:
To identify, describe, or define a subject.
Tito Puente es un músico hispano. Tito Puente is an Hispanic musician.
Aztlán es la tierra originaria de los antiguos aztecas. Aztlán is the original land of the ancient Aztecs.

Estar:
With the present participle (-ando, -iendo) to form the progressive tenses.
La población hispana de Miami está aumentando cada día. The Hispanic population of Miami is increasing every day.

Por:
To indicate duration of time. Durante may also be used in this case, or no preposition at all.
El Salvador sufrió un período de violencia por más de diez años (durante más de diez años). El Salvador suffered a period of violence for more than ten years (during more than ten years).

In the following common expressions.
Por ahora For the time being
Por cierto Of course
Por consiguiente Consequently

Para:
To express movement or direction toward a destination or goal.
Salgo para San Salvador el viernes próximo. I’m leaving for San Salvador next Friday.

Expressions with Tener
Tener frío / calor To be cold / hot (a person) Tengo frío. I’m cold.
Tener éxito To be successful Tiene mucho éxito. She is very successful.
Tener hambre To be hungry ¿Tienes hambre? Are you hungry?


**Haber**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Haber</th>
<th>There is; there are</th>
<th>Hay un perro. Hay tres perros.</th>
<th>There is a dog. There are three dogs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>There is; there are</td>
<td>Hay un perro. Hay tres perros.</td>
<td>There is a dog. There are three dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había / hubo</td>
<td>There was; there were</td>
<td>Había muchas personas en la fiesta. Hubo una fiesta medieval.</td>
<td>There were many people at the party. There was a medieval party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habrá</td>
<td>There will be</td>
<td>Habrá muchas personas.</td>
<td>There will be many people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the participating sections followed the exact level-three Course Syllabus as non-participating sections, adjustments aimed at accommodating the lab meetings were necessary. The modified course syllabus outlined the responsibilities of all students matriculated in the course, and contained a statement explaining that §3 and § 13 were scheduled to meet in the computer lab for internet conferencing, and a general statement explaining that the student had matriculated in a section designated for doctoral research. This document was distributed and posted on Blackboard.

With regard to the EI/SRT component, the researcher prepared four copies of the master list of the recorded/repeated sentences for every participating student. These copies allowed the researcher and the research assistant to score the learner productions as recorded on the cassette tapes. Four copies were necessary to provide both the researcher and assistant with one copy each for both pre- and post-test scoring.

The Grammaticality Preferences Component required both scantron sheets and hard copies of the document, along with sufficient quantities to distribute it at the beginning and end of the semester. Bubblesheets also required a number two lead pencil.

**3.5.2 Equipment**

The Computer Lab contained an adequate amount of personal computers so that each student could contribute to the chat sessions. Each computer needed to have Internet connections to log onto Web-4M and to access Blackboard, and each participant
needed to be assigned a user-account specifically for accessing the computers in this specific laboratory.

The Language Lab was equipped with a Master Board from which pre-recorded materials could be broadcast to listener-cubicles. The Master Board allowed for one broadcast of the EI/SRT phrases to the entire section. Each student sat at a listener-cubicle that contained headphones with microphones and a cassette deck for voice-recording their responses. Each student was also provided with a cassette tape for recording.

Overhead projectors were required for posting the discussion questions and a machine for reading, scoring, and reporting the results of the scantron forms for the written exam were required. Two forms per participant were required, in addition to an answer key.

Hand held recording devices were needed for the small-group discussions, with sufficient recording length to cover fifty minutes of dialogue.

### 3.5.3 Summary

Three sections were designated for this study. Section 2 was form-and-meaning focused and discussed all work in a face-to-face environment. Section 3 was also form-and-meaning focused and discussed its work in the chat forum. The third group, §13 was meaning-focused and held its discussion in the chat forum. One professor directed all three sections in weekly discussion of the course material. Pre- and post- tests were administered at the onset and finish of the semester, respectively, and the chats/face-to-face sessions were held weekly throughout the semester.

While the researcher has included the methodological procedures for all three groups, recall that data were available for the two chat groups only. The purpose behind including the FFMF face-to-face group in this chapter is to provide a thorough account of the proceedings as they occurred and to illustrate the manner in which data were gathered in the event that this work is replicated or expanded upon in the future.
Chapter 4
Results

The present chapter reports the results of the data collected for the study. Participant characteristics at the onset of the semester, followed by the post-test results are presented first with accompanying statistics. Chat transcripts are presented next, both quantitatively and qualitatively, with regard to *ser/estar*, *ser/estar* + *meaning-changing adjectives*, *additional expressions*, and *por/para* followed by instructor-to-student feedback practices.

4.1 Participant Characteristics at Pre-Tests

It was necessary to determine the characteristics of each group at the start of the semester in order to determine whether or not the groups were alike at the onset of the study. A summary of the descriptive statistics for the participating sections in terms of each pre-test for the mean scores is presented below in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

2.1: §3 Descriptive Statistics Pre-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§3 Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>EI / SRT</th>
<th>GPC</th>
<th>Oral 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.45455</td>
<td>26.45455</td>
<td>18.77273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>5.771253</td>
<td>5.771253</td>
<td>3.315646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level (95.0%)</td>
<td>2.558831</td>
<td>2.558831</td>
<td>1.470075</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1 Homogeneity

In order to determine whether or not the participants were from the same population sample t-Tests for independent samples were run for §3 (FFMF) and §13 (MF) chat groups to verify that these groups were statistically alike. The results, summarized in Table 4.3, confirm that both chat-groups were homogenous at the onset of the study.
4.2 Post-Test Results

A paired two-sample student’s t-test was run on the pre- to post-test results to determine the gains earned by each group for each test, if any. Section 3 results reveal that the t-Stat value (-9.50749) does not fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.079614) for the Elicited Imitation Sentence Repetition Tests; t-Stat value (-3.51717) does not fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.079614) for the Grammaticality Preference Components, and t-Stat value (-5.887909283) does not fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.079614205) for the Orals. Section 13 results reveal that the t-Stat value (-7.27803) does not fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.119905) for the Elicited Imitation Sentence Repetition Tests; t-Stat value (-0.62811) does fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.119905) for the Grammaticality Preference Components, and t-Stat value (-2.773523196) does not fall into the critical region (t-Crit = 2.119904821) for the Orals. It is concluded that there was significant improvement in terms of all pre- to post-tests for FFMF §3. While there was significant improvement for MF §13 in terms of the EI/SRT and Oral, there was not significant improvement for §13 in terms of the GPC.

In order to determine if the EI/SRT, the GPC, and the Oral for Time 2 revealed statistical differences in the post-test scores for the two groups under study, i.e. §3 versus §13, t-Tests for independent samples were run for the FFMF and MF chat groups. The raw scores are reported in table 4.4. The results of the t-Test, found in table 4.5, reveal that there was no statistically significant difference in terms of oral exam scores, but that there were differences in terms of their performance on the EI/SRT and GPC. The differences are in favor of the FFMF group.
Table 4.4: Raw Scores for Pre and Post Tests, § 3 (FFMF) and §13 (MF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>EI / SRT</th>
<th>GPC</th>
<th>Oral 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FFMF</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td>FFMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: t-Tests for Independent Samples §3, 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-tests</th>
<th>EI/SRT</th>
<th>GPC</th>
<th>Oral 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI/SRT</td>
<td>t (37, 39) = 2.241, p = 0.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPC</td>
<td>t (26.02, 39) = 2.095, p = 0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral 2</td>
<td>t (35.61, 39) = 1.518, p = 0.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Chat Transcripts

Students in the designated chat sections engaged in chat on a weekly basis. Please see the schedule of the sessions and the topic for each session in table 4.6. The first three sessions served as training and debugging sessions (January 9, 16, 23), and the final chat (April 24) was utilized by the professor as a final-exam review for which students mixed and/or doubled up on sessions. Factoring in an additional three sessions which were eliminated due to technical difficulties, and subtracting session six on April 3rd, 2003 due to the students using their text books during that chat, a total of seven transcripts were analyzed for the study. Technical difficulties which resulted in data loss included 1) a university-wide shut down on one occasion where the server was inaccessible for the better part of one work day, 2) one session in which the Web-4M hosting network did not allow the students to log on for a consistent period of time, thus littering the chat with the coming and going of the participants as they made attempts to rejoin the chat after being exited by the program, and 3) one day’s sessions not being saved correctly. It is important to note that table 4.6 reflects the chatscripts scrutinized for the study, and omits any sessions discarded in response to training, technical difficulties, the instructor’s final exam review. Thus, while the chat on January 30th is the first chat analyzed for the study, it is actually the fourth chat session of the semester, but the first to be acceptable for analysis. Likewise, chat sessions were held on the 13th and 27th of February, the 27th of March, and the 24th of April, thus making chat #2 the fifth of the semester, chat #3 the seventh of the semester, chat #4 the ninth of the semester, chat #5 the tenth, #6 the twelfth, #7 the thirteenth, and #8 the fourteenth.
In view of the fact that specific forms were chosen in the task of consciousness raising, it was important to examine the role that focused attention, or lack of focused attention, may have had on those forms in the SCMC environment. Learner productions were examined quantitatively and qualitatively, and the results follow.

The text-book categories to which the participants were exposed were exploited for the categorization of the productions of *ser/estar, por/para, ser/estar + meaning changing adjectives, and additional expressions*. Each production was coded according to the context of use and assigned a category according to intended use. Next, in terms of *ser/estar* the transcripts were evaluated for verb choice and correct usage for each category, i.e., agreement (subject-verb, gender, number). The total in/correct was then tabulated for each section, and the percentage of correct productions was calculated. The details of the students’ productions are presented in the following order: *ser, estar, ser/estar + meaning changing adjectives, additional expressions, por, and para.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chat #</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>January 30</td>
<td>Granada, por Don Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February 06</td>
<td>Don Quijote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>February 20</td>
<td>Butterfly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>March 06</td>
<td>Rigoberta Menchú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>March 20</td>
<td>Los Perros Mágicos de los Volcanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>April 03</td>
<td>Versos Sencillos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>April 10</td>
<td>El Diario Inconcluso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>April 17</td>
<td>Raquelito Tiene un Mesaje</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.6: Chat Schedule & Discussion Topics**
4.3.1.1 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Ser

This section illustrates the manner in which the two groups addressed *ser*. Each category is addressed, examples are given, correct forms are presented, and a summary of the results follows in table 4.7.

Spanish uses the verb *ser* to identify or define a subject, such as 1) Gloria Estefan is a Hispanic musician, or 2) Cuneiform is the earliest known writing system. Students in §3 utilized *ser* in this context with 93.29% accuracy, compared to §13’s accuracy level of 90.92%.

§3 chaparrastique2 Moncho *era* el pajaro pequeño y Don Gregorio *era* el pajaro grande (como Sesame Street).
§13 juan_carlos2 communism *es* uno teoria

Origin, ownership, or the material of which something is made is the second category which falls under *ser*. Examples include: 1) Christina Aguilera is from Pittsburgh, 2) The books are Tina’s, and 3) The pants are made of cotton. Section 3 expressed these ideas with 83.33% accuracy and §13 express them with 50% accuracy.

§3 azucar_moreno2 Quizas *seas* de una ciudad como Boise, ID...No quiero regresar alli
§13 mariposa2 *es* mio

Category three, *describing inherent qualities or characteristics of people, animals, objects*, tends to be a difficult category because it requires adjective agreement. Thus, in order to say Yvonne is pretty (*Yvonne es bonita*), the adjective pretty must be feminine. Section 3’s productions were 93.96% accurate, and §13’s 78.31%.

§3 bandera2 *porque* llora acerca de su situacion, no significa que *es* debil
§13 planeta_azul2 si, *es* muy largo libro

Indicating time, dates and seasons is category number four and both sections expressed these with one-hundred percent accuracy.
When I was younger I lived in many different countries, it’s difficult but it’s possible.

It’s noon.

Category five, indicating time or location of an event, was rarely expressed. Section 13 produced no examples of this, while one production correctly surfaced in §3.

The dream takes place on Mars?

The final category, passive voice, was generated with 80% accuracy for 3 and 66.67% for 13.

I don’t think it was a constitutional violation to recite the pledge that contains a reference to God because the country was founded with the principles of God.

Because sometimes when students are forced to do something patriotic in public, but they shouldn’t be forced to say the pledge.

Table 4.7 summarizes the categories and the samples produced by each group for *ser*. In terms of the total number of attempts at using *ser* constructions in the seven contexts, the FFMF group not only made more attempts to use the forms, but also produced the forms more accurately over all.
### Table 4.7: Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates SER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>Ser</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§3</td>
<td>FFMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>§13</td>
<td>MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>93.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>90.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>93.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>78.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>93.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>85.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.1.2 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Estar

This section illustrates the manner in which the two groups addressed this form of the copula. Each category is addressed, examples are given, correct forms are presented, and a summary of the results follows in table 4.8.

The verb *estar* is used to indicate location of a person, a place, or an object. Section 3’s productions were 61.54% correct, while the meaning-focused group produced correct forms 55.56% correct.

§3 besazo2 tenemos mucho suerte estar en EEUU porque hay países con más problemas que hay aquí

§13 loquito2 ojos_ver- estas aquí??!!!

*Estar* is combined with the present participle (-ando, -iendo) to form the progressive tenses. While scores were low for this category, §3 was 64.71% correct, while §13 was 42.11% correct.

§3 cubanacan2 creo que el dinero y el poder tiene mucho que ver cuando estas tratando de explicar por que los ser humanos se tratan tan mal

§13 habichuela2 o ve la radio como un perro

*We are very lucky to be in the US because there are countries with more problems than there are here*

*Ojos_ver—are you here??!!!*

*I think money and power have a lot to do with when you’re trying to explain why human beings treat each other so badly*

*or he sees the radio as a furious dog that’s*
ferioso que **esta ladrando, o haciendo** ruido

*barking, or making noise*

The third category requires *estar* with an adjective to describe status and conditions or to describe a change in a characteristic. Under this category one can express the temperature of one’s coffee (My coffee is really hot), to a person’s mood (She is very angry right now), to one’s physical state (He looks very handsome today). Section 3 expressed these ideas with 65.79% accuracy, while section 13 employed them with 61.90% accuracy.

§3 **reina_sofia2** *esta* alegre cuando *esta* en casa  
§3 **cubanacan2** el queso *esta viejo* y podrio  
§3 **besazo2** *estoy triste* cuando no puedo recordarlos

§13 **loquito2** *como* *estan*, todos?  
§13 **hurucan2** sí, las gentes pobres *estan* mejor *porque* el pais es mas pobre de EEUU

*S/he is happy when s/he’s at home*  
*The cheese is old and rotten*  
*I’m sad when I can’t remember them*  
*How is everybody?*  
*Yes, the poor people are better because the country is poorer than the USA*

The verb *estar* is also used a past participle to indicate the condition that results from an action. In this case, the past participle functions as an adjective and agrees in gender and number with the noun to which it refers. Section 13 failed to produce these ideas correctly, while section 3 only earned 54.17%.

§3 **cubanacan2** freud siempre *estaba preocupado* con su madre  
§13 **anteojos_magicos2** cuando un persona llora todos los dias, despues las emociones son muy roto.

*Freud was always preoccupied with his mother*  
*When a person cries every day, his/her emotions are broken* afterwards

On the whole, both sections scored more poorly when attempting to express contexts that required *estar*. Nonetheless, the FFMF group still expressed themselves more accurately than the MF group. Table 4.8 displays the totals for these categories.
Table 4.8: Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates ESTAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§3 FFMF 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.54</td>
<td>§13 MF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3 FFMF 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3 FFMF 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3 FFMF 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.3 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Ser and Estar with Meaning-Changing Adjectives

Some adjectives convey different meanings depending on whether they are used with *ser* or *estar*. For example, the phrase *He is boring* is expressed with *ser* to describe his inherent personality as a bore, while the phrase *He is bored* is described through *estar* to clearly mark the distinction. Other examples include: a) *aburrido*, b) *bueno* (good natured vs. tatsy), c) *interesado* (interesting vs. interested), d) *limpio* (inherently clean vs. only clean now), e) *listo* (intelligent vs. ready), f) *loco* (mentally ill vs. frantic/crazy), g) *malo* (evil vs. bad), h) *verde* (green color vs. ripeness), i) *vivo* (alert vs. alive). Under this category the learners have the task of first choosing the correct verb form, and secondly to account for agreement. Examples include:

---

§3 1) cencerro2 sin imaginacion, vida *es* aburrido … aburrida
2) azteca2 y *es* un buen maestro
3) cubanacan2 *es* muy buena gente

§13 1) ojos_verdes2 *gato_violeto* *es* un nombre bueno ... me gusta
2) margarita2 los perros *son* buenos
3) inca2 los perros ayudan? *son* buenos??

*Without imagination, life is boring*... *boring*  
*And he’s a good teacher*  
*He is a good person*  
*Gato_violento es a good name*  
*The dogs are good*  
*The dogs help? They’re good??*

Table 4.9 summarizes the performance of both groups. The FFMF group earned an 81.82% while the MF group earned a 35.71%.
4.3.1.4 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Additional Expressions

This category is an important one when considering the impact of consciousness raising in communicative environments with regard to ser/estar (and por/para in terms of category e) because while the L1 relies on the verb ‘to be’ to express ideas such as to be ‘hungry’, ‘afraid of’, ‘right’, ‘wrong’, ‘lucky’, ‘strong’, ‘late’ and ‘there is/are/was/were,’ the L2 does not. If the participants are paying attention to form and meaning they will be less inclined to generate a literal translation and more inclined to take all ‘to be’ contexts into account. For example, §3 not only utilized these additional expressions fairly accurately, the students also employed the forms in the present and past tenses:

§3 1) besazo2 tenemos mucho suerte estar en EEUU porque hay países con mas problemas que hay aquí
2) anteojos_magicos2 no creo que había personas que luche molinas de viento en el tiempo que Don Quijote era escribir.
3) chaparrastique2 Si, anoche. Sueno que hubo plantes creciendo en mi clase de ciencias en escuela secondaria y no puedo las toque.

Table 4.10 reveals that FFMF § 3 was 89.55% accurate in their attempts to express such ideas, while § 13 was only 50% accurate in the few attempts they did make.

Table 4.9: Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates
SER / ESTAR + MEANING CHANGING ADJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/E ADJ.</th>
<th>§3 FFMF</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>S/E ADJ.</th>
<th>§13 MF</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84.21</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92.86</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are very lucky to be in the US because there are countries with more problems than there are here.
I don’t think there were people who fought windmills during the time Don Quijote was written.
Yes, last night. I dreamt that there were plants growing in my secondary schools’ science class and I couldn’t touch them.

Table 4.10 reveals that FFMF § 3 was 89.55% accurate in their attempts to express such ideas, while § 13 was only 50% accurate in the few attempts they did make.
Table 4.10: Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>§3 FFMF</th>
<th>§13 MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Weather: it’s hot/cold/windy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B To be: hungry/thirsty/lucky/afraid/etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C There is/are</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D To be late</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E To look for/wait for/etc.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.5 L2 ‘to be’ Expressions: §3

In terms of L2 ‘to be’ expressions, FFMF §3 performed strongly overall, outperforming MF §13 for all categories. Section 3 was weakest in terms of employing the copular verbs in *estar* contexts. On the surface, it appears as though that may be due errors in verb choice; however this is not the case. Upon closer inspection it becomes clear that *indicating location* (*estar*: 1) and *indicating the results of an action* (*estar*: 4) were the topics under which errors of verb-choice surfaced most strongly. In all other contexts the main source of error was either the participle form or past tense morphology. This is an important distinction because it demonstrates that FFMF §3 did not employ a default form of the L2 copular, but instead made efforts to carefully employ the L2 verbs in accordance with the meaning and function of the respective forms.

Consider the examples in which the source of error is the participle. In these instances *estar* is the correct verb but the participle that accompanies it is not correctly formed.

- choclo2 *porque* el *esta* salir su casa … pienso que Sancho *es* valiente *porque* esta *viaja* con Don Quijote
  - *because he is leaving* *his home* … *I think that Sancho is brave because he is traveling* *with Don Quijote*
Interestingly, a few samples surfaced in which the participle was well formed, but

The verb choice was, as it appeared in the past tense, problematic. In the following example the present participle is perfectly formed but the construction is erroneous in that when the learner switched to past tense he was unable to tend to both verb choice and past tense morphology.

_You see what is occurring* in the Middle East_

_I don’t think the children were* having fun with the pledge… its not a violation because they were* learning the pledge_

While there were a few verb-choice errors (“_pero Moncho es tambien furioso_—but Moncho is* also furious”) the bulk of verb-choice errors resulted from reporting in the past tense:

- _diego_rivera2 porque no entiende, y _era_ furioso y triste__
  _because he doesn’t understand, and he was* furious and sad_

- _bosque_verde2 el _fue_ confuso _he was* confused_

- _chequere2 el rey _fue_ triste _porque_ salio su pais, _tuvo razon_ a llorar__
  _the king was* sad because he left his country, he had a right to cry._

Difficult reporting in the past is made evident in other examples. In Chaparrastique2’s comment “_El Padre _era_ sorpresa y _estaba_ furioso_—the father was* surprised* and he was furious,” two of the past tense forms and both ‘to be’ verbs appear next to one another as if the learner cannot decide 1) which is the appropriate past tense form for expressing his ideas and 2) which verb is most appropriate within that context. In addition, the past participle form was also incorrectly produced (_sorpresa_ instead of _sorprendido_). Conceivably, this learner recognizes that the context will dictate which past form to use, but he has not yet been able to distinguish among them unequivocally and subsequently his verb choice is affected.
The confusion over verb tense is further demonstrated through productions such as Reina_sofia2’s, “si no pudiera visitar me cuidad, **fuera muy triste y queria luchar**—If I weren’t able to visit my home town **I would be very sad and I would want to fight.**” Added to its complexity is the attempt to employ an if-clause. While the learner may recognize the structure for if-clause statements (if + past subjunctive followed by conditional) she was unable to supply neither the correct form (conditional) nor the correct verb (**estar**) within this context.

The next two examples reveal that learners did pay attention to agreement, which provide additional evidence that the source of error stems from past tense morphology. In the first example the entire list is pluralized as it should be, although it is accompanied by past tense **ser** instead of **estar**.

- reina_sofia2 Los padres de Moncho **fueron** agitados, preocupados, tensos, tristes, frustrados, desesperanzados
  
  *Moncho’s parents were agitated, preoccupied, tense, sad, frustrated, desperate*

In the second example, even the feminine form of the adjective is correctly written, although it too is accompanied by past tense **ser** instead of **estar**.

- ruinas_tikal2 La mama **era** furiosa al final de la película
  
  *The mother was furious at the end of the film*

Furthermore, of the 19 errors for **ser** category one, and of the 11 errors for **ser** category three, only 6 of those errors were verb choice in both cases. Errors in category six were not due to verb choice, but rather to substituting the preposition **de** for the infinitive, and errors in category seven were due to past participle formation. Errors in **ser** category two stemmed from generating the L1 possessive form in place of the L2 possessive form, while errors for **ser/estar + meaning changing adjectives** stemmed from gender and number agreement:

- alhambra pensia la pelicula es muy bueno e interesante
  
  *I thought the movie is very good and interesting*

- besazo2 si cuentos como eso la vida es demasiado aburrido, **son divertida**
  
  *in stories like that (where) life is too boring, they’re fun.*
Finally, the accuracy with which FFMF §3 employed the *additional expressions* provides further evidence that the participants were making the distinction between the various L2 expressions and were reasonably careful in the application of the verbs in their respective contexts. Of the sixty seven attempts to express these additional expressions only six were inaccurately produced.

Thus, upon inspection of the student’s erroneous productions it is clear that the FFMF group did distinguish among the L2 verb forms, with the notable exception. When reporting in the past, participants who correctly distinguished among the copular verbs in the present failed to do so, and opted for *ser* in these past contexts. In all other instances, FFMF errors were due to errors of agreement in terms of *ser*, while *estar* category one, indicating location, and *estar* category four, indicating the results of an action, were difficult in terms of verb-choice.

### 4.3.1.6 Focused Attention §3

It was important to determine if there had been explicit evidence of focused attention to these forms in the transcripts in order to provide definitive support that these participants’ consciousness had been raised. In total, eight examples surfaced which clearly demonstrate focused attention to *ser* and *estar*. In the first four examples the students provide corrective feedback to one another, while in the fifth example the student corrects his own orthographic error. In the sixth example, the learner corrects himself when he realized that he produced the conditional form (*sería*) in place of the imperfect form (*era*) by publishing “*sería = era*” a few lines after the mistake appeared. Examples 1, 2, 3 and 5 are noteworthy because the students employed a system of marking corrections with an asterisk to make them more salient. The asterisk is missing in examples 4 and 6, making the feedback a bit ambiguous, yet present nonetheless. Examples 7 and 8 demonstrate students’ growing awareness of the use of *ser* in impersonal phrases.
1) alambra Soy cansada por que miro la television todas las noche I’m* tired because *I watch television every night 
besazo2 estoy* 
Alhambra estoy si lo siento estoy, yes sorry

2) castillo2 electricidad es no importa, pero muy importante tener agua electricity isn’t important*, but very important is having water 
diego_rivera2 importante* 

3) alhambra Mis suenos estan locos my dreams are* crazy 
cubanacan2 son they are

4) diego_rivera2 muchos gigantes en espana? many giants in Spain? 
cencerro2 si hay muchas gigantes en espana Yes there are many giants in Spain

5) diego_rivera2 hoy, atacando molinas de viente en un acto de una persona con muchas problemas mentales 
today, attacking windmills is* act of a person with many mental problems 
diego_rivera2 es*

6) azteca2 Mi reaccion, estaria muy irrita my reaction, I’d be very irritated 
besazo2 seria muy dificil ir a un otra pais donde no coneces nadia 
it would be very difficult to go to another country where you don’t know anyone 
diego_rivera2 es muy dificil de mover a un otro pais, especialmente cuando seria un rey 
it is very difficult to move to another country, especially when he would be* a king 
bandera2 creo que el rey moro se fue del pais con dignidad 
I think the Moorish King left with dignity 
diego_rivera2 seria = era would be = was
7) **derechista2**  *Es importante* que los niños entiendan el himno porque no deben cantar cuando no saben que cantan *It’s important that children understand the pledge because they shouldn’t recite it if they don’t know what they’re reciting*

**bandera2**  *si, es importante que* lo entiendan  *yes, it’s important that they understand it*

**derechista2**  *porque*

8) **diego_rivera2**  *pero es necesita a levanta durante el pledge*

**azucar_moreno2**  *levantE to stand*

**azucar_moreno2**  *es necesario que levantE it’s necessary to stand*

**azucar_moreno2**  *el subjunctive the subjunctive*

### 4.3.1.7 L2 ‘to be’ Expressions: §13

The transcripts paint a different picture for the meaning-focused group. The strongest category for this section was expressions with *ser*. While there are verb-choice errors, most errors derive from subject verb agreement, which suggests that this group may have been employing *ser* as a default form. Careful inspection of all L2 ‘to be’ productions supports this claim.

In *ser* category one, fourteen of the twenty-one errors are due to subject verb agreement, two are from verb choice, and the remaining are errors of number agreement. This group seems to have two main verb forms, third person singular and plural, and they employ these forms as their main forms throughout the chat sessions in both past and present tenses:

- **margarita2**  Maya2: tu creer que el rey moro en este poema *son negro?*

  *Maya2: you think that the Moorish King in this poem is* black?
While four of the errors for ser category two entail use of the L1 possessive, two of the erroneous forms stem from indicating origin. That is, rather than stating “…the Moors are from Africa…” the learner wrote “…the Moors is* from Africa…” (“si, porque los moros es de Africa”). This occurs again when another student wrote “los lobos/perros es de los volcanes—the wolves/dogs is* from the volcanos.”

Five errors from ser category three were errors of verb-choice; the rest resulted from subject-verb errors and errors of agreement. Again, the data suggest that ser is the default form for expressing “to be.” In the following examples the learners 1) fail to properly conjugate the verb to match the subject, and 2) agreement of gender and number are absent:

- margarita2 Cuando tu es debil, gente no respecto un debil persona
  When you are* weak, people don’t respect a weak person

- loquito2 La historia de una persona, y la historia de la cultura de persona es muy importante.
  Personal history and cultural history are* very important

- santo_domingo2 ¿es Don Quijote menos valiente porque sus comunicat no es real?
  Is Don Quijote less brave because his monters are* not real?

- santo_domingo2 leyendas urbanas es muy interesante
  urban legends are* very interesting

- margarita2 pienso tacapa y chaparrastique es chicos
  I think tecapa and chaparrastique are* male
Meaning focused §13, not unlike FFMF §3, also produced word for word translation of certain impersonal expressions, such as the one produced by Manu_chau2, “Yo creo que es importante para ensenar los ninos en las escuelas” (“I think it is important <para>* to teach the children at school”); however §13’s tendency was to employ para while §3’s tendency was to employ de.

Finally, errors for ser category seven all stemmed from the improper production of the participle form:

- santo_domingo2 yo pienso sancho fue aceptando don quijote
  *I think Sancho was accepted* by don quijote

- jose_marti2 ateos son aceptar mas en EEUU que Espana
  *atheists are accepted* more in the US than Spain

- hurucan2 ahora en Guatemala el gobierno es mas desarrollo
  *now in Guatemala the government is more developed*

Contexts requiring estar clearly reveal ser to be the default form. Errors for estar categories one, three and four all stem from verb choice errors with ser as the preferred form. Below are representative samples of the productions that surfaced for each category:

Category One:

- ojos_verdes2 en un fragmento moderno, don Quijote seria en un hospital para gente con problemas de sus cabezas
  *in a modern fragment, don Quijote would be* in a hospital for people with head problems

- habichuela2 es comedia poque Don Quiote no es en realidad
  *it is a comedy because Don Quijote is* not in reality
Category Three:

- margarita2 El presidente no es débil. Cuando el es débil el país no conocer
  *The president isn’t weak. When he is* weak the country won’t know

- inca2 el rey mostría que es débil por llorando, pero es vale porque el es triste
  *the king showed that he is weak by crying, but it’s ok because he is* sad

- maya2 imagine si Don Quixote fue aborrachado
  *imagine if Don Quixote were* drunk

- el_pachuco2 siente amor por el maestro. Don gregorio ayudo moncho. En el fin de la
  película moncho escuche a su mama, y el fue enojado porque el piensi don gregorio fue
  un mentiroso he feels love for the teacher. Don gregorio helped moncho. In the end of
  the film moncho listened to his mother, and he was* angry because he thought don
  gregorio was a liar

Category Four:

- guisante2 pregunta tres cuando todos es termino
  *question three when everyone is* finished

- maya2 fue embarasado
  *he was* embarassed

Estar category two, forming the progressive tenses, was unusually difficult for the
MF group. Eleven of the nineteen errors stemmed from confusion over the functions and
meanings behind the forms they were producing, which lead to the joint use of simple
and compound forms of the verbs. The most extreme example of this is Maya2’s
statement that Jose Martí was fighting for the independence of the slaves (Jose Martí esta
luchaba por la independencia de los esclavos) where she correctly employs the third
person singular form of estar but does so in conjunction with the third person singular of
the verb to fight (luchar) in the imperfect (luchaba) rather than in participle form
(luchando). In other, less extreme examples, the learner combines the third person plural
of ser in the present tense (they are) with the same form and tense of the verb hablar
(they speak/ they are speaking) to mean “the students are talking a lot.”

Margarita2 Los estudiantes son hablan mucho.
In the next two examples Gato_violento2 and Juan_carlos2 also do this, however they both select a different form of the past:

- gato_violetto2  don quijote *era* choca la tele (imperfect)
  
  *don quijote was* choking the tv

- juan_carlos2  tuvo uno sueno recientemente donde mi comunicat de historia *fue* cultiva marijuana (preterite)
  
  *I had a dream recently where my history professor was* cultivating marijuana.

