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ABSTRACT

Many in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) agree that interaction is a critical component in the process of second language acquisition (Hatch 1978; Long, 1996; Pica 1994). According to Long (1996), second language (L2) learners have the best chance of successful L2 acquisition when placed in an environment in which conversational interaction occurs in the target language. Research has also shown that such interaction, generally face-to-face and in real-time, plays an important role in language pedagogy (Ellis, 2008; Freiermuth, 2002; Gass & Selinker, 2008; Gass, Abhul, & Mackey, 2012; Long, 1996; Yuan, 2003). In fact, Gass et al. (2012) assert that the focus of SLA researchers is no longer whether interaction facilitates L2 acquisition, but rather which aspects of the L2 benefit the most from interaction and which forms of interaction are the most beneficial for L2 learners (Gass et al., 2012, p. 6-7). As enrollment in online programs has increased nationwide during the past 10 years, many Florida post-secondary institutions have developed online course offerings, including those for beginning level foreign language courses. Although research suggests that learners benefit from both face-to-face and online real-time interaction, the online foreign language courses offered by Florida post-secondary public institutions are provided in an asynchronous online format, with no expectation of real-time interaction. Furthermore, there is no differentiation at the state or institutional levels between course expectations in traditional and online beginning level foreign language courses, something which implies that learners in both environments can expect to achieve similar results with respect to learning outcomes. Prompted by my own questions, and those of colleagues in the field, a study was undertaken to examine current instructional environments for beginning level language courses, in this case French 1120, in Florida public post-secondary institutions. A five-part study was conducted involving students and faculty at two Florida institutions. The
main focus of the study was to examine any relationship which may exist between interaction and linguistic outcomes in the various face-to-face (F2F) and online environments available to language learners. A secondary purpose of the study was to examine whether student experiences and learning outcomes meet student expectations, how instructors teach within the various instructional environments, and whether affective factors play a role in choice of instructional environment. Although all instructors indicated that the communicative approach is a preferred teaching style, results revealed that preferred teaching style may not match actual strategies employed within the instructional environment since the F2F environments were found to be highly interactive, target language rich environments whereas L2 interaction was non-existent within the online environments. Results indicated that students enrolled in F2F and online beginning level language courses performed similarly on assessments of reading proficiency suggesting that real-time interaction is not as important as interaction with content/text and the transfer of L1 reading skills in the acquisition of L2 reading skills. Conversely, learners in the traditional, face-to-face environment achieved significantly higher levels of oral proficiency than those in the asynchronous online environment. Results showed a relationship between frequency and type of interaction within a particular instructional environment and subsequent oral proficiency. Student survey and assessment results suggest that, although the main priority of beginning language learners is to be able to speak the language, students enrolled in asynchronous online French 1120 do not feel that this environment is meeting their expectations with regard to overall instructional environment and linguistic outcomes. Implications for future study and pedagogy are discussed.
CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND

Impetus

As a former policy consultant for the Florida Department of Education for two years and a former Florida post-secondary administrator for another two years, I had the opportunity to engage many state and community college leaders in conversation on the topic of online courses. In asking why particular institutions offer online courses, the primary reasons conveyed to me tended to focus first on the opportunity to generate income for the college by offering courses targeting students who may not otherwise be able to enroll, such as working adult students, stay-home parents, and the like. I was told that online courses offer the opportunity for flexibility in scheduling, lack of need for a classroom and accompanying financial overhead, and the ability to assign more students to an instructor than in an on-campus face-to-face course. Because instructional modules tend to be pre-prepared, the instructor becomes more of a facilitator in a program relying largely on self-teaching by the students, enabling that instructor to take on more students than a traditional classroom teacher. Secondary reasons tended to focus on the belief that the online learning environment benefits students with anxiety by removing them from a classroom setting. In asking about the issue of assessments in these types of courses, I learned that for many institutions, assessments such as tests and quizzes tended to be offered within the online environment, in a multiple choice format with no expectation of any kind of test security other than a pledge in which the student promises to behave in an ethical manner. As a language educator, I pondered what all of this meant not only for general education students, but for those seeking to learn a language. Investigating further, I spoke with staff in the online education departments of a number of Florida institutions, including the institution at which I worked as an
administrator and adjunct instructor. I had been asked to teach an online French course and I wondered exactly how I was going to do it in an asynchronous online format. I came to learn that the online language courses at this particular institution were structured exactly the same way as courses for all other subject areas and that the other state and community colleges in Florida structured them in a similar manner with a course web site in which course direction is delivered via course announcements. Instruction is delivered in the form of pre-constructed modules which may be instructor-authored or most often from an electronic textbook. Instructors and students have access to online discussion boards, chat rooms, and e-mail, each of which are used at the instructor’s discretion. Upon asking how students would interact and speak with each other and the instructor, I was told that students would be able to send pre-recorded responses to the instructor but that no real-time interaction was expected and no tools would be provided for this. At that point, I declined to teach the online course as it was not clear to me how the students would be able to acquire linguistic skills without an interactive component, an element that many in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) agree is important to the process of second language acquisition (Hatch 1978; Long, 1996; Pica 1994, 1996). According to Long (1996), second language (L2) learners have the best chance of successful L2 acquisition when placed in an environment in which conversational interaction occurs in the target language. Research has also shown that such interaction, generally face-to-face and in real-time, plays an important role in language pedagogy (Ellis, 2008; Freiermuth, 2002; Gass & Selinker; 2008; Gass, Abhul, & Mackey, 2012; Long, 1996; Yuan, 2003). In fact, Gass et al. (2012) assert that the focus of interaction researchers is no longer whether interaction facilitates L2 acquisition, but rather which aspects of the L2 benefit the most from interaction and which forms of interaction are the most beneficial for L2 learners (Gass et al., 2012, p. 6-7). With asynchronous online language
courses seemingly missing this critical element, it became obvious that the instructional setting should be examined in order to ascertain if and how it may be different from the traditional classroom setting and whether any observed differences affect learning outcomes.

**Specific Aims**

This dissertation seeks to examine the relationship between instructional environment and linguistic outcomes for beginning level second language learners. Although there is research which examines the success of online learners in general post-secondary courses, findings are largely based on enrollment data, qualitative analysis, and analysis of final course grades (Allen & Seaman, 2010; Shachar & Neuman, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2010) rather than on actual student performance data as determined by standardized assessments given to students enrolled in the same course across different instructional environments. Enrollment data certainly provides an indication of the level of popularity of online learning and may also be reflective of the number of online course offerings available to students, but it does not provide information on learning outcomes and whether online and face-to-face students perform at comparable levels. In studies of general online learning, which are based on enrollment data and final course grades, both Shachar and Neuman (2010) and the U.S. Department of Education (2010) maintain that online students perform equal to or better than traditional students however, it seems that evaluating student achievement based mainly on course grades can be problematic due to the variance in instruction, grading practices, and assessment security. Interestingly, although the U.S. Department of Education indicates that it considered over 1000 studies for inclusion in meta-analysis of online learning effectiveness, only 50 of the proposed 1,000 studies were deemed suitable due to the fact that they measured learning outcomes using an experimental design. Only 27 of those studies contrasted the online and face-to-face environments while the
remaining 23 contrasted blended and face-to-face environments. The included studies did not examine every possible subject area and zero involved foreign language instruction. The lack of studies deemed acceptable for meta-analysis provides evidence that very few are examining and comparing measured learning outcomes in online and face-to-face courses. Furthermore, there is no research to my knowledge which measures and compares the learning of second language learners across the online, hybrid, and traditional environments as determined by standardized performance assessments. Do we truly know whether students in non-traditional instructional environments are as knowledgeable as those learning in a brick and mortar classroom and vice versa? The answer appears to be a resounding “no”. Based on the lack of published institutional data comparing student achievement in traditional, online, and hybrid language courses, it seems that very few educational institutions, organizations, and agencies are asking this question. When it comes to language learning, anecdotal information provided by instructors in traditional classrooms indicates that students coming from an online environment typically arrive with lower second language proficiency than traditional classroom students. Generally, such observations have led to the supposition that the online environment provides few opportunities for interaction and speaking in addition to few to no secure assessments of proficiency. In Florida, many post-secondary institutions currently offer online options for language study, but it is unclear what students enrolled in these courses know and are able to do. The goal of this dissertation is to investigate how language instruction is delivered in online and traditional environments today and to compare learning outcomes in order to determine the suitability of these environments for the acquisition of skills such as speaking, reading, and writing. Also investigated is the role that affective and lifestyle factors may play in a student’s choice of learning environment and whether the environment itself meets student expectations. Keeping in
mind that each will be compared to linguistic outcomes, three main questions emerge: What is the relationship between the type of instructional environment and the interaction taking place amongst instructors and students and, might any relationship affect proficiency? Is there a relationship between the type of interaction and the demonstrated level of critical thinking (i.e. cognitive presence) within a particular environment? Do other factors such as enrollment status, lifestyle, anxiety, motivation, and learning readiness affect the choice of instructional environment and does the environment meet student expectations? In an effort to begin to answer these questions, a five-part study examining instructional environments and learning outcomes of students enrolled in beginning level language courses in Florida post-secondary institutions was conducted. The current chapter provides an introduction to the most popular instructional environments in use today as well as background information on the state of post-secondary online foreign language education in Florida and motivating factors for the investigation at hand. Chapter 2 provides a short history and overview of the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), discusses interaction and its role within SLA, and explores current research on computer mediated communication (CMC) in second language learning. Chapter 3 provides an overview and general method of the aforementioned study. Chapter 4 presents the results and Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results with implications for future research.