What’s more, in each of the samples above the learners produced the verb not in the participle form, but in the simple present tense, perhaps as a means to accommodate the gerund form that they sought to express. Hurucan2 generates the participle form correctly in his production, but employs the past subjunctive form of the verb *ser* instead of a past form of *estar* (“*si, pero el rey moro fuera llorando enfrente de muchos personas—yes, but the Moorish King was* crying in front of many people”).

With regard to *additional expressions* the MF group reveals the same tendencies. Of the nineteen erroneous productions one was the result of a misuse of *tener* where the required form was *hacer* (*loquito2 Africa tiene mucho(isimo) calor—Africa is very hot*”), two were the result of *estar* taking the place of *haber* (e.g., *mar_rojo2 pienso que estan leyendas en mi cultura, pero no se estos—I think there are* legends in my culture, but I don’t know these), and the remaining errors were due to *ser* taking the place of *haber*. One example is of particular interest. In the following dialogue Juan_carlos2’s statement that the US-Indigenous people were lucky sparks a reaction from two participants and the instructor (Velazquez2). The instructor responds to Juan_carlos2’s form and offers an interrogative recast to correct the form yet maintain conversational flow. However, her recast is ignored when Margarita2 and El_Pachuco2 focus on Juan_carlos2’s message rather than his structure.
Furthermore, a default of *ser* in the present rendered dealing with past tense morphology all the more difficult.

With regard to *ser/estar + meaning changing adjectives* errors also stemmed from gender and number agreement:

- o moctezuma2: ojos: si, americanos **son** mala
  
  *ojos: yes, Americans are bad*

- o planeta_azul2: carmina **es** muy loco, si si
  
  *carmina is very crazy*, *yes yes*

- o ejote2: los libros de psicología es buen
  
  *psychology books are good*

Overall it is clear that MF §13 relied on *ser* as the default L2 ‘to be’ form. In contexts requiring *ser* they ignored form to the point of disregarding agreement of gender and number, in contexts requiring *estar* they employed *ser*, and in *Other Expressions* where the L1 uses ‘to be’ *ser* was the default form.
4.3.1.8 Focused Attention §13

Although the MF group’s task was to focus on meaning it was also imperative to determine whether or not there were instances of form focused attention. Four instances surfaced with regard to ser/estar. In the first sample Santo_domingo2 inquires as to whether or not he needs to use subjunctive in this context:

velazquez2 hola — hello
santo_domingo2 hola mi profesora—hello my professor
santo_domingo2 ¿como estás?—how are you?
Jose_marti2 bien, ¿y tú?—I’m well, and you?
Santo_domingo2 así así, muy cansado... —ok, very tired
santo_domingo2 subjuntivo?—subjunctive?

In the next example Ojos_verdes2’s production of the phrase “que será, será” (whatever will be, will be) prompts three explanatory responses, one of which provides the L1 equivalent of the verb form (maya2 sera= will be). What is also interesting in this sample is that Ojos_verdes2 makes an attempt to provide written accents in the chat. A shortcoming of the Web-4M chat forum is that written accents were not encoded into the program, which required students to either discover how to generate accents, to develop compensatory strategies for marking written accents, or to process the information without accents relying primarily on context. Here, Ojos_verdes2 adopts the compensatory strategy of writing the accents as a separate entity alongside his production.

ojos_verdes2 que sera’ sera’ — S Hawking --whatever will be, will be-S. Hawking
moctezuma2 que es sera? —what is sera?
jose_marti2 el canción famosa --the famous song
maya2 sera= will be
ojos_verdes2 Stephen Hawking no escribo’ la canción ... pero, lo amo’
--Stephen Hawking didn’t write the song ... but he loved it

In the next example Guisante2 code-switches to English. This code-switch prompts Ojos_verdes2 to offer assistance in the L2. Interestingly, as Ojos_verdes2 provides two options for expressing would be in Spanish he marks his suggestion
interrogatively, which suggests that while he was providing assistance to Guisante2, he may have also been soliciting assistance on his own feedback.

\[
guisante2 \text{ creo que el would be en chatahoochee en el hospital}\]
\[
I \text{ think he would be in Chatahoochee in the hospital}\]
\[
ojos_verdes2 \text{ would be = seria o estaria ... no?}\]
\[
guisante2 \text{ that is where the psychiatric hospital is}\]

Finally, El_pachuco2 inquires as to whether the situation of the indigenous people of the United States was bad or if it still is bad. Juan_carlos2 responds that the situation is still bad. It is possible that El_pachuco2 is questioning Juan_carlos2’s choice of tense, since preterite (\textit{fue}) would indicate that the poor conditions had ended, and imperfect (\textit{era}) could suggest that this past situation is still on going. Essentially, Juan_carlos2 clarifies by stating “both”, i.e., was (\textit{fue}) and is (\textit{es}). Whether or not El_pachuco2 is seeking syntactic information or content clarification is uncertain because the dialogue began and ended as posted below, however since it is possible that El_pachuco2 was seeking syntactic feedback it was important to note here.

\[
\textit{juan\_carlos2} \text{ la situacion de indigena estadounidense fue muy mal}\]
\[
\textit{theUS- indigenous situation was very bad}\]
\[
\textit{el\_pachuco2} \text{ fue o es?}\]
\[
\textit{Was or is?}\]
\[
\textit{juan\_carlos2} \text{ ambos}\]
\[
\textit{both}\]
\[
\textit{ambos}\]

The transcripts for §13 paint a different picture. The strongest category for this group was expressions with \textit{ser}. While there are verb-choice errors, most errors derive from subject/verb agreement, which suggests that this group was employing \textit{ser} as a default form. Careful inspection of all ‘to be’ productions supports this claim.
4.3.2 Student Use of Por and Para

This section examines the role that focused attention, or lack of focused attention, may have had on the L2 prepositions *por/para* in the SCMC environment. Again, the text-book categories were exploited for the categorization of the students’ productions and was coded according to the context of use and assigned a category according to intended use. The total in/correct was then tabulated for each section, and the percentage of correct productions was calculated. Table 4.11 displays the percentages of accurate productions that surfaced for *por* and Table 4.12 for the percentages of accurate production for *para*.

4.3.2.1 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Por

The preposition *por* is used to express movement along or through a place: *I am going to Cyprus via Turkey next week*. For this first category §3 produced all three samples correctly, while §13 did not attempt to express ideas in this context.

§3 derechista2 el apodo de Moncho es apropiado porque el era pequeno y fue por todas partes como un pajaro.  
§13 No examples

Moncho’s lastname is appropriate because he was little and went everywhere like a bird

The second category for *por* is used to indicate duration of time. Note that *durante* (while) may also be used in this case, or no preposition at all need be used. Section 3 produced but one error out of four, while §13’s only production was incorrect.

§3 chaparrastique2 La situacion de los estadounidenses indigenas es muy triste.  
Por cuatro siglos, perdieron su tierra a los hombres Europeanos.  
§13 los_cadejos2 en guatemala hay muchos personas pobres, y sus familias fue pobres para siglos

The indigenous situation in the states is very sad. For four centuries, they lost their land to the Europians  
In Guatemala today there are many poor people, and their families were poor for* centuries
Por, category four, also expresses the cause, reason, or motive of an action. Section 3 produced sixteen correct instances of this idea, while §13 produced one incorrectly out of five instances.

§3 cocotazo2 gente de muchos otros culturales vino a este pais por libertad a su religion para que su religion se respete

People from other cultures came to this country for religious freedom so that their religion would be respected

§13 mar_rojo2 yo pienso que si el rey se fue y conquisto lo que queria, esta bien si lloro. alomejor se siento cansado y por eso lloro. la gente llora por muchas diferentes razones

I think that if the king left and conquered what he wanted, it’s ok if he cried. Perhaps he was tired and cried for that reason. People cry for many different reasons

Category four, expressing on behalf of, for the sake of, in favor of also requires por. Section 3 produced all five samples with complete accuracy while §13 scored 6/7 for 85.71% accuracy.

§3 cubanacan2 Es comico que don quijote se loco pero a la misma vez me siento mal por el

It’s fnny that Don Quijote is so crazy but at the same time I feel bad for him

§13 santo_domingo2 llorando por la nacion

crying for the nation

Expressing the exchange or substitution of one thing for another, category five, also requires por. Section 3 generated this with 50% accuracy (1/2) while §13 did not produce any sample.

§3 cubanacan2 pero pueden vender tu organo en la calle para much dinero

But they can sell your organ on the street for* a lot of money

§13 No examples

Category six represents expression of the agent of an action in a passive sentence. Both groups produced three examples, but for §13 produced all the samples were accurate, while §3 produced one error.

§3 chaparrastique2 Creo que es muy importante para ninos entender las palabras a las canciones que cantan. Sin ese sabio, es imposible para la mensaje de la cancion ser entenido por los estudiantes.

I think it’s important for children to learn the words to the songs they sing. Without this knowledge, it’s impossible for the song’s message to be understood by the students

§13 ojos_verdes2 el communisim es la solucion porque ha sido endosado por frida kahlo

Communism is the solution because it has been endorsed by Frida Kahlo.
Categories seven, *indicating a means of transportation or communication*, and eight, *indicating rate, frequency, or unit of measure*, were void of examples for both groups.

Under category nine, common expressions, the following examples surfaced: d) *por eso*—that’s why, for that reason, h) *por lo menos*—at least, o) *porque*—because, p) *por qué*—why, q) *por ejemplo*—for example, r) *por favor*—please. Overall ‘because’ and ‘why’ of category number nine were most represented in both groups in terms of the *por* groupings. More often than not ‘because’ was correctly written as *porque*. However, due to its similarity to the form ‘why’ (*por qué*), a number of constructions were written interchangeably. Mistaking the two forms was the prime source of error in implementation of categories ‘because’ and ‘why’.

§3 azteca2 los seres humanos se tratan tan cruelmente *porque* no tiene comunicacion y no comprende culturas cubanacan2  *por qué* no?

§13 mar_rojo2 yo pienso que si el rey se fue y conquisto lo que queria, *esta* bien si lloro. alomejar se siento cansado y *por eso* lloro. la gente llora *por* muchas diferentes *rezones* hurucan2 me gusta el cuento *porque* ofrece un oportunidad ensenar leyendas de los salvadores inca2 *por que* crees que los seres humanos se tratan cruelmente?? Loquito2 si, *por ejemplo* Venezuela juan_carlos2 *por favor*
Table 4.11: Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates POR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Por §3</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>Por §13</th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFMF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9d</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9d</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9e</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9o</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>92.45</td>
<td>9o</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>84.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9p</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62.86</td>
<td>9p</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>72.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9q</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9q</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>85.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2 Total Attempts and Overall Accuracy Rates: Para

*Para* is used to express movement or direction toward a destination or goal. This is category one and no samples surfaced in either group.

Category two, indicating a specific time limit or fixed point in time, was not generated by §13 and §3 only produced one sample out of two accurately.

§3 alhambra Donde *esta* vayando para *Spring Break?*

§13 No examples

Expressing a purpose, goal, use, or destination was popular with §3, who generated forms with 90.32% accuracy in contrast to §13 who produced five incorrect instances out of nine.

§3 bandera2 *es* una apodo apropiado para Moncho el *es* como un pajaro joven y nuevo en el mundo

§13 guisante2 creo que construcciones culturales *son* rectitud para ti y dedicacion para su pais

*It’s an appropriate name for Moncho because he is like a young, new bird in the world*

*I think cultural constructions are goodness for yourself and dedication for your country*
Group 3 correctly expressed category four, an implied comparison of inequality, once, while §13 generated two examples, one of which was correct.

§3 reina_sofia2 es verdad para el estéreo tipo
§13 mar_rojo2 no pienso que llorando es señal de debilidad, pienso que llorando es normal para todos

It’s true for being a stereotype
I don’t think crying is a sign of weakness, I think that crying is normal for everyone

Finally, category five, indicating a person’s opinion or making a judgment, was expressed nine times by §13 with 33.33% accuracy and three times by §3 with 100% accuracy.

§3 anteojos_magicos2 para los hombres a llorar es una señal de debilidad
§13 ojos_verdes2 por qué es don Quijote muy popular ahora? no es interesante para mí

For men, crying is a sign of weakness
Why is Don Quijote so popular now? For me, it’s not interesting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Incorrect</th>
<th>Total Produced</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Para</td>
<td>§3 FFMF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>§13 MF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89.19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.3 Expressing Por and Para

Overall, ‘because’ and ‘why’ of category number nine were most represented in both sections in terms of the por groupings. More often than not ‘because’ was correctly written as porque. However, due to its similarity to the form ‘why’ (por qué), a number of constructions were written interchangeably. Mistaking the two forms was the prime source of error in implementation of categories 9o and 9p. If ‘why’ and ‘because’ are
removed the total attempted is greatly reduced in both groups. Section 3 moves from 175 productions to 34 and §13 decreases from 156 to 20; accuracy rates do not change markedly, however.

In terms of *por* versus *para* §13 manifests considerable problems. That is, §13 employed *por* with 82.05% accuracy with *why/because* included in the calculations and 85% with them removed, compared to an overall accuracy rate of 40% for expressions with *para*. Errors in communicating within contexts that required *para* stemmed from substitution of *para* with *por*:

Category Three: moctezuma2 *por* representa la molinos de vientos como monstruos
*In order to* *represent the windmills as monsters*

Category Four: margarita2 no don quijote necistar lentes *por* su ojos
*No don quijote needs contacts for* *his eyes*

Category Five: santo_domingo2 Es realidad *por* Don Quixote
*It is reality for* *Don Quixote*

*juan_carlos2* pero fantasia *por* todos otros
*but fantasy for* *everyone else*

Similarly, the errors that stemmed in the contexts that require *por* were all due to substitution of *para* for *por*, except in one instance where one student used *porque/porque de* instead of *por* to express ‘because of’ (category three).

Category Two:
*los_cadejos2* en guatemala hay muchos personas pobres, y sus familias *fue* pobres *para* siglos
*En guatemala there are many poor people, and their families were poor for* *centuries*

Category Three:
*ojos_verdes2!* *SOY DE CHATAHOOCHEE, ESTOY FURIOSO PARA GUISANTE!*  
*I’M FROM CHATAHOOCHEE, I’M FURIOUS BECAUSE OF* *A PEA!*
Guatemala tiene muchas problemas porque los Estados Unidos

Guatemala has many problems because of the United States

Guatemala tiene problemas porque de EEUU???

Guatemala has problems because of the USA?

Todos países tienen problemas porque los EEUU

All countries have problems because of the USA

Category Four:

no pregunte lo que puede hacer su país para usted. Pregunte lo que usted puede hacer para su país -- S Hawking

Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country – S Hawking

Impersonal expressions (e.g. Es difícil para pensar instead of ‘Es difícil pensar’ to express ‘It is difficult to think’) and where Spanish requires the subjunctive (e.g. Es importante para aprender instead of Es importante que aprendan to express ‘It’s important that they learn’) were also problematic for the learners since they attempted to make word-for-word substitutions in the L2 even though word-for-word substitutions were erroneous in the L2.

Section 3 produced por and para with similar accuracy levels. They scored 85.71% with the why/because expressions included, and 88.24% with them removed, in terms of contexts that require por; they scored 89.19% for contexts that require para. In all instances errors resulted from substituting one preposition for the other. This group also generated a few word-for-word substitutions in contexts that required subjunctive and in impersonal expressions.

There were expressions not produced by either group, such as indicating a means of transportation (por: 7), and indicating rate/frequency/unit of measurement (por: 8). Absence of these expressions may be attributed to the topics of discussion not demanding expression of such ideas. Certain fixed expressions were not generated either. Expressions such as por ahora (for the time being), por cierto (of course), por consiguiente (consequently), por la tarde/noche (in the afternoon/night), por lo menos (at least) por lo tanto (therefore), por más/mucho que (however much), por otra parte (on the other hand), por poco (almost), por supuesto (of course), por último (finally) never
surfaced. These forms are very useful in communication especially in light of the discussion topics but they nonetheless failed to appear in the chat dialogues.

There is no overt evidence that students focused on these prepositions from session to session. Ironically, in FFMF §3 Cubanacan asks “que pasó con por y para” (What happened to por and para?) while in MF §13 Inca2 corrected Loquito2’s erroneous production:

**Loquito2** por los estudiantes, es un largo list de palabras
*for the students, it’s a long list of words*

**Inca2** loquito….. es “para” no es “por”
*Loquito….. it’s “para” not “por”*

Whether or not Cubanacan was speaking for him/herself or for the whole group is impossible to determine, but what is clear is that while there may not be overt signs of attention, the FFMF group did employ these forms more accurately. Furthermore, MF §13’s correction reveals that even during a MF activity learners’ still placed some attention/focus on form. While message tends to override form in communicative environments, Inca2’s correction also reveals that these interactions are not devoid of attention to form and perhaps SCMC may lend itself to greater form focused attention due to the nature of this environment.

### 4.4 The Global Picture

In general terms, the FFMF, §3, produced 1,990 total verb forms representing present, preterite, imperfect, subjunctive, conditional, and *ir + a* to represent future, in the transcripts analyzed. In contrast, the MF group, §13, produced 1,657 verb forms with present, preterite, imperfect, and conditional most represented. This difference is noteworthy given that the FFMF group had approximately ten minutes less time to chat per session, due to the pre-chat questions, and because the FFMF group carried greater cognitive demands for each session due to the requirement to focus on both meaning and form. Table 4.13 displays the results of each section. Future, present and past perfect,
present and past progressive, passives, commands, and past subjunctive were also represented in the transcripts for both sections, although so few in number that they registered at only a fraction of a percentage of the whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.13: Main Forms Produced in Chat Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 Syntactic Maturity

Given that the FFMF group produced a greater variety of language in the chat transcripts it was necessary to determine how syntactically mature its productions had been compared to the productions of its meaning-focused counterpart. Minimal terminable units, or t-units, were calculated. A t-unit is defined as a main clause with all of its subordinate clauses and modifiers attached to it. In order to establish syntactic maturity, t-units must be identified, and the number of words per t-unit must be determined. The total number of words from the sample of t-units is 1) counted and totaled, and 2) divided by the total number of t-units in the sample. This number represents the syntactic maturity level for the sample evaluated. Syntactic maturity levels were calculated for each chat session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.14: Syntactic Maturity (t-units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chat #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test whether the syntactic maturity of §3 is significantly better than that of §13, the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test, which only compares two groups, was run on the data. A non-parametric test of medians was required since no assumption is made about the distribution of the levels of syntactic maturity, and in the case of the Mann-Whitney non-parametric test, the null hypothesis is that the shape of the distribution for §3 and §13 are identical. The significance parameter is less than 0.05, such that it is predicted that §3 outperforms §13. A prediction in favor of §3 necessitated a one-tailed test, and the mean value of §3 as equal to or less than §13 can be rejected at the 0.05 level, with 0.037 indicating a significant difference. According to the results of this statistic the Mann-Whitney test reveals that §3 outperformed §13 in terms of syntactic maturity. The results are displayed in table 4.16.

While reading the transcripts the effect of grammatical consciousness-raising is evident in the sophistication of this group’s productions as compared to the MF group. The samples below are representative of the type of language that surfaced during each chat session.

In the sample below, the students are discussing the topic of the role of pledge of allegiance in public schools. This conversation requires the students to employ the subjunctive on a number of occasions, and the form does indeed surface. Impersonal expressions, such as ‘it’s important, it’s possible’, and ‘so that,’ require the subjunctive when followed by an inflected verb; or an infinitive if there is no subject change. In this exchange the presence of both the subjunctive and the infinitive forms clearly demonstrate the maturity level typical of this group. While they are not perfectly stated in every instance these learners are demonstrating the first signs of the presence of subjunctive in their interlanguage. The underlined forms below demarcate the students’ use of the forms, and the italicized portions of the students’ productions denote error. Note that this conversation surfaced in the last chat session of the semester.

§3
1) chequere2 algo es posible, para una persona no creer que sea una buena idea recitar ese homenaje lo dependa en los creencias de la persona
   cubanacan2 lo más importante es que los

something is possible, for a person to not relieve that it’s a good idea to recite the pledge depends on the beliefs of that person
The most important thing is that the
ninos entiendan lo que estan recitando cuando prometen el apoyo a los EEUU
azteca2 si todos son diferente

derechista2 Es importante que los ninos entiendan el himno porque no deben cantar cuando no saben que cantan
bandera2 si, es importante que lo entiendan

derechista2 para que su religion se respecte
bandera2 es importante al algun nivel.....no pienso que es necesario cantar el himno todos los dias

diego_rivera2 pero es mas importante de aprender las palabras antes del significado del himno

bandera2 no es necesario responder a la persona que niega a recitarlo, es su opinion, y su esgoge

In this sample, Derechista2 not only employs an if-clause statement, but he produces two of them very well: 1) if + present (si tengo) + future (lloraré)—if I have to..., I will... and 2), if + present (si paso) + conditional (estaría) —if I spend... I would be.

§3
2) derechista2 llorare si tengo que dejar porque si paso mi vida en un solo lugar no estaria comfortable en un lugar otro

Here, students recognized that expressing these ideas required subjunctive; atace* and luchen. While neither statement is perfectly formed, atace* should be written as ataque and no creo should be followed by que, these samples provide evidence that the participants are gaining understanding over the subjunctive.
§3 3) diego_rivera es muy comedia de Don Quijote atace molinas de viento  
chaparrastique2 No creo que personas en 2003 luchen molinas de viento.  

It is very funny that Don Quijote attacks the windmills.  
I don’t think that people in 2003 would fight windmills.

The presence of reflexive-verbs makes this sample interesting. Reflexive verbs require the pronoun to be placed before the inflected verb, me despierto—I get up, or onto the infinitive form, as in al levantarse—upon waking up. Given those options, the following options are also possibilities: a) se puede despertar b) puede despertarse. Pronoun placement with reflexive-verbs tends to be a difficult feature to master, however this group not only produced the reflexives but also exercised their range of possibilities in their expression. Aside from one misspelling (a veces*), the exchange is characterized by correct use of the imperfect for both meaning and form, a sound implementation of the present perfect, and agreement is tended to. Furthermore, an attempt to express object pronouns is evident; although the indirect object pronoun is substituted for the direct object pronoun.  

§3 4) chequere2 besazo no da informacion falso!  
reina_sofia2 Cuando tengo suenos, tengo suenos de pesadillas  
cubanacan2 pero a vezes mi mente se puede despertar pero no puedo mover mi cuerpo  
bandera2 recuerdo algunos de mis suenos cuando me despierto, pero despues de un poco tiempo usualmente les olvido  
chaparrastique2 a veces, recordaba mis suenos, a veces, no recordaba mis suenos.  
besazo2 Mi amiga, pero ha oido de un hombre que sabe mucho de los suenos  
chequere2 no creo muchas personas recuredan sus suenos al levantarse  

Besazo isn’t giving false information!  
When I dream, I have nightmares  
But sometimes my mind can wake itself up but I can’t move my body  
I remember some of my dreams when I wake up, but after a little while I usually forget them  
Sometimes, I used to remember my dreams, sometimes I didn’t used to remember my dreams  
My friend, but she has heard of a man that knows a lot about dreams  
I don’t think many people remember their dreams when they wake
In contrast, MF §13’s productions were typically characterized by the following two exchanges. Both discussions contain: code-switching (shot, court ruling, communisim, break, concern, yes, mature, so), expressions that are translated literally (‘este ir ser un larga vez explicar—‘This is going to take a long time to explain’) and well stated productions that are overlooked in subsequent postings by other participants (student 1: “el communisim es la solución porque ha sido endosado por frida kahlo”, student 2: “frida endosado communismo?” -- student 1:”Communism is the solution because it has been supported by frida kahlo”, student 2: “She supported* communism?”).

§13

1) loquito2 Muchos grupos shot por que diferencias políticas, grupos indígenas incluido

loquito2 En un "court ruling" EEUU, necesitan 30$ a los grupos indígenas

ojos_verdes2 el communisim es la solución ciertamente

juan_carlos2 communism es un teoria

ojos_verdes2 el communisim es la solución porque ha sido endosado por frida kahlo

loquito2 frida endosado communismo?

jose_marti2 !tienen una "break" de primavera buena!

loquito2 Los periódicos no hablan a lecturas no "concern" EEUU

2) juan_carlos2 communism es uno teoria

moctezuma2 este ir ser un larga vez explicar

margarita2 yes, es muy triste

margarita2 por que Moncho no es Don Gregorio amigo

guisante2 moncho es joven pero muy mature

gato_violeto2 so moncho no entiende

Many groups were shot because of political differences, indigenous group included

In a US “court ruling” they need 30$ for the indigenous groups

Communism is a solution, certainly

Communism is a theory

Communism is the solution because it has been supported by frida kahlo

She supported* communism?

Have a good spring “break”!

The newspapers don’t talk about things that don’t “concern” the US

Communism is a theory

This is going to take a long time to explain (literal translation)

Yes, it is very sad

Because Moncho is not Don Gregorio’s friend

Moncho is young but very mature

So moncho doesn’t understand
4.4.2 Lexical Density

In addition to establishing syntactic maturity levels for the chat groups, lexical density was also calculated. Lexical density, also termed semantic range, refers to the proportion of novel to repeated words in a text. That is, a text with low lexical density levels is repetitious, whereas a text with high lexical density levels employs a variety of expressions and terminology. In other words, it is determined by calculation type/token ratios. While lexical density tends to be low in spoken samples, calculating the semantic range of the participating groups within the communicative, yet written environment of SCMC helps to establish the characteristics of the groups as they dealt with their respective tasks. Table 4.15 summarizes the results of the semantic range as calculated per chat transcript. The FFMF group waivers from one session to the next and shows no steady increase or drastic decrease in lexical density at any one point in time. The MF group showed much more steady results in that its scores did not waiver much, revealing incremental improvement or decrease in semantic range over the course of the semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chat #</th>
<th>§3</th>
<th>§13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>23.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>21.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>29.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>29.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>29.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.66</td>
<td>39.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, to test whether or not the semantic range between FFMF §3 and MF §13 were significantly different statistically, a Mann-Whitney non-parametric test of medians was run. In this case, the results for lexical density confirm that there is no reason to conclude that the medians differ. While this does not suggest that the values are completely the same, it does indicate that there is no reasonable level of significant difference in the lexical density levels displayed by each group.
Table 4.16: Mann-Whitney U Test for Two Independent Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Maturity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>66.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>38.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical Density</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Syntactic Maturity</th>
<th>Lexical Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>10.500</td>
<td>23.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon</td>
<td>38.500</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.791</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>-.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exact Sig [2* (1-tailed sig.)]</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Feedback Practices

Chat transcripts were further scrutinized in order to address the matter of form-focused attention. First, it was necessary to determine the corrective feedback practices of the instructor in order to gauge whether or not the participants in both chat groups received unequal treatment by the instructor in terms of input. While the instructor was given the liberty to engage in a range of corrective strategies for the FFMF group, but was limited in her corrective measures for the MF group, it was critical to determine the instructor’s practices. If the participants received uniform treatment in the input, their behavior, and the results of the study, could be attributed to some other factor in the treatment.

4.5.1 Instructor to student feedback practices

The behavior of the instructor in the chat environments in terms of instructor-to-student feedback was examined. The purpose behind examining the manner in which she responded to the demands of attending to a) form-and-meaning for §3 and b) meaning for
§13 was to establish whether the respective learners were indeed faced with different treatment, and subsequently input, or whether they received similar and comparable treatment by the instructor. Specifically, metalinguistic feedback, recasting, explicit correction, and clarification request behavior were examined. Overall, the instructor was very conservative with her corrective behavior. The bulk of her interaction with the students, for both chat sections, was that of a conversational facilitator. The results follow.

4.5.2 IS Metalinguistic Feedback

One example of metalinguistic instructor-to-student feedback surfaced. The sample surfaced as a response to a well-formed student production rather than as an attempt to prompt the student to produce the correct form. Note that the instructor’s pseudonym was Velazquez. The production, as it transpired in §3 was:

besazo2 No creo que la gente tenga que cantarlo si no estan de acuerdo con las palabras o si no se entienden.
I don’t believe the people have to sing it if they don’t agree with the words, or if they don’t understand.

velazquez2 besazo excelente uso del subjuntivo!
besazo excellent use of subjunctive!

4.5.3 IS Recasts

The instructor exhibited four patterns of interaction with both chatting groups in terms of recasting: 1) direct repetition of the phrase in a corrected form, 2) introduction of the corrected, recasted, phrase with “yes”, 3) salient recasts, and 4) interrogative-recasts. Each tendency is examined below.
IS Recasts: Direct Repetition

One of the instructor’s tendencies was to directly repeat the poorly-formed phrase with the corrections intact. Two examples of direct repetition surface in §3. In the first example it is possible that the student doesn’t recognize the nature of the recast and avoids addressing it, however is most likely that the context was inappropriate for a repetition because the instructor’s feedback came after the Castillo2 had replied already. While Besazo2 may or may not have noticed the correction, it is likely that Castillo2 did because she clearly re-read the exchange before posting her orthographic correction for her misspelling of ‘Jack.’ The second example is similar in that if Azucar_moreno2 were to repeat the professor’s productions it would be conversationally unnatural, but continuing with the conversation would not. It is likely that Azucar_moreno2 noticed the feedback although she published a reply to the content because without posting direct acknowledgment of the form because she tended to engage in much peer correction, thus clearly demonstrating vigilance to form in general.

§3

1) besazo2 que es tu leyendo favorita?
castillo2 me gusta "Jck and the beanstalk"
velazquez2 cual es tu leyenda favorita?
castillo2 *Jack

§3

2) azucar_moreno2 Si, mi madre usaba vivir enrio de
Janiero y me dijo esa leyenda
velazquez2 azucar tu madre *solia* vivir en
Brasil. Por cuanto tiempo?
azucar_moreno2 1970-1980
velazquez2 por diez anos. Y tu estuviste en
Brasil tambien, azucar?

In §13 there is one instance in which the learner recognizes and acknowledges the syntactical correction behind the recast. Loquito2 responds by thanking the instructor for the correction and re-writes the sentence. However, later on in the conversation the participant is unable to extend the recast to the past and reuses the
incorrect form of the copular. In the second example, it is clear that the participant did not notice the instructor’s correction because he restates it almost exactly in a subsequent posting, although the instructor did publish feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§13</th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>velazquez2</th>
<th>matan a Robin Hood! OH!!</th>
<th>They’re killing Robin Hood! OH!!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loquito2</td>
<td>Robin es muerte, lo siento</td>
<td>Robin is dead, sorry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velazquez2</td>
<td>Robin esta muerto</td>
<td>Robin is dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loquito2</td>
<td>gracias, velazquez, esta muerto</td>
<td>thanks, velazquez, he is dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velazquez2</td>
<td>de nada loquito</td>
<td>you’re welcome loquito</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loquito2</td>
<td>en Africa, ahora, mas de 30,000,000 personas fuiste muerte</td>
<td>in Africa, now, more than 30,000,000 were dead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§13</th>
<th>2)</th>
<th>planeta_azul2</th>
<th>bueno puerta</th>
<th>good point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velazquez2</td>
<td>buen punto</td>
<td>good point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planeta_azul2</td>
<td>si bueno puerta juan</td>
<td>yes, good point juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there is one sample in §13 in which direct repetition brings the exchange to its conclusion. The instructor not only reformulates the student’s utterance, but also expands upon it by offering more information. It is unclear as to whether or not Maya2 noticed the instructor’s feedback and chose to ignore it and/or think about it, or whether it went unnoticed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§13</th>
<th>3)</th>
<th>maya2</th>
<th>Jose Marti esta luchaba por la independecia de los esclavos</th>
<th>Jose Marti is/was* fighting for the independence of the slaves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velazquez2</td>
<td>esta luchando por la independencia de los esclavos y de Cuba</td>
<td>he is fighting for the slave’s and Cuba’s independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IS Recasts: Introduced by “yes”**

The instructor also recasted by first introducing ‘yes’ before recapitulating the phrase in its corrected form. Introducing the recasts with ‘yes’ serves the purpose of illustrating to the student that the message was received and understood, while at the
same time providing a model for the student’s erroneous form. This corrective method
did not prompt viewable, i.e. published, student-responses. Nonetheless, not every
context called for the uptake, if there had been uptake, to be manifest as output. There is
one instance in which the feedback clearly went unrecognized, however. Sample three
from MF §13 clearly demonstrates that Loquito2 did not recognize the instructor’s recast
as offering him the information he sought in line three of their exchange.