Online Learning: An Overview

With the increasing popularity of online, web-based learning, many post-secondary institutions now offer specific courses and degree programs via a web-based format. In fact, students now have the option to attend a college or university virtually, with the possibility of never setting foot on an actual campus (Allen & Seamen, 2013). These new options have opened debates amongst educators on numerous related issues such as: delivery of instruction, teacher-
student interaction, student-student interaction, evaluation of student learning, cheating, plagiarism, and whether the web-based environment provides an instructional environment equal to, or better than, the traditional face-to-face classroom. Although research has been conducted in the areas of computer-mediated communication (CMC) and its usefulness within the general academic realm (Luppicini, 2007), as well as in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) (Sauro, 2011, 2012), no comprehensive pedagogical framework has been developed as a basis for second language acquisition via CMC. Surprisingly, despite the lack of such a framework, K-12 and post-secondary institutions offer online foreign language courses.

Online learning, or E-Learning, is learning and teaching which are supported via electronic means. It generally involves a computer and network-enabled platform which is typically web-based and supported by computer-based activities, virtual activities, and digital collaboration. Content may be delivered synchronously or asynchronously via the Internet, an intranet/extranet, audio or video tape, satellite TV, and CD-ROM. It can be self-paced or instructor-led and generally includes media in the form of text, image, animation, streaming video and audio (Tavangarian et al., 2004). In the past ten years, online web-based delivery of instruction has become the most popular form of distance learning. In the annual study conducted by Allen and Seaman (2010, 2011, 2013) for Babson Research Group, in partnership with the Sloan Consortium and Pearson Education, data show there has been a marked increase in web-based coursed offerings and student enrollments nationwide over the past ten years. Data collected from over 2,800 public and private post-secondary institutions, show an enrollment increase in online courses (students taking at least one online course) of more than 300 percent from 2002 to 2012, increasing by more than a half million students from 2010 to 2011 alone, pushing the number of students enrolled in at least one online course to 6.7 million in 2012.
Likewise, the percentage of public post-secondary institutions offering complete programs online increased 44 percent over a ten year period, from 48.9 percent of institutions offering fully online programs in 2002 to 70.6 percent offering fully online programs in 2012. An even greater increase of close to 120 percent was observed for private post-secondary institutions, with 22.1 percent of private institutions offering fully online programs in 2002 compared to 48.4 percent in 2012. Allen & Seaman (2010, 2011, 2013) define online, web-based courses as those in which at least 80 percent of the course content is delivered online. Since classroom teachers tend to include some kind of online, or computer-based component, face-to-face instruction includes courses in which zero to 29 percent of the content may be delivered online. Hybrid, or blended, courses deliver 30 to 79 percent of the course content online. Finally, a fully online course is estimated to deliver 80 to 100 percent of course content in an online, web-based format. Typically, online web-based courses are asynchronous, allowing students to work on course goals at times convenient for their personal schedules. These courses tend to be most popularly offered by post-secondary institutions in Florida (Florida Distance Learning Consortium, 2013) because these courses allow students the opportunity for flexibility in scheduling, they are easier to staff, require no face time, and require fewer resources to be provided by the institution (Herman & Banister, 2007). In my own experience as a former administrator at the post-secondary level, the state college where I worked, and where I still teach, created an online campus. Doing so enabled the college to offer additional sections for courses for which there was no on-campus classroom space at a reduced cost to the institution. In a report published by the Sloan Consortium and The Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, Meyer (2008) found that effective course design can reduce operating costs. The report provided evidence from thirty institutions which reduced costs by 37 percent, saving about $3 million per year in operating
costs. Likewise, another study found that per student costs to deliver a course online versus in a
traditional classroom setting dropped by 63 percent, from $280 per student to $103 per student
(Herman & Banister, 2007) In a recent report for the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, Battaglino,
Haldeman, and Laurans (2012) found a 36 percent decrease in per student expenditures for the
online courses versus traditional courses with estimated per pupil costs averaging $10,400 per
student for traditional courses as opposed to $6,400 per student for online courses. In general,
asynchronous online courses can accommodate more students per section, allowing institutions
to serve many more students than with traditional face-to face courses which require classroom
space, hybrid courses which also require classroom space, or two-way video courses which
require a conference room or classroom with specialized technology.

Online foreign language education is still relatively new, and although a case can be
made for the mutual influence of instructional technology and SLA theory as well as the
increased need for the use of such technology to be evaluated for its usefulness to the process of
second language acquisition (Chapelle, 2009) we have yet to see comprehensive studies on the
effect of the overall instructional environment on linguistic outcomes (Blake, 2008, 2011, 2013;
Winke & Goertler, 2008), investigating whether students enrolled in exclusively online courses
are actually learning when compared to students in the traditional face-to-face environment. The
same can be said for general online education specific to Florida, where the Florida Department
of Education (FDOE) has not yet examined whether actual learning is taking place in post-
secondary online courses as compared to the traditional face-to face environment. Because the
FDOE has not yet undertaken a study of the effectiveness of online courses at post-secondary
institutions throughout the state, no evidence has been provided to show that online programs
and courses turn out students who are equally as, or more competent than, traditional face-to face
learners. Additionally, in Florida, courses offered at post-secondary institutions share course numbers across all institutions. According to the description provided on the web site for the Common Course Numbering System by Florida Department of Education (2012), the common course numbers “describe course content to improve research, assist program planning, and facilitate the transfer of students”. Because online courses in Florida share course numbers with their face-to-face counterparts, the implication is that online courses are the same as the traditional face-to-face courses in all aspects, yet there is no published research to provide evidence that this is the case.

According to data obtained from the publicly available Internet database of the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (2011), Florida’s colleges and universities offer over 600 online degree programs. Amongst the courses offered online at Florida public post-secondary institutions (community colleges, state colleges, and universities) are foreign language courses. In the 2011-2012 academic year, four foreign languages were offered in some sort of distance learning format: Spanish, French, German, and Chinese. A total of 299 distance learning courses were offered in the four languages. Of the 299 courses offered, 290 were exclusively web-based and asynchronous, providing instruction via the internet in a format which requires no real-time interaction between instructors and students, while only 9 were offered via other formats such as video, two-way television, or multi-mode, also known as hybrid – a combination of face-to-face classroom instruction and an asynchronous online environment. The foreign language courses offered in Florida in an online, web-based, asynchronous format are as follows: Spanish (224 courses), French (53 courses), German (13 courses). While Chinese was offered in a distance learning format, it was only offered via two-way television in a synchronous format which is thought to more closely mimic a face-to-face classroom environment. In 2011-2012, only two of
the eleven public state universities offered online, web-based foreign language courses: University of South Florida (USF) and University of Central Florida (UCF). The remainder of the online foreign language courses was offered by various community or state colleges. During the 2012-2013 academic year, 316 foreign language courses were offered in a distance learning format, all of which were offered in the asynchronous online format with the exception of two Spanish courses offered via video and one Chinese course offered via real-time two-way television format. A total of 25 percent of these courses are offered by one of three universities: USF, UCF, and Florida International University (FIU) with the other 75 percent being offered by state or community colleges. Of the 603 total foreign language courses offered in an asynchronous online format in Florida over a two year period, 42 percent were beginning/novice 1120 level courses (Elementary I), with another 40 percent being the follow-up 1121 level course (Elementary II). The remaining 18 percent of the courses were delivered at the 2200 level (Intermediate) or above. With few Florida public universities taking part in the online learning revolution as it relates to foreign language courses, offering either online or hybrid foreign language courses, one has to wonder whether they are on the right track, or missing valuable opportunities for students. Whether the few Florida universities, along with the state and community colleges, who are offering online foreign language courses, are providing a valuable learning experience for students remains to be seen.

State and National Expectations for Foreign Language Courses and Learners

In the state of Florida, the Statewide Course Numbering System for public universities and colleges is a common numbering system is used by all public postsecondary institutions in Florida and by participating non-public institutions. The major purpose of this system is to facilitate the transfer of courses between participating institutions (FDOE, 2012). The system
assumes that course content for courses sharing the same number will be similar, with the delivering institution having limited control over the course title, credit and course content. The numbering system does not differentiate between a traditional, online, or hybrid course and assumes that all students in all instructional environments will have access to the opportunities provided within the course description. For a beginning level French course such as French 1120, it is generally accepted that the course will emphasize the following basic skills: speaking, reading, comprehension, and writing (See Appendix A). Stated learning outcomes generally expect students to be able to speak, read, write, and understand basic French language in the present indicative. When it comes to speaking skills, (i.e. oral proficiency skills) of the 40 Florida universities and state colleges, 34 (85%) specify oral communication as being a main course objective. While the majority of the course objectives provided describe the expected attainment of some level of oral proficiency with terms like: oral communication, oral expression, basic conversation, dynamics of speech, discussion, elementary conversation (See highlighted areas of Appendix A), at least one Florida institution specifies that, by course completion, students will be able to speak at a “novice high” level as defined by the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 – Speaking, published by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2012) and discussed in Chapter 3 (See Appendix H). A comparison of the descriptions of expected speaking skills to the ACTFL guidelines reveal a general expectation of the Novice High level. According to the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (2006), a collaborative project of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and other organizations which began in 1996, “communication is at the heart of second language study, whether the communication takes place face-to-face, in writing, or across centuries through the reading of literature” (NSFLEP, 2006). Interpersonal
communication is emphasized along with cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. Further, the 21st Century Skills Map (ACTFL, 2011) indicates that “students, as effective communicators, use languages to engage in meaningful conversation, to understand and interpret spoken language and written text, and to present information, concepts, and ideas” at every skill level (novice, intermediate, and advanced). According to the 21st Century Skills Map (2011, p. 6), at the novice level, students should be able to comprehend and use short memorized phrases and sentences to communicate. At the intermediate level, students should be able to express their own thoughts, provide descriptions, and communicate about familiar topics using sentences and strings of sentences. They comprehend general concepts and messages about familiar and occasionally unfamiliar topics. They can also ask questions on familiar topics. At the advanced level, students are able to narrate and describe using connected sentences and paragraphs in at least three time frames when discussing topics of personal, school, and community interest and can comprehend main ideas and significant details regarding a variety of topics. The extent to which students will be able to communicate by the end of any given course is dependent upon the intensity of the language program, but it is clear that communication is central to the language learning process. Based on research conducted on the role of interaction in second language acquisition, one can make the assumption that in order to communicate, interaction must occur within the instructional setting and that the majority of the interaction should be in the target language, also known as the L2 (Ellis, 2008; Hatch 1978; Long, 1996; Pica 1994, 1996). Interestingly, the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (2011) advises prospective online students that online courses are not likely to provide opportunities for interaction and indicate that course materials involve mostly print materials, rather than interactive content. Additionally, the organization advises students that teacher interaction may also be delayed by
periods of up to 3 days (See Appendix M). Likewise, the University of South Florida Saint Petersburg (2011) advises prospective foreign language online students that speaking is not a skill which is a focus of the online beginning level language courses and that the best setting in which to learn to speak a language is a classroom setting, due to its interactive nature (See Appendix M), yet the same credit is given for the online course even though there is no differentiation between online and face-to-face courses within the Statewide Course Numbering System.

**The Modern Foreign Language “Classroom” in Florida**

In order to understand how beginning level foreign language courses are instructed today, and how interaction within each environment may affect student outcomes, it is necessary to take a step inside of the settings most commonly utilized to deliver instruction in the Florida college and university system: the traditional environment, the hybrid environment, and the online environment. As previously mentioned, according to Allen and Seaman (2010), a traditional course is one in which up to 29% of instruction is delivered online, with the remainder occurring in a face-to-face, real-time format (i.e. a classroom), a hybrid course is one in which 30–79% of the course content is delivered online, and an online course is one in which 80-100% of instruction is delivered online. During the preparation of the current study, via an analysis of beginning level language courses offered throughout Florida, a more precise definition of the aforementioned instructional environments has emerged. Table 1 shows real-time instructional minutes by instructional environment.
Table 1

Real-time Instruction in Beginning FL Courses in Florida Post-Secondary Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Traditional (F2F)</th>
<th>Hybrid Full (HyF)</th>
<th>Hybrid Half (HyH)</th>
<th>Online (On)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Weeks</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Minutes/ Week</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Total Minutes</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2800</td>
<td>2800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there may be slight variations due to individual differences between institutions, in general, traditional beginning foreign language courses provide 2,800 minutes of face-to-face instruction over a 14 week period with an average of 200 real-time contact minutes per week. Any additional activities and assignments, whether online or otherwise, are at the discretion of the instructor, and may vary by institution and instructor. Given the highly variable nature of supplemental assignments and activities outside of the required class time, and the fact that time allotted to deliver instruction in traditional face-to-face language courses are the standard by which instructional time for alternative instructional environments are calculated, this particular study will categorize the instructional environments in terms of real-time instruction minutes. Thus, the 2,800 minutes of scheduled instruction in traditional foreign language courses is considered to be 100% real-time instruction. By contrast, the online environment delivers 0% of instruction in a real-time format. This type of course is a deadline driven environment in which students work on their own to meet course goals. Course goals are generally based upon those of the face-to-face traditional course, so one may expect that the intention is to provide students with 200 minutes of instruction per week in an asynchronous format. Yet, because students are not required to log in at an appointed time, the actual amount of time that students are exposed to language instruction is unknown and may vary by institution, instructor, and student depending upon the pace at which a student may work, the type of instructional materials available to the
student, and the types of activities that students are required to complete. In addition to the traditional and online environments, two types of hybrid courses have emerged. The hybrid “full semester” course delivers 160 minutes per week of real-time instruction. This is 2,240 minutes or 80% real-time instruction. In this type of hybrid course, students are expected to receive 560 minutes, or 20% of instruction, in an online format. By contrast, the hybrid “half semester” course delivers 7 weeks of real-time instruction at a rate of 120 minutes per week, a total of 840 minutes of real-time contact with 30% of instruction being face-to-face and 1,960 minutes, or 70%, being online.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to begin to examine the online and traditional instructional environments, it is necessary to look at research on Second Language Acquisition (SLA), specifically as it pertains to the classroom setting as, more often than not, learners engage in language learning via some kind of formal instruction. This chapter provides an overview of SLA research and its application to the instructional setting along with recent research on Computer Mediated Communication (CMC) and its application to the second language instructional environment.