In the first example, for FFMF §3, it is important to note that Velazquez’s
comment was the final comment in a series of exchanges aimed at clarifying a failed
correction on the part of a participant, Choclo2. That is, Bosque_verde2 wrote, “no crees
que el fue une comunissta –don’t you think he was a communist”. Choclo2 understood
une to be a feminine form and corrected because comunista would take a masculine
article. In response to this posting, and his understanding of it, Choclo2 replied with a
correction “era un comunisto--he was a communist” immediately followed by an
explanation “no es feminales—it isn’t feminine*.” This posting attracted the attention of
the instructor because Choclo2 wrote feminales in place of femeninas (feminine). She
then asked “que es feminales choclo –What is feminales choclo?” to which he replied
with a new version of the word (feminine?) with interrogative punctuation in an attempt
to discover if that were the underlying source of confusion, or if the new feminine were
the correct term. He wrote, “feminine? opposito de masculine--feminine? the opposite of
masculine.” The instructor realized what the student was attempting to express and stated
“ah, choclo, femeninas—ah, choclo, femeninas” and offered him the correct word. At this
point Desaparacido2 joined the conversation and stated “femeninas es no masculino—
feminine isn’t masculine,” to which Velazquez2 replied, “Yes feminine is different from
masculine, desaparecido.” In this exchange, it is clear that the participants had been paying
attention to form all along, and that the exchange between Desaparecido2 and Velazquez2 doesn’t
generate further output from Desaparecido2 because it ends the exchange.

§3
1) desaparecido2 femeninas es no masculino Feminine is not masculine
velazquez2 si femeninas es diferente de masculinas, desaparecido Yes feminine is different from masculine, desaparecido
§3

2) diego_rivera2 marti es muy espirituo con sus versos y ideas
    velazquez2 si diego, muy espiritual

Marti is very spiritual with his verses and ideas
Yes diego, very spiritual

§3

3) azucar_moreno2 en la constitucion, amendemente uno!!
    velazquez2 si azucar, la primera enmienda

In the constitution, amendment one
Yes azucar, the first amendment

§3

4) chaparrastique2 parables, como en el biblo.
    velazquez2 si chaparrastique *parabolas* como en la Biblia

Parables, like in the bible
Yes chaparrastique *parabolas* like in the Bible

§13

1) los_cadejos2 marti fue una de los mejores poetas del su tiempo
    velazquez2 si fue uno de los mejores poetas de su tiempo

Marti was one of the best poets of his time
Yes, Marti was one of the best poets of his time

2) el_pachuco2 pienso que nuestros sueños son relacionados a nuestro vive diariamente
    velazquez2 si, nuestros sueños estan relacionados con nuestras vidas

I think that our dreams are related to our daily life
Yes, our dreams are related to our lives

§13

3) loquito2 La guerra es Hell
    velazquez2 si la guerra es un infierno :)
    loquito2 como se dice "hell" en espanol?

War is hell
Yes, war is hell
How does one say “hell” in Spanish?

IS Salient Recasts

In some cases the instructor generated a salient recast. That is, the corrective feedback strategy employed by the instructor exhibited characteristics of both recasts and explicit feedback. The forms were made more salient through notational devices (i.e., capital letters or marking the form with an asterisk). One salient recast surfaced for §13, and this recast did not generate output on the student’s part, so whether or not the student noticed the recast is in question.
Moncho is between the republicans and the nationalists at the end
Yes hurucan, Moncho IS between both of them

Regarding FFMF §3, examples two and three are parts of an ongoing conversation in which the participants may or may not have recognized the recast in the course of the conversation. In the case of example two, it has already been argued that it is likely that this participant did recognize the recast because she was a student very vigilant to form and corrected her peers often. Sample three is not such a clear case because while the conversation continues, Besazo2 never states whether or not he understood the instructor’s message in line two. In another instance, neither Besazo2 nor Alhambra acknowledges the instructor’s yes-recast and subsequent dialogue neither confirms nor refutes noticing.

§3
1) besazo2 La cuenta esta un comedia porque Don Quijote es muy loco
   alhambra esta comedia
   velazquez2 Si, el cuento ES una comedia
   The story is a comedy because Don Quijote is very crazy
   It is comedy
   Yes, the story IS a comedy

2) azucar_moreno2 Si, mi madre usaba vivir en rio de Janiero y me dijo esa leyenda
   velazquez2 azucar tu madre *solia* vivir en Brasil…
   Yes, my mother used to live in rio de Janiero and she told me that legend
   Azucar your mother *used to* live in Brasil…

3) besazo2 ese narrador no es loco pero sus suenos estan raros
   velazquez2 besazo, por que SON raros los suenos de este narrador?
   besazo2 me parece que mis suenos reflejan mi vida, a veces
   chequere2 suenos estan significados solo cuando los haces
   This narrator is not crazy but his dreams are strange
   Besazo, why ARE they narrator’s dreams strange?
   It seems to me that my dreams reflect my life, sometimes
   Dreams are meaningful only when you make them (meaningful)
**IS Interrogative Recasts**

Her final corrective recast-strategy was in the form of an interrogative-recast. Interrogative recasts allowed the professor to offer corrective feedback to the students without interrupting the communicative flow. Unlike the other recasting strategies, interrogative recasts solicited a response in FFMF §3.

Interrogative recasts generated responses, as demonstrated by the sample posted below. Nine lines were published before Chaparrastique simultaneously produced the correct verb-form (*estar*) for this context, in line 10, but followed it up with an erroneous production in the same publishing (*era sorpresa*). This first use of *estar* was enough to prompt its use by Azteca. In line 13 Chaparrastique attempted to employ an if-clause, which prompted the instructor to respond with an interrogative recast. Cubanacan responded to the instructor’s feedback regarding Chaparrastique’s verb choice but incorrectly modified the verb. Bosque_verde contributed to the conversation in line 16, but her choice of *ser* over *estar* prompted the instructor to respond instantly with a second interrogative-recast. Bosque_verde responded to this recast, but she did so undecidedly in terms of verb choice. In her explanation, her message was unclear. She wrote “mal” in parenthesis in line 20, but chose a form of *estar* perhaps in response to the instructor’s recast, the students floundering regarding *ser* and *estar*, and/or her own uncertainty as to which was the appropriate form for discussing such topics in Spanish. In lines 19 and 21 Derechista detected the need for *estar* and first re-stated the gist of the dialogue with the correct verb, and then recasted the statement himself. However, in his recast he failed to attend to form in his elaborated production in line 20 (*estuvo* vs. *estuve*). When reviewing this sample, it is interesting to consider the possibility that the same C-R could have resulted if the instructor had employed other recasting strategies. That is, in this case, the use of an interrogative recast may not have been a crucial part of the correction in that the same C-R may have occurred without the use of a question given that the learners were engaging in grammatical C-R. It is also interesting to consider that the interrogative recast may have served to solicit information which would have continued the interaction but by prompting the students to repeat, clarify or elaborate on their productions and, with luck, re-write an explanation with the correct
form. The crucial element underlying each possibility here is that the presence of grammatical C-R is the key to strengthening the chance that the feedback will be noticed, especially when it surfaces as part of the communicative flow.

§3

1. **azteca2** y es furioso
2. **diego_rivera2** pero Moncho es también furioso
3. **abrazote** el reaccionó de la mama de moncho fue muy furioso
4. **azteca2** Moncho dijo ateo rojo pero los palabras final es mariposas
5. **bandera2** Moncho es desilusionado……y triste
6. **ruinas_tikal2** La mama era furiosa al final de la pelicula
7. **desaparecido2** muy bueno choclo es aqui
8. **ruinas_tikal2** creo que ella era sorprendida a Don Gregorio
9. **chequere2** si al fin de la pelicula todos los protagonistas son triste
10. **chaparrastique2** La mama estaba muy triste que Don gregorio fue poner en el camion. El Padre era sorpresa y furioso.
11. **azteca2** Los padres de moncho estan muy triste pero tiene miedo
12. **diego_rivera2** porque no entiende, y era furioso y triste
13. **chaparrastique2** Si haria Andres, estaria muy furioso a Don Gregorio tambien.
14. **velazquez2** chaparrastique si fueras Moncho estaba furioso con don Gregorio, no? Porque Andres, el hermano, no tuvo mucha relacion con el maestro
15. **cubanacan2** yo no estuviera furioso
16. **bosque_verde2** el fue confusado
17. **velazquez2** bosque, Moncho estaba confuso? por que?
18. **reina_sofia2** Los padres de Moncho fueron agitados, preocupados, tensos, tristes, frustrados, desesperanzados
19. **derechista2** estuvo enfadado y triste
20. **bosque_verde2** porque su amigo esta "mal"
21. **derechista2** los padres de Moncho estuvo

I wouldn't be furious
he was confused
bosque, Moncho was confused? Why?

Moncho’s parents were agitated, preoccupied, tense, sad, frustrated, desperate
he was angry and sad
because he friend was “bad”

The mother was very sad that Don gregorio was put in the truck. The father was surprised and he was furious.
moncho’s parents are very sad but they’re afraid
because he doesn’t understand, and he was furious and sad
if I were Andres, I’d be very furious with Don Gregorio also
chaparristique if you were Moncho you would be furious with Don Gregorio, right? Because Andres, the brother, didn’t have much of a relationship with the teacher
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In a second example of responses to interrogative-recasts, the instructor restated Castillo’s statement, thus modeling the correct form, in order to obtain more information from him. Castillo responded with a more sophisticated production and provided an example. She demonstrated uptake with regard to both the structure of the sentence and the instructor’s feedback on the L2 term “realistas”.

The third example is especially interesting. Here Alhambra stated that he was tired because he watched TV every night. The instructor asked, through an interrogative-recast, if he was tired because he didn’t get enough sleep, but before she published her remark Besazo published the correct verb-form and marked it with an asterisk for salience. Alhambra responded with a correction and an apology.

Section 13 responded differently to interrogative recasts. While Moctezuma acknowledged the instructor’s recast in example three, she only answered the questions instead of being prompted to re-produce the form in Spanish. Here the instructor was reproaching the student for L1 use and rewrote Moctezuma2’s production in the L2, to
which the student just replied with “yes, yes.” Although the participant replied to the instructor, it is unclear as to whether or not the learner recognized the recast. A similar situation occurs in the fourth example where the participant answers the instructor’s question without clearly indicating if she recognized the correction underlying the interrogative recast, or if she simply replied to a question that she comprehended. While the conversational flow is maintained, there is no overt sign of uptaking the recast and therefore it is difficult to determine if she recognized the corrective feedback or if she just understood the question and replied. Once Again, it is difficult to determine if the interrogative recast was noticed by Juan_carlos2 in the second sample because he did not respond to the question and the conversation ended with Velazquez’s inquiry. Finally, in the first example below it is clear that the participants did not understand the nature of the interrogative recast. That is, El Pachuco was so interested in why Juan_carlos stated what he did in the first line, that he and the other participants did not comprehend the nature of the interrogative recast and carried on the conversation without uptake or output.

The differences that surfaced in the FFMF versus MF groups offer evidence that the groups exhibited different behaviors during the sessions according to whether or not their attention was on form or both form and meaning. Given the behavior that surfaced in the MF group with regard to interrogative recasts, it is possible that an environment where consciousness-raising is made explicit through specific instructions to focus on form is needed for learners to pay attention to, to comprehend the nature of, and to know how to respond to form-focused recasts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nº</th>
<th>participant</th>
<th>input</th>
<th>translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>juan_carlos2</td>
<td>los indigenas de eeuu fueron suerte</td>
<td>the US indigenous are lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>el_pachuco2</td>
<td>porque los indigenas en EEUU fueron suerte?</td>
<td>why are the US indigenous lucky?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>velazquez2</td>
<td>tuvieron suerte porque pachuco?</td>
<td>why were they lucky pachuco?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>margarita2</td>
<td>si, no comprende porque los indigenas en EEUU fueron suerte!</td>
<td>yes, I don’t understand why the US indigenous were lucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>juan_carlos2</td>
<td>las indigenes fueron suerte porque el gobierno quisien la tierra de indigenes</td>
<td>the indigenous were lucky because the government wanted their land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>el_pachuco2</td>
<td>juan_carlos dice &quot;los indigenas de EEUU fueron suerte&quot; quiero conocer porque</td>
<td>juan_carlos says “the US indigenous were lucky” I want to know why</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§13
2) juan_carlos2 los gobiernos son corruptos
   velazquez2 estan corruptos? Por que? Quien
   los corrompe? como se puede evitar?
   governments are corrupt
   they’re corrupt? Why? Who corrupts them?
   How can it be avoided?

§13
3) moctezuma2 No es claro si inteligente es bueno
   for largo-perido supervivencia -- S Hawking
   ojos_verdes2 Stephen Hawking no habla espanol
   moctezuma2 my translation
   velazquez2 Tu traduccion moctezuma?
   moctezuma2 si si
   It isn’t clear if intelligence is good for long
term survival -- S Hawking
   Stephen Hawking doesn’t speak Spanish
   my translation
   your translation moctezuma?
   yes yes

§13
4) margarita2 el gobierno de EEUU nunca son verdad
   velazquez2 margarita el gobierno nunca tiene razon? Por que?
   margarita2 La rica ayda la rica
   the US government is never right
   margarita the government is never right?
   Why?
   the rich help the rich

4.5.4 IS Explicit Correction

Explicit correction was a rare occurrence in the chat rooms, but three instances of
direct professor-to-student correction did surface in §3. In one instance the instructor
merely provided the student with the Spanish word-equivalent and marked her production
with an asterisk to make it more salient:

§3
1) anteojos_magicos2 por que los eeuu es un
   hipocrite……..
   velazquez2 hipocrita*

In the second instance the instructor directly stated that the learner was looking for a
specific word:
In both samples the instructor explicitly called attention to the students’ productions, but she ventured no deeper into the context than merely providing the correction. That is, she did not provide an explanation for her correction; she was simply direct since the correction was for a lexical item.

The most complex sample of explicit correction stemmed from a discussion about the indigenous situation in the United States where an interrogative recast generated no overt response to the instructor’s recast attempt, perhaps prompting the instructor to produce the strongest example of an explicit correction. In this case, the instructor was attempting to call attention to gender agreement for the Spanish words for indigenous, *los indigenas*, because while it ends in –as, typically a feminine plural form, *indigenas* holds a masculine article, *los*. The dialogue below reflected the student’s response and the instructor’s attempt to call attention to this form.

1. castillo2: creo *los indigena* de EEUU no tiene situacion bien
   *I think the US-indigenous don’t have a good situation*

2. anteojos_magicos2: *los indigenos* en los EEUU viven en ciudades muy muy malo, no tienen agua o electricidad
   *The US indigenous live in very, very bad cities, they don’t have water or electricity*

3. reina_sofia2: no se mucho de los derechos humanos de *los indigenas* en EEUU
   *I don’t know much about the human rights of the indigenous in the US*

4. ruinas_tikal2: casi todos *los culturals indigenas* no existen ahora como antes
   *Almost all of the indigenous cultures don’t exist now like before*

5. derechista2: no se la situacion *indegina* estadounidense
   *I don’t know the situation of the US indigenous*

6. velazquez2: *porque no tienen una buena situacion los indigenas de EEUU, castillo?*
   *Why don’t the US indigenous have a good situation, castillo?*

7. derechista2: *indigena**
   *Indigena*

8. diego_rivera2: todas *tas indigenas* no viven en pueblas malas
   *Not all indigenous live in bad towns*

9. cubanacan2: creo que *los indigenos* de EEUU tuvieron una vida muy dificil
   *I think the US indigenous had a difficult life*

10. azteca2: *las inigenas* tiene un mejor vida en
    *The indigenous have a better life*
11. anteojos_magicos2 los estaos unidos que en Guatemala pero en Oklahoma y North Dakota hay ciudades especificamente para los indigenos.
12. diego_rivera2 electricidad es muy important por los tiempos cuando vivimos.
13. ruinas_tikal2 los indigenas en los estado unidos existen en un grupo muy pequeno importante.
14. diego_rivera2 pero en Oklahoma y North Dakota hay ciudades específicamente para los indigenos.
15. bandera2 en Guatemala, porque es un pais del tercer mundo tiene problemas mas duros que los estaos unidos acerca de las indigenas.
16. azteca2 es cierto que muchos indigenas son emborracho?
17. besazo2 la situacion es que los indigenos aqui no es lo mismo que en Guatemala.
18. chequere2 la situacion indigena EEUU es no excelente pero yo creo es mejor de la situacion indigena en Guatemala.
19. velazquez2 LOS indigenAs*
20. derechista2 en la comienza los indigenas tuvieron problemas...muchas problemas pero no se sobre ahora.
21. besazo2 Los indigenos aqui vive una vida mas rica que en los país del tercer mundo.
22. chaparrastique2 la situacion de los estadounidenses indigenas es muy triste. Por cuatro siglos, perdieron su tierra a los hombres Europeanos.
23. derechista2 pienso que las situaciones en EEUU para indigenas son mejores que las situaciones en Guatemala y otros paises.
24. anteojos_magicos2 no besazo los indigenos no tienen mismos derechos que los gringos.
25. chaparrastique2 hoy, estan en reservaciones en el oeste de los EEUU.
26. bandera2 pero los indigenas en Guatemala han perdido su tierra a las personas mas ricas que no estan indigenas.
27. velazquez2 sabemos que la palabra indigena = nativo
28. ruinas_tikal2 las indigenas tienen los derechos
humanos mismos de todas las personas...si **una indigena** quiere vivir a lado de mí y asimile con todo, es posible, pero ellos eligen a vivir en tierra con **otros indigenas**

29. **besazo** como viven **los indigenos** aquí?

30. **anteojos_magicos** por que los eeuu es un hypocrite. Y cuando dice "todos tienen mismo derechos" es falso. Ves a que esta occurrir ahora a los personas de la Middle East.

31. **velazquez2** por eso todas las personas que nacen en EEUU son indigenas de EEUU

32. **reina_sofia2** si es triste que **los indigenas** tienen que vivir como asi

33. **anteojos_magicos2** pero como **una indigena** se movan cuando no tienen dinero?

34. **velazquez2** hipocrita*

35. **chequere2** **los indigencias** de los EEUU tienen mas derechos que los indigencias de Guatemala

36. **diego_rivera2** **las indigenas** no recibieron los mismo derechos pero creo que todas que viven y trabajan en los EEUU deservan los mismo derechos

37. **cubanacan2** creo que como los **indigenos** de Guatemala, los nativos de EEUU tuvieron una historia bien triste

38. **besazo2** pero me parece que es verdad que los **indigenos** no quieren vivir como nuestras tienen su propio cultura

39. **aterciopelados2** los **indigenas** de los eeuu tienen no tierra, asi ellos tienen misma problemas tan como Guatemaltecos

40. **cocotazo2** los **indigenas** le los eeuu quieren mantener su cultura tan no adaptan a la cultura del los eeuu

41. **bandera2** el mal tratamiento de la gente a su poblacion por el gobierno ocurre por todo el mundo, pero gobiernos diferentes tratan los **indigenas** en maneras diferentes
The transcripts exhibit a great deal of activity. Anteojos_magicos, Besazo, and Diego_rivera showed no signs of having noticed the recasts for gender agreement, although Diego_rivera marked his typing error from line 12 on line 14, but did not mark his typing error from line 8 (\textit{tas indigenas}). Derechista2 corrects for his posting in line 5 (\textit{no se la situacion indigena estadounidense}) by republishing the error and marking it with an asterisk (\textit{indigena*}) in line 7. Ruinas_tikal produced the forms correctly only to falter in terms of gender agreement in his final line published. Chaparristique, Chequere, Cocotazo, and Reina_sofia correctly generated the form at all turns, while Bandera improved after the instructor’s explicit correction. In this exchange the interrogative recast failed to generate its usual response, and continuous incorrect postings of the term prompted the instructor to generate the most explicit corrective feedback found throughout the entire set of chat transcripts; capitalization and asterisk marking.

4.5.5 IS Clarification Requests

Clarification requests tended to surface as a result of confusion over vocabulary. At times, the instructor would provide the equivalents in the L1, but she also provided the L2 equivalent. Five samples surfaced for §3 and four samples surfaced for §13. Samples are posted below for each section.

\textbf{§3}

1) cencerro2 quiere signifiaca homenaje? \hspace{1cm} \textit{What does homenaje mean?}
   choclo2 homaje \hspace{1cm} \textit{Homage}
   choclo2 respect \hspace{1cm} \textit{Respect}
   velazquez2 homenaje=homage \hspace{1cm} \textit{Homenaje = homage}

2) azteca2 porque no es necesita a pledge allegiance \hspace{1cm} \textit{Why isn’t the pledge necessary}
   velazquez2 pledge allegiance??? \hspace{1cm} \textit{Pledge allegiance??}
   velazquez2 que significa? \hspace{1cm} \textit{What does it mean?}
   chaparristique2 Que significa que, Velazquez? \hspace{1cm} \textit{What does what mean, Velazquez?}
   velazquez2 que significa pledge allegiance? \hspace{1cm} \textit{What does pledge allegiance mean?}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cubanacan</th>
<th>pledge of alligence</th>
<th>Pledge of allegiance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chaparrastique</td>
<td>lo deciamos todos los dias.</td>
<td>We say it every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruinas_tikal</td>
<td>El pledge alligence es para expresar su patriotismo para America</td>
<td>The pledge of allegiance is for expressing your patriotism to America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diego_rivera</td>
<td>como se dice &quot;pledge of allegiance&quot; en ESPANOL???</td>
<td>How do you say “pledge of allegiance” in SPANISH???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alhambra</td>
<td>No mas pledge of allegiance</td>
<td>No more pledge of allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castillo</td>
<td>promesa de lealtad</td>
<td>Pledge of allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diego_rivera</td>
<td>que es lealtad?</td>
<td>What is lealtad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>castillo</td>
<td>alligence</td>
<td>Allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bandera</td>
<td>alligence</td>
<td>Allegiance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§13
1) velazquez | maya recuerda que loshijos de los europeos que vinieron a America ahora viven en America | Maya remember that the children of the Europeans that came to America now live in America |
| maya | que son 'loshijos'? | What are “loshijos”?

velazquez | los hijos=los descendientes | Los hijos = the descendents |

§13
2) inca | los soldados de plomo son de metal?? no entiendo. | The lead soldiers are made of metal? I don’t understand |
| el_pachuco | plomo=lead | Plomo = lead |
| inca | los soldados son de metal or tienen metal en sus cuerpos?? | The soldiers are made of metal or they have metal on their bodies?? |
| ojos_verdes | son de metal ... yo pienso los soldados son de plomo, o sea de metal | They are made of metal...I think the soldiers are made of lead, that is of metal |
| velazquez | yo creo plomo=metal o lead plomo significa "lead" en esta cuenta, verdad? | I think plomo = metal or lead Plomo means “lead” in this story, right? |
| planetza_azul | inca | |

§13
3) velazquez | conoces a otra guerra? | Do you know of another war? |
| el_pachuco | conozco de mas guerras | I know of more wars |
| velazquez | pachuco, conoces otra guerra en la que el bando victorioso describe el bando derrotado? | Pachuco, do you know of another war in which the victors describe the losers? |
| ojos_verdes | que es la palabra "derrotado" | What is the world “derrotado” |
| velazquez | defeated | defected |
| velazquez | derrotado=perdedor=defeated | Derrotado = loser = defeated |
| el_pachuco | bando = edict?? | Bando = edict?? |
| velazquez | bando = side | Bando = side |
4.5.6 IS Summary

The instructor was asked to participate in the students’ discussions and it was explained to her that her role was to provide the students with authentic, native-speaker generated language, as it would normally occur in the course of a dialogue. She was told that she would have different responsibilities per group, and thus different corrective options. She was instructed not to correct the meaning-focused group for grammatical errors, especially when those errors were local errors which did not impede comprehension. In the case of global errors, she was instructed to solicit more information through recasts or clarification requests provided that the clarification focus on the message’s content, rather than its grammatical structure, or to ask students to elaborate on the ideas or on a messages that they are not quite expressing clearly. That is, her role in the meaning focused group was that of a guide who worked to assist the learners in the development of a deeper understanding of the content through communicative, meaning-centered, content-centered dialogue.

With regard to the form-and-meaning focused group, the instructor was asked to pay particular attention to the learners’ productions of *ser/estar* and *por/para*, and was given the option to engage in a number of corrective strategies: 1) restate the incorrect statement correctly (recast), 2) ask for clarification of both meaning and form, 3) ask the student to elaborate on the intended message so as to encourage the student, and to give opportunity, to produce the correct form, 4) solicit clarification for an unclear or incorrectly stated production, 5) provide explicit feedback by calling direct attention to the non-target like production, 6) provide metalinguistic feedback. That is, her role was to guide the learners in the development of deeper understanding of content through consciousness-raising (*por/para, ser/estar*) in the creation of meaning and in the discussion of content.

The data reveal that the instructor did not rely on a variety of corrective feedback practices, but rather relied on recasts and clarification requests as her chief method of instructor-to-student dialogic evaluation. Recasts were the most common corrective measure employed, and her corrective strategies were consistent, although few in number, for both chat groups. One instance of metalinguistic feedback surfaced, but the
nature of that feedback was not corrective; the instructor responded with praise to a well-stated student-generated production. Finally, three instances of explicit correction surfaced in §3, all of which revolved around vocabulary use rather than form. Table 4.17 summarizes the corrective practices of the instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.17: IS Feedback Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by ‘yes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salient Recast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative Recast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comment in response to a well formed student production; it did not surface as a corrective measure.
**All feedback in this category focused on lexical, not grammatical, items.

The data reveal that the manner in which the instructor responded to the demands of attending to the form-and-meaning and the meaning-focused group resulted in the adoption of few corrective strategies in terms of the application of the possible strategies available and the number of instances of correction. Ultimately, both groups received comparable treatment, and subsequently corrective input overall, by the instructor.

4.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the results of the data collected for the study. Pre-test scores were presented and it was determined that all three participating groups were of equal ability at the outset of the study, according to the results of the t-Test for independent samples. Posttest results were examined for the FFMF and MF chat sections, and based on the results of the t-Test for independent samples it was determined
that there were significant statistical differences in performance in terms of the EI/SRT and GPC, in favor of FFMF §3, but there was no statistically significant difference in performance for the two chat groups in terms of the Oral component.

Chat transcripts were analyzed on a global and local scale. Locally, correct productions of the copular verbs and the prepositions were considered along side erroneous productions of the same. Overall, the FFMF group outperformed the MF group in terms of correct usage of the four forms. The data revealed that FFMF §3 distinguished between the various L2 ‘to be’ options, while MF §13 relied on ser as the default form. Contexts requiring por or para revealed that errors for both participation sections stemmed from substitution one preposition for the other.

Globally, syntactic maturity and lexical density were determined. Meaning-focused §13 demonstrated a constant level of syntactic maturity while FFMF §3 was in constant flux from one chat session to the next. The Mann-Whitney statistic revealed that the scores for §3 versus §13 was significantly different in favor of §3, and that this difference is not due to chance. Regarding lexical density, FFMF §3’s scores wavered while MF §13’s scores were more consistent, but the Mann-Whitney statistic showed that there is no reasonable level of significant difference between the scores of the two groups.

Instructor-to-student feedback practices were also examined. It was deemed that the instructor did not engage in a variety of corrective practices, but rather tended to recast and request clarification. While there was one instance of metalinguistic feedback in the FFMF group, it was not corrective in nature, but rather was an exclamatory comment on a well-formed student production. Also, while there were three instances of explicit correction in the FFMF group, the corrections were for word-choice and agreement, not for the por/para, ser/estar. Due to her consistent feedback practices for both participating groups, and because she was most inclined to act as a conversational facilitator during each chat, it was deemed that both the FFMF and the MF groups received comparable input from the course instructor.
Chapter 5
Student-to-Student Feedback Practices

The students’ behavior in the chat rooms was also examined. The purpose was to analyze how the learners responded to their communicative environments, respectively. The data reveal that the two sections assumed a different approach to the chat sessions. The FFMF group made efforts to focus on form and meaning, although they assumed a global approach. Attention to both form and meaning in a highly communicative environment proved to be an important device which prompted learners to make efforts to publish contributions that revealed their work at supporting meaning with form and form with meaning. The MF group also made efforts to focus on meaning, but its approach was markedly different than that of its form-and-meaning focused counterpart. That is, the social dynamic of focusing on meaning-only generated an environment characterized by joviality and conflict, which ended up not only less syntactically mature and less complex than the form-and-meaning focused group, but was also static in terms of syntactic maturity levels throughout the semester, save for the final chat session in which the group’s syntactic maturity level seemed to show some improvement.

The data for each group follows. Specifically, metalinguistic feedback, recasting, explicit correction, and clarification request tendencies were examined. Orthographic errors and joking tendencies were added in response to the students’ productions.

5.1 SS Metalinguistic Feedback: §3

In the first example, Choclo didn’t recognize the past tense form of the verb in this context without its written accent and sought assistance from Derechista, who clarified the context by providing metalinguistic feedback. Choclo indicated that he understood by thanking Derechista for the feedback.
1) derechista2 no creo que el rey moro se fue del pias con dignidad porque es un hombre y el lloro
choclo2 que significal lloro?
choclo2 significa
choclo2 lo siento
derechista2 llorar pasado....
choclo2 gracias

I don't think the Moorish King left without dignity because he is a man and he cried
What does lloro mean?
Mean
Sorry
llorar—past	hanks

In the next sample Diego_rivera2 is provided with metalinguistic feedback as the method by which to clarify his expressed confusion.

2) chequere2 fue muy triste pero, yo creo salo con dignidad
diego_rivera2 salgo?
chequere2 el preterite de salir

It was very sad but, I think he left* with dignity
I leave?
The preterite of salir

In the next sample Azteca2 talks about comedian Pauly Shore pejoratively, and in so doing comments that he needs to employ the preterite when referencing the comedian because he is no longer at the height of his career. Tecapa2 jokingly joins Azteca2 and uses the comedian’s trademark line against him by saying he can’t “wheeze the juice” any longer. To that, Desaparecido2 responds by expressing his like for the comedian and in turn expresses another of the comedian’s trademark expressions in Spanish.

3) azteca2 pero pauly shore no es bueno
tecapa2 No puede "weezing the juice",
azteca2 mi malo necisito uso preterito por Pauly Shore porque no existe ahora
desaparecido2 pauly shore es bueno. que pasa

But pauly shore isn’t good
He can’t “wheeze the juice”
My bad, I need to use preterite for Pauly Shore because he doesn’t exist now
Pauly shore is good. What’s up budddddly!

In the next three examples Azucar_moreno2 corrects three different productions for subjunctive. In the first example her corrections are accurate, but in the second and third corrections she fails to recognize that the subjunctive is not required when there is no change of subject. In sample five, the correction is enough for Azteca2 to regenerate the phrase in its entirety, but in a corrected form. Sample five is interesting because it reveals that the student extended the recast to another verb, thereby demonstrating the
recognition and extension of the recast. With each correction Azucar_moreno2 also employs capital letters to make her correction more salient. In addition, in samples four and six, she recasts the form and states that she has reproduced the phrases in the subjunctive.

4) diego_rivera2 pero es necesita a levanta durante el pledge
   azucar_moreno2 LevantE
   azucar_moreno2 es necesario que levantE
   azucar_moreno2 el subjunctivo

   But its necessary to stand* during the pledge
   That one stands
   It's necessary that one stands
   The subjunctive

5) azteca2 Ojala que recibo un A
   azucar_moreno2 recibirA
   azteca2 Esperamos que recibAMOS A's!!

   I hope I receive* an A
   Receive
   We hope that WE ALL GET A’s!!

6) derechista2 estoy feliz que estoy en los EEUU
   azucar_moreno2 estE..el subjuntivo
   azucar_moreno2 Estoy feliz que estE en EEUU

   I’m happy that I’m* in the US
   I am*.. subjunctive
   I’m happy that I’m* in the US

The final sample of student-student metalinguistic feedback also surfaced from Azucar_moreno2’s vigilance. In this instance she corrects for agreement.

7) besazo2 tenemos mucho suerte estar en EEUU porque hay paises con mas problemas que hay aqui
   azucar_moreno2 muchA suerte gracias

   We are very lucky* to be in the US
   because there are countries with more problems than there are here
   Very lucky
   thanks

5.2 SS Metalinguistic Feedback: §13

Examining the metalinguistic feedback produced in §13 requires a review of previously scrutinized samples. That is, the four samples that surfaced when scrutinizing ser/estar productions are also the four samples of metalinguistic feedback produced by this group. Again, there is direct feedback for the subjunctive in example one, written accents alongside the L1 equivalent of the form in question, and two options for expressing would be in the L2 marked interrogatively in an attempt to both assist and be
assisted while expressing this form. In sample four, El_pachuco inquires as to whether
the indigenous situation in the US was or is still problematic.

1) 
   | velazquez2   | hola           | hello  |
   | santo_domingo2 | hola mi profesora | hello my professor |
   | santo_domingo2 | ?como estas?    | how are you?       |
   | Jose_marti2  | bien, ?y tu?   | I’m well, and you? |
   | Santo_domingo2| asi asi, muy cansado... | ok, very tired |
   | santo_domingo2| subjuntivo?    | subjunctive?       |

2) 
   | ojos_verdes2 | que sera' sera'-- S Hawking | whatever will be, will be-S. Hawking |
   | moctezuma2   | que es sera? | what is sera? |
   | jose_marti2 | el cantion famosa | the famous song |
   | maya2        | sera= will be | sera= will be |
   | ojos_verdes2| Stephen Hawking no escribo' la cantion ... pero, lo amo' | Stephen Hawking didn’t write the song ... but he loved it |

3) 
   | guisante2 | creo que el would be en chatahoochee en el hospital | I think he would be in Chatahoochee in the hospital |
   | ojos_verdes2 | would be = seria o estaria ... no? |
   | guisante2 | that is where the psychiatric hospital is |

4) 
   | juan_carlos2 | la situacion de indigena estadounidense fue muy mal | theUS- indigenous situation was very bad |
   | el_pachuco2  | fue o es? | Was or is? |
   | juan_carlos2 | ambod | both |
   | juan_carlos2 | ambos | both |

5.3 SS Recasting: §3

Section 13 did not engage is such corrective practices but two instances of SS recasting surfaced in §3. In the first sample Besazo2’s two-line comment sparks affirmative feedback from Cencerro2 and Abrazote2. In their postings, they provide Besazo2 with the correct form for expressing “nature” in the L2, enabling him to incorporate them into his subsequent posting.
1) besazo2 me parece que la leyenda dice de como el nature tiene mas fuerte de todo
besazo2 tenemos una responsibilidad a el natur
cencerro2 la leccion moral de la cuenta es respetar naturaleza
abrazote si, respetar naturaleza
besazo2 respetar la naturaleza es una tema muy impotante y no hay bastante gente que hace eso

It seems to be that the legend says how nature is the strongest of all
We have a responsibility to nature
The story’s moral lesion is to respect nature
Yes, to respect nature
Respecting nature is an important theme and there are not enough people that do so

The second instance of recasting is the most syntactically complex. Azteca2 understands Chaparrastique2’s message and offers a recasted version of how to properly express such an idea in Spanish. That is, Azteca2 recognizes the need for subjunctive in this context and rephrases Chaparrastique2’s statement as it could be expressed in the subjunctive. Note that the idea is not expressed exactly, but rather is an approximation of what Azteca2 believes his colleague is trying to express.

2) chaparrastique2 Creo que es posible para querer algo tanto mucho que lo sonas porqae
suenos son vistas de que quieras.
azteca2 si es posible que quiera algo con tanta pasion antes de que te des cuenta

I think its possible to want something so much that you dream it because dreams are windows on what you want
Yes it is possible to want something with such passion even before you realize it

5.4 SS Explicit Correction: §3

Twenty six instances of explicit correction surfaced in FFMF §3. Feedback ranged from student-to-student to self-corrections. A total of six of the explicit correction samples surfaced as a result of Azucar_moreno2’s vigilance. In the first three examples Azucar_moreno2 corrects for subject-verb agreement. In example number four below Cencerro2 corrects the morphology of gustar. Note that the participants marked their corrections with an asterisk to make them more salient.
1) aterciopelados2 …..Don quijote tuve mucho cuentos a decir azucar_moren2 *tuvo aterciopelados2 tuvo, gracias azucar_moren2 de nada ….Don quijote had* many stories to tell *had (student-generated asterisk) Had, thanks You’re welcome

2) bosque_verde2 Don quijote le di los molinas "hell" azucar_moren2 *dio 3) besazo2 os parece que don quijote he luchado algo que esta realmente y no es solo de su cabeza azucar_moren2 *ha Don quijote gave* the windmills “hell” *gave (student-generated asterisk) Do you guys think that don quijote has* fought something that is real and isn’t just in his head *has (student-generated asterisk)

3) besazo2 No me gusta americanos sus poemas tengan bueno ritima azucar_moren2 *gustan* 4) alhambra castillo2 New life cencerro2 I don’t like Americans* sus es necesario aprender un lesson diego_rivera2 necesario* His* poems have good rhythm his it is necessary* to learn a lesson necessary

5) castillo2 vida nuevo azucar_moren2 nueva New life new

6) abrazote su poemas tengan bueno ritima azucar_moren2 sus His* poems have good rhythm

7) abrazote es necesario aprender un lesson diego_rivera2 necesario* It is necessary* to learn a lesson

8) castillo2 no creo es espiritual. yo acordo azucar_moren2 es estrellas *acuerdo I don’t believe it is spiritual. I agree it is the stars *agree (student-generated asterisk)

Students also corrected each other for gender agreement (sample 5), number agreement (sample 6) and for orthographic errors (samples 7 and 8).

Finally, students self-corrected for subject-verb agreement (sample 9), for gender agreement (samples 10, 11, 12) and for the indirect object pronoun, in the case of sample 13. Note that in sample 10 Cubanacan2 writes “i’un” to call attention to the need for the masculine form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Corrected Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>cubanacan2 no es</td>
<td>It isn’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cubanacan2 no son</td>
<td>They aren’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>cubanacan2 es una quimico malo</td>
<td>It is a bad chemical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cubanacan2 i’i un</td>
<td>i = incorrect \ un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>cencerro2 sin imagincion, vida es aburrido</td>
<td>Without imagination, life is boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cencerro2 aburrido</td>
<td>boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>ruinas_tikal2 la buena es el mejor</td>
<td>The good one &lt;feminine&gt; is the best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ruinas_tikal2 *el bueno</td>
<td>The good one &lt;masculine&gt; (student-generated asterisk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>derechista2 pienso que mis suenos hablan sobre</td>
<td>I think my dreams speak about things that are in my life or will be in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cosas estan en mi vida o estaren en mi vida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>derechista2 me hablan*</td>
<td>Speak to me * (student-generated asterisk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.5 SS Explicit Correction: §13

Students in MF §13 explicitly corrected each other a total of five times. The first three samples are student-student corrections, while the last two samples are self-corrections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Text</th>
<th>Corrected Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>planeta_azul2 si me no comprendo la relacion</td>
<td>Yes I don’t understand the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>con papa y joven china... ojal no</td>
<td>between the father and the young Chinese girl...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>romantica, ella muy joven</td>
<td>I hope not romantic, she very young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>habichuela2 planeta...ella ES muy joven...es un</td>
<td>Planets... she IS very young... it is a crazy family!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>familia loca!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>loquito2 por los estudiantes, es un largo</td>
<td>for the students it’s a long list of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>list de palabras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inca2 loquito......es &quot;para,&quot; no es &quot;por&quot;</td>
<td>loquito...... it's “para,” not “por”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>habichuela2 no pienso llorando es debil; I</td>
<td>I don’t think crying is weak; I believe the people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beleive los personas no pueden</td>
<td>that can’t cry are weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>llorar son debiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>el_pachuco2 i believe= creo que</td>
<td>i believe= creo que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>los_cadejos2 corbardes</td>
<td>Cowards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>los_cadejos2 son corbades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>ojos_verdes2 ojala que lluva cafe en el campo</td>
<td>I hope it rains coffee on the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ojos_verdes2 lo siento</td>
<td>Sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ojos_verdes2 lluvia -&gt; llueva</td>
<td>Lluva (\rightarrow) llueva (rains)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 SS Clarification Requests: §3

A total of nine clarification requests surfaced for FFMF §3. Clarification requests ranged from relatively short exchanges (samples 1 and 2) to the more detailed, in-depth exchange prompted by talk of the legendary “goat sucker” in sample three.

1) azucar_moreno2 Moncho era bobo porque le engano a Don Gregori
   anteojos_magicos2 bobo?
   azucar_moreno2 tonto

2) azucar_moreno2 simbolizan que el maestro le engano Mancho
   ruinas_tikal2 engano?
   azucar_moreno2 enseno, lo siento

In the next sample the students work to clarify the meaning of “chupa cabras” and the nature of the legend surrounding such creatures. The idea of a goat sucking/eating monster seems funny to the students who all seek to be sure they understand what is being published. By the end of the exchange Diego_rivera2 asks why a monster would eat goats, to which Cubanacan2 jokingly replied, “He doesn’t have anything better to do.” The remaining six clarification requests were of this nature; back and forth exchanges meant to clarify a specific point of confusion.

3) ruinas_tikal2 que es le leyenda urbana sobre la chupacabra?
   Ruinas_tikal2 la chupacabra??
   besazo2 que es chupacabra
   Azteca2 goat sucker
   Cubanan2 es un monstro que comes cabras en Latino Americana
   chaparraste2 un onstruo quien chupa cabras en Latino Americana
   cencerro2 ok
   azteca2 come cabras o ninos?
   ruinas_tikal2 no se este leyendo??
   Besazo2 que son cabras?
   Diego_rivera2 What is the urban legend about the goat sucker?
   The goat sucker??
   What is chupacabra?
   Goat sucker
   It’s a monster that eats goats in Latin America
   A monster that sucks goats
   Does he eat goats or children?
   I don’t know this legend??
   What are cabras?
chaparrastique2  cabras, no ninos  Goats, not kids
chaparrastique2  cabras son "goats"  Cabras are “goats”
derechista2  aprendi sobre chupacabras ano ultimo  I learned about goatsuckers last year
ruinas_tikal2  si yo se cabras son goats  Yes I know that cabras are goats
diego_rivera2  porque un monstruyo chupa cabras??  Why <would> a monster suck goats?
alhambra  Donde son las chupacabras?  Where are the goat suckers?
cubanacan2  no tiene nada mejor que hacer  He doesn’t have anything better to do

In the final sample, the topic of discussion was the Pledge of Allegiance and confusion ensued because one of the participant nicknames was Bandera, or Flag. Anteojos_magicos2 attempted to address Bandera2 but confuses Azucar_moreno2 by the lack of comma which would indicate that Anteojos_magicos2 is addressing Bandera2. Due to the context of the conversation Azucar_moreno2, along with other participants, are rightly confused and interpret the statement made by Anteojos_magicos2 as a statement about the flag, instead of as a statement intended for the participant with that nickname.

4) anteojos_magicos2  bandera es un problema en un pais como los estados unidos.  Bandera, it’s a problem in a country like the United States
bandera2  en paises con mucho dinero y poder, como los estados unidos, puede tratar los indigenas mejor, pero en paises con dificultades economicas, esta un problema  In countries with much money and power, like the United Stats, it can treat the indigenous better, but in countries with economic difficulties, it is a problem
besazo2  me parece que es la problema de la gente no es del gobierno..  It seems to be that it is the people’s problem, not the government’s
azucar_moreno2  Como es la bandera un problema?  How is the flag a problem?
anteojos_magicos2  no ese frasa es intender para bandera.  No that phrase was intended for Bandera
castillo2  bandera es un problema en mas paises  The flag is a problem in more countries
azucar_moreno2  Como es la bandera un problema?  How is the flag a problem?
azteca2  no me gusta la bandera.  I don’t like the flag
cubanacan2  que tiene que ver la bandera con los problemas  What does the flag have to do with the problems
anteojos_magicos2  bandera no es una problema.  The flag isn’t a problem
besazo2  que significa bandera??  What does bandera mean??
azteca2  como se dice (flag)  How do you say flag
cubanacan2  bandera  flag
cubanacan2  bandera  flag
5.7 SS Clarification Requests: §13

Twenty five clarification requests were generated by MF §13. The three samples below are representative of the manner in which this group worked together to clarify communicative difficulties. Overall, their exchanges were lengthy, and were typically accompanied by code-switching to English. In the first example, the clarification request leads to Ojos_verdes2 picking on Los_cadejos2, perhaps because the phrase was too simple a phrase to write in the L1. What Ojos_verdes2 had failed to realize was that Los_cadejos2 production may have been in response to Moctezuma2’s L1-L2 production.

1)  habichuela2 Todavia no comprendo el relacion entre el papa y el joven china... fue romantica?  I still don’t understand the relationship between the father and the young Chinese girl... was it romantic?
moctezuma2 bad relaciones
los_cadejos2 mal relaciones
ojos_verdes2 ?muy interesante los cadejos ... ?puede usted ser más vago?
los_cadejos2 si
jose_marti2 si habi
jose_marti2 chu

In the second sample the students are distressed by the US’s decision to go to war with Iraq and have trouble moving the conversation forward because they end up bantering over whether the correct reference for “los cadejos” is wolves or dogs.

2)  juan_carlos2 !la literatura!  The literature!
margarita2 no comprendo nuestra gobierno
juan_carlos2 por favor
los_cadejos2 por que hablar con la literatura
ojos_verdes2 lobos magicos ... hablamos sobre lobos magicos
inca2 quien los lobos representan??
el_pachuco2 no lobos. perros
margarita2 que es lobos?
gato_violeto2 los cajotes ayudan la gente
inca2 que nos ensenan los perros de la vida?
margarita2 donde esta los perros?
habichuela2 lobos significa de perros?
los_cadejos2 los perros son magicos...

The literature!
I don’t understand our government
Please
Why talk about the literature while there’s a war today
Magic wolves... we’re talking about magic wolves
What do the wolves represent?
Not wolves. Dogs
What is lobos?
The coyotes help the people
What do the dogs teach us about life?
Where are the dogs?
Lobos means dogs?
The dogs are magic...
Wolves are in the story
Los cadejos aren’t wolves. They’re dogs
Not wolves nor deer
Yes, the wolves/dogs are from the volcanoes

The third example demonstrates the manner in which these students relied on the L1 to carry them through their conversations. Rather than using circumlocution or descriptive analysis, this group tended to employ L1 forms, rather than decelerate the communicative flow.

3) juan_carlos si- la promesa a la bandara es bueno
el_pachuco que significa de homenaje
santo_domingo pledge yo pienso
habichuela significa de "pu homage"
juan_carlos to pay homage
planeta_azul si
loquito que es homenaje?

Yes, the pledge of allegiance is good
What does homenaje mean?
Pledge I think
It means to pay homage
To pay homage
Yes
What is homenaje?

5.8 SS Orthographic Errors: §3

Students generated twenty orthographic corrections in FFMF §3. In each case the students self-corrected. Note that the students marked their corrections with an asterisk in some cases.

1) bandera porque los espanoles le dijo que tuvo
bandera que salir su palcio y va a las calles
palacio

Because the spanish told him he had to leave his palace and go to the streets
Palace

2) cubanacan lo que yo pienso es que no es el sitio
cubanacan que vas a echar de menos pero la gente
contigo que vive con tigo

What I think is that it isn’t the place you’ll miss but the people that live with you
With you

3) diego_rivera hoy, atacando molinas de viente en un
diego_rivera acto de una persona con muchas
es* problemas mentales

Today, attacking windmills is an act of a person with many mental problems
is
4) derechista2 algunos leyendoas urbanas son supersticiones y gente mucha creo en supersticiones asi los hablan asi otras no estara en una situacion leyendas*

Some urban legends are superstitions and many people believe in superstitions so they talk about them so others will not be in the situation legends

5.9 SS Orthographic Errors: §13

This group corrected typographic errors a total of seven times; every adjustment of orthographic errors was a self-correction. Sample five is noteworthy because MF §13 did generate written accents at times.

1) habichuela2 Sancho portacta don el mismo! portacta = protecta Sancho protects don from himself
2) el_pachuco2 a mi me gusta la peliciula el_pachuco2 pelicula I like the film
3) mariposa2 you tambien mariposa2 yo Me too
4) habichuela2 como cuando hay una guerra y mucos habichuela2 datlos=darlos soldadoos su muerten y hay un periodo de silencio para datlos su respta Like when there is a war and many soldiers die and there is an period of silence to give them respect
5) maya2 ojos verde, como tu haces los maya2 ojos_verdes2 es un secretom maya2 ojos_verdes2 secreto maya2 okay Ojos verde, how do you do the accents? It’s a secre*, Maya2 Secret okay

5.10 SS Joking: §3

Chat transcripts reveal a low frequency of joking behavior among students in group 3. They did engage in some joking and produced small amounts of language play. Furthermore, they posted minimal instances of the L1 throughout the course of the semester.
1) azteca2 cual es la gran tristeza del mundo
    azucar_moreno2 pienso que es alguien en la clase
    *What is the biggest world sadness
    *I think its someone in the class

2) choclo2 ojala que lueva cafe
tecapa2 por que quiere ojala que lueva cafe caliente?
    *I hope it rains coffee
    *Why do you hope it rains hot coffee
     
cubanacan2 a mi me gusta esa cancion tambien
cubanacan2 esta
    *I like this* song a lot too
    *this
    
azteca2 si yo tambien
derechista2 me gusta esta cancion
    *Yes, i do too
    *I like this song
    
derechista2 me gusta como la sona
azucar_moreno2 ojala que lueva leche y azucar para cumplir mi cafe
diego_rivera2 tengo hambre
    *I hope it rains milk and sugar to complete my coffee
    *I'm hungry
    
Sample three is the most demonstrative of language play instances in the FFMF group. The students not only play on words (Freud / fraude) but also continue the word play through a rhyme in the next to the last line.

3) choclo2 freud es fraude?
    choclo2 no!!!
bosque_verde2 freud fue loco
    azteca2 si
    chaparrastique2 si si
desaparecido2 si
    choclo2 el es loco un poco, pero no fraude
castillo2 si freud es muy inteligente, pero es un fraude
    *Freud is fraude?
    *No!!!
    *Freud was crazy
    *Yes
    *Yes yes
    *Yes
    *He is crazy a bit, but not fraud
    *Yes freud is very intelligent, but he is a fraud

5.11 SS Joking: §13

This group was inclined to ridicule one another, were likely to engage in language play, and to work to display extralinguistic cues such as those listed in sample seven. In as much as the students were jovial, good-humored, and playful, they were also bullies who taunted and mocked one another generating an atmosphere of interpersonal conflict at times. Furthermore, they were much more inclined to employ the L1 and to code-
The samples below represent the both the conflictive and jovial dynamic generated by this group. A total of twenty-two instances of joking or bullying surfaced.

In the short story *Los perros mágicos de los volcanes*, *Los Cadejos* are magic dogs. The participant whose nickname is *Los_Cadejos* realizes this and comments about it. Two other participants follow suit and language play ensues.

1) los_cadejos2 me llamo los cadejos
   el_pachuco2 te llamas los cadejos??
   ojos_verdes2 hola los_cadejos2, puedes hacer magico ?
   los_cadejos2 puedo hacer magico
   los_cadejos2 por que soy un cadejo
   ojos_verdes2 que magico tienes, los_cadejos2 ?
   los_cadejos2 x-ray
   los_cadejos2 puedo volar
   los_cadejos2 soy mas fuerte por que soy mas inteligente y tengo mas magico que los salvadores
   los_cadejos2 soldados, perdón
   el_pachuco2 los soldados quiere mato los cadejos
   los_cadejos2

In the next sample another student, *Jose_marti2*, assumed the identity of the poet José Martí at the suggeston of *Ojos_verdes2*, and attempted to answer the question posed by the professor.

2) velazquez2 EN LA ULTIMA ESTROFA MARTI COMPARA SU VERSO CON UNA ESPADA, POR QUE?
   ojos_verdes2 NO SE!!
   ojos_verdes2 jajaj
   jose_marti2 a
   ojos_verdes2 gracias jo
   ojos_verdes2 se
   el_pachuco2 quizá el poeta haya visto llover rayos de lumbre pura sobre su cabeza en sus sueños
   ojos_verdes2 jose_marti2 esta aqui ... por que no le preguntamos?
   jose_marti2 el lumbre es su ideas, posiblemente.....y estas son belleza

*IN THE LAST VERSE MARTI COMPARES HIS VERSE WITH A SWORD. WHY?*

*IN THE LAST VERSE MARTI COMPARES HIS VERSE WITH A SWORD. WHY?*

*I DON’T KNOW!!*

*Jajaj*

*A*

*Thanks jo*

*se*

*Perhaps the poet has seen it rain rays of pure light over his head in his dreams*

*Jose_marti2 is here... why don’t we ask him?*

*The light is his ideas, possibly... and these are beauty*
In this sample the students are playing with gender roles in that the pseudonyms do not reveal the gender of the participants. Ojos_verdes2 is a male, and Jose_marti2 is a female.

3) ojos_verdes2 jose_marti! hola mi amiga! Jose_marti! Hello my friend <feminine>!
ojos_verdes2 er er
ojos_verdes2 amigo Friend <masculine>
jose_marti2 jese es un amigo Jose is a male friend
jose_marti2 amigo Friend
jose_marti2 :) :)
ojos_verdes2 jajaja jajaja

The following sample demonstrates the manner in which the students would criticize each other. The instructor reprimands Moctezuma2 for posting a stereotype in the forum. This reprimand prompts namecalling by Ojos_verdes2, “Moctezuma2 is a pig... Moctezuma is dirty.”

4) moctezuma2 creo que latinas son amante buenas I think latinas are good lovers
moctezuma2 sexual es cultura The culture is sexual
velazquez2 moctezuma eso son estereotipos Moctezuma those are stereotypes
ojos_verdes2 moctezuma es un cerdo Moctezuma is a pig
velazquez2 y en esta clase tratamos de comprender And in this class we try to understand
la realidad para evitar estereotipos reality in order to avoid stereotypes
moctezuma2 lo siento. no se que sexo es tabu Sorry. I didn’t know sex was tabu
ojos_verdes2 moctezuma es sucio Moctezuma is dirty
ejote2 pero yo creo que nosotros no podemos But i think that we can’t (distinguish)
la realidad vs. estereotipos aqui en este país reality vs. stereotypes here in this country

Likewise, samples five and six demonstrate how the students bullied each other when they made accusations of incompetence against fellow participants.

5) ojos_verdes2 guerras no son buenas Wars aren’t good
jose_marti2 observacion bueno, ojos! Good observation, ojos!
jose_marti2 no observacion bueno, ojos Not a good observation, ojos

6) loquito2 GRACIAS, INCA!!! THANKS, INCA!!
inca2 no problemo!! No problem!!
el_pachuco2 inca! de nada es "you're welcome!!" Inca! De nada is “you’re welcome!!”
mar_rojo2 jaja Jaja
Use of emoticons and other extraverbal linguistic cues was a common feature of the language generated by the MF group. The example posted below serves to demonstrate this use of emoticons.

7) moctezuma la espiral signifique venir en conscience porque la espiral comenzar a un punto y hace circulo. el circulo va a la misma punta pero venir mas cerca cada vez alrededor es similar a la proceso de crecer (ganar conscience)

moctezuma ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^ ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
moctezuma <--- anarquista
moctezuma que cree la espiral signifique?

ojos_verdes la espiral significa un maestro muy loco ... jajaja

mar_rojo no sabes nada ojos!! Jaja

Finally, the following sample demonstrates the psychological response to teasing. In response to a previous posting by Jose_marti, Ojos_verdes writes that Jose_marti is smoking crack. Clearly offended by this judgment on her previously posted comments, she negates his comment but misspells the verb form. She quickly corrects it before returning the accusation, and in so doing publishes the phrase before she completed it.

8) ojos_verdes ¡Jose_marti está fumando la roca de la grieta!

jose_marti no estou fumando!

jose_marti estoy

jose_marti tu estas fumando

jose_marti lo

ojos_verdes no no es la verdad
5.12 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the student-to-student feedback practices that surfaced in each respective chat group throughout the course of the semester. Specifically, metalinguistic feedback, recasting, explicit correction, clarification requests, orthographic correction and joking behaviors were examined. Explicit correction and orthographic correction were the most commonly deployed feedback measures for the FFMF group, while the MF group relied on clarification requests. There is evidence that both groups placed some emphasis on form; however the impact of grammatical consciousness-raising versus the lack of it generated different social environments. The FFMF group was very on-task and serious while the MF group was very likely to joke with and bully one another. The habits of each group, in terms of corrective feedback, is a direct reflection on the levels of consciousness raising that transpired in the SCMC environments.
Chapter 6
Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to answer the main question, whether raising learners’ consciousness on *por/para*, and *ser/estar* in synchronous, computer mediated communication based conferencing fosters the development of those grammatical features to a greater degree than in SCMC chat without consciousness-raising. Each of the main question subsets are addressed first. Evidence supporting each answer’s claim is provided, and finally the main research question is addressed.

6.1 Question One

Does the affordance of focusing on *por/para*, *ser/estar* assist in the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the form-and-meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the group that engaged in consciousness-raising in terms of those forms?

Whether or not consciousness-raising facilitated the development of *por/para*, *ser/estar* over the course of the semester for the form-and-meaning-focused chat group, §3, can be determined through reviewing the data. Post-test scores were significantly different in favor of the FFMF group over its meaning-focused counterpart. At the onset it was established that both groups entered the study with equal abilities and were thus part of the same population since the variation within each group was not statistically significant in the inter-group comparison, (refer to table 4.3). The students were exposed to the same course materials, both groups followed the standard syllabus for all level three courses at Florida State University, and both sections were taught by the same professor. The sole difference was the introduction of consciousness-raising activities in the FFMF chat group. Before each chat the students reviewed the pre-chat questions they had prepared before coming to class. These questions were samples which contained the L2 forms in context, and each question was thematically related to the course content about which they would chat. Students were given access to these questions on Wednesday evenings so that they only had one night to prepare for Thursday’s chat
session. Students completed the questions as a homework assignment before coming to the computer lab, and they reviewed these questions with the instructor, verbally, for approximately ten minutes before beginning each chat. These questions served as a guided component to C-R before the students assumed the responsibility of raising their own consciousness in the chat forum. Prior to each chat, the instructor would remind the group to concentrate on por/para, ser/estar. The researcher argues that the statistical difference at the post-tests, in favor of FFMF §3, is attributable to the consciousness-raising that occurred during the chat sessions. The data offer direct and indirect evidence of consciousness-raising for ser/estar but there is only indirect evidence (qualitative and quantitative productions and accuracy rates for the prepositions) for C-R of por/para because the FFMF group produced no overt signs of output or feedback on the prepositions. However, the data also indicate that when students were the ones responsible for their own consciousness-raising, they did not limit their focus to por/para, ser/estar but rather paid attention to grammar as a whole. Likewise, the instructor did not limit her feedback practices to the copular verb and the prepositions either. Support follows. In order to answer this question number one, the following must be addressed: 1) IS feedback, 2) SS feedback, 3) Syntactic Maturity, 4) Lexical Density, 5) task focus.

6.1.1 IS Feedback

The data reveal that both groups received the same treatment in terms of instructor-to-student corrective feedback. Of the corrective options available to the instructor she relied most heavily on recasts and clarification requests. Recasts are claimed to be beneficial because they are an immediate response to a poorly formed utterance, and therefore allow learners to make linguistic comparisons between their utterance and the L2 code which authentically conveys the message they attempted to express (Doughty 1999). They are also said to be beneficial because they provide occasion for students to notice linguistic features in the input; noticing is considered to be a crucial element in the cognitive processing which leads to development (Schmidt
However in this data set it is important to bear in mind that the instructor corrected very little for both groups overall. Recasts were the number-one generated corrective strategy, but with only fourteen recasts in total over seven transcripts covering 280 minutes of dialogue, for the FFMF group, it is clear that recasts did not surface with a high frequency. The recasting strategies of the instructor were: 1) direct repetition of the phrase in a corrected form, 2) introduction of the corrected, recasted, phrase with “yes”, 3) salient recasts, and 4) interrogative-recasts. While recasts with “yes” and salient recasts did not prompt immediate published responses, interrogative-recasts solicited an immediate response in all cases but one. Direct repetition-recasts brought the conversation to an end in one instance but did not do so in another, while the sole sample of metalinguistic feedback that surfaced in the chat transcripts came about in response to a well-formed production rather than as a correction. In sum, the instructor exercised her corrective practices minimally and both FFMF and MF chat groups received uniform treatment in the input in terms of corrective feedback. That in mind, it is important to consider whether or not the students recognized the feedback, and whether or not so few samples were even beneficial.

According to Lyster (1998) in situations where meaning takes precedence over form, learners are less likely to recognize recasts as correcting for anything more than meaning. In the case of the FFMF group interrogative recasts were acknowledged. Thus, one type of recast strategy explicitly reveals its impact and suggests that students responded well to this feedback because they knew to expect such feedback would address form in addition to meaning. Likewise, it is possible that although the other three recasting strategies did not provide immediate uptake, that the participants processed the corrective feedback as such because they were expecting the instructor to address both form and meaning in each chat session. It is also important to consider that the power of C-R is that it doesn’t pretend to directly and immediately impact fluency or communicative goals (Rutherford and Sharwood-Smith, 1985). Rather, it is meant to stir the cognitive juices that that will lead to noticing, uptake and output. Thus, the question as to whether or not the participants recognized the nature of the IS feedback that did surface is answered through the combination of 1) evidence of some instances of the
output that immediately followed the instructor’s recast (i.e., reproduction of the statement in a corrected form, declarative acknowledgement of the correction, or an extension of the form instead of mere repetition), 2) the post-test results, 3) the syntactic maturity levels of §3, and 4) the student-to-student feedback practices the surfaced over the course of the semester.

Whether or not so few instances of corrective feedback were sufficient to benefit the participants requires comment. In the SCMC environment for FFMF participant-initiated consciousness-raising the instructor’s role was backgrounded in favor of student-generated corrective strategies. Her restricted role may be attributed to the students’ behavior during the chat sessions. Students in this group stayed on task and they developed a number of corrective strategies to draw salience to both self- and other-corrections. Certainly, the responsibility to be conscious of their own productions in addition to the production of others exposes their consciousness-raising efforts. That is, because students were prepared to focus on L2 forms and the meaning conveyed behind those forms, they engaged in a number corrective strategies, and corrected frequently. Since they were generating the forms fairly accurately, and in view of the fact that the students stayed on task, the instructor’s role was consequently limited; she contributed to the dialogue a total of 75 times in this group, as compared to a total of 152 turns in MF §13. As a result, the instructor’s presence was minimal, and although her corrective turns were alike in both sections, her mere presence may have served as a potent indicator of the need for greater attentiveness when she did come on the scene in the FFMF group. The fact that the students knew that she would be participating, and that her participation could be an indication of correction and could contain grammatical, lexical, or content feedback, may have served to maintain grammatical C-R. On the other hand, because the MF students were not explicitly aware of the instructor’s feedback practices, they did not overtly tune into her contribution in the chat as more than participatory for the most part. Thus, whether the participants were aware or unaware did impact the manner in which they responded to the instructor.