Instructed Second Language Acquisition

Second language acquisition (SLA), a field of study which began about fifty years ago with roots in child language acquisition, psychology, linguistics, and language teaching (Huebner, 1998), investigates the capacity of humans to learn languages beyond the first language (L1) after acquisition of the L1 has occurred, such as during late childhood, adolescence, or adulthood (Ortega, 2009). Researchers within the field are interested in learning how the acquisition of a second language (L2) takes place and recognize that there are generally two types of learners: instructed, via formal study, and naturalistic, via the course of everyday life in various settings which may range from casual informal contact to complete immersion (Munoz, 2008; Ortega, 2009). Recognizing that there is little agreement amongst researchers with regard to how an L2 can be acquired within an instructional setting, Ellis (2008) established a set of principles of instructed L2 acquisition, based upon research from a variety of theoretical perspectives within the field. Though not intended to be prescriptive, the research review and its application to instruction, provide an opportunity for teachers to apply aspects of SLA research to the instructional environment.
The principles of instructed SLA, as determined by Ellis (2008) are as follows:

- Develop formulaic expressions and a rule-based competence
- Focus predominantly on meaning
- Focus on form
- Develop implicit knowledge of the L2 while maintaining explicit knowledge
- Take learners’ built-in syllabus into account
- Provide extensive L2 input
- Provide opportunities for output
- Provide an opportunity to interact in the L2 to develop L2 proficiency
- Take individual differences into account
- Assess learners’ L2 proficiency by examining free and controlled output

In an attempt to establish guidelines for the development of online foreign language courses, Nielson and Gonzalez-Lloret (2010) established a set of guidelines similar to those of Ellis.

The guiding principles determined by Nielson and Gonzalez-Lloret (2010) are:

- Follow established principles of SLA, providing opportunities for input, output, interaction, and feedback.
- Establish a sense of community in the online environment
- Choose relevant and appropriate course content and technological tools
- Provide instructors and students with sufficient training

It is generally agreed by researchers in the field of SLA that interaction is a central component of L2 acquisition (Ellis, 2008; Gass, Abhul, & Mackey, 2012; Nielson & Gonzalez-Lloret, 2010).

The following sections further explore interaction and its importance to the process of language acquisition in general, as well as to the process of second language acquisition.
Interaction

As a Necessity for Language Development

For over seventy years, the idea that interaction plays an important role in language acquisition has been an important one. In fact, as early as 1934, in studies of children, Vygotsky, a socio-culturalist, put forth the idea that interaction can take place within one’s mind, known as private speech. Studies of isolated and feral children (Curtiss, 1977; Mason, 1942; Skuse, 1984) have provided evidence that interaction is not only a necessity for first language development, but for the development and maintenance of cognitive abilities. While these studies and others provide evidence for a critical period in first language acquisition (Lenneberg, 1967) and similar constraints on second language acquisition (Johnson & Newport, 1989; Thompson, 1991; Birdsong & Molis, 2001) the underlying assertion is that the lack of human and linguistic interaction can be detrimental to linguistic development for both first and second language learners. To further support the value of interaction in first and second language acquisition, Ellis (1999, p.1) asserts that interaction is “the primary purpose for our species-specific language capacity”. Additionally, Tomasello (2003, p.2), concurs with Ellis and observes that it “takes many years of daily interaction with mature language users for children to attain adult-like skills, which is a longer period of learning with more things to be learned—by many orders of magnitude—than is required of any other species on the planet”. More recently, Lee, Mikesell, Joaquin, Mates, and Schumann (2009) observed that interaction is a necessity for language acquisition, indicating that humans possess an instinct or an innate drive to interact with others.

Importance in Second Language Acquisition

Interaction has long been a topic of discussion and debate in the field of SLA. As previously mentioned, the idea that human learning takes place via human interaction was first
proposed by Vygotsky. This theory, based in educational psychology, served as a starting point from which SLA researchers began explore how second languages are acquired. In SLA, there are various theories about interaction and its role in L2 acquisition. Ellis (1999, p.1) defines interaction as “the social behavior that occurs when one person communicates with another” and says that interaction “can occur inside our minds, both when we engage in the kind of ‘private speech’ discussed by Vygotsky (1978) and more covertly, when different modules of the mind interact to construct an understanding of or a response to some phenomenon”. One-way nativist theories such as Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1981) and Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1985) place importance on either the information received from the interlocutor (input) or the product of the interaction (output) rather than on the process of the interaction itself. Interaction theory (Hatch 1978; Long, 1996; Pica 1994, 1996) places importance on the process of face-to-face interaction and communication in the overall development of language proficiency. The Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) proposes that while comprehensible input is important for second language acquisition, the effectiveness of the input is increased when, via output, learners interact and negotiate for meaning. Although the process of interaction may seem simple at first glance, it involves a fairly complex process of negotiation, with strategies of which the interlocutors are generally unaware. Long (1996) found that, when communication breaks down, as often happens in an L2 learning setting, interlocutors will utilize certain communicative strategies to derive meaning and make input more comprehensible. This provides feedback to the learner and prompts learners to modify their output to utilize the correct form or structure needed. Common strategies involved in the negotiation of meaning are: slowed speech, deliberate speech, requests for clarification, repair of speech, and paraphrasing (Brown, 2000). Jepson (2005) found that negotiation of meaning not only increases the likelihood that
comprehension will occur, but that it may also promote awareness and use of new target language forms, again providing evidence that interaction facilitates acquisition. Additional research has shown that, when a speech error is made, interlocutors tend to model the correct form or structure to the learner. This is generally referred to as negative evidence, or error correction, in the form of a recast. This type of modeling provides the learner with feedback on production and grammar, allowing the learner to focus on structures and forms that they have not yet acquired. Through the process, learners may receive an increased amount of input, spend more time concentrating on and seeking clarification for what they do not understand, and take more time to process the corrective input. Such experiences have been shown increase comprehension and lead to the acquisition of new language forms. Thus, interaction draws attention to the gap between a learner’s knowledge and what they have yet to acquire (Gass & Selinker, 2008).

While the Interaction Hypothesis suggests that the process of interaction itself is of primary importance for language development and acquisition, and numerous studies connect interaction to the process of language acquisition, some researchers question its exact role. Allwright (1984) indicated that interaction itself may be a manner by which learners find learning opportunities but that finding the opportunities does not necessarily lead to their beneficial and productive use (Johnson & Johnson, 1999). Similarly, Gass and Selinker (2008) suggested that interaction may function as a priming device, a process which facilitates learning but may not be how learning takes place. In his own research, Ellis (1997) found that interaction may also have negative consequences, such as an overwhelming amount of input, or input which may be too complicated for learners to grasp. Although there are differing views of interaction amongst researchers, the evidence suggests that interaction has, and continues, to play an
important role in the process of second language acquisition. As previously mentioned on page 1, it no longer seems to be a question of whether interaction facilitates second language acquisition, but rather, which aspects of the L2 benefit from it (Gass et al., 2012). The next section discusses interaction in the context of the online environment and explores how the available interactive tools may be used in instructed SLA.