It is important to consider that her restricted role in the FFMF group also could have been due to the demands of attending to all postings. Complicating that role is non-
linear nature of SCMC postings since contributions are published in the order in which they are received by the chat client they appear on the screen in a disjointed fashion, which requires participants to piece together the conversational strands for coherency. Adding corrective duties, the need to save the data periodically during the chat session and student monitoring to that task may have slowed down the instructor’s capacity to tend to so much simultaneously.

So, while the literature argues that recasting is a widely and frequently used corrective strategy (Doughty 1994, Lyster and Ranta 1997; Lyster 1998), while some researchers highlight the benefits of recasting (Doughty 1994) and others argue that it is the corrective strategy least likely to lead to uptake (Lyster and Ranta 1997; Lyster 1998), in this data set recasting was the preferred strategy of the instructor, although recasts were very few in number. Also in this data set, interrogative recasts, but not direct repetition or recasts with “yes,” or salient recasts, resulted in acknowledgement and output. This suggests that when interrogative recasts are combined with instructions to the students of the need to focus on form, they appear to be beneficial. While recasts with direct repetition, recasts with “yes” and salient recasts did not produce immediate output by the participants, it is important to bear in mind that the conversational dynamics may cause a response to be inappropriate in the scheme of the conversation. If the learner pauses to reflect on the feedback and the conversation has transpired in such a way that a published acknowledgement, or a delayed response, would not move the conversation forward it would be inappropriate and unnecessary to post a response to the correction and therefore while feedback strategies may have been noticed, they may not have been published. Furthermore, because the students’ task was to focus on form throughout each chat session their consciousness may very well have been raised although they did not submit responses.
6.1.2 SS Feedback

Whereas recasts and clarification requests were the most commonly employed IS corrective-strategies, only two instances of SS recasting surfaced in the FFMF group. These participants relied on the categories *explicit correction* and *orthographic correction* most frequently, followed by *clarification requests* and *metalinguistic feedback*.

Correcting orthographic error was quite common. Orthographic correction for §3 was an individual assessment corrective strategy in which participants corrected their own spelling mistakes. Orthographic errors may stem from the drive to communicate; as participants try to get their viewpoint published typographical errors may surface. If the subsequent posting contains a spelling error the participant is likely to notice this as she rereads the lines published, and thus the text-based environment may naturally raise consciousness on one’s orthography. Supporting this awareness is grammatical consciousness-raising. That is, the combination of a text-based environment that already serves to raise consciousness (as seen in both the FFMF and MF groups) combined with an underlying awareness by the students to tend to form in the FFMF group may account for the frequent instances of self-correction. In fact, self-correction occurred almost as much as peer-to-peer explicit correction (20 orthographic / 26 explicit correction) for the FFMF group.

Explicit correction was the most commonly employed peer-to-peer corrective strategy. These peer-to-peer corrections were pedagogical in nature. In each instance these corrections were aimed at providing a corrected form in response to an ill formed utterance. Participants corrected one another for subject-verb agreement, gender and number agreement, and orthographic errors. Additionally, participants also explicitly corrected their own productions. In both cases of peer-to-peer and individual explicit correction, students employed a) capital letters, and/or b) an asterisk to draw attention to the corrective nature of the subsequent posting. It is pertinent to note that most instances of explicit peer-to-peer correction did not generate immediate student acknowledgement or output, but given that these strategies were student-generated it offers evidence that the
students were focused on form and meaning in terms of correction. They noticed their own errors and the errors of others and published feedback in the forum, thereby providing evidence of focus. Furthermore, they were expecting to be corrected and knew that they were at liberty to correct others. What’s more, since they did engage in self- and peer-correction, since they were the ones who took charge of the corrective measures, the absence of immediate acknowledgement of a form may be symbolic of contemplation and reflection. If they are pensive after a correction, and the speed of the conversation does not call for a revised publication of the form, a correction may be socially inappropriate. Likewise, if the topic had shifted rapidly a published correction may only serve to take the conversation backward. In both cases, upon reflection they would simply resume the conversation. Consequently, zero response does not signify complete disregard to the corrective feedback, especially in view of the fact that they students had taken control of the corrective measures.

Metalinguistic feedback also played a role in peer-to-peer feedback for FFMF §3. Here students either corrected one another, used metalinguistic feedback to clarify confusion in the absence of written accents (student 1: *salo*, student 2: *salgo?*, student 1: *el preterito de salir*), as a means by which to indicate one’s status or opinion about that status (*pauly shore no es bueno... mi malo, necesito uso perterito por pauly shore porque no existe ahora*), and as a pedagogical strategy aimed at calling attention to the underlying syntactical error in terms of both verb form and gender and number agreement. Such practices further evidence the learners assuming responsibility for raising their consciousness levels during chat sessions.

Finally, the most “conversational” feedback strategy, clarification requests, was employed infrequently. Peer-to-peer clarification requests for the FFMF group ranged from brief to complex exchanges, but very few instances surfaced. Such low numbers suggest their focus had been on form because clarification requests, by nature, address matters of meaning and content.

The fact that the data show students adopting corrective feedback strategies to such an extent speaks to their focus. Transcripts show that the students actively engaged in correction and that their corrections were pedagogic in nature. They did not belittle
one another, tease that the error represents incompetence, make fun of one another’s responses or engage in the flaming that has been found to occur in chat forums (Warschauer 1997ab). Instead, they attended to their own and one another’s productions throughout the course of the dialogue. This behavior contrasts that of the MF group, whose primary “corrective” strategy consisted of the most “conversational” feedback option, clarification requests. In view of the fact that these corrective strategies were student-generated, it is concluded that this group did engage in grammatical consciousness-raising.

6.1.3 Syntactic Maturity

On reading the FFMF chatscripts it is clear that this group’s productions were more syntactically complex. Not only did this group generate more language overall, with a greater variety of forms represented that in the MF group, but they also demonstrated higher levels of syntactic maturity in the language they did produce. Furthermore, these higher levels of syntactic maturity were statistically significant in favor of FFMF §3 as determined by the Mann-Whitney statistic. Statistically significant differences are attributable to the students taking responsibility for their own consciousness-raising and not to some coincidental factor. In their exchanges their sophistication is evident, but this only accounts for SM as a whole. If the data specific to por/para, ser/estar is examined there is overt evidence for attention to ser/estar but not por/para. In fact, in this group Cubanacan2 asks “que pasó con por y para.” With regard to ser/estar this group did not employ a default form. The data indicate that in the present indicative the students correctly employed ser and estar in the majority of the cases and that the bulk of the verb-choice errors surfaced when learners switched from the present indicative to the past; suggesting that such errors result from a developing command over past tense morphology and not copular verb choices per se.

The quantity and quality of their productions, along with their explicit corrections for ser/estar, are the overt signs of specific feature focus, but there is implicit evidence of
consciousness-raising as well. In addition to their *ser/estar* performance is their treatment of other ‘to be’ expressions in which the L1 relies on the copula verb while the L2 does not. The students managed such expressions quite well, which further suggests that this group had assumed responsibility for grammatical consciousness-raising because they were able to extend their L2 ‘to be’ productions beyond *ser/estar* to incorporate a number of additional expressions. Furthermore, beyond correction for *ser/estar* alone it has been established that this group corrected for more than these verbs. Their feedback practices reveal that they corrected for subject-verb, gender, and number agreement, and orthography. If they had not been attending to form it is unlikely that practices which focus on grammatical structure would have surfaced as they did in the FFMF chatscripts.

Over all, the data reveal higher global levels of syntactic maturity, as demonstrated by t-unit calculations, and higher local levels of maturity, as demonstrated by their more accurate productions with *ser/estar, por/para*. Such results verify the presence of grammatical consciousness-raising. When the participants were directed to pay attention to form in the midst of their communicative act they were given specific forms to which to attend. They rose to the task and attended to form. However, they did not limit their attention to those forms alone, but rather approached the SCMC environment as a communicative and grammatical forum.

### 6.1.4 Lexical Density

The data reveal equal levels of lexical density, statistically, for the FFMF and the MF group. FFMF §3 carried a higher cognitive burden in its responsibility to tend to form and meaning in the midst of communication. If form is tended to, higher levels of accurate productions and more sophisticated language is expected. Likewise, if meaning is selected for attention, a greater semantic range is expected. The data reveal that FFMF §3 demonstrated higher levels of syntactic maturity, and now that those same participants demonstrated equal levels of lexical density, statistically, even though they had a dual-focus with which to contend.
6.1.5 Task Focus

FFMF §3 tended to be serious, focused, and attentive to the task at hand. Firstly, while their conversations were not lacking in the usual communicative paralinguistic notations, they were very few in number. The almost “manic” drive to compensate for extra-verbal cues noted in other research on chat (Werry 1996) was not characteristic of this group because the students relied on linguistic means to convey their messages. Rather than generating emoticons and typographic characters to express emotions, these students employed discourse strategies to convey meaning, with the most typical responses consisting of sí—yes and de acuerdo—ok/I agree. Furthermore, they were more likely to engage in circumlocution and description of a term than to resort to publishing an L1 equivalent. Secondly, these students not only engaged in self-correction, but they also corrected others for a variety of L2 features. It was explained to students that form and meaning are inseparable; that if they’d like to convey a message as accurately as possible they would need to focus on the grammatical structures which express such meaning. This put the responsibility of consciousness-raising in the hands of the participants, and based upon the corrective dynamic that surfaced, the students did well in this task. Thirdly, the expectation to focus on both form and meaning generated an environment of interpersonal harmony. Students did not ridicule one another, nor did they make personal attacks or depreciatory comments about their peers. On the contrary, the atmosphere was a good-natured and jovial; one in which corrective feedback was issued appropriately and was never considered to be an offensive gesture. Flaming was never an issue. This group played with language and did experiment, but when compared to the dynamic that surfaced in the MF group, the dynamic of the FFMF group was more serious.

6.1.6 Conclusion: Question 1

It has been established that the instructor exercised the same feedback practices for both chat groups. It has been established that the FFMF group produced greater quantities of language and that qualitatively were more accurate. Statistically significant
levels of syntactic maturity confirm this. This group also generated more instances of the L2 verbs *ser/estar* and the L2 prepositions *por/para* and other ‘to be’ expressions (*additional expressions*), and they produced these forms more accurately overall. This group demonstrated that they did not have a default form of the L2 features. It has been established that the students actively engaged in corrective feedback strategies; explicit correction (peer-to-peer), orthographic correction (self-correction, with two instances of peer-to-peer orthographic correction), and marking corrections for saliency (asterisk, capital letters). It has been demonstrated that students overtly focused on *ser/estar*, as evidenced in their peer-to-peer corrections. While no such focus was overtly evident for *por/para*, the features for which students corrected demonstrated that their grammatical consciousness had been raised as a whole. When students were responsible for their own consciousness-raising they did not limit their focus to single a categorical element in the L2, but rather addressed grammar as a whole, and as a fundamental aspect of communication. Therefore, it is concluded that when students were given specific L2 features on which to focus and were also made responsible for raising their own consciousness, consciousness-raising did result, but participants did not limit their focus to *por/para*, *ser/estar* only. Instead of honing in on these features specifically, learners amplified their focus to a variety of grammatical features. It is concluded that the amplified scope of grammatical consciousness raising that students assumed when taking responsibility for their own consciousness-raising did assist in the development of *ser/estar* for the FFMF group: 1) students corrected for these features, 2) students did not limit themselves to *ser* alone, but rather employed *estar, haber, tener*, etc., and did so accurately, and 3) their efforts throughout the semester are reflected in their post test scores. It was the task of focusing on specific L2 features that resulted in an amplified consciousness levels in each chat session and it is concluded that C-R and not overt focus on *por/para* assisted in the development of these prepositions. Again, the participant response to the task of specific L2 feature focus was not to limit their focus, but rather to concentrate on grammar as a whole. Hence, the task of focusing on specific L2 features generated the grammatical consciousness raising that contributed to development as a whole, which in turn affected *por/para*, not the other way around. The students did
generate more *por/para* samples and generated them more accurately that the MF group. However, there is no observable evidence in the chatscripts that they did tend to these prepositions. Greater quantities and greater quality of *por/para* productions, along with post-test scores suggest *por/para* were not ignored, and that along with post-test scores suggest C-R had its impact.

### 6.2 Question Two

**Does the lack of focusing on *por/para*, *ser/estar* hinder the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the meaning-focused group, i.e., the chat group that does not engage in consciousness-raising?**

#### 6.2.1 IS Feedback

Again, the data reveal that instructor-to-student corrective feedback was equal for both groups and that the instructor relied most heavily on recasts and clarification requests. The corrective strategies employed by the instructor, including the recast strategies, did not generate immediate acknowledgement or output on the whole for the MF group. Again, in situations where meaning takes precedence over form, learners may be less likely to recognize recasts as correcting for anything more than meaning (Lyster 1998). This is important to bear in mind because although both groups did not display output in response to the instructor’s feedback in every instance, the data show: a) cases where feedback clearly went unrecognized for the MF group, b) more instances of acknowledgement clearly recognized by participants in the FFMF group, and c) a few ambiguous circumstances where detection is impossible to prove or disprove based on the publications, although in some of those difficult to dis/prove cases the dialogues suggest noticing more for the FFMF group than for the MF group.

Recall that only one situation under direct repetition recasts may have been a potentially inappropriate environment for the student to post a corrected response in the MF group, while the second sample clearly indicated that the learner did not recognize the instructor’s feedback as per his subsequent posting: *planeta_azul2 bueno puente;*
velazquez2 buen punto; planeta_azul2 si bueno puerta juan. In the third example for the MF group one student response to the direct repetition recast did generate output but the learner was unable to extend the feedback beyond the present indicative (loquito2 Robin es muerte, lo siento; velazquez2 Robin esta muerto; loquito2 gracias, velazquez, esta muerto; ... loquito2 en Africa, ahora, mas de 30,000,000 personas fuiste muerte).

Whereas the FFMF group also demonstrated difficulty dealing with the L2 past, recall that the participants were able to extend recasts beyond mere repetitions in the present indicative to generate other verb forms in their output. The response to direct repetition recasts was somewhat different for the FFMF group. Recall that in the first example the student who was corrected, Besazo2, did not reply to the instructor, but that when responding to Besazo2’s inquiry it is likely that Castillo2 noticed the correction because he re-read the exchange and posted an orthographic correction on his production. In the second sample for the FFMF group the participant did not generate reproductions of the feedback the professor had provided because doing so would have been unnatural conversationally. Furthermore, this particular participant had the habit of correcting her peers, and so although she did not overtly acknowledge the output it is likely that she did notice it.

Recall that for recasts introduced by ‘yes,’ the first example of the FFMF group was a concluding remark to an ongoing exchange on form, and that continuing the conversation would have been unnecessary given that the entire exchange revolved around form from the start. Recall an example in which the MF group clearly did not recognize the nature of the instructor’s recast (loquito2 La guerra es Hell; velazquez2 si la guerra es un infierno ☺; loquito2 como se dice "hell" en espanol?). Recall that it was uncertain whether or not the remaining recasts introduced by ‘yes’ had been noticed by either group.

Recall that salient recasts generated no overt evidence of uptake in either group and that that interrogative recasts generated overt responses in the FFMF group, but not in the MF group. That is, while the FFMF group demonstrated noticing of interrogative recasts as evidenced in their output, the productions of the MF were not so straightforward. In two of the samples the MF students maintained the conversational
flow which does not definitively determine whether or not they noticed the interrogative recast as a recast or whether they simply replied to a question in the midst of the conversational flow. Likewise, in another instance the recast is left unanswered. Recall that the final student-production in which the instructor employs an interrogative recast is one which clearly demonstrates the MF group was indeed more meaning focused; the students are so concerned with why one participant labeled the US Indigenous peoples as lucky (fueron* suerte) that they continue the conversation with the erroneous form despite the instructor’s feedback (tuvieron suerte porque pachuco?).

In this meaning-focused environment unawareness of the form underlying corrective IS feedback depicts the MF group in many cases. Learners did not tend to recognize the instructor’s recasts in part because they weren’t looking for them and therefore were not likely to recognize the feedback as corrective since their primary focus was on meaning. While some level of C-R may be present due to the fact that the dialogue took place in the SCMC forum the main difference is that the levels of C-R that surface when the main focus is on meaning are not sufficient for facilitating grammatical development. While forms may or may not be noticed in all instances, this group didn’t engage in C-R intentionally, and given that it has been established that they were more conversational, it is less likely that this group noticed the corrections. Furthermore, the data suggest that what is needed for learners to pay attention to form-focused recasts is an environment in which C-R is made explicit through specific instructions to pay attention to form.

Whether or not so few instances of corrective feedback, alongside instances of feedback in which students did not recognize the nature of the feedback, were sufficient to benefit the participants warrants comment. Lee (2000) and Blake (2000) both report that in highly communicative environments like SCMC the need for more than incidental focus on grammatical features is essential for grammatical development. Like Kern (1995), they agree that when form is not tended to grammar falls to the wayside in favor of communication because when the feedback is ambiguous to the learner it does not provide the ideal learning environment. If the learners cannot recognize the nature of the feedback there is little value in that feedback because it will not serve to promote the
noticing needed to promote language development. These learners were less aware of the instructor’s feedback overall and there is explicit evidence that they did not perceive her contributions to be much more than conversational turns at times. Once more, it is important to emphasize that there were instances in which it is unclear whether or not the learners perceived the instructor’s feedback as such: on the one hand there was evidence of C-R in the SCMC environment for the MF group, but on the other hand it was shown that this group was indeed more meaning focused than form focused. Clearly, student-sensitivity to feedback is beneficial and it is possible that some of the “uncertain” cases in both groups reveal instances in which learners noticed the feedback, at least, but failed to publish a reply because the social dynamic and conversational flow did not call for it, at most. When taking in to account the fact that §13 group was more meaning focused than form focused, and upon consideration of the instances where students undoubtedly failed to recognize the instructor’s feedback, it is unlikely that the corrective measures were as effective as they could be had this group explicitly focused on form and meaning.

It is also important to note that while the instructor did engage in the same corrective strategies and equal quantities of corrections in both FFMF and MF groups, she published 77 more turns in the MF discussions. One reason for this could be a result of the social dynamic that surfaced in this group. The group was very likely to engage in language play with and teasing of one another, and there were more instances of English throughout each chat session. In response, the instructor assumed more of a participatory role; she made efforts to keep the learners on task, and to facilitate the discussion. She also expressed her own opinion at times, which was a personal element that she did not share with the FFMF group. Another reason she may have made more participatory contributions was because she did not need to tend to so many aspects of this group’s productions; alleviating some of her responsibilities and allowing her to engage herself socially, at least a bit. A final explanation may be that while this instructor valued a balance between communicative capabilities and grammatical skill, she was trained under a system which emphasized communicative competence and placed little value on grammar. Instructors under this program were not permitted to formally address grammar in the classroom, were not permitted to introduce supplementary grammar
exercises beyond those presented in the text book, and were discouraged from correcting students’ grammatical production (except when reviewing the text book exercises). Given that this instructor’s methodological, pedagogical, and theoretical training took place under a program with such a framework, it is quite possible that her practices in the chat sessions were heavily influenced by the program’s framework.

6.2.2 SS Feedback

By far, the most common peer-to-peer feedback strategy was clarification requests. Students did not hesitate to clarify communicative difficulties regarding meaning and content and their exchanges were as brief or as extensive as needed to satisfy communicative needs. In the process of satisfying communicative needs it was not uncommon for the participants to code-switch to the L1 to fill in the needed form and continue on with the conversation.

This group also engaged in orthographic correction. While only seven instances of orthographic correction surfaced, with each instance being self-correction, this is an indication that the MF group was sensitive to form. The samples demonstrating orthographic correction reveal that the learners were examining their postings upon publication, and thus were reflecting on their production in the midst of communication. Other indications of attention to form surfaced in the fact that students generated instances of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback. Interestingly, three out of five of the explicit corrections and three out of four of the metalinguistic feedback samples involved *por/para, ser/estar* and in one of the peer-to-peer corrections a student used capital letters to make the correction more salient. One final indication that MF learners were not oblivious to form in the SCMC environment was the implementation of written accents; students either discovered how to obtain the accented characters or they wrote the accents alongside the appropriate vowel.

In general, the peer-to-peer dynamic that surfaced in this group in terms of structured feedback was minimal. Students relied on clarification requests to explore the discussion topics for deeper meaning. In this quest, they did not ignore form, however.
6.2.3 Syntactic Maturity

Leow (2000) reported that learners who demonstrated a higher level of awareness performed significantly better than those with a lower level of awareness when tested on written and recognition-based follow up protocols. This observation holds true for the MF group because although this group may not have ignored form, their transcripts reveal their primary focus to be on meaning. The dialogic nature of the SCMC environment without a specific requirement to focus on form in addition to meaning resulted in many single-word utterances aimed at either agreeing, disagreeing, or carrying the conversation to the next level. Without a focus on form, these utterances were syntactically weak because they did not consist of a main clause, and subordinate clauses and modifiers were missing in favor of single-word utterances. When students were free to make conversation in the SCMC environment they did rely on the text-based medium to facilitate the conversational flow, and did not ignore the syntax. However, since the instances of syntactical focus were inconsistent and corrective measures were not overtly responded to overall it is unlikely that such a dynamic would be as conducive to grammatical development as an environment which required deliberate focus on form.

The data reveal that this group employed ser as the default L2 ‘to be’ form. The group published less material quantitatively, qualitatively their work was less accurate, and post test scores demonstrate that this group experienced a negative gain on the GPC. Learners in the MF group employed the third person singular and plural as the standard form for expressing ‘to be.’ This is evident in the data where errors of subject-verb agreement reveal that this group correlated es and son with ‘is’ and ‘are’ regardless of context. When estar, additional expressions and ser/estar + meaning changing adjectives were examined, it was clear that participants were inserting ser in these contexts as well. The data reveal that MF §3’s errors regarding por/para derived from substitution of one preposition over the other.
The data reveal that when learners conversed in the SCMC environment the text-based medium served to raise consciousness structurally, but the instances were inconsistent and subsequently were insufficient to stimulate development syntactically.

6.2.4 Lexical Density

In terms of lexical density, the MF group did not outperform the FFMF group. Given that the MF group carried a lighter cognitive load it is interesting that their semantic range was equal to that of the FFMF group, statistically. While students did engage in a search for deeper meaning and understanding in an attempt to achieve a comprehensive and in depth analysis of the course readings, their language was no more diverse that that of the FFMF group. This may be due, in part, to the nature of the SCMC environment. While it is not equivalent to the face-to-face environment, the language that tends to surface in SCMC is conversational in nature and the exchanges reflect this. In informal speech, sophisticated, elaborate expressions are exchanged for straightforward and uncomplicated terminology, i.e., elaborate expressions are exchanged for the most precise word which clearly portrays the intended message quickly, efficiently and effectively. In their pursuit to maintain conversational flow in the SCMC environment, it is plausible that less variety is the most economical, unless learners are specifically requested to focus on lexical development. Equal levels of lexical density among the two chat groups may also be attributable to the fact that these learners are still novices with limited vocabularies. Before reaching this level their reading assignments, communicative demands, and writing requirements were prescriptive, controlled activities. At Level III the nature of these activities moved from guided to more open-ended, and thus were initiating learners into an environment that demanded greater student-generated production and control over communication. The chat sessions were free-practice exercises which called on the students to be the producers of the language and demanded that they be in charge of the conversation. Given that this was one of the least controlled learning environments they had experienced, i.e., the activity in which the
students were obliged to exercise the most control, they relied on their existing, limited, knowledge and L2 resources when experimenting with this new communicative medium. Furthermore, the MF group was more likely than the FFMF group to code-switch and was less likely to engage in circumlocution to avoid publishing L2 forms. Thus, the goal to communicate may have superceded the goal to build a stronger vocabulary in the L2. It follows that, equal levels of lexical density among the two chat groups may also be attributable to social dynamic that developed in the chat forums, respectively. That is, the FFMF group was focused on form and individuals were placing their energy into self-correction and peer-to-peer correction, which may have impacted their ability to also focus on the lexicon, although equality with the MF group indicates that the cognitive demands did not negatively impact lexical density levels. The social dynamic which surfaced in the MF group was a bit fiery. These students were inclined to criticize another; which suggests that when there is not a specific focus, i.e., a focus beyond mere communication, the participants may channel their energy socially, and flaming, the prevalence of hostile language (Warschauer, 1997a), may be more likely to arise.

### 6.2.5 Task Focus

MF §13 tended to be mischievous, informal, and lackadaisical with one another during chat sessions. First, their conversations were marked by joking and they demonstrated a drive to express paralinguistic cues. Emoticons and typographic characters aimed at emotional expression and reaction to a posting were common. This group was likely to insert L1 forms in the midst of communication in preference to taking the time to engage in circumlocution and/or description of an L2 term for which they lacked knowledge. Secondly, students did not engage in the corrective strategies that characterized the FFMF group. They did engage in self-correction in the form of correcting orthographic errors, and a few instances of peer-to-peer correction surfaced in terms of explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback, however the overall corrective dynamic was not the norm that developed for this group. Instead, their focus came to be
exploration of the discussion topics for deeper understanding. Giving students the freedom to take the floor and collaborate in a student-lead discussion did contribute to a learner-centered environment, but it also contributed to an environment of interpersonal conflict where learners ridiculed one another, mocked one another and targeted the students whom they perceived to be weak. In fact, when questioned about how a participant incorporated written accents into the chat client, the participant did not share the skill, but rather replied that it was a secret. Thirdly, the exploration of the discussion topics in the chat forum provided an informal atmosphere characterized by joking and language play. While students did ridicule one another, they also engaged in constructive joking and play. Finally, although it is clear that this group’s primary focus was on meaning, the researcher is careful not to depict it as devoid of structural focus. This group was informal, mischievous and playful, but they did stop to address form in the midst of conversation on a number of occasions and they generated written accents off and on throughout the chat sessions. What’s more, their play with language may have served to demonstrate that as they used language to communicate, that they could manipulate it for their purpose. Such manipulation could potentially contribute to grammatical development, and the researcher speculates that it is unlikely that this sort of language play would surface in face-to-face exchanges. While the potential that language play in SCMC holds as a facilitator of grammatical development is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is an interesting finding which deserves future attention.

6.2.6 Conclusion: Question Two

It has been established that this group was a playful and mischievous group who did indeed focus on meaning. The data demonstrate that this group demonstrated equal levels of lexical density, statistically, as the FFMF group, but produced fewer samples of por/para, ser/estar. The data show that the samples they did produce were not as accurate as the FFMF group, and on a global scale, this group was less syntactically complex. The data also reveal that this group employed ser as the default ‘to be’
expression. Since the main focus for the group was on meaning, a *ser* default is not unexpected because with a conversational focus, students from the same L2 background may overlook such errors in favor of maintaining conversational flow. On the other hand, the data also show that MF participants did not ignore form. Instances of language play, metalinguistic comments and inquiries, instances of explicit correction, frequent requests for help, and the incorporation of written accents all reveal that students did tend to form in the SCMC environment. For these reasons, it is concluded that while the lack of focusing on *por/para, ser/estar* did not hinder the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester, that incidental focus on form was insufficient to facilitate development of those forms. The text based medium heightened the participants awareness to form in general, and this group did single out *por/para, ser/estar*, but the absence of grammatical consciousness-raising generated an informal environment characterized by conversational strategies (emoticons, clarification requests, code-switching), self-correction (orthographic errors), and interpersonal conflict (bullying, name calling, belittling) where participants ignored each others errors, especially morphosyntactical errors, in favor of communication.
6.3 Question Three
What role did consciousness-raising play in participant development?

Students in the FFMF group were given the task of grammatical consciousness-raising for the L2 forms *por/para, ser/estar*. First, they reviewed pre-chat questions aimed at raising their consciousness to the L2 forms through language samples, thematically related to the course material, which contained the forms in context. Next, they were held responsible for their own grammatical consciousness-raising in the chat forum. Participants were instructed to pay attention to their own and their peer’s production of the forms. The social dynamic that surfaced speaks to the role that consciousness-raising played in the participants’ development.

The social dynamic that surfaced in the FFMF group was serious. While the students were good humored, funny, and engaged in language play, they were a serious group set to the task. They did not stray from discussing the chat questions and they maintained focus on the topic at hand. The attentiveness of this group to the task demands resulted in a peer-to-peer dynamic in which explicit SS correction was regular practice. This is important because as Moris and Tarone (2003) point out, the social dynamic that emerges in the classroom can either inhibit or promote development. In the case of the FFMF group, these participants did not view explicit correction as a threatening, aggressive move. Quite the contrary, they developed a system of marking their corrections for salience as a means by which to clarify the nature of the correction and assist fellow participants. The participants also self-corrected. Self-corrections surfaced as orthographic corrections and either served as a personal corrective measure, a measure to assist other participants in reading the dialogue, or both. Self correction demonstrated that students were reviewing their work, while peer corrections revealed that students were engaged and attentive to their peer’s work. Such interactions generated an atmosphere of cordiality, cooperation and mutual respect. When learners were responsible for their own grammatical consciousness-raising, such was the result. This established dynamic positively impacted participant development and is a symbol of the potential relevance and influence of learner consciousness-raising.
In contrast, the social dynamic that surfaced in the MF group was informal. Students did incidentally focus on grammar and they did display a limited number of peer-to-peer and self correction, but overall their attitudes toward one another generated an atmosphere of interpersonal conflict. While they did address the chat questions, they also wandered off task and joked about the contributions of their peers. The absence of grammatical consciousness-raising lightened the cognitive load to the extent that participants channeled their energy into teasing, playing around, and casual exchanges. This is important because the potential to inhibit development was present. The MF group did recognize and respond to peer-aggression, and the stress that it caused was evident in the brief, yet very incorrect responses that followed as the participants made efforts to defend themselves and to post their response quickly. The impact of the lack of grammatical consciousness-raising is such that in its absence learners channeled their energy unconstructively when compared to the FFM group.

Levels of awareness also affected the peer-to-peer dynamic in the SCMC environment. When faced with the same instructor-to-student corrective practices the participants’ levels of awareness were connected to their communication strategies and their corrective strategies. In the absence of much instructor-to-student corrective feedback, the FFMF group, in response to the task of grammatical consciousness-raising, took charge of generating the corrective measures in the chat forum. They preferred to be direct and explicit and incorporated saliency devices to ensure peer-recognition of the feedback. Furthermore, it is likely that this overlying awareness to form and the subsequent expectations behind peer-to-peer and instructor-to-student feedback contributed to recognition, and perhaps detection (whether followed by immediate acknowledgement or output) of the nature of the feedback. Moreover, the fact that these students were aware that both the instructor and their peers may be offering corrective feedback in any given posting put students in the mindset that each line published would be constructive grammatically and/or thematically, and were therefore fishing for such information. On the other hand, the absence of awareness on behalf of the MF students generated an environment where the usual interactions were characterized by communicative exchanges. When participants needed to clarify meaning or content their
most common strategy consisted of requesting clarification. This is a communicative strategy, and reveals a communicative rather than grammatical, focus. While there were instances of correction and grammatical awareness, they were few. For this group, the bulk of the instructor’s feedback was most likely unrecognized, or at unacknowledged in terms of output, and even if the students had adopted peer-to-peer correction as a feedback strategy similar to that of the FFMF group the social dynamic could have interfered with the process. Negative gain on the GPC and statistical differences in favor of the FFMF group for the GPC and EI/SRT posttests further confirm this. Thus, when students were not responsible for grammatical consciousness-raising and were relatively unaware about grammatical form, the environment was a heavily social environment in which errors were ignored in favor of communication.

In terms of communicative strategies, the MF group demonstrated more compensatory and communicative creativity. That is, this group was very likely to: translate lyrics and begin to sing in the middle of the chat; to incorporate emoticons to either facilitate, exaggerate, or underscore their message, attitude, or viewpoint; to resort to the L1 when they doubted or lacked the ability to express themselves in the L2; to code-switch when they could not find the accurate word in the L2 or when thinking of the word risked interrupting the communicative flow. The FFMF group did not engage in such compensatory measures to the same degree as the MF group because in place of code-switching or resorting to English FFMF participants engaged in circumlocution and L2 description to express themselves. While they did ask for L2 equivalents at times, they were much more inclined to rely on the L2 over resorting to the L1.

Finally, grammatical consciousness-raising, or lack there of, was influenced by the chat medium. The MF group’s consciousness was raised in the chat forum as they were able to view the postings and reflect on what had been published. C-R is evident in the fact that these students corrected for orthography (self-correction), and because there were a few instances where they did correct one another (peer-to-peer). Because their consciousness had not been raised to grammar it is reasonable to conclude that the text-based environment influenced these instances of form focused attention. Furthermore, the researcher speculates that the language play that surfaced is more suited to this
environment than other student-centered environments because in written form it may be possible that the participants can maintain language play for as longer periods of time without being socially inappropriate or suffering reprimand, and more participants can partake in the language game than could in the traditional classroom setting. While language play in SCMC environments merits research, if more learners could engage in language play and it would be socially acceptable to do so, such a dynamic would provide strong evidence for the utility of chat in grammatical development, perhaps even in the absence of C-R.

The FFMF group’s consciousness was also raised by the chat forum. That is, in the task of raising one’s own consciousness participants were able to focus on ser/estar because engaging in grammatical consciousness-raising in an environment which has already been shown to raise consciousness to form facilitated in the development of the FFMF participants. Learners corrected themselves and others quite frequently in the chat forum and it is likely that the SCMC environment facilitated this because it gave students the opportunity and the time to evaluate their own and other’s productions. However, raising consciousness to grammar in the text-based medium also resulted in C-R on an amplified scale; participants did not limit the scope of their focus to por/para, ser/estar only. What resulted was that the learners could, and did, focus on ser/estar and broadened their scope from there. As their scope became more and more amplified to a variety of grammatical contexts por/para benefited even though there is no direct evidence that they received specific attention. Similarly, it is plausible that the drive to communicate influenced their choice of corrective measures. The most efficient, effective means of correction was the most explicit because when faced with the demand of focusing on meaning and form it is the corrective measure least likely to be confused as content-based. With the demand to pay attention to both form and meaning, such a strategy is resourceful because it clearly distinguished a content error from a morphosyntactic error, and thereby provided valuable feedback on grammatical errors without interrupting the conversational flow. Thus, the SCMC environment shaped the nature of the consciousness-raising that surfaced and consciousness-raising shaped the dynamic of the exchanges in the SCMC forum.
Hence, grammatical consciousness-raising served to raise students’ awareness of grammatical form, it resulted in self correction and constructive peer-to-peer correction, positively impacted the peer-to-peer dynamic as collaborators in each other’s learning, encouraged learners to stay on task, and discouraged reliance on the L1. Overall, it served as a tool which facilitated grammatical development in the SCMC forum. In the case of the MF group, the SCMC environment was fundamental to grammatical C-R, while in the FFMF group it served as another factor to support grammatical C-R.

At this point it is important to address C-R from a pedagogical perspective also. Recall that an interesting element that surfaced in this data set was the instructor’s feedback practices. As she was unaccustomed to grammatical correction in the midst of communication and has been trained under a system which frowned upon grammar, she did not (or was unable to) engage in the corrective strategies available to her and ended up treating both groups equally. In their respective environments the learners responded to this quite differently. These distinct reactions speak to student task orientation. Within a given framework and in relation to the task at hand two very different outcomes were generated. The ultimate outcome reflected the nature of the different tasks. A number of goals may be met in the SCMC environment. When C-R is introduced, the potential is amplified to include grammatical development, reflection on form, corrective strategies and both FFMF and FF engagement. The pedagogical implications are great because the desired outcome greatly influences the manner in which SCMC, with or without C-R, would be introduced into the language learning environment.

An inseparable element that goes with task-orientation and learning environment is student engagement. The data from this study revealed that some participants engaged in a type of private speech, i.e. publications which were clearly personal comments, rhetorical in nature, but published within the social arena nonetheless. This begs the questions as to whether such a student is engaged in the act by the mere fact that he may have put effort into his “personal” statement before posting it publically. However, it may also be possible that such a posting may only represent “forced participation” where a student “participates” only to establish himself in the forum with the purpose of establishing a history of participation, albeit limited in nature, in order to accumulate
points for a participation grade. While such an individual may not truly be engaged, similar circumstances may arise for an individual who publishes constantly. If a person publishes for the sake of publishing with little regard for the ensuing conversation, that publication may contribute little to the session and the individual may not truly benefit from the exchange. On the contrary, a person with few publications may be actively engaged in the forum through full attention to peer publications, by reading and re-reading the exchanges, but may be very calculated in what he chooses to publish, and particular about his contribution. Thus, identifying what does and does not constitute participation must be addressed. These possibilities are representative of the realities of SCMC and deserve consideration in terms of assessment. Furthermore, the FFMF group clearly demonstrated that it stayed on task while the MF group focuses and strays. Assessing participation in these two environments would necessitate different evaluation standards. Thus, with each task a different outcome may result and instructors must not only take task orientation and environment into consideration; they must not neglect the manner in which the students are assessed within in each orientation.

In a similar vein, this data set has demonstrated the potential for grammatical development that C-R holds in SCMC environments. Implementing C-R activities in SCMC at earlier stages of development may be advantageous, as would its implementation into small-group chats. On the other hand, it may not be possible to “switch off” C-R once it is initiated. The FFMF group in this study did not limit its focus to por/ para or ser/estar alone, so whether or not a group would be able to switch back and forth between MF and FFMF work in SCMC would have implication for task orientation, assessment, and development. Whereas SCMC as a tool for communicative development has its value, and whereas the introduction of C-R in SCMC has demonstrated its potential, the choice to implement SCMC, and the manner in which it would be implemented, has implications for curricular structures as a whole. If learners cannot “switch off” C-R in SCMC the impact of early implementation on development must be considered. If grammatical development proves to be accelerated by this process it would be worthwhile to introduce SCMC before level three with the idea that learners will develop communicative fluency, and perhaps expand their lexical repertoire at later
stages of development when they have a stronger grammatical foundation and the skills to focus on semantics and the like.

6.4 Main Question

The main question to be addressed is whether raising learners’ consciousness on *por/para*, and *ser/estar* in synchronous, computer mediated communication based conferencing fosters the development of those grammatical features to a greater degree than SCMC without consciousness-raising.

Weighing the utility of grammatical C-R in face-to-face discussions against grammatical C-R in the chat forum, and meaning-focused work in the chat room requires further investigation. The researcher is unable to make claims on the equality, superiority, or inferiority of grammatical C-R in the face-to-face group in comparison to the chat groups due to the regrettable lack of data on the instructor-to-student and student-to-student feedback practices. Furthermore, the absence of the data that would bring the face-to-face practices in support or contradiction of consciousness-raising to light renders the researcher incapable of judging both intra- and inter-group practices. In consequence, the inability to gather data on the FFMF, face-to-face section precludes an analysis. While it remains to be seen how SCMC with and without C-R compare to face-to-face dialogue with C-R, this study can contest to the development of *por/para*, *ser/estar* in the presence and absence of grammatical C-R, for this population, in the SCMC forum. The text based communicative environment of SCMC proved to yield the same benefits as previous studies; it is a learner-centered environment whose text-based medium encourages reflection, facilitates output, and promotes interaction. In this study, the text-based environment raised consciousness to form for the MF group to some extent at least. There were instances of morphosyntactic inquiry, self-correction, language play, and, while minimal, there were instances of peer-to-peer correction. Thus, the nature of the SCMC environment proved to encourage grammatical consciousness-raising in the midst of a group whose primary focus was communicative. In spite of this
heightened awareness, inconsistent attention to form was not as powerful as deliberate attention. The result of introducing grammatical C-R was the development of a social dynamic in which students took control of the corrective measures in the form of peer-to-peer feedback and self-correction. They developed error-marking strategies to unequivocally demonstrate the nature of the feedback in order to tend to both form and meaning in this quick-paced, highly communicative environment. Furthermore, the introduction of grammatical C-R resulted in the inability of the FFMF group to limit its focus to *por/para, ser/estar* alone. Instead, they employed an amplified approach to paying attention to grammar under which there is 1) direct and indirect evidence in support that *ser/estar* were positively impacted, and 2) indirect evidence that *por/para* was positively impacted.

Upon consideration of the IS and SS feedback practices, the group dynamics that surfaced, the levels of syntactic maturity and lexical density, and the resultant focus of each group, it is concluded that the affordance of raising learners’ consciousness on *por/para, and ser/estar* in synchronous, computer mediated communication based conferencing most likely fostered the development of those grammatical features to a greater degree than in chat without specific instructions to focus on form. Again, whether or not face-to-face interaction with consciousness-raising in the traditional classroom is comparable to the awareness that surfaced in both SCMC environments warrants further investigation.
Chapter 7
Conclusion

This chapter opens with an overview of the study, addresses the applied methodology, reviews the participant characteristics, reexamines the findings, summarizes the conclusions, addresses weakness, and presents ideas for future investigation.

7.1 Study Overview

Studies on SCMC have yet to reach agreement as to whether or not this medium is a tool that facilitates grammatical development. Contributions to this specific topic include Blake (2000), Lee (2000) and Sotillo (2000), who address development in terms of negotiation, and Pelletieri (2000), Kern (1995), and Salaberry (2000) who examine syntactical development specifically. While each study concurs that there are benefits to this medium, Blake, Kern, Lee, and Sotillo agree that incidental attention to form in a highly communicative environment like SCMC is insufficient to promote grammatical development. The purpose of this study was to bridge that gap and introduce measures in which grammatical focus would be deliberate.

The study set out to examine whether or not grammatical consciousness-raising in computer mediated communication based conferencing fosters the development of L2 forms por/para, ser/estar to a greater degree than either SCMC conferencing without C-R or face-to-face classroom discussions with C-R. The lack of data on the face-to-face exchanges required the researcher to limit the investigation to the chat sessions only. The original question set included the following questions: 1) Does the affordance of focusing on por/para, ser/estar assist in the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the form-and-meaning-focused groups, i.e., the groups that engage in consciousness-raising in terms of those forms?, 2) Does the lack of focusing on por/para, ser/estar hinder the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the
meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the group that does not engage in consciousness-raising?, and 3) What role did consciousness-raising play in participant development? The adjusted set considered the following: 1) Does the affordance of focusing on *por/para, ser/estar* assist in the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the form-and-meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the chat group that engaged in consciousness-raising in terms of those forms?, 2) Does the lack of focusing on *por/para, ser/estar* hinder the emergence of these structures over the course of the semester for the meaning-focused chat group, i.e., the group that does not engage in consciousness-raising?, and 3) What role did consciousness-raising play in participant development?

### 7.2 Review of the Procedures

Three groups were designated for the study. Two sections were designated to chat with one section, §3, as form-and-meaning focused and the other as meaning-focused only, §13. A third group, §2, was designated as a form-and-meaning focused group which engaged in face-to-face discussions in the traditional classroom setting. All form-and-meaning participants were instructed to concentrate on form so as to better express meaning. They were informed that the course instructor would be tending to their grammatical productions and would be correcting them in one manner or another. MF participants were only requested to pay attention to meaning and content, and were encouraged to explore the chat topics for deeper significance and analysis. Discussions were held weekly.

In order to assess the participants performance, pre- and post-tests were generated and administered: EI/SRT (elicited imitation, sentence repetition testing), GPC (grammaticality preference component), and Oral examinations. A preliminary form of the EI/SRT was generated and pilot tested. All statements were thematically related to the course text-book; all statements were reviewed by the native-speaker instructor, and were tested by Spanish speakers for naturalness of speed. Student volunteers reported to
the computer lab to test this version of the test. They were recorded, their results tallied, the discrimination and difficulty indices were calculated, and the final sentences were chosen. Sentences were arranged according to difficulty level in the order of easiest to most difficult, followed by sentence length. The final version of the forms was administered at the start and finish of the semester. Oral exams were also held at the onset and finish of the semester. All topics were assigned by the course instructor and were thematically related to the course material. All sections were held to the same standards (accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) and were given the same exam topics. Finally, the GPC required students to select their preference from among a choice of two phrases, with a total of 55 questions, which contained samples of *por/para* and *ser/estar* and distracters. All sentences were reviewed by the course instructor for authenticity and accuracy, and then again for generating the answer key. This component was also distributed at the beginning and end of the term.

In addition to the pre- and post-test development, other administrational measures were required. First, pre-chat / pre-discussion questions and chat questions were written. The pre-chat/discussion questions served to raise grammatical consciousness in preparation for the FFMF discussion. The chat questions were the topic of discussion for all three sections that originally participated in the study. Second, student and instructor manuals were organized so that students understood the study and their role in it, as well as the preliminary and week-to-week procedures. Finally, grammar handbooks for the form-and-meaning focused groups were prepared, background and exit questionnaires were developed, Blackboard course sites were established, chat user accounts were created, and instructor training sessions were held.

### 7.3 Review of the Participants

The participants were all between the ages of 19-25 and either tested into or were passed on to Level III through Florida State University’s Basic Spanish instructors. The instructor was a native speaker of Spanish and with four years experience at FSU.
7.4 Review of the Data

First, descriptive statistics were run on the results of the pre-tests of the chat groups to examine the characteristics of each group. Recall that the absence of the needed data for the face-to-face discussions needed to be accounted for and subsequently this group was removed from consideration. The researcher was unable to obtain the necessary recording devices to document the students’ performance during their face-to-face discussion. The data which would reveal the face-to-face practices in support or contradiction of consciousness-raising leaves the researcher without the needed information to make judgments about intra-group practices let alone inter-group practices. Furthermore, the lack of data reflecting the instructor-to-student and student-to-student feedback practices also makes cross-comparison impossible. As the data which would speak to C-R in the face-to-face group was missing the consequence was that determining whether or not consciousness-raising assisted in the grammatical development for the face-to-face group is inconclusive, and whether or not consciousness-raising in the face-to-face environment is superior, inferior, or equal to C-R in SCMC or SCMC without C-R demands further investigation. Accordingly, t-Tests independent samples were run for §3 and §13 to establish homogeneity, and the results also confirmed homogeneity for the EI/SRT (t (37, 39) = 2.010, p = 0.052), GPC (t (37, 39) = 1.095, p = 0.281), and Oral (t (37, 39) = -0.021, p = 0.983).

T-Tests for independent samples were run again for the post tests on the data for FFMF and MF chat groups. The results, indicated that there were no differences in the Oral exam scores (t (35.61, 39) = 1.518, p = 0.138), but that there were differences in terms of their performance on the EI/SRT (t (37, 39) = 2.241, p = 0.031) and GPC (t (26.02, 39) = 2.095, p = 0.046) in favor of the FFMF group.

Chat transcripts were examined next and it was determined that the FFMF group generated greater quality and quantity of language in terms of por/para, ser/estar. It demonstrated higher levels of syntactic maturity as established on a Mann-Whitney statistical analysis on the t-units, along with equal levels of lexical density to MF §13. Furthermore, this group was a serious and focused group who did not stray from the task,
and who adopted corrective feedback strategies. The MF group produced less language than the FFMF group and of they language they produced this groups was less accurate in terms of *por/para, ser/estar*. This group was primarily meaning focused, and they did pay attention to form. The participants in this group did not engage in the corrective strategies to the same extent as the FFMF group, but instances of peer-to-peer correction did surface, as did inquiries about grammatical structures. Finally, it was determined that both groups received equal treatment in terms of instructor-to-student corrective feedback.

### 7.5 Summary of the Conclusions

The responsibility of the FFMF group to raise its own grammatical consciousness resulted in consciousness-raising on an amplified scale; students were didn’t limit the scope of their focus to *por/para, ser/estar* alone. Overt evidence reveals that they did focus on *ser/estar* but there is no such evidence for *por/para*. Nevertheless, the global approach to C-R assumed by the FFMF positively impacted the development of *por/para*. In terms of the MF group, it is concluded that whereas the lack of focusing on *por/para*, *ser/estar* did not impede development, occasional focus on form was insufficient to facilitate growth to the same degree as deliberate focus. SCMC heightened the participants awareness to form but the absence of grammatical consciousness-raising generated an informal environment characterized by conversational tendencies.

It is concluded that grammatical consciousness-raising facilitated grammatical development in the SCMC forum. SCMC served to heighten awareness to form and prompted self-correction and reflection. In the case of the MF group, the SCMC environment was fundamental to grammatical C-R, while in the FFMF group it served as another factor that facilitated grammatical C-R.
7.6 Limitations

While research on deliberate, focused attention to the L2 in the SCMC environment makes its contribution to the field of applied linguistics in and of itself, a significant limitation of this study is the absence of data on the face-to-face exchanges of FFMF §2. Section 2’s data would reveal the consciousness-raising practices that surfaced in the small-group work. Establishing whether or not they engaged in grammatical consciousness-raising and what the nature of their exchanges may have been like would have provided important information for the overall implications of this study. The quantity and quality of the language produced would have served as a basis of comparison for evaluating the utility of C-R in this medium versus the chat medium. That is, if form is tended to, higher levels of accurate productions and more sophisticated language is expected. Likewise, if meaning is selected for attention, a greater semantic range is expected. The data reveal that FFMF §3 demonstrated higher levels of syntactic maturity, and that those same participants demonstrated equal levels of lexical density, statistically, as the MF group even though §3 had a dual-focus with which to contend. Should SCMC interactions prove that learners can sustain focus on both meaning and form in this environment, but not the face-to-face environment, a strong case will be made for the magnitude of chat in L2 development. The ability to sustain focus on both form and meaning in face-to-face versus SCMC environments warrants investigation.

In addition, the data in §2 would have shed light on both student-to-student and instructor-to-student feedback practices that surfaced for C-R in this environment to offer a basis of comparison among the three possible classroom methodologies. Knowing the social make up that resulted from C-R in face-to-face group work may have either strengthened or weakened the case for work in SCMC environments and would have provided valuable insight as well. Thus, whether or not face-to-face interaction with consciousness-raising in the traditional classroom is comparable to the awareness that surfaced in both SCMC environments warrants further investigation.

A second limitation to the study pertains to the oral exams. While students were all held to the same standards, had to fulfill the same requirements, and were evaluated
on the same scale, the exams did not explicitly measure productions of *por/para*, *ser/estar*, but rather measured speaking proficiency as a whole. Firstly, it is unlikely that all of the forms would have surfaced with equal frequency in natural speech, and it would be difficult to prompt their production without revealing the intentions of the instructor, at least for the MF group. Secondly, unless the exams were spontaneous productions of language in the form of interviews, it would be difficult to prevent pre-examination preparation that could skew the results. Even preparation for an “on-the-fly” interview may contain residual elements of features residing in short-term memory reflective of student preparation. While oral exams were meant to serve as an independent measure of language proficiency, as opposed to as a calibration standard for evaluating the EI/SRT results, their results were not calculated with specific regard to *por/para, ser/estar* and therefore are not representative of student’s oral performance on those forms. Examination of oral performance must scrutinize the specific L2 forms in future studies in order to gauge the impact that SCMC may have on oral production in C-R and nonconsciousness-raising groups.

Small sample size is a third limitation. While the matriculation numbers represent the typical classroom size of a state school, the total number of participants is still small. In addition, the study was run over a single semester. Studies which track development of the forms over a longer period of time would be worthwhile, although operationalization of such an investigation would introduce a variety of variables not present in this study that may skew the results. A constraint of the chat client is that Web 4-M does not time-stamp its publications. The ability to scrutinize publications in accordance with the velocity at which they are posted would reveal a great deal of information behind chat-room dynamics. Measuring the pauses, and the delays, and the reaction and the feedback times would reveal the rate at which processing occurs before participants are responsive. Calculating reaction time to feedback, for example, over the course of the semester for a given grammatical feature to determine uptake and output rates could supplement observations made on participant behaviors for future studies.

Finally, technical difficulties attributed to the inability to track individual behavior across the semester. Whenever there were log-in problems the instructor relied
on a reserve of established pseudonyms to quickly log the students into the forum and get them chatting. Furthermore, if a student had trouble connecting initially and subsequently got “kicked off” of the forum, she would attempt to connect with the established pseudonym, the replacement, or another nickname accepted by the chat program. As a result, students were able to get into the chat forum, but the researcher was unable to trace individual habits throughout the semester.

7.7 Suggestions for Future Research

This study offers evidence as to the positive potential that SCMC environments have in the development of grammatical competence when participants engage in grammatical consciousness-raising. The study deserves repetition so as to compare the results from a number of groups at a number of institutions (private, state, community college) in order to evaluate learner development at this level and within a variety of academic cultures so as witness consistency or inconsistency in the results with the end goal of making definitive claims applicable to the development of ser/estar, por/para, as well as other grammatical features, under C-R and SCMC. Suggestions for change to the current structure include: 1) digital recordings of individual participants, 2) oral exams must focus on por/para, ser/estar, 3) holding chats on a software program capable of time stamping publications, 4) relying on a chat program that can track participants according to an identification number so that individuals can be tracked regardless of the pseudonym assumed, 5) the introduction of a fourth group, 6) post chat, post discussion reflective protocols, 7) personality tests, and 8) working memory measures. In order to ensure the integrity of all data, individual recording devices are needed for each face-to-face participant. This will allow for a meticulous review of the individual’s participation and his utterances, and will offer a thorough examination of the group dynamics. The instructor must also have her own recording device so that her contribution can be clearly recorded as well. Furthermore, the sessions should be video-taped for organizational purposes and back-up support. Oral exams supplement the EI/SRT, GPC and chatscripts
and are an important component in establishing the overall proficiency of the participants. Oral exams must test specifically for *por/para, ser/estar* and should therefore be conducted in the form of individual or paired, spontaneous-production interviews. Orals should be recorded and scrutinized by the instructor and another rater for reliability, and an immediate post-test interview soliciting the students reflections on their focus during the oral exam should be conducted and recorded for assistance in the study’s analysis. Care must be taken to ensure that the oral exams are not compromised in terms of their natural quality. In order to achieve this, it may be necessary to carry out a number of oral exams throughout the semester. Also, more frequent oral examination may be what is necessary to obtain natural productions of the L2 features being examined. Results of such restructuring would contribute to the body of literature already dedicated to the impact of SCMC on oral production, and could serve as the basis for future work on the relationship between SCMC production and oral production. The chat client should have the capability to time-stamp student publications and track students regardless of the chosen pseudonym. Time-stamping would allow the researcher to identify the lag time between corrective feedback and a response, between an erroneous production and correction time, between a comment and subsequent replies, between a publication and self-correction, and much more. Evaluating reaction times for a given feature of the course of the study may offer evidence of development if the reaction decreases over the course of the study, and may offer insight as to the time spent on grammatical focus in general. Likewise, the ability to track individuals would allow the researcher to determine individual patterns which may positively and negatively impact the chat dynamic and the learning environment, and would allow both group and individual conclusions to be drawn. The option of changing one’s nickname is also important because the lack of familiarity with a “character” would disrupt the establishment of a negative social dynamic since no one would be able to tell who logged on as whom for any given chat. Also, it would be worthwhile to add a fourth group to the investigation. A fourth group which would engage in meaning-focused face-to-face discussions would balance the study in terms of variable isolation and would help to draw conclusions which may be applicable to the language-learning population at large in
terms of the utility of C-R in the SCMC environment. Of course, all face-to-face dialogues must also be digitally recorded, transcribed, and analyzed to provide evidence of focus on form, and focus on meaning, respectively, and the nature of the exchanges resultant from such groupings. It would be well to incorporate post-chat, post-discussion reflective protocols in order to gain insight on the underlying awareness and focus of the participants. Assessing participant’s personality traits through personality tests may further assist in data interpretation and perhaps shed light on the social dynamic that may surface, or not, for a given task, focus, and learning environment. Finally, implementation of and L1 test for working memory could serve as a calibration standard by which to evaluate and interpret EI/SRT L2 results in the face of small participant populations, as was found in this study and which is typical in L2 classrooms.

This study also brings to light a number of findings that merit further investigation. First, both groups focused on form to some degree, respectively. Since the MF group did not ignore form, future studies should investigate how to nurture this tendency so as to take full advantage of form when it does surface in this environment. Investigating language play may be a starting point. Both groups engaged in language play, but more instances of play surfaced in the MF group. This group was more likely to sing songs in Spanish or to translate songs into Spanish during chat sessions; they assumed the identities of their pseudonyms and attempted to contribute to the discussion accordingly; and sought to express paralinguistic cues frequently. Such was not the case in the FFMF group, whose most evident sample of language play came in the form of a word play (Freud / fraud) and rhyming (…es loco un poco, pero no fraude), and for whom “playing” was making a joke or humorous comment. If this environment encourages language play, it would be important to examine when, where and why it is likely to surface, what the typical topics are, and what verb forms and lexical items surface so as to gain insight on how to promote development. It would be important to examine exactly how this tendency which seems to occur naturally in non C-R chats could be used to promote development.

A second theme that warrants investigation, also related to the theme of language play investigation, is private speech in SCMC. At times it is clear that certain
publications are not truly meant for contribution or group consideration, but rather are personal remarks whose meaning is truly meant for the publisher and not the participants. Investigating the type of private speech that surfaces, the conditions under which it surfaces, i.e., is the participant bored, frustrated, seeking attention, experimenting, protesting, etc., and participant response to the publishing of private speech it is an area ripe for inquiry.

A third topic for future investigation is the examination of grammatical development for small, group chats. Given that grammatical development surfaced for both groups when they participated in a full-class chat where there is much more to attend to with greater potential for distraction and stress resulting from the quick pace of full-class chat, it would be worth investigating grammatical development in small-group chats both with and without C-R to establish whether or not small group chats would serve to raise grammatical consciousness to the same or to a greater degree than full-group chats with C-R.

It would also be worth investigating C-R in both full-class and small-group chat with more native speaker participants to determine the student reaction to working with Spanish speaking peers. The sole native speaker in this study was the professor, so introducing other native-speaker contributors to the mix and examining the social dynamic and grammatical development rates under those conditions would make yet another contribution beyond this study.

While replication of the study with improvements has its advantages, a two semester study would also be valuable. Work on grammatical development in SCMC has drawn its conclusions, to date, on the data collected from single-semester studies. Given that both groups in this study did demonstrate structural sensitivity in the chat forum in the short-term, long-term studies are of great importance. Long term studies should explore long term grammatical development in SCMC to determine if the consciousness-raising that surfaces in the environment itself does indeed facilitate and sustain development over time. What’s more, tracking incidental learning in the SCMC environment over time stands to offer great insight into development itself; chatscripts may serve to map the development of awareness. For these reasons the implications of
long-term work on the side of the participant and researcher in SCMC should not be overlooked.

The data revealed that both groups demonstrated the same levels of lexical density regardless of whether they focused on form and meaning, or meaning alone. The data also show that the MF group was more inclined to code-switch or search for L1 equivalents than to make the effort of description or circumlocution in order to maintain the conversation in the L2. Future investigations should consider the role that lexical consciousness raising exercises may have in the SCMC environment. While grammatical focus demands empirical evidence proving the presence of such a focus, communication for meaning does not because in the absence of meaning processing is complete communicative breakdown. Therefore, the utility of SCMC in raising consciousness in terms of lexical development calls for further research.

Additional studies which place the responsibility of consciousness-raising in the hands of the learners deserve attention. The development of different linguistic features in SCMC where the learners are at the helm would serve to generate a robust body of research on SCMC and L2 development. Likewise, the absence of grammatical consciousness-raising lightened the cognitive load to the extent that participants channeled their energy into teasing, playing around, and casual exchanges. This is important because the potential to inhibit development was present. Future research must consider this possibility and investigate further.

Lastly, the social dynamic and the feedback practices that surface under each framework posted in each suggestion above must not be ignored. The consistency or inconsistency which may develop in each environment, respectively, may reveal a lot about the dynamics which instigate and prevent development and about what learners are likely to tend to and/or to ignore.
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Appendix A IRB 15282 Informed Consent

Principal Investigator

MELISSA L. FIORI-AGOREN

Basic Spanish Program Assistant Director for the Florida State University, Diffenbaugh Building, #302A, Florida State University, Tallahassee Florida 32306. Phone: 850-644-2343. mfioriag@mailer.fsu.edu

Graduate Student in Second Language Acquisition & Applied Linguistics through the Spanish Department at the Pennsylvania State University, 352 N. Burrowed Building, University Park PA 16802.

Description of Research

The purpose of this study, Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication in the L2 Classroom, IRB # 15282, is to examine the potential that communication in the form of Internet Conferencing (synchronous computer mediated communication) has in the language-learning (L2) classroom. The study will attempt to identify Internet chat as a tool that assists in learner development. The study will run the course of the Spring 2003 semester.

Participants’ role

In taking part in this study your section may participate in weekly chat sessions in the computer lab. Each session will run for the duration of the class, approximately 50 minutes, and will last until the end of the semester. Alternatively, you may be enrolled for a section not designed for computer lab chat sessions. If you are in such a section you will meet daily to cover the same materials but will meet in the standard classroom setting. While you will not be anonymous for the purposes of tracking, organizing and analyzing the data collected, your identity will be anonymous in the report. That is, you will be personally identified during data collection; you will not be identified personally in the final report. Finally, as part of the study you all participants will be asked to complete a background questionnaire and follow-up questionnaire at the study’s close, you will be asked to take part in oral and written components both at the onset and termination of the semester.

Risks and Benefits to Participation

Benefits: This study attempts to examine effective language learning strategies in the Internet Conferencing environment with the hope of introducing efficient and valuable approaches for classroom
language development. Your participation will help determine the value of chat in the language classroom, and will add to the existing body of knowledge about language acquisition.

**Risks:** This study involves no mental or physical risks beyond those encountered in the normal course of every day life.

**Your Rights as a Participant**

Your participation in this research is confidential. Only the Principal Investigator will have access to your identity and to information that can be associated with your identity, *for the purposes of the study*. No personally identifying information will be disclosed at any time, including in the event of publication of the research.

Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw your participation at anytime without penalty. Should you choose not to participate or to withdraw your participation, you will be required to transfer to a section of SPN 2200 that is not participating in the study. You are requested to make such a decision before the University’s drop-add period so as not to interrupt the dynamic of the course section to which you transfer.

You will receive no monetary compensation for your participation, and there are no monetary costs to you. You will receive the designated credits typically assigned to Spanish 2200, with that credit based on your meeting the course criteria and expectations outlined in the 2200 syllabus distributed to all sections. In the event of withdrawn participation, record of your attendance and any collected assignments will be transferred to your new course instructor.

If you have any questions about the research procedures, or any general questions you may ask them now or contact Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren at 850-644-2343 at any time during the research period. For additional information, you may contact the Office for Research Protections, 212 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, PA 16802, (814) 865-1775; and/or the Florida State University Human Subjects Committee, Mail Code 2763, or 2035 E. Paul Dirac Drive, Box 15, 100 Sliger Bldg., Innovation Park, Tallahassee, FL 32310.
Participant & Principal Investigator: Record of Informed Consent

I freely, voluntarily, and without element of force or coercion, consent to be a participant in the research project *Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication in the L2 Classroom, IRB # 15282*.

This research is being conducted by Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren, who is the Basic Spanish Program Assistant Director at Florida State University and a doctoral student at the Pennsylvania State University. I understand that the purpose of the research is to examine the potential that communication in the form of Internet Conferencing (i.e., chat) has in the language-learning classroom, and that the study will attempt to identify Internet chat as a tool that assists in learner development. I understand that as part of the study the class may meet in the computer lab once weekly. I understand that materials generated during the chat sessions are materials being examined for purposes of the study. I understand that I will fill out questionnaires and that there are both oral and written components to my participation. I understand that I may decline to answer specific questions.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and while it is requested that I withdraw within the drop-add period assigned by the Florida State University, I do understand that I may stop participation at any time without prejudice or penalty. I also understand that if I were to withdraw my participation that records of my attendance and course grades will be transferred to my new course instructor.