**In Computer Mediated Language Courses**

Online technology provides additional forums for communication such as e-mail, discussion boards, online chat, and texting, along with social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook. Researchers in the fields of second language acquisition and foreign language education have begun to investigate the potential usefulness of the various online applications as tools for interaction among students and teachers. As more advanced technological tools become available, and more schools develop online foreign language courses, researchers in both the fields of CMC and SLA have found that tools for synchronous communication can be highly beneficial (Meloni, 2010; Nielson & Gonzalez-Lloret, 2010) as their use can serve to most closely mimic the interactional environment needed to promote L2 acquisition, encouraging communication and collaboration between learners (De la Fuente, 2003). For this reason, features such as web and video conferencing providing real-time two-way video, online chat and whiteboards, and instant messaging are in many ways, preferable to asynchronous tools. Payne and Whitney (2002) found that text-based CMC, such as online chat, may help improve L2 speaking ability because it employs the same cognitive mechanisms involved in spontaneous conversational speech, therefore serving to help learners negotiate for meaning, obtain feedback, and ultimately improve overall language skills (Lee, 2002). Based on these findings, one might conclude that the preferred manner by which to deliver foreign language instruction online is via
a synchronous format. Meloni (2010) points out, however, that because tools for synchronous communication can require more technological and financial resources on the part of both students and the institution, and can be less reliable than asynchronous tools because they require more bandwidth to run than the asynchronous tools, the potential problems and costs involved in their use can be prohibitive. Additionally, Nielson and Gonzalez-Lloret (2010) recognize that “there are often logistical scheduling constraints with synchronous CMC, especially when grouping students across time zones”. In an attempt to build a framework for online foreign language learning via a review of existing research, Nielson and Gonzalez-Lloret, (2010) suggest that a combination of synchronous and asynchronous tools in online foreign language courses would best promote the interaction required for second language acquisition, while taking into account some of the logistical issues involved. However, the asynchronous option is most often offered to students, such as in the case of the Florida public post-secondary institutions, suggesting that the institutions offering asynchronous online foreign language courses may be doing so for reasons of cost effectiveness as well as the preferred simplicity of scheduling such courses as compared to synchronous options. This implies that the choice to offer asynchronous language courses may be based mostly on reasons related to finances, technological resources, and scheduling issues rather than on pedagogical ones.

In Asynchronous Online Language Courses

As asynchronous online foreign language courses become more popular, and the real-time face-to-face interaction important to the acquisition process is removed, a concern for language teachers is whether interaction can take place at all, and if it does, how and in which forms it may take place in the asynchronous online setting. While useful in certain contexts, asynchronous online communication is missing the element of real-time interaction and does not
generally allow for participants to utilize visual, auditory, and social cues to derive meaning (Hardison, 2003; Kuhl, 2004). In other words, such tools generally involve reading and writing only with the ability to see and hear your interlocutor highly limited or non-existent. There are some popular and useful tools for asynchronous interaction, with the oldest and most reliable tool for asynchronous communication being e-mail (Meloni, 2010; Nielson & Gonzalez-Lloret, 2010). While it may seem antiquated as compared to more recent technologies, it allows discussions to be carried on asynchronously and in private, as opposed to other asynchronous tools, which are public. Usually housed within a course website or management system, discussion/message boards and blogs facilitate guided discussions about a particular topic. The discussion board, a public tool, provides a linear, threaded discussion to a posted topic within particular course. A blog may be used within a particular class or it may be expanded to include participants from other institutions and the general public. Discussions generally revolve around a particular topic, but tend to be more free form, without threads to show the sequence of communication. A newer form of asynchronous communication is the social networking site which provides both synchronous and asynchronous interaction. Because social networking sites are still quite new, educators have only recently begun exploring them to begin to figure out how to incorporate these tools into both their face-to-face and online courses. For some, developing a course Facebook page is useful for providing up-to-date information for students without the need to provide students with permission to access an instructor’s personal Facebook page. Twitter is also becoming popular, although it is not as easy to use as Facebook and does not provide a clear route for discussions. Platforms such as Edmodo provide a Facebook-like experience within a secure environment. Lastly, online courses may utilize various forms of presentation software for the posting of presentations to the course website or exchanging files.
via e-mail. While there are many newer options for developing and sharing presentations, the 
most widely accepted and used is Microsoft PowerPoint. Students may also post and share text, 
video and audio files via a course website, social networking, or via e-mail. According to course 
syllabi readily available from Florida colleges and universities offering asynchronous online 
foreign language courses, these courses generally utilize e-mail, discussion boards, and file 
sharing to facilitate interaction without a requiring a synchronous real-time component. The 
following section explores the types in interaction which may occur in online and traditional 
environments and discusses the idea of cognitive presence within interaction as a necessity for 
learning.

Models of Distance Learning Interaction

In a learning environment, whether face-to-face or online, multiple types of interaction 
occur. According to Moore and Kearsely’s Model of Distance Learning Interaction (2005), there 
are three types of interaction which take place in a learning environment: Learner-Content, 
Learner-Learner, and Learner-Instructor. In a revised version of the Moore and Kearsely model, 
Bouhnik and Marcus (2006) proposed adding a fourth interaction type, Interaction with the 
System, the system being the technological tools necessary to facilitate interaction within a 
distance learning environment. Moore and Kearsely’s original model was further supported by 
al. (2009), which found the same three main categories of distance learning interaction (Learner-
Learner, Learner-Instructor, and Learner-Content) but observed that the quality and quantity of 
interactions may vary. As a practical matter, one might assume that these same basic categories 
are present within a traditional classroom environment and may be utilized to analyze the type of 
interaction occurring across all instructional environments. As such, the Moore and Kearsely
Model of Distance Learning Interaction will be utilized in the current study and its use will be specified in Chapter 3: General Procedure.

**Evidence of Critical Thinking within Interaction**

Garrison, Anderson, and Archer (2000, 2001) proposed that a learning environment can and should be considered a community of inquiry. Their Model of Community Inquiry proposes that the educational experience should contain three core elements in order to facilitate learning: teaching presence, social presence, and cognitive presence. Cognitive presence, an important element in critical thinking, is defined as the “extent to which the participants in any particular configuration of a community of inquiry are able to construct meaning through sustained communication” (Garrison et al., 2000, p. 89). Social presence, serving a support role to cognitive presence, is defined as “the ability of participants in the community of inquiry to project their personal characteristics into the community, thereby presenting themselves to the other participants as ‘real people’”. Teaching presence, involving design and facilitation of the education experience, can be performed by anyone within the community of inquiry, but is most commonly performed by the teacher. These three elements interact with one another in order to create the community of inquiry, as shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Community of Inquiry (Garrison et al., 2000)](image_url)
Based on this model, a template for identifying these elements within a given learning environment was proposed. Table 2 (Garrison et al., 2000) specifies the categories and indicators for each element.

Table 2
Community of Inquiry Coding Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Presence</td>
<td>Triggering Event</td>
<td>Sense of puzzlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Connecting ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td>Apply new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>Emotional Expression</td>
<td>Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Communication</td>
<td>Risk-free expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group Cohesion</td>
<td>Encouraging Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Presence</td>
<td>Instructional Management</td>
<td>Defining/Initiating Discussion Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Understanding</td>
<td>Sharing personal meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>Focusing discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed as a tool within the Model of Community Inquiry, the Practical Inquiry model is referenced within the Cognitive Presence category of the Community of Inquiry, operationalizing cognitive presence as a tool to assess critical discourse and reflection (Garrison et al., 2001). The levels of cognitive presence, referenced above, are not unlike the cognitive domains of Bloom’s taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl., 2001; Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956). A close look at the Practical Inquiry Model reveals that its categories encompass Bloom’s categories of knowledge and comprehension (remembering and understanding in the revised version) within the triggering event. Likewise, Bloom’s application and analysis (applying and analyzing) are referred to as exploration within the Practical Inquiry model, with integration and resolution equivalent to Bloom’s synthesis and evaluation (creating and evaluating). Essentially, the domains of Bloom’s taxonomy and the Practical Inquiry Model assess depth of learning via
the cognitive processes accessed to process new information. For the purpose of utilizing the Practical Inquiry model to analyze the level of cognitive presence within SLA, Chu (2005) modified Garrison’s model to further break down the triggering event into two categories, recognition and comprehension. This modification further aligns the practical Inquiry Model with Bloom’s taxonomy and allows for the identification of evidence of critical thinking within the L2 learning environment. The study proposed herein will utilize Chu’s revised Practical Inquiry model to identify cognitive presence within L2 learning environments. Its use is further explained in Chapter 3: General Procedure.

General Findings: Asynchronous Tools for Communication and Interaction

Synchronous CMC has been used as a teaching tool to replace or supplement face-to-face communication in a number of disciplines, including foreign language, (Arnold & Ducate, 2006) and is generally thought of as superior to asynchronous environments in that learners receive immediate interaction and feedback. Studies on asynchronous computer mediated communication (ACMC) have found a range of results when it comes to its potential benefit to the learning process, from the positive to the negative. On the positive side, ACMC allows students more time for reflection and formulation of responses via a threaded discussion board discussion than would be available via a synchronous online chat forum or even during a face-to-face classroom discussion (Meyer, 2003). It also allows for discussion among students who would otherwise not have time in their schedules to meet in a real-time environment (Lomicka & Lord, 2004). Various studies point to the many advantages of ACMC in the construction of collaborative learning environments which include: information exchange, evidence of critical thinking and in-depth processing, sharing and building upon ideas also known as scaffolding in order to construct knowledge (DeWert, Babinski, & Jones, 2003; Liou, 2001; McKenzie &
Murphy, 2000; Mitchell, 2003; Pawan, Paulus, Yalcin, & Chang, 2003; Pena-Shaff & Nicholls, 2004; Sengupta, 2001). On the negative side, some studies have shown that threaded discussions appear to be one-way with little interaction between students (Pawan et al., 2003, p. 129) inhibiting the negotiation and construction of meaning and ideas, also known as cognitive presence (Garrison et al., 2001; Weasenforth, Biesenbach-Lucas, & Meloni, 2002). In a study of online interaction between future foreign language teachers, Arnold and Ducate (2006) sought to clarify the opposing findings on ACMC. They found that, more often than not, students engaged in interactive discussions. They note that, in some previous studies, the participation of the instructor seemed to inhibit student communication and because the instructor was involved, students also spent more time editing their own responses. However, when the instructor was absent from the discussions, the students focused more on facilitating discussion than on editing themselves. They also found that, with the instructor absent from the activity, students engaged in more social behaviors than in previous studies in which the instructor was present, contributing to a more collaborative learning environment. Arnold and Ducate (2006) conducted a study of transcripts from asynchronous discussions, conducted via discussion board, and analyzed them using the four stages of cognitive presence (trigger, exploration, integration, and resolution) of the Practical Inquiry Model developed by Garrison et al. (2001). The discussions, which were held between foreign language methodology classes at two different universities, took place over the course of a semester. They found evidence that students involved in the discussion board discussions reached the exploration and integration stages, but that very few reached the resolution stage. Because of this, they suggest that the instructor may want to become involved at a certain point in order to provide guidance and help students reach this advanced level of critical thinking and information processing.
In general, ACMC interaction via discussion board, as a supplement to the face-to-face synchronous environment, has the potential to be a useful tool to promote the establishment of collaborative learning communities and higher order thinking when properly guided by the instructor. It allows students time to reflect before posting a response and can be convenient for those with scheduling issues therefore unable to meet in real-time via a synchronous platform, such as web conferencing or online chat, or even face-to-face. With this in mind, the question becomes whether the use of asynchronous communication tools can be utilized as an interactional tool to facilitate L2 acquisition in an exclusively asynchronous online learning environment.

It is important to note that the existing body of research on asynchronous interactional tools focuses on their utilization in supplement to traditional face-to-face foreign language instruction. The use of these tools within an exclusively asynchronous learning environment has yet to become a widespread research focus. This section provides an overview of the available tools for asynchronous interaction and their potential usefulness to the process of instructed second language acquisition.

**E-Mail.** Research conducted throughout the 1990s provided evidence that e-mail interaction, when conducted between native (NS) and nonnative (NNS) speakers, as a modern pen pal type relationship, may result in increased L2 NNS proficiency (Aitsiselmi, 1999; Florez-Estrada, 1995; Ioanniou-Georgiou, 1999). While some research tends to provide support for the use of e-mail communication as a tool for L2 acquisition, there is also some evidence that students should have already attained a certain level of proficiency in order to benefit from e-mail interaction with NS and that, without the linguistic resources necessary to sustain interactions with native speakers (Saita, Harrison, & Inman, 1998), students will benefit less, or
not at all, from this type of interaction. Stockwell and Levy (2001) looked at whether the number of e-mail interactions between native speakers and non-native speakers affects student proficiency level. In their study of e-mail interaction between native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) of Japanese they tracked the frequency of interactions occurring between NS-NNS dyads over the course of a 5 week period. They then analyzed the interactions for syntactic proficiency using the percentage of error-free T-units. A T-unit is one main clause with all subordinate clauses attached to it (Hunt, 1965) i.e. a main clause with dependent clauses attached. The results of the T-unit measures were then correlated with the number of messages and the number of lines produced in each message in order to determine whether a relationship existed between the number of interactions and L2 proficiency. They found that the more e-mails an NNS participant wrote to, and received from, the NS partner, the fewer errors the NNS generated. They also found that the more proficient students were to begin with, the more they wrote to their NS partner. They observed that less proficient students, while able to participate, had more difficulty in producing messages to begin with, thereby not progressing as well as those who were more proficient to begin with indicating that interaction via e-mail may not be an effective tool for L2 acquisition for less proficient or beginning level learners. This study also uncovered factors which showed a potential for limiting student success with L2 e-mail communication, such as: disinterest in topic, low motivation, anxiety, technological incompetence, and inconsistent or slow responders. Because the pen pals who deviated from the assigned topics actually produced more messages than those who stuck with the assigned topics, the researchers suggest that teachers should provide students with flexibility as well as strategies for navigating the online interactional environment. In a later study, Stockwell and Harrington (2003) studied e-mail communication between L2 learners of Japanese and Japanese native
speakers for evidence of improvement in syntactic and vocabulary development. Again, e-mail was used in supplement to the face-to-face classroom, not as the only means of L2 interaction. Over the five-week study, the learners of Japanese showed improvement in syntactic structure but no marked improvement in vocabulary. In a similar study, Torii-Williams (2004) also found that L1 English learners of Japanese benefitted from e-mail exchanges with native-speaker Japanese university students in Japan. Teacher evaluation of the e-mail exchanges showed that students learned new grammatical structures and increased vocabulary. Students reported that they spent more time ensuring that communications to their Japanese counterparts were grammatically correct. The L1 English learners also began an unsolicited collaboration to edit each other’s e-mails before they were sent to the Japanese pen-pal. In addition, students also reported a greater sense of cultural understanding as a result of the project. Similarly, in a study on e-mail communication as a tool to improve foreign language writing performance via peer-to-peer communication between L1 Chinese learners of English, as a supplement to the face-to-face environment, Shang (2007) found that target language e-mail communication improved learner syntax and grammar but did not have an effect on vocabulary. Similar to the findings of Stockwell and Harrington (2003), this study also found that students who exchanged messages more frequently showed greater improvement in writing skills. Because previous studies had found that beginning level students tend to struggle with, and benefit less from L2 e-mail communication because of simple lack of L2 knowledge, the participants involved in the Shang study were intermediate level students.

Research conducted on the use of e-mail as a tool within the L2 learning environment focuses on its use as a supplement to the face-to-face classroom environment for learners who had achieved a proficiency level beyond that of a true beginner. Subjects of these studies were
college students ranging from intermediate to advanced level foreign language students. Results show that the students who benefitted most from e-mail exchange with native speakers were those who exchanged the most messages, thus assessed at having a high level of participation. The research indicates that students who performed at an overall lower level, and were therefore less proficient, lacked the necessary skills to be able to communicate effectively in the L2 via the e-mail format. As a result, those students showed less improvement and fewer overall gains than those who were more advanced to begin with. The body of research on L2 e-mail communication generally involves student-student interaction, either peer to peer within a particular class or native speaker to non-native speaker within a particular language, and does not address teacher-student L2 e-mail interaction. Because e-mail communication between student and teacher tends to be of an informational nature, the type of e-mail communication described in the aforementioned body of research may be an activity assigned by the teacher, but it is unlikely that the teacher would be the online interlocutor. In fact, I found no studies which explore teacher-student e-mail communication in the L2 learning context as a tool for L2 development, however the studies in existence on general teacher-student e-mail interaction reference this teacher-student e-mail communication as beneficial for sharing information and relationship building (Decker, Dona, & Christenson, 2007; Fraser & Walberg 2005; Young, Kelsey, & Lancaster, 2011).