I understand that this course fulfills the expected curriculum requirements as determined by Florida State University, and that my participation does not impede upon or hinder my completion of Florida State University’s language requirement component. I understand that I will receive no monetary compensation for participating in this study.

I understand that participation in this research project creates no known risks beyond those encountered in the course of daily life.

I understand the information given to me and I have received answers to any questions I may have had about this project. I also understand that I may contact Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren at any time during the study for answers to my questions about the study or about my rights as a participant.

To the best of my knowledge and belief, I have no physical or mental illness that would increase the risk of me participating in this study. I am 18 years of age or older, and am a full-time student at the Florida State University of Tallahassee, Florida.

I have read this consent form and I understand and agree to the conditions of this study. I also understand that I will receive a copy of the record of informed consent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness Signature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Debriefing Statement

March 23, 2003

IRB # 15283
Participants in “Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication in the L2 Classroom”

Dear Participants:

Thank you for your participation in the study introduced to you as “Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication in the L2 Classroom”.

The purpose of this study is to examine the potential that synchronous computer-mediated communication in the form of Internet Conferencing (SCMC Conferencing) has in the language-learning classroom. Specifically the researcher will focus on chatting as a tool in the development of grammatical competence and seeks to identify Internet Chat as a tool that assists in said development.

Three groups were designated for the study. The nature of the groups follows. Section 2 would not participate in chat sessions but would be provided with opportunity to discuss each short story questions sets in the traditional class room setting. Students in this section were asked to focus on both content and their productions of ser/estar, por/para during their small group discussions, (i.e., to focus both on meaning and form).

Section 3 was also asked to focus on meaning and form but their group discussions occurred over the internet chat forum. Both sections 2 and sections 3 were supplied with grammar handbooks, pre-chat questions presenting ser/estar, por/para in focused and meaningful exercises designated to assist students in not only interpreting the stories for deeper meaning but also for augmenting their use and exposure to ser/estar, por/para in context. Finally, section 13 was instructed to concentrate on the development of deeper analysis and meaning to the short stories. This section did not receive grammar handbooks for ser/estar, por/para, they did not complete the pre-chat discussion questions, but they did engage in short story analysis via the chat forum.

In its final form the title of the study will assume the following designation: “The Development of Grammatical Competence through Synchronous Computer Mediated Communication”.

Sincerely,
Melissa L. Fiori-Agoren
Basic Spanish Program Assistant Director at the Florida State University
Doctoral Candidate at the Penn State University in Applied Linguistics and SLA
Appendix C 1
Questionnaire Native Speaker

Academic Background
➢ Please describe your academic background, and your current field of study.

➢ What is your teaching history? Please include the number of years you have been teaching, where you have taught, and any academic training you have received.

Teaching & Learning Philosophy
➢ Describe your teaching philosophy. Please include your goals as an instructor, your role in the classroom, and methodological expectations.

➢ Describe your philosophy of learning. Please express your beliefs about the roles and responsibilities of the learner.

➢ Please state your beliefs about the language learning process. How would you describe the process of learning a language?

➢ Express your ideas about error correction. How little/much is necessary? Under what circumstances and/or contexts is it in/appropriate?

Experience with Technology
➢ Please relate your experience working with technology both in general, and in the classroom. When was and what was your first experience with technology? When was and what was your first experience using it in the classroom? (Here, technology may be a broad or as specific as you envision it—videos, tape, software, web-activities, chatting, etc.)

➢ Explain and describe your opinion about effective uses of technology in the classroom. What programs, techniques, applications, etc. are most valuable for language learning, and why?

➢ Please describe your experience with Black Board. In what capacity have you used the program? Do you dis/like Black Board?
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Questionnaire Participants

Name: ______________________ Date: __________ Section: __________
Instructor: ___________________ Participant Research # ______

Personal History
➢ What is your date of birth?
➢ What is your native language?
➢ What other languages do you know and in what capacity?
➢ If applicable, please explain your capabilities and your experience with the language you list.

Academic Background
➢ What is your major field of study.
➢ Please describe your experience with Spanish before enrolling in this course. Please include the following information: How many years have you studied? Did you test into this level or were you enrolled in other courses before being passed on to this level?
➢ If applicable, where did you take past Spanish courses?
➢ What is your reason for enrolling in this course?

Teaching & Learning Philosophy
➢ What do you believe makes for a successful language learner?
➢ What do you believe are the roles and responsibilities of students enrolled in this course?
➢ What do you believe are your professor’s role and responsibilities?
➢ What are your goals for this semester as a student in SPN 2200?
Experience with Technology

➢ Please relate your experience working with technology both in general, and in the classroom.
  o When was and what was your first experience with technology? What are your main uses of technology (school work, email, chatting, web surfing, distance learning courses, etc.)

  o When was and what was your first experience using it in the classroom? Explain/describe how technology was used and your reaction to it.

➢ Explain and describe your opinion about effective uses of technology in the classroom. What programs, techniques, applications, etc. are most valuable for language learning, and why?
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Questionnaire Participants: Post Study

Name: __________________________ Date: ________ Section: __________
Instructor: _________________________ Participant Research # _______

Teaching & Learning Philosophy

➢ What do you believe makes for a successful language learner? Do you believe your opinion changed since the start of the semester? Why or why not?

➢ What were your goals at the start of the semester? Do you feel you met those goals? Why or why not?

Experience with Technology

➢ What do you dis/like about Chat? Please explain your response.

➢ What are the dis/advantages? Please explain your response.

➢ What is your opinion about incorporating Chat as a fundamental component of Spanish 2200? Please explain your response.

➢ Should Chat be implemented in other courses? Should FSU dedicate resources to making this tool available to all professors, all majors, for all courses, for other projects?

Teaching & Learning Philosophy

➢ What do you believe makes for a successful language learner? Do you believe your opinion changed since the start of the semester? Why or why not?

➢ What were your goals at the start of the semester? Do you feel you met those goals? Why or why not?

Experience with Group Work

➢ What do you dis/like about face-to-face discussions? Please explain your response.

➢ What are the dis/advantages? Please explain your response.
➢ What is your opinion about incorporating Chat as a fundamental component of Spanish 2200, instead of face-to-face work? Please explain your response.

➢ Should Chat be implemented in other courses? Should FSU dedicate resources to making this tool available to all professors, all majors, for all courses, for other projects?
INSTRUCTIONS

Thank you for your participation in this research.

For this component of the study you will be asked to listen to a number of phrases in Spanish. After each phrase please repeat the phrase out loud, as you just heard it, to the best of your ability in Spanish. Some sentences are easy, some are difficult.

The phrases you will hear are downloaded on the masterboard. When you are given the signal please activate the recording device at your desk. Once you have set the tape deck to record your responses at your desk, the masterboard will be activated.

Once the masterboard and the recording device at your desk are activated please do not stop, rewind or forward the recording. Please let the recording run without interruption. You will have 3 seconds between recordings to repeat the phrase as you heard it.

Practice
a. Su libro es de fama internacional.
b. Esas manzanas son verdes pero no están para comer.
c. Esos poemas fueron escritos por Octavio Paz.
d. Mis amigos no están en casa este fin de semana.
e. Creo que van a viajar por tren.
Elicited Imitation: Experimental

1. Miami es una ciudad muy rica y moderna.
2. Lo admiran por su carácter.
3. La fiesta es en el centro estudiantil.
4. La mayoría de los Mexicanos son mestizos.
5. La historia y la cultura de México son muy variadas.
6. Las composiciones son para el viernes.
7. Salgo para Madrid el mes próximo.
8. Principalmente está relacionada con el petróleo.
9. Muchos turistas visitan por curiosidad.
10. La reunión es el viernes a las diez.
11. Usó el oro para financiar las guerras.
12. Esos muebles antiguos son de mi abuela.
13. Pedro rompió la taza y ahora está rota.
15. Miles de Cubanos lucharon por la independencia.
16. Compré las flores para mis amigas.
17. Caminamos para el parque por la calle principal.
18. Por más que intento dejarlo, no puedo.
19. Estoy atrasada y ya son las ocho de la mañana.
20. Ese estudiante es listo pero no está preparado para el examen.
21. Los Cubanoamericanos son los que lograron mayor prosperidad.
22. Mis padres están en Texas pero son de California.
23. Fue a la conferencia para apoyar a sus colegas.
24. Fue el fanatismo que causó tantos problemas.
25. Las tierras estaban habitadas por sociedades complejas.
26. En este país hay un médico por cada dos mil habitantes.
27. Para cualquier visitante México es una tierra de contrastes.
28. Marín fue el primer gobernador elegido por los puertorriqueños.
29. La mamá está furiosa porque los quehaceres no están terminados.
30. Llámale a Carlos por teléfono para decirle que vamos esta noche.
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GPC

Thank you for your participation in this research.

For this component of the study you will be asked to review a number of phrases in Spanish. For each phrase determine your preference by choosing among the following options: a if you prefer sentence a, b if you prefer sentence b, c if you prefer neither of the two phrases, d if you prefer both, and e if you are not sure about which you prefer.

There are a total of fifty-five questions and you will have twenty-five minutes to review the phrases and mark your preferences.

Name: 

Section: 

Professor: 

Date: 
1. a. El libro está en la cabeza del hombre.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. El libro es en la cabeza del hombre.

2. a. Están dos personas en la reunión.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Son dos personas en la reunión.

3. a. Jugué al fútbol por tres años.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Jugué al fútbol para tres años.

4. a. Tiene esperanza para el futuro.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Tiene esperanza por el futuro.

5. a. Si una persona está sufriendo es una buena idea para ella usar marihuana.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Si una persona está sufriendo es una buena idea que use marihuana.

6. a. Es mucho calor en Florida.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Hace mucho calor en Florida.

7. a. Ellos son niños.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Ellas son niños.

8. a. Cuando yo era 16 obtuve mi licencia de conducir.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Cuando yo estuve 16 obtuve mi licencia de conducir.

9. a. Los gatos están rodeados por un grupo de perros.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Los gatos están rodeados para un grupo de perros.

10. a. Los estereotipos son difíciles de entender.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Los estereotipos son difíciles para entender.

11. a. El médico traen los libros.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. El médico traemos los libros.

12. a. Es importante decir la verdad a tus seres queridos.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Es importante para decir la verdad a tus seres queridos.

13. a. La taza es rota.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. La taza está rota.

14. a. El niño gordo no puede tocar la mesa.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. El niño gordo no puede tocar la mesa.

15. a. La tierra originaria de los Marcianos es Marte.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. La tierra originaria de los Marcianos está Marte.

16. a. No cambia porque de esa razón.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. No cambia por esa razón.

17. a. Son las seis de la mañana.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Están las seis de la mañana.

18. a. Para un país tan pequeño tiene muchos habitantes.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Por un país tan pequeño tiene muchos habitantes.

19. a. Los niños tienen sueño.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Los niños son sueños.

20. a. Salgo para Madrid el mes próximo.      A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
    b. Salgo por Madrid el mes próximo.
   b. San Augustín fue fundada en 1565.  
22. a. Los zapatos son para mí.  
   b. Los zapatos son para mi.  
23. a. Tengo algo por ti.  
   b. Tengo algo para ti.  
24. a. La leche es caliente, ¡no la tomes ahora!  
   b. La leche está caliente, ¡no la tomes ahora!  
25. a. Eres tarde.  
   b. Llegas tarde.  
   b. Alejandro Sanz está un cantante muy famoso.  
27. a. Un hombre y una señora son enfermos.  
   b. Un hombre y una señora están enfermos.  
28. a. Quería matricularme en esta clase para aprender español.  
   b. Quería matricularme en esta clase por aprender español.  
29. a. Hay tres perros en la calle.  
   b. Son tres perros en la calle.  
30. a. Puedo no ir al cine.  
   b. No puedo ir al cine.  
   b. Es mucho frío en Pennsylvania.  
32. a. Las composiciones están terminadas.  
   b. Las composiciones son terminadas.  
33. a. El hombre está el padre de los niños.  
   b. El hombre es el padre de los niños.  
34. a. La próxima reunión estaba el viernes.  
   b. La próxima reunión era el viernes.  
35. a. Lo haré por ti.  
   b. Lo haré para ti.  
36. a. Cambio este disco compacto por ese disco compacto.  
   b. Cambio este disco compacto para ese disco compacto.  
37. a. La reunión es en la sala de profesores.  
   b. La reunión está en la sala de profesores.  
38. a. Busco para mi amigo.  
   b. Busco a mi amigo.  
39. a. Está tarde, ya son las once de la noche.  
   b. Es tarde, ya son las once de la noche.  
40. a. El bebé está comiendo el pan.  
   b. El bebé está comiendo la pan.
41. a. Es muy guapa.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Está muy guapa.

42. a. La población de hispanohablantes en los estados unidos está aumentando rápidamente.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. La población de hispanohablantes en los estados unidos es aumentando rápidamente.

43. a. Vota por el candidato más honesto.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Vota para el candidato más honesto.

44. a. Estaba mucha gente en la fiesta.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Había mucha gente en la fiesta.

45. a. El hombre le besa a la señora.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. El hombre besa a la señora.

46. a. Fidel Castro es de Cuba.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Fidel Castro está de Cuba.

47. a. Espero a mis amigos y luego vamos a cenar.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Espero para mis amigos y luego vamos a cenar.

48. a. Madrid está al norte de Toledo.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Madrid es al norte de Toledo.

49. a. Ella está cocinando carne.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Ella cocina carne.

50. a. Es una persona muy inteligente.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Es una muy inteligente persona.

51. a. Vinieron a casa para ayudar a las tías.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Vinieron a casa a ayudar a las tías.

52. a. Cuando era 5 años me gustaba jugar con muñecas.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Cuando tenía 5 años me gustaba jugar con muñecas.

53. a. Para mí, la película tiene un mensaje muy fuerte.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Por mí, la película tiene un mensaje muy fuerte.

54. a. El bebé es hambre.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. El bebé tiene hambre.

55. a. Mi generación está rodeada por tecnología.  A  B  Neither  Both  Not sure
   b. Mi generación está rodeada de tecnología.
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### Coding Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**1) To identify, describe, or define a subject.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tito Puente es un músico hispano.</td>
<td>Tito Puente is an Hispanic musician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztlán es la tierra originaria de los antiguos aztecas.</td>
<td>Aztlán is the original land of the ancient Aztecs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2) To indicate origin, ownership, or the material of which something is made.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Saralegui es de La Habana.</td>
<td>Cristina Saralegui is from Havana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esos muebles antiguos son de mi abuelita. Son de Madera.</td>
<td>Those old pieces of furniture are my grandma’s. They are made of wood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3) To describe inherent qualities or characteristics of people, animals, and objects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cristina es rubia; es lista y simpática.</td>
<td>Cristina is blonde; she is smart and nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es divertida y muy enérgica.</td>
<td>She is amusing and very energetic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4) To indicate time, dates, and seasons.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoy es Miércoles. Son las diez de la mañana.</td>
<td>Today is Wednesday. It’s ten o’clock in the morning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es octubre; es otoño.</td>
<td>It is October; it is fall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5) To indicate the time or location of an event.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El próximo concierto de Gloria Estéfan es el Viernes a las ocho de la noche.</td>
<td>Gloria Estefan’s next concert is Friday at eight o’clock at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La fiesta de los estudiantes hispanos es en el Centro Cubano-americano.</td>
<td>The Hispanic students’ party is at the Cuban American Center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6) **To form certain impersonal expressions.**

- Es importante luchar por los derechos de los grupos minoritarios.  
  It is important to fight for the rights of minority groups.

- Es fácil olvidar que muchas familias hispanas han vivido en este país por tres siglos.  
  It is easy to forget that many Hispanic families have lived in this country for three centuries.

7) **With the past participle to form the passive voice.**

- La Florida fue colonizada por españoles en el siglo XVI.  
  Florida was colonized by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century.

- San Agustín, la ciudad más Antigua de EE.UU., fue fundada en 1565.  
  Saint Augustine, the oldest city in the United States, was founded in 1565.
## Ser and Estar with Adjectives

Some adjectives convey different meanings depending on whether they are used with *ser* or *estar*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SER</th>
<th>ESTAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a Aburrido</td>
<td>Bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Bueno</td>
<td>Healthy, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c Interesado</td>
<td>Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d Limpio</td>
<td>Clean—now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e Listo</td>
<td>Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f Loco</td>
<td>Crazy, frantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g Malo</td>
<td>Sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h Verde</td>
<td>Green—not ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Vivo</td>
<td>Alive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ese muchacho es aburrido. Como no tiene nada que hacer, está aburrido.

That boy is boring. Since he doesn’t have anything to do, he is bored.

Ese estudiante es listo, pero nunca está listo para sus exámenes.

That student is smart, but he is never ready for his exams.

Esas manzanas son verdes, pero no están verdes.

Those apples are green (color), but they are not green (unripe).

---

**POR**

1) To express movement along or through a place.

A muchos salvadoreños les encanta caminar por la avenida Cuscatlán.

Many Salvadorans love to walk along Cuscatlán Avenue.

2) To indicate duration of time. *Durante* may also be used in this case, or no preposition at all.

El Salvador sufrió un período de violencia por más de diez años (durante más de diez años).

El Salvador suffered a period of violence for more than ten years (during more than ten years).
3) To indicate cause, reason, or motive of an action.

Rigoberta Menchú recibió el Premio Nobel por su infatigable labor en favor de su gente. Rigoberta Menchú received the Nobel Prize for her untiring work on behalf of her people.

Muchos turistas visitan el volcán Izalco por curiosidad. Many tourists visit the Izalco volcano out of curiosity.

4) To express—on behalf of, for the sake of, in favor of.

Los indígenas lucharon mucho por la paz en El Salvador. The indigenous people fought a lot for peace in El Salvador.

Debemos hacer muchos sacrificios por el bienestar del país. We must make many sacrifices for the well-being of the country.

Según las encuestas, la mayoría va a votar por el candidato liberal. According to the polls, the majority is going to vote for the liberal candidate.

5) To express the exchange or substitution of one thing for another.

¿Cuántos colones dan por un dólar? How many colons do they give for a dollar?

6) To express the agent of an action in a passive sentence.

En el pasado El Salvador fue gobernado por muchos militares. In the past, El Salvador was governed by many military men.

Esos poemas fueron escritos por Claribel Alegría. These poems were written by Claribel Alegría.

7) To indicate a means of transportation or communication.

Voy a llamar a Carlos por teléfono para decirle que vamos a viajar por tren, no por autobús. I’m going to phone Carlos to tell him that we’re going to travel by train not by bus.

8) To indicate rate, frequency, or unit of measure.

En El Salvador hay un médico por cada dos mil habitantes. In El Salvador there is one doctor per two thousand people.

Rigoberta Menchú ganaba veinte centímas por día. Rigoberta Menchú used to earn twenty cents a day.

9) In the following common expressions.

| a | Por ahora | For the time being |
| b | Por cierto | Of course |
| c | Por consiguiente | Consequently |
| h | Por lo menos | At least |
| i | Por lo tanto | Therefore |
| j | Por más (mucho) que | However much |
PARA

1) To express movement or direction toward a destination or goal.
Salgo para San Salvador el viernes próximo.  I’m leaving for San Salvador next Friday.

2) To indicate a specific time limit or fixed point in time.
Ese mural ya estará terminado para Navidad.  That mural will already be finished by Christmas.

3) To express a purpose, goal, use, or destination.
Queremos ir a El Salvador para participar en una conferencia sobre derechos humanos.  We want to go to El Salvador to participate in a conference on human rights.
En esta pared hay espacio para un mural.  On this wall there is room for a mural.
Esta tarjeta postal es para ti.  This postcard is for you.

4) To express an implied comparison of inequality.
El Salvador tiene muchos habitants para un país tan pequeño.  El Salvador has many inhabitants for such a small country.
Para ser tan joven, tú entiendes bastante de política internacional.  For someone so young, you understand quite a lot about international politics.

5) To indicate the person(s) holding an opinion or making a judgment.
Para los salvadoreños, el arte de Isaías Mata refleja la esencia de su cultura.  Para mí, expresa un fuerte mensaje social.  For Salvadorans, Isaías Mata’s art reflects the essence of their culture.  For me, it expresses a strong social message.
**ADDITIONAL EXPRESSIONS**

**A. The Weather**

To express “to be hot / cold / windy” with regard to the weather.

1) Hacer buen tiempo  
   to be good weather  
   ¿Qué tiempo hace?  
   Hace buen tiempo  
   What is the weather like?  
   It’s nice out.

2) Hacer frío  
   to be cold  
   Hace frío.  
   It’s cold.

3) Hacer calor  
   To be hot  
   Hace calor.  
   It’s hot.

4) Hacer viento.  
   To be windy.  
   Hace viento.  
   It’s windy.

5) Haber sol / lluvia.  
   To be sunny / rainy.  
   Hay sol / lluvia.  
   It’s sunny / rainy.

6) Tener frío / calor.  
   To be cold / hot (a person)  
   ¿Tienes frío / calor?  
   Are you cold / hot?
### B. Expressions with Tener

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Spanish Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Tener frío / calor</td>
<td>To be cold / hot</td>
<td>Tengo frío. I’m cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Tener éxito</td>
<td>To be successful</td>
<td>Tiene mucho éxito. She is very successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Tener hambre</td>
<td>To be hungry</td>
<td>¿Tienes hambre? Are you hungry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Tener miedo de</td>
<td>To be afraid of</td>
<td>Tiene miedo de perros grandes. He is afraid of big dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Tener prisa</td>
<td>To be in a hurry</td>
<td>Tienen prisa. They are in a hurry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Tener razón</td>
<td>To be right</td>
<td>Tienes razón. You’re right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) No tener razón</td>
<td>To be wrong</td>
<td>No tienes razón. You’re wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Tener sed</td>
<td>To be thirsty</td>
<td>Tenemos sed. We’re thirsty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Tener sueño</td>
<td>To be sleepy</td>
<td>Tengo sueño. I’m sleepy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Tener suerte</td>
<td>To be lucky</td>
<td>No tenemos mucha suerte. We’re not very lucky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Tener X años</td>
<td>To be X years old</td>
<td>Tiene 88 años. She is 88 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Aquí tener.</td>
<td>Here (you) are (here you have it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Tener fuerza</td>
<td>To be strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>Tener importancia</td>
<td>To be important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Haber**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Spanish Meanings</th>
<th>English Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>There is; there are</td>
<td>Hay un perro. Hay tres perros.</td>
<td>There is a dog. There are three dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Había / hubo</td>
<td>There was; there were</td>
<td>Había muchas personas en la fiesta. Hubo una fiesta medieval.</td>
<td>There were many people at the party. There was a medieval party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Habrá</td>
<td>There will be</td>
<td>Habrá muchas personas.</td>
<td>There will be many people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. Expressing “Late”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Spanish Meanings</th>
<th>English Meanings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Llegar tarde.</td>
<td>To be late. (to arrive late)</td>
<td>Llegas tarde.</td>
<td>You’re late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Llegar con x minutos de retraso.</td>
<td>To be x minutes late.</td>
<td>Llegas con 10 minutos de retraso.</td>
<td>You’re ten minutes late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Ser tarde.</td>
<td>To be late (time/hour).</td>
<td>Es tarde.</td>
<td>It is late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Estar haciéndose tarde.</td>
<td>To be getting late.</td>
<td>Se está haciendo tarde.</td>
<td>It is getting late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Más vale tarde que nunca.</td>
<td>To be better late than never.</td>
<td>Más vale tarde que nunca.</td>
<td>Better late than never.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Other expressions with “For”

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Buscar</td>
<td>To look for</td>
<td>Buscamos un método fácil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Esperar</td>
<td>To wait for</td>
<td>Espero a mi amiga y vamos a cenar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Pedir</td>
<td>To ask for</td>
<td>Pedimos vino y nos trajeron cerveza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Por primera vez</td>
<td>For the first time.</td>
<td>Lo entiendo por primera vez.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E 2

#### GPC Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPC Questions &amp; Answers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Course Instructor Roles and Responsibilities

Your role as the course instructor and as a native speaker is to participate in the learners’ electronic chat and their face-to-face discussions of the short stories they have read for class. The motivation for your participation is so that learners have exposure to native productions of Spanish.

You will participate in the chat sessions of two different groups meaning-focused (MF) (11:15-12:05) and form-focused (FF)(10:10-11:00), and you will have different responsibilities for each group. In addition to these groups is a third group which is a form-focused group that does not chat, but rather engages in face-to-face discussions in the standard classroom.

Meaning Focused Chat Group 11:15-12:05

You are asked to participate in the group’s discussion. Your role is to participate in order to provide the students with authentic, native-speaker generated language, as it would naturally occur in the course of a dialogue. Please do not correct the students’ grammatical errors (especially if their mistakes do not impede comprehension). Instead you may reiterate an incorrectly stated construction by reformulating the statement correctly (recasting). You may also solicit clarifications requests, provided that you request clarification of the ideas/content/message the learner is attempting to express. You may also ask students to elaborate on their ideas or on a message that they are not quite expressing clearly.

You are asked to guide students in their communicative dialogues in which meaning (not attention to form) assumes primary importance. Your role is to guide the learners in the development of a deeper understanding of the content through communicative, meaning-centered, content-centered dialogue.

Form Focused Chat Group 10:10-11:00

You are asked to participate in the group’s discussion. However this time, you should pay particular attention to the learners’ productions of ser/estar and por/para. Whenever students erroneously produce ser/estar and por/para please perform one of the following strategies for correction: 1) restate the incorrect statement correctly (recast), 2) ask for clarification of both meaning and form, 3) ask the student to elaborate on the intended message so as to encourage the student, and to give opportunity, to produce the correct form, 4) solicit clarification for an unclear or incorrectly stated production, 5) provide explicit feedback by calling direct attention to the non-target like production, 6) provide metalinguistic feedback. You may also request clarification of content in the course of the discussion.

Your role is to guide the learners in the development of deeper understanding of content through focusing on form and structure (por/para, ser/estar) in the creation of meaning and in the discussion of content.
Definitions & Examples

Modeling: Native-speaker productions that serve as a model by which students may (or may not) use as a tool for learning.

Recasting: The reiteration of all or part of a learner's production without the error.

- Learner Production: When you work together, how long it take?
  Recast: When you worked together, how long did it take?

- Learner Production: Why you not do your homework?
  Recast: Why didn’t you do your homework?

Clarification Requests: They are used to indicate that the student's production was either misunderstood and needs to be reformulated in some way, and thus draws the learner's attention to the need to repair his/her statement.

- Instructor: At what time do you get up in the morning?
  Learner Production: At nine thirty.
  Instructor: When do you get up in the morning?
  Learner Production: I get up at nine thirty.

- Instructor: At what time do you get up in the morning?
  Learner Production: In the morning.
  Instructor: Yes, when you wake up, what time do you get out of bed?

Explicit Correction: Overtly correcting the student’s production.

- Learner Production: The child was in terribly trouble.
  Instructor: The child was in terrible trouble, because he did terribly on the exam. “Terribly” tells how he did on the exam in order to be in “terrible” trouble.

Metalinguistic Feedback: This consists of comments, information, questions, or any strategy in which the instructor draws attention to the student’s productions without out overtly providing him/her with the correct form. Its purpose is to call the learner’s attention to the error in an attempt to prompt the learner to produce the correct form him/herself.

- Learner Production: He eated a lot of food.
  Instructor: The past tense of “to eat” is irregular.

- Learner Production: *La problema es complicado. (The problem is complicated).
  Instructor: Problema ends in “a,” but is it feminine in Spanish?
Quick Reference Table for Meaning Focused vs. Form Focused Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning Focused:</th>
<th>Form-Focused:</th>
<th>Form-Focused:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:15-12:05</td>
<td>10:10-11:00</td>
<td>9:05-9:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Chat</td>
<td>Standard Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td>Recasting</td>
<td>Recasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request (Content only)</td>
<td>Clarification Request (Content and Structure)</td>
<td>Clarification Request (Content and Structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidentiality:

While you are the principal instructor for these participating sections it is imperative that you do not discuss your particular responsibilities with anyone other than the principal researcher and the other instructor for the duration of the study. Although students are aware that they are enrolled in sections designated for research, providing them with information regarding the nature and content of the chat sessions (with specific reference and regard to the form-focused component of the study) would compromise the study’s validity. Please make every effort to not reveal the points of divergence at they pertain to focus on form and the chat sessions.
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Procedures for Chat Sessions:

Section 3 10:10-11:00 (FFMF)

Getting Started

Lab Accounts:

All students enrolled in courses that make use of the Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab must obtain an account specific to that lab. This account is specific to the Modern Languages & Linguistics lab and must be generated immediately at the start of the semester.

To obtain a Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab account you must have a current FSU identity card, a current email account, and you must provide the computer lab with one ream of paper. (If you do not have a current email account with the University you must sign up for your account at http://cars.acns.fsu.edu/ (select "New Accounts") or visit the 3rd floor, Carothers Hall. Don't delay—there can be up to a 24-hour waiting period after obtaining your University account (officially entitled an ACNS account) before your account is activated.)

Go to the Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab, 129 Diffenbaugh Building, with a copy of your spring schedule, your i.d. card and your ream of paper and inform the lab assistant that you need to establish an account. After you establish an account it takes twenty-four hours for your information to be completely processed.

Black Board:

All students must establish an account with Black Board. If you have no such account you must request one by visiting https://campus.fsu.edu. Once you have established an account you will have access to all courses that have active Black Board course accounts. Choose the SPN2200 link to enter the account established for this course.

If you would like more information about Black Board, its components and capabilities please refer to the following link: http://company.blackboard.com/Bb5/manuals/Bb5-LevelThree-Student/
Lab Days

Please come to class on time and log on immediately.

Please come to class with your preparation questions completed and ready for review.

Log on to the chat at http://campus.fsu.edu, SPN2200, Communication, Virtual Classroom

While waiting for your peers to log on, please review por/para, ser/estar.

Rules

You must maintain Spanish for the entire session.

You must be respectful to your peers.

You must discuss the topic at hand and/or related themes.

This time is not to be used for social purposes.

You must use these 50 minutes to develop and explore each theme in detail.

While exploring the themes for greater depth and meaning, do not forget to focus on grammatical forms and accuracy.

Please do not be afraid to express and defend your opinion.

Discussions

For each chat-based discussion your professor will post the themes and topics to be addressed. The purpose of these discussions is to provide you with a forum in which you may explore the course material for deeper meaning and understanding, in an environment conducive to a comprehensive, in depth, and more profound appreciation of the story’s content and message.

- Please address these questions during your chat session, and work together to explore your ideas and opinions on the subject matter.

- Please pay particular attention to your use of ser/estar and por/para.

- If you do not understand something, or if something needs clarification, do not hesitate to seek assistance! The purpose of these sessions is to practice working through such difficulties!

- When seeking clarification, please be sure to indicate whether or not you are seeking clarification of content or clarification of grammatical form. Also, pay attention to your instructor’s clues and feedback. She will be actively assisting you in generating accurate forms throughout as you explore the discussion questions.

- Take advantage of the opportunity to work through questions for both meaning and content AND for the accuracy of your productions of por/para, ser/estar.
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Procedures for Chat Sessions:

Section Number 13  11:15-12:05 (MF)

Getting Started

Lab Accounts:

All students enrolled in courses that make use of the Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab must obtain an account specific to that lab. This account is specific to the Modern Languages & Linguistics lab and must be generated immediately at the start of the semester.

To obtain a Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab account you must have a current FSU identity card, a current email account, and you must provide the computer lab with one ream of paper. (If you do not have a current email account with the University you must sign up for your account at http://cars.acns.fsu.edu/ (select "New Accounts") or visit the 3rd floor, Carothers Hall. Don't delay—there can be up to a 24-hour waiting period after obtaining your University account (officially entitled an ACNS account) before your account is activated.)

Go to the Modern Languages & Linguistics computer lab, 129 Diffenbaugh Building, with a copy of your spring schedule, your i.d. card and your ream of paper and inform the lab assistant that you need to establish an account. After you establish an account it takes twenty-four hours for your information to be completely processed.

Black Board:

All students must establish an account with Black Board. If you have no such account you must request one by visiting https://campus.fsu.edu. Once you have established an account you will have access to all courses that have active Black Board course accounts. Choose the SPN2200 link to enter the account established for this course.

If you would like more information about Black Board, its components and capabilities please refer to the following link: http://company.blackboard.com/Bb5/manuals/Bb5-LevelThree-Student/
Lab Days

Please come to class on time and log on immediately.

Log on to the chat at http://campus.fsu.edu, SPN2200, Communication, Virtual Classroom

Rules

You must maintain Spanish for the entire session.

You must be respectful to your peers.

You must discuss the topic at hand and/or related themes.

This time is not to be used for social purposes.

You must use these 50 minutes to develop and explore each theme in detail.

Please do not be afraid to express and defend your opinion.

Discussions

For each chat-based discussion your professor will post the themes and topics to be addressed. The purpose of these discussions is to provide you with a forum in which you may explore the course material for deeper meaning and understanding, in an environment conducive to a comprehensive, in depth, and more profound appreciation of the story’s content and message.

- Please address these questions during your chat session, and work together to explore your ideas and opinions on the subject matter.

- If you do not understand something, or if something needs clarification, do not hesitate to seek assistance! The purpose of these sessions is to practice working through such difficulties! Take advantage of this opportunity.

- Please remember—keep the dialogues in Spanish.
Discussions

For each chat-based discussion your professor will post the themes and topics to be addressed. The purpose of these discussions is to provide you with a forum in which you may explore the course material for deeper meaning and understanding, in an environment conducive to a comprehensive, in depth, and more profound appreciation of the story’s content and message.

- Please address these questions during your small group discussion session, and work together to explore your ideas and opinions on the subject matter.
- Please pay particular attention to your use of *ser/estar* and *por/para*.
- If you do not understand something, or if something needs clarification, do not hesitate to seek assistance! The purpose of these sessions is to practice working through such difficulties!
- When seeking clarification, please be sure to indicate whether or not you are seeking clarification of *content* or clarification of grammatical form. Also, pay attention to your instructor’s clues and feedback. She will be actively assisting you in generating accurate forms throughout as you explore the discussion questions.
- Take advantage of the opportunity to work through questions of *both meaning and content AND the accuracy* of your productions of *por/para, ser/estar*. 
To express movement along or through a place.

A muchos salvadoreños les encanta caminar por la avenida Cuscatlán. Many Salvadorans love to walk along Cuscatlán Avenue.

To indicate duration of time. During may also be used in this case, or no preposition at all.

El Salvador sufrió un período de violencia por más de diez años (durante más de diez años). El Salvador suffered a period of violence for more than ten years (during more than ten years).

To indicate cause, reason, or motive of an action.

Rigoberta Menchú recibió el Premio Nobel por su infatigable labor en favor de su gente. Rigoberta Menchú received the Nobel Prize for her untiring work on behalf of her people.

Muchos turistas visitan el volcán Izalco por curiosidad. Many tourists visit the Izalco volcano out of curiosity.

To express—on behalf of, for the sake of, in favor of.

Los indígenas lucharon mucho por la paz en El Salvador. The indigenous people fought a lot for peace in El Salvador.

Debemos hacer muchos sacrificios por el bienestar del país. We must make many sacrifices for the well-being of the country.

Según las encuestas, la mayoría va a votar por el candidato liberal. According to the polls, the majority is going to vote for the liberal candidate.

To express the exchange or substitution of one thing for another.

¿Cuántos colones dan por un dólar? How many colons do they give for a dollar?
To express the agent of an action in a passive sentence.

En el pasado El Salvador fue gobernado por muchos militares. In the past, El Salvador was governed by many military men.

Esos poemas fueron escritos por Claribel Alegría. These poems were written by Claribel Alegría.

To indicate a means of transportation or communication.

Voy a llamar a Carlos por teléfono para decirle que vamos a viajar por tren, no por autobús. I’m going to phone Carlos to tell him that we’re going to travel by train not by bus.

To indicate rate, frequency, or unit of measure.

En El Salvador hay un medico por cada dos mil habitants. In El Salvador there is one doctor per two thousand people.

Rigoberta Menchú ganaba veinte centimes por día. Rigoberta Menchú used to earn twenty cents a day.

In the following common expressions.

Por ahora For the time being Por lo menos At least
Por cierto Of course Por lo tanto Therefore
Por consiguiente Consequently Por más (mucho) que However much
Por eso That’s why Por otra parte On the other hand
Por fin Finally Por poco Almost
Por la mañana In the morning Por supuesto Of course
Por la tarde / noche In the afternoon / evening, night Por ultimo Finally
**Para**

*To express movement or direction toward a destination or goal.*

Salgo para San Salvador el viernes próximo. I’m leaving for San Salvador next Friday.

*To indicate a specific time limit or fixed point in time.*

Ese mural ya estará terminado para Navidad. That mural will already be finished by Christmas.

*To express a purpose, goal, use, or destination.*

Queremos ir a El Salvador para participar en una conferencia sobre derechos humanos. We want to go to El Salvador to participate in a conference on human rights.

En esta pared hay espacio para un mural. On this wall there is room for a mural.

Esta tarjeta postal es para ti. This postcard is for you.

*To express an implied comparison of inequality.*

El Salvador tiene muchos habitants para un país tan pequeño. El Salvador has many inhabitants for such a small country.

Para ser tan joven, tú entiendes bastante de política internacional. For someone so young, you understand quite a lot about international politics.

*To indicate the person(s) holding an opinion or making a judgment.*

Para los salvadoreños, el arte de Isaías Mata refleja la esencia de su cultura. Para mí, expresa un fuerte mensaje social. For Salvadorans, Isaías Mata’s art reflects the essence of their culture. For me, it expresses a strong social message.
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To identify, describe, or define a subject.

Tito Puente es un músico hispano.  Tito Puente is an Hispanic musician.
Aztlan es la tierra originaria de los antiguos aztecas.  Aztlan is the original land of the ancient Aztecs.

To indicate origin, ownership, or the material of which something is made.

Cristina Saralegui es de La Habana.  Cristina Saralegui is from Havana.
Esos muebles antiguos son de mi abuelita.  They are made of wood.
Son de Madera.

To describe inherent qualities or characteristics of people, animals, and objects.

Cristina es rubia; es lista y simpatica.  Cristina is blonde; she is smart and nice.
Es divertida y muy energica.  She is amusing and very energetic.

To indicate time, dates, and seasons.

Hoy es Miércoles.  Son las diez de la mañana.  Today is Wednesday.  It’s ten o’clock in the morning.
Es octubre; es otoño.  It is October; it is fall.

To indicate the time or location of an event.

El próximo concierto de Gloria Estefan es el Viernes a las ocho de la noche.  Gloria Estefan’s next concert is Friday at eight o’clock at night.
La fiesta de los estudiantes hispanos es en el Centro Cubano-americano.  The Hispanic students’ party is at the Cuban American Center.
To form certain impersonal expressions.

Es importante luchar por los derechos de los grupos minoritarios.  
It is important to fight for the rights of minority groups.

Es fácil olvidar que muchas familias hispanas han vivido en este país por tres siglos.  
It is easy to forget that many Hispanic families have lived in this country for three centuries.

With the past participle to form the passive voice.

La Florida fue colonizada por españoles en el siglo XVI.  
Florida was colonized by the Spaniards in the sixteenth century.

San Agustín, la ciudad más Antigua de EE.UU., fue fundada en 1565.  
Saint Augustine, the oldest city in the United States, was founded in 1565.
**ESTAR**

**To indicate location.**

Mis padres son de California, pero ahora están en Texas.  
My parents are from California but now they’re in Texas.

La Florida está al norte de Cuba.  
Florida is north of Cuba.

**With the present participle (-ando, -iendo) to form the progressive tenses.**

La población hispana de Miami está aumentando cada día.  
The Hispanic population of Miami is increasing every day.

**With an adjective to describe states and conditions or to describe a change in a characteristic.**

La madre está furiosa porque a nadie le gusta el cuadro que pinto su hija.  
The mother is furious because no one likes the picture her daughter painted.

No puedes comerte esa banana porque no está madura todavía.  
You can’t eat that banana because it isn’t ripe yet.

¡Este café está frío!  
This coffee is cold!

**With a past participle to indicate the condition that results from an action.**  
*In this case, the past participle functions as an adjective and agrees in gender and number with the noun to which it refers.*

Action:  
Resultant condition:

Pedrito rompió la taza.  
La taza está rota.  
The cup is broken.

Pedrito broke the cup.

Adolfo terminó sus quehaceres.  
Sus quehaceres están terminados.  
His chores are done (finished).

Adolfo finished his chores.
Ser and Estar with Adjectives

Some adjectives convey different meanings depending on whether they are used with ser or estar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SER</th>
<th>ESTAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aburrido</td>
<td>Aburrido Bored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bueno</td>
<td>Bueno Healthy, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesado</td>
<td>Interesado Interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpio</td>
<td>Limpio Clean—now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listo</td>
<td>Listo Ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loco</td>
<td>Loco Crazy, frantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malo</td>
<td>Malo Sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verde</td>
<td>Verde Green—not ripe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivo</td>
<td>Vivo Alive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ese muchacho es aburrido. Como no tiene nada que hacer, está aburrido.

That boy is boring. Since he doesn't have anything to do, he is bored.

Ese estudiante es listo, pero nunca está listo para sus exámenes.

That student is smart, but he is never ready for his exams.

Esas manzanas son verdes, pero no están verdes.

Those apples are green (color), but they are not green (unripe).
### The Weather

**To express “to be hot / cold / windy” with regard to the weather.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Sentence Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hacer buen tiempo</td>
<td>to be good weather</td>
<td>¿Qué tiempo hace?</td>
<td>What is the weather like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hace buen tiempo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hace buen tiempo</td>
<td>It's nice out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacer frío</td>
<td>to be cold</td>
<td>Hace frío.</td>
<td>It's cold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacer calor</td>
<td>To be hot</td>
<td>Hace calor.</td>
<td>It's hot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacer viento.</td>
<td>To be windy.</td>
<td>Hace viento.</td>
<td>It's windy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tener frío / calor.</td>
<td>To be cold / hot (a person)</td>
<td>¿Tienes frío / calor?</td>
<td>Are you cold / hot?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expressions with Tener

- **Tener frío / calor**
  - To be cold / hot (a person)
  - Tengo frío.
  - I'm cold.
- **Tener éxito**
  - To be successful
  - Tiene mucho éxito.
  - She is very successful.
- **Tener hambre**
  - To be hungry
  - ¿Tienes hambre?
  - Are you hungry?
- **Tener miedo de**
  - To be afraid of
  - Tiene miedo de perros grandes.
  - He is afraid of big dogs.
- **Tener prisa**
  - To be in a hurry
  - Tienen prisa.
  - They are in a hurry.
- **Tener razón**
  - To be right
  - Tienes razón.
  - You're right.
- **No tener razón**
  - To be wrong.
  - No tienes razón.
  - You're wrong.
- **Tener sed**
  - To be thirsty.
  - Tenemos sed.
  - We're thirsty.
- **Tener sueño**
  - To be sleepy.
  - Tengo sueño.
  - I'm sleepy.
- **Tener suerte**
  - To be lucky.
  - No tenemos mucha suerte.
  - We're not very lucky.
- **Tener X años**
  - To be X years old.
  - Tiene 88 años.
  - She is 88 years old.
- **Aquí tener.**
  - Here (you) are
  - Aquí tienes.
  - Here you are.
### Haber

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Hay un perro.</td>
<td>There is a dog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Hay tres perros.</td>
<td>There are three dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Había / hubo</td>
<td>Había muchas personas en la fiesta.</td>
<td>There were many people at the party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hubo una fiesta medieval.</td>
<td>There was a medieval party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habrá</td>
<td>Habrá muchas personas.</td>
<td>There will be many people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expressing “Late”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Llegar con x minutos de retraso.</td>
<td>Llegas con 10 minutos de retraso.</td>
<td>You're ten minutes late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser tarde.</td>
<td>Es tarde.</td>
<td>It is late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estar haciéndose tarde.</td>
<td>Se está haciendo tarde.</td>
<td>It is getting late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Más vale tarde que nunca.</td>
<td>Más vale tarde que nunca.</td>
<td>Better late than never.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other expressions with “For”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buscar</td>
<td>Buscamos un método fácil.</td>
<td>We are looking for an easy method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperar</td>
<td>Espera a mi amiga y vamos a cenar.</td>
<td>I’m waiting for my friend and we are going to have dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedir</td>
<td>Pedimos vino y nos trajeron cerveza.</td>
<td>We asked for wine and they brought us beer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por ahora</td>
<td>Por ahora, no está mal.</td>
<td>It isn’t bad for the time being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por primera vez</td>
<td>Lo entiendo por primera vez.</td>
<td>I understand it for the first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ser...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Es difícil...</td>
<td>Es difícil saber la respuesta; es difícil alcanzarlo.</td>
<td>It's difficult to know the answer; to reach it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es fácil</td>
<td>Es fácil aprender a cocinar.</td>
<td>It’s easy to learn to cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es necesario...</td>
<td>Es necesario limpiar la casa.</td>
<td>It’s necessary to clean up the house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
¡Granada, por don Fernando!
por
Un autor anónimo

CHAT NÚMERO 1 ✪ EL 30 DE ENERO DE 2003

✧ Si pasas tu vida en un solo lugar y algún día vienen unas personas a expulsarte del único lugar que conoces y que has conocido, ¿cómo reaccionarías? ¿Qué harías?

✧ ¿Crees que el rey moro se fue del país con dignidad aunque se fuera llorando? ¿Llorarías tú si no pudieras visitar tu ciudad / pueblo de nacimiento nunca jamás?

✧ ¿Es el llanto una señal de la debilidad? ¿Se puede llorar y ser una persona fuerte? ¿Cuándo y bajo cuáles circunstancias es aceptable mostrar nuestros sentimientos? ¿Crees que son construcciones culturales? Explica.
En este fragmento de Don Quijote de la Mancha, *Aventura de los Molinos de Viento*, hay algunas perspectivas aparentemente contradictorias. Es decir, en el mismo episodio hay:

a) Realidad y fantasía  

b) Comedia y drama  

c) Realismo e idealismo

Escribe ejemplos de a, b, y c y discútelos.

Luego, imagina unos ejemplos de a, b, y c, si Don Quijote y Sancho Panza vivieran hoy en día, en el año 2003, ¿cómo serían sus experiencias?

¿Cómo sería, como imaginaría, un fragmento moderno en la vida moderna de Don Quijote y Sancho Panza?
1. ¿Quiénes son los protagonistas de la película?
2. ¿Cómo es el maestro físicamente? ¿Cómo es su personalidad? ¿Es del bando republicano o nacional?
3. ¿Cómo es Moncho? ¿Cuál es su apodo(nickname)? ¿Crees que es apropiado?
4. ¿Cuál es la guerra que comienza al final de la película? ¿Cuáles son los bandos enfrentados?
5. ¿Cómo reacciona Moncho al final de la película? ¿Por qué? ¿Qué hizo? ¿Qué dijo? ¿Qué significan sus dos últimas palabras?
6. ¿Cómo reacciona la mamá de Moncho al final? ¿Por otra parte, cómo reacciona el papá?
7. ¿Qué harías tú si fueras la mamá? ¿Qué harías tú si fueras el papá? ¿Qué harías tú si fueras Andrés, el hermano? ¿Cuáles serían las consecuencias de tus acciones? ¿Qué es más importante para ti?
8. La película está basada en tres historias: “Un saxo en la niebla,” “Carmiña” y “La lengua de las mariposas” ¿Qué ocurrió en cada historia?
9. ¿Te gustó la película? ¿Por qué? ¿Qué te gustó más? ¿Qué no te gustó? ¿Por qué?
ME LLAMO RIGOBERTA MENCHÚ
Y ASÍ ME NACIÓ LA CONCIENCIA
--AUTOBIOGRAFÍA--

**CHAT NÚMERO 4 ♦ EL 6 DE MARZO DE 2003**

Los derechos humanos y la defensa de la justicia social han sido problemático para muchos países, los EEUU inclusive.

- ¿Qué sabes de la situación de los indígenas de los Estados Unidos? ¿Cómo compara la situación estadounidense con la situación en Guatemala?

- ¿Es una condición de los seres humanos maltratarse a unos a otros? Es decir, maltrato a la población por el gobierno ocurre por el mundo entero y ha sucedido a pesar del establecido sistema político, así que por qué piensas que los seres humanos se tratan con tanta crueldad? Es sorprendente que ese tratamiento ocurra en países democráticos?

**LOS PERROS MÁGICOS DE LOS VOLCANES
POR
MANLIO ARGUETA

**CHAT NÚMERO 5 ♦ EL 20 DE MARZO DE 2003**

*Los perros mágicos de los volcanes* es una leyenda salvadoreña que trata de explicar el fenómeno de los volcanes Tecapa y Chaparrastique y la realidad social del país. Las leyendas sirven para explicar las realidades de la vida.

- Piensa en los cuentos de hadas (como Caperucita Roja o Los Tres Cerditos). ¿Para qué sirven? ¿Qué nos enseñan de la vida, específicamente?

- Piensa en las “leyendas urbanas” (por ejemplo, una persona se despierta cubierta de hielo, y al despertarse descubre que alguien se le sacó un órgano). ¿Por qué son tan populares estos tipos de historias?

- ¿Existen algunas leyendas en tu lugar de origen? ¿Cómo son? ¿De qué se tratan? Compártelas con la clase.
¿Qué metas / sueños tienes tú?

¿Cómo crees que vas a realizar tus metas?

¿Crees que es posible querer algo con tanta pasión que antes de que te des cuenta (before you realize it) vives la vida con la que soñabas?

¿Recuerdas tus sueños al levantarte? ¿Alguna vez has soñado con una experiencia tan extraña que todavía te deja confundido? ¿Qué pasó?

¿Sabes interpretar los sueños? ¿Por qué piensas que la mente mezcla elementos reales con elementos irreales en los sueños?

Recientemente había mucho debate en cuanto al homenaje a los EEUU.

¿En tu opinión ¿Tiene el homenaje su lugar en las escuelas públicas?

¿Tiene derecho una persona de rehusar / negar de recitarlo?

¿Cómo responderías a una persona que niega a recitarlo?

¿Es una violación constitucional recitar un homenaje que contiene una referencia a Dios?

¿Puede ser una persona patriótica y no creer que sea una Buena idea recitar ese homenaje?

¿Es probable que los niños entiendan lo que recitan cuando prometen su apoyo a los EEUU? ¿Es importante que lo entiendan?
¡GRANADA, POR DON FERNANDO!
POR
UN AUTOR ANÓNIMO

CHAT NÚMERO 1 ♦ EL 30 DE ENERO DE 2003

✦ If you spend your whole life in only one place, and one day people come and force you to abandon the only place that you know and have known, How would your react? What would you do?

✦ Do you believe the Moorish King left the country with dignity even though he left crying? Would you cry if you could never return to visit your home town/city?

Is crying a sign of weakness? Can a person cry and still be a strong person? When and under what circumstances is it acceptable to show/reveal our emotions? Do you believe that those expectations are culturally constructed? Explain.

DON QUIJOTE DE LA MANCHA
AVENTURAS DE LOS MOLINOS DE VIENTO
POR
MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA

CHAT NÚMERO 2 ♦ EL 6 DE FEBRERO DE 2003

✦ In this fragment of Don Quijote de la Mancha, Aventuras de los Molinos de Viento, there are a number of seemingly contradictory perspectives. That is, in the same episode there are elements of:

a) Reality and fantasy

b) Comedy and drama

c) Realism and idealism

✦ Give evidence of each and discuss your evidence.

✦ Give examples of a, b, and c if Don Quijote and Sancho Panza were alive today, in the year 2003. What would their experiences be like now?

✦ What would a modern-day fragment of the life of Don Quijote y Sancho Panza be like today? How would you imagine them in modern-day time?
1. Who are the protagonists?

2. What is the teacher like, physically speaking? What is his personality like? Is he from the Republican or the Nationalist party?

3. What is Moncho like? What is his nickname and do you think it is appropriate?

4. Which war is fought at the beginning of the film? Which political parties are confronted?

5. How does Moncho react at the end of the film? Why? What did he do? What did he say? What do his last two words symbolize?

6. How does Moncho’s mother react at the end of the film? How does the father respond?

7. What would you do if you were his mother? What would you do if you were his father? What would you do if you were Andrés, the brother? What would be the consequences of your actions? Which is more important to you?

8. The story is based on three stories, “Un saxo en la niebla,” “Carmiña,” and La lengua de las mariposas.” What happens in each story?

9. Did you like the film? Why? Which part did you like most? Which part did you not like? Why?
**Chat Número 4 • El 6 de Marzo de 2003**

Human rights and defending social justice have been problematic for many countries, the US included.

- What do you know about the situation of the indigenous peoples of the US? How does it compare with the situation in Guatemala?

- Is it a human condition to mistreat each other? That is, bad treatment of its people by the government occurs throughout the world and has occurred regardless of the political system in place, so why do you think human beings treat each other with such cruelty? Does it surprise you that this kind of treatment occurs in democratic countries?

**Chat Número 5 • El 20 de Marzo de 2003**

*Los perros mágicos de los volcanes* is a Salvadoran legend that tries to explain the phenomenon of the Tecapa and Chaparrastique volcanoes as well as the social situation of the country. Legends serve the purpose of explaining life’s realities.

- Think about fairy tales (such as Little Red Riding Hood or The Three Little Pigs). What is the purpose of these stories? What do they teach us about life, specifically?

- Think of “urban legends” (for example, a person wakes up covered in ice, and on waking up discovers that someone has stolen an organ). Why are these kinds of stories so popular?

Are there any legends from where you come from? What are they like? What are they about? Share them with the class.
EL DIARIO INCONCLUSO
POR
VIRGILIO DÍAZ GRULLÓN

CHAT NÚMERO 7 ✪ EL 10 DE ABRIL DE 2003

✦ What goals / dreams do you have?
✦ How do you expect to realize your goals?
✦ Do you believe that it is possible to want something with so much passion that before you realize it you are living the life you used to dream about?
✦ Do you remember your dreams when you wake up? Have you ever dreamed something so strange that that you still are confused by it? What happened?

Do you know how to interpret dreams? Why do you think the mind mixes reality with fantasy in dreams?

RAQUELO TIENE UN MENSAJE
POR
JAIME CARRERO GARCÍA

CHAT NÚMERO 8 ✪ EL 17 DE ABRIL DE 2003

Recently there has been much debate about the Pledge of Allegiance in the United States.
✦ In your opinion, does the Pledge have its place in public schools?
✦ Does a person have the right to refuse to recite it?
✦ How would you respond to a person who refuses to recite the Pledge?
✦ Is it a violation of the constitution to recite something that contains a reference to God in it?
✦ Can a person be patriotic and not believe it to be a good idea to recite the Pledge?
✦ Is it likely that children understand that they are promising when they recite the Pledge? Is it important that they understand?
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¡GRANADA, POR DON FERNANDO!
POR
UN AUTOR ANÓNIMO

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 1 ♦ EL 30 DE ENERO DE 2003

1. ¿Cómo son los reyes Católicos? Describe el carácter de los reyes.

2. ¿Cómo es el rey moro? Describe su carácter.

3. ¿De dónde son el rey moro y los reyes Católicos?

4. ¿Por cuánto tiempo vivió el rey moro en Granada?

5. El rey moro defendió su reino por sus súbditos (his subjects) pero los reyes Católicos eran más poderosos y por consiguiente el rey moro perdió su reino. ¿Cómo reacciones a esta parte de la historia española? También los reyes Católicos defendieron su reino por sus súbditos, según su punto de vista, así que, ¿quién tuvo más razón? ¿Quién no tuvo razón?

6. ¿Todavía hay mucha influencia mora en España? ¿Dónde?
DON QUIJOTE DE LA MANCHA

AVENTURAS DE LOS MOLINOS DE VIENTO

POR

MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 2 ✶ EL 6 DE FEBRERO DE 2003

1. Don Quijote tomó los molinos por monstruosos gigantes por equivocación. ¿Alguna vez tomaste algo por equivocación cuando eras joven? ¿Cuántos años tenías cuando cometiste tal equivocación? ¿Dónde estabas y de dónde vinieron los “monstruos”? ¿Ocurría esta equivocación solamente por la noche?

2. ¿Cómo reacciona Don Quijote a los monstruosos gigantes? ¿Tiene miedo? ¿Cómo reaccionaste tú? ¿Tenías miedo?

3. ¿Cómo eran los monstruos? ¿Eran monstruos amables o eran monstruos que tenían mucha hambre y comían niños?

4. ¿Es Don Quijote una persona valiente (brave)? ¿Eres tú valiente? ¿Por qué?

BUTTERFLY

PELÍCULA

CHAT NÚMERO 3 ✶ EL 20 DE FEBRERO DE 2003

1. ¿Quiénes son los protagonistas de la película?

2. ¿Cómo es el maestro físicamente? ¿Cómo es su personalidad? ¿Es del bando republicano o nacional?

3. ¿Cómo es Moncho? ¿Cuál es su apodo(nickname)? ¿Crees que es apropiado?

4. ¿Cuál es la guerra que comienza al final de la película? ¿Cuáles son los bandos enfrentados?

5. ¿Cómo reacciona Moncho al final de la película? ¿Por qué? ¿Qué hizo? ¿Qué dijo? ¿Qué significan sus dos últimas palabras?

6. ¿Cómo reacciona la mamá de Moncho al final? ¿Por otra parte, cómo reacciona el papá?

7. ¿Qué harías tú si fueras el hermano? ¿Cuáles serían las consecuencias de tus acciones? ¿Qué es más importante para ti?

8. La película está basada en tres historias: “Un saxo en la niebla,” “Carmiña” y “La lengua de las mariposas” ¿Qué ocurrió en cada historia?

9. ¿Te gustó la película? ¿Por qué? ¿Qué te gustó más? ¿Qué no te gustó? ¿Por qué?
ME LLAMO RIGOBERTA MENCHÚ
Y ASÍ ME NACIÓ LA CONCIENCIA
--AUTOBIOGRAFÍA--

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 4 ✪ EL 6 DE MARZO DE 2003

1. ¿Quién es Rigoberta Menchú?
2. ¿De dónde es?
3. ¿Cuál es su nacionalidad?
4. ¿Cuál es su etnia?
5. ¿Cómo es? (físicamente y en cuanto a su personalidad)
6. ¿Cuántos años tiene?
7. Rigoberto Menchú luchó por los derechos de los grupos minoritarios y por su bienestar. ¿Alguna vez luchaste tú por algún motivo político o personal o, por lo menos, por una causa que te importa a ti?

LOS PERROS MÁGICOS DE LOS VOLCANES
POR MANLIO ARGUETA

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 5 ✪ EL 27 DE MARZO DE 2003

1. ¿Quién es el narrador del cuento?
2. ¿Es un cuento triste o alegre? ¿Por qué?
3. ¿Quiénes son los cadejos?
4. ¿Quiénes son y cómo son Don Tonio y sus trece hermanos?
5. ¿Cómo son Tecapa y Chaparrastique?
6. ¿Para qué sirven las leyendas?
EL DIARIO INCONCLUSO
POR
VIRGILIO DÍAZ GRULLÓN

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 7 • EL 10 DE ABRIL DE 2003

1. ¿Es un sueño o es la realidad?
2. En tu opinión, ¿cuáles son las partes verdaderas y cuáles son las partes falsas?
3. ¿Cómo es el narrador? ¿Cómo lo describirías?
4. ¿Cambia su vida en la tierra por una vida extraterrestre?
5. ¿Hay elementos de realidad en este cuento o es totalmente un sueño?

RAQUELO TIENE UN MENSAJE
POR
JAIME CARRERO GARCÍA

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 8 • EL 17 DE ABRIL DE 2003

1. ¿Deben entender todas las palabras de lo que cantan los niños o por lo menos deben entender algunos?
2. Por una parte Puerto Rico tiene lazos estadounidenses, por otra parte tiene su propia identidad. ¿Es una buena idea combinar algunos elementos de las dos sociedades, o es mejor que dominen algunos elementos propios? ¿Es posible para las dos culturas convivir en igualdad de condiciones?
3. ¿Estás de acuerdo con lo que sigue...? Los niños son demasiado jóvenes para entender el himno y por esa razón es importante que sepan recitar el himno por ahora para que aprendan el significado más profundamente luego.
¡GRANADA, POR DON FERNANDO!
POR
UN AUTOR ANÓNIMO

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 1 ● EL 30 DE ENERO DE 2003

1. What are the Catholic King and Queen like? Describe their character.
2. What is the Moorish King like? Describe his character.
3. Where are the Moorish King and the Catholic King and Queen from?
4. The Moorish King defended his crown for his subjects but the Catholic King and Queen were more powerful, and consequently the Moorish King lost the throne. How do you respond to this piece of Spanish history? The Catholic King and Queen also defended their throne on behalf of their subjects, from their point of view, so who was right? Who was wrong?
5. Is there still a lot of Moorish influence in present-day Spain? Where is it?

DON QUIJOTE DE LA MANCHA
AVENTURAS DE LOS MOLINOS DE VIENTO
POR
MIGUEL DE CERVANTES SAAVEDRA

PREPARACIÓN PARA CHAT NÚMERO 2 ● EL 6 DE FEBRERO DE 2003

1. Don Quijote took the windmills for giant monsters by mistake. Have you ever made such a mistake when you were young? How old were you when you made said mistake? Where were you and from where did the “monsters” come from? Did this mistake only used to happen at nighttime?
2. How does Don Quijote react to the gigantic monsters? Is he afraid? How did you respond? Were you afraid?
3. What were the monsters like? Were they friendly or were they very hungry children eaters?
4. Is Don Quijote a brave person? Are you brave? Why?
1. Who are the protagonists?

2. What is the teacher like physically? What is his personality like? Is he a Republican or a Nationalish?

3. What is Moncho like? What is his nickname? Do you think it is appropriate?

4. Which war begins at the beginning of the film? What are the 2 sides?

5. How does Moncho react at the end of the film? Why? What did he do? What did he say? What do his last two words mean?

6. How does Moncho’s mother react at the end? On the other hand, how does his father react?

7. What would you do if you were the mother? What would you do if you were the father? What would you do if you were Andrés, the brother? What would be the consequences of your actions? What is more important to you?

8. The story is based on three stories: “Un saxo en la niebla,” “Carmiña” and La lengua de las mariposas”. What happened in each story?

9. Did you like the film? Why? What did you like the most? What didn’t you like? Why?
1. Who is Rigoberta Menchú?

2. Where is she from?

3. What is her nationality?

4. What is her ethnicity?

5. What is she like (physically and with regard to personality)?

6. How old is she?

7. Rigoberta Menchú fought for the rights of minorities and for their well-being. Have you ever fought for a political or personal cause, or at least, for a cause important to you?

1. Who is the narrator of the story?

2. Is it a sad or happy story? Why?

3. Who are the “cadejos”?

4. Who are and what are Don Tonio and his thirteen brothers like?

5. What are Tecapa and Chaparrastique like?

6. What purpose do legends serve?
1. Is it a dream or is it reality?
2. In your opinion, which parts are real and which parts are not?
3. What is the narrator like? How would you describe him?
4. Does he exchange his life on earth for an extraterrestrial one?
5. Are there elements of reality in this story or is it totally a dream?

1. Should children understand all the words that they sing or should they understand some of them at least?
2. On the one hand Puerto Rico has ties to the US, on the other hand it has its own identity. Is it a good idea to combine some elements of both societies or is it better to allow certain elements to carry more importance? Is it possible for the two cultures to coexist equally?
3. Do you agree with the following statement? Children are too young to understand the national anthem and for that reason it is important that they learn to recite it for the time being, so that they can learn about its more profound meaning later.
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