In the context of an online foreign language course, the research suggests that e-mail can be a useful interactional tool in the asynchronous environment as a form of L2 communication between native and non-native speakers of the same language, provided that the non-native speakers have already attained a level of proficiency above that of a beginner. When properly directed and monitored by the instructor, e-mail can also be utilized as a tool to build certain
types of L2 knowledge within a group of learners as well a form of communication between teacher and student. In an online course of any subject, e-mail tends to be a main form of communication, along with the discussion board and the online course announcements board, between instructor and student. The extent to which online foreign language instructors may use e-mail as a means of interaction used to facilitate L2 acquisition in the asynchronous environment remains to be seen. Despite its positive impact, when utilized in the right conditions, currently available syllabi for online language courses in Florida suggest that e-mail is not generally utilized by online instructors as an L2 interactional tool.

Discussion and message boards. Within the last decade, research in academic areas generally weakly linked or unrelated to SLA suggest that discussion boards, also known as message boards, provide opportunities for reflection, evaluation, problem solving, social interaction, and the exchange of ideas (DeWert, Babinski, & Jones, 2003; Kumari, 2001; Pawan et al., 2003). However, other studies have found that the discussion board forum may not foster interaction between students (Pena-Shaff & Nicholls, 2004) with some studies finding a lack of social and cognitive interactivity (Garrison et al., 2001; Meyer, 2003).

In an SLA based study, Chu (2005) sought to determine the level of cognitive presence (i.e. types of critical thinking) exhibited by students in two types of interactions: face-to-face discussions and asynchronous online discussion boards. The study focused on how critical thinking may differ from the online to the face-to-face environments, in this case utilizing asynchronous discussions as a complement to face-to-face instruction. In order to identify the various levels of cognitive presence, a modified version of the previously discussed Practical Inquiry Model (Garrison et al., 2001), was utilized. The modified model took phase 1- **triggering event**, and split it into two phases: *recognition* and *comprehension*, thereby adding a fifth phase
to the original model. Participants were L1 Korean and Japanese advanced learners of English participating in a face-to-face class with internet-based homework assignments. Interactions were analyzed via the utilization of Chu’s modified version of the Practical Inquiry Model. The model proposes five levels of critical thinking, in order: recognition, comprehension, exploration, integration, resolution. Results were calculated based on the number of turns taken in a discussion and on analysis of the content of each turn. The study found that the discussion board format facilitated critical thinking 90% of the time as opposed to the face-to-face environment which facilitated critical thinking 50% of the time. Interestingly, neither the face-to-face nor online environments provided evidence of participants having reached the final stage of resolution, however the discussion board format did provide evidence of a higher level of cognitive presence than the face-to-face format. When utilizing the discussion board, students spent more time in the exploration phase (phase 3) whereas in the face-to-face discussions, students spent the most time in the recognition phase (phase 1). Additionally, the online discussions provided evidence of the first four phases having been reached (recognition, comprehension, exploration, and integration) whereas the face-to-face discussions provided evidence that only the first three stages had been reached. While the data show an exchange of information happening in both groups, neither the online nor the face-to-face group reached the resolution phase, thus providing no evidence that the construction of new meaning occurred. The data also showed that in the face-to-face format, discussions veer off course more frequently. Fifty percent of the face-to-face discussions were categorized as “other” and unrelated to the topic, whereas in the online format only 9.3% of the discussion was categorized as “other”. This study provides evidence that the online discussion board, because of its asynchronous unconstrained nature with respect to time, may be a more effective platform for discussion than
the face-to-face format, which is time limited and can be conducive to discussions veering off
topic, but that in both cases, some kind of intervention may be required to enable students to
students to reach the advanced stages of critical thinking.

In a study on the use of the online discussion board to facilitate L2 English acquisition in
beginning ESL students in elementary school grades (Zha, Kelly, Park, Meeaeng, & Fitzgerald
2006), results showed that while the discussion board environment increased student use of
written English for personal expression and enjoyment, it also promoted the decrease in use of
formal language in favor of more informal expressions. The study provided evidence that
students corrected their own language use, when influenced by the messages of peers, implying
that some negotiation does occur in this environment. In contrast, students rarely corrected each
other or requested meanings of words from one another, nor did they improve in their use of
genre, providing evidence that the discussion board did little to influence higher order thinking.
Although this study involved participants in grades 2-5 (ages 6-11) rather than adult learners, it
does provide support for the notion that the online environment, whether e-mail or asynchronous
discussion board, provides more benefit to intermediate and advanced L2 learners than those at
the beginning levels. Similarly, a study by Lee (2002, p. 286) provided the following
observation: “learners tended to ignore each other’s mistakes and moved forward with the
discussions […] students need to be advised of the need to write correctly to maintain a balance
between function, content, and accuracy”. Because the majority of studies involving online
discussion boards, and CMC in general, had focused on student-student interaction with little
involvement from the instructor, Meskill and Anthony (2005) conducted a study in which the
instructor was present to provide “skillful instructional scaffolding” and regular feedback to the
students. Once again, this study involved the use of the discussion board as a supplement to the
face-to-face instructional environment as an extension of the classroom. Participants of the study were first year, second semester Russian language students participating in instructor-guided discussions in the target language. Analysis of transcripts showed that students challenged themselves with regard to target language production. They experimented with new forms and vocabulary, provided feedback to one another, and interacted with the instructor within the discussion board forum. In this case, the ACMC environment allowed the instructor to slow down the conversation in an asynchronous environment, providing increased opportunities to focus on form, thus focusing the attention of the students in a way which is more difficult to do in the faster paced real-time classroom environment. This study bolsters the observation made by Lee (2002) and suggests that while careful integration of discussion boards into the L2 learning environment can serve to supplement and benefit the L2 learner’s overall L2 system, computer-mediated communication should not be a replacement for live, synchronous instruction.

Summary. The principal tools for student-student and student-teacher interaction in asynchronous online post-secondary courses are: e-mail and the discussion board. These tools may be used for bidirectional discussions and may also be utilized for informational purposes. A tool for one-way communication, which is generally informational, is an online announcement board in which course information may be generated by the instructor. In studies conducted on the uses and potential benefits of e-mail and discussion boards as instructional tools to facilitate the process of second language acquisition, the following has been observed:

- Both forums are most beneficial to students who have attained a level of L2 proficiency beyond that of beginner. The more advanced the student, the more his/her L2 system will benefit from interaction within the asynchronous environment.
- Although targeted activities involving native and non-native speaker dyads can be beneficial to the L2 learner, whether instructors actually use e-mail as an L2 instructional interactional tool at all has yet to be fully investigated.
• In the asynchronous environment, skillfully directed e-mail and discussion board activities are more beneficial to learners than freeform discussions.

• In both forums, L2 communication became less formal, implying a need for instructor involvement to ensure that students are focusing on all aspects of a language.

• When compared to the face-to-face environment, and under the right circumstances, both online forums provide opportunities to interact in a slower-paced environment, allowing intermediate to advanced learners more time to reflect, edit responses, focus on form, and utilize critical thinking skills thus providing students with the opportunity to reach a higher level of cognitive presence than the face-to-face environment.

• Both forums are used most often in supplement to face-to-face and real-time CMC interaction rather than as the primary instructional environment.

• Whether these forums, when used as the sole manner of interaction such as via an asynchronous online language course, remain beneficial to the learners is unknown as no empirical studies have been found.

• It seems that no empirical studies in which students enrolled in an asynchronous online language course are compared to students enrolled in face-to-face courses have been conducted.
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The research presented thus far suggests that real-time synchronous interactional tools provide a forum through which learners can interact with one another, providing input and negotiating for meaning, leading to comprehensible output and the acquisition of new forms. Additionally, asynchronous tools have been found to provide some benefit to students of all levels, while beginning level students tend not to benefit as much from asynchronous interaction in the online environment as more advanced students. Although the evidence presented in Chapter 2 suggests that synchronous tools, or even a combination of real-time and asynchronous instruction, can be most beneficial to intermediate and advanced L2 learners, the vast majority of the online foreign language courses offered by Florida colleges and universities are exclusively asynchronous and offered only to beginning and intermediate level students. These courses share course numbers and descriptions with face-to-face counterparts offered at colleges and universities throughout the state, implying that both the online and face-to-face courses offer the same interactional opportunities and content. It is with these issues in mind that the proposed study seeks to answer the following questions:

(1) What is the relationship between the type of interactional environment and linguistic outcomes for students in the following types of beginning level foreign language courses: asynchronous online, face-to-face, and hybrid?

(2) Is there a relationship between type of interaction and demonstrated level of critical thinking (i.e. cognitive presence) within each interactional environment? If so, how might this affect linguistic outcomes for learners?

(3) Is there a relationship between other factors such as enrollment status, lifestyle, anxiety, motivation, and learning readiness on choice of instructional environment and linguistic outcomes?
A primary purpose of the proposed study is to determine the type of interaction occurring within specific instructional environments and investigate how the presence or absence of real-time interaction, between teacher and students, as well as amongst students, in a beginning French language course affects linguistic outcomes for beginning level students enrolled in an asynchronous online, hybrid, and face-to-face French language courses. The secondary purpose of this study is to investigate whether interaction within each environment provides evidence of higher order thinking processes and what the effects may be, if any, on linguistic outcomes. A tertiary purpose of this study is to assess whether other factors such as motivation, anxiety, and lifestyle have an effect on linguistic outcomes.

According to previously cited research and what is commonly known by professionals in the field of foreign language education, students in a modern face-to-face instructional environment interact with the instructor and peers in real-time, allowing for questions to be answered and issues to be worked out immediately in order to move the student forward in the L2 acquisition process. Required student materials are generally the following: textbook, lab manual and/or workbook, audio and/or video CDs. The face-to-face course may be supplemented up to 29% with asynchronous discussion board and e-mail interaction, resources, and materials via an online environment or other technological platform, such as a language lab, in addition to 200 minutes of classroom instruction each week. Students in the face-to-face environment also have the opportunity to interact with one another outside of allotted class time via study groups, the development of social relationships which may occur as a result of the classroom environment, and subject matter related activities which may occur as part of the campus cultural environment such as films, presentations, discussions, cultural events, etc. The asynchronous online course utilizes e-mail and online discussion boards as a main means of communication.
with the instructor and each other, with informational one way communication occurring from
teacher to student via an online course announcement board. Generally, 100% of the course is
held in an asynchronous environment. Because asynchronous courses are driven by assignment
deadlines, students are not required to meet with the instructor or peers during an allotted period
of time in which the attention of the students is captured within an L2 themed environment.
Required student materials are generally the following: Internet access and computer, textbook
(either online or hardcopy), lab manual and/or workbook (either online or hard copy), audio
and/or video CDs or files, word processing and digital presentation software for file sharing.
Students in the asynchronous environment can form study groups in the online environment, but
are less likely to form friendships since students do not generally have the opportunity for
extended contact with their peers. Any additional exploration of the language and/or culture will
take place based on the personal motivation of the student. Both the online and face-to-face
student have access to basic instructional materials providing access to written and spoken forms
of the language, although the online student does not have the opportunity to interact verbally in
the L2 in real-time, there is an opportunity access spoken language via available media and send
sound files of student speech to the instructor for evaluation and feedback. Hybrid courses tend
to be a blending of the face-to-face and online environment, generally with reduced “face-time”
in favor of increased online activities. The percentage of real-time interaction may vary amongst
hybrid courses.

Although both e-mail and discussion boards have proven to be beneficial platforms for
L2 interaction, when utilized as a supplement to face-to-face instruction, research has shown that
activities in both forums should be skillfully directed by the instructor in order for the learner to
move forward in the acquisition process. Furthermore, research has suggested that these forums
are least beneficial to those who have limited to no knowledge of the language, such as in the case of beginning L2 learners.

In light of these findings, I hypothesize that beginning level French language students in the asynchronous online learning environment will not perform as well on assessments of linguistic outcomes pertaining to speaking and reading comprehension as the students who have the opportunity to interact in the real-time, face-to-face courses with access to a supplemental asynchronous environment. Although studies focusing on intermediate to advanced level students have indicated that asynchronous interaction provides a less time restricted environment, thus yielding evidence that advanced levels of higher order thinking are more likely to be attained as compared to the face-to-face environment, the interaction taking place within both the traditional and asynchronous beginning level environments will likely reveal lower levels of cognitive presence due to the fact that these students possess a lower level of overall L2 linguistic knowledge to begin with. Further, I expect that determining level of cognitive presence will be difficult in the online courses, given that interaction may be severely reduced compared to the level of interaction expected in the traditional classroom. Findings may provide support for institutional differentiation between online and face-to-face foreign language course offerings in course title, description, and credit awarded and as well pedagogical implications on curriculum, delivery of instruction, pacing, and expected outcomes. With regard to the hybrid courses, learning outcomes and level of cognitive presence will be dependent upon the amount of real-time interaction occurring in the face-to-face component of these courses.
Study Description

In order to address the research questions, a five-part study was devised. The study, involved the participation of three Florida state and community colleges along with professors and students of French 1120 courses at the participating institutions. Professors and students were asked to complete surveys, actual French 1120 traditional, hybrid, and online courses were observed, and students enrolled in the various types of French 1120 courses completed two skills assessments toward the end of their respective courses. Instructor and student participants were provided with consent forms (See Appendices B and C).

Participants

Post-Secondary Institutions

Three of the Florida state and community colleges within the public post-secondary educational system consented to serve as a location for the study. Consent was provided via each institution’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) process. Consent to host the study involved nothing more than the ability of the researcher to be present on the campus. Institutional consent did not guarantee departmental, student, or instructor participation. Depending upon the policies of the individual institutions, the researcher may or may not have been provided access to professors and students in order to invite participation in the study. Any restrictions related to the recruitment of subjects will be presented in the discussion of study results. Institutions were chosen based on the variety of French 1120 courses offered as well as proximity (within 300 miles) to the researcher’s place of residence, thus limited to the central and south Florida areas. To be considered for the study, participating institutions were required to offer French 1120 courses in at least two instructional environments. Out of concern for the potential implications that the study could have on course instructors, students, and institutional programming,
participating institutions, and all participants within each institution, were granted anonymity. Because of this, discussion of the study will not reference individual institutions, but groups of participants. Participating students were required to be enrolled in a French 1120 course at one of the participating institutions and may, or may not, have been enrolled in the observed courses.

**French 1120 Instructors**

To understand each of the aforementioned instructional environments, it is important to develop a profile of the instructors charged with delivering instruction within each environment and the type of interaction occurring within each environment. This profile includes: years of experience, preferred instructional environment, actual instructional environment(s), teaching style, types of technological tools used in the respective instructional environments, and teaching methods – essentially who they are and how they run their classes. To allow the researcher to build such a profile, participating instructors completed a survey. While the survey itself assumes that real-time interaction occurs within the traditional and hybrid environments, it also captures whether real-time and/or asynchronous interaction occurs within the asynchronous online environment. Seven instructors from 3 instructional environments completed the survey. The environments and corresponding codes used to make reference to them are as follows: Online (On), Face-to-face (F2F), Hybrid - full semester (HyF).

**French 1120 Students**

Student participants were Florida state and community college students enrolled in French 1120 at their respective institutions. Student participation was a three part process involving a survey and two outcome assessment activities. Students took a survey designed to collect data about learning readiness and goals, instructional environment, affective factors, demographics, and language learning background (See Appendix G). Participating students also
completed a language production activity and a language comprehension activity designed to assess skills attained in French 1120. While an initial goal of this study was to evaluate linguistic outcomes encompassing the skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as the study was underway, it soon became apparent that the scope was too large to overcome emerging logistical challenges with the feasible assessment of participating learners who were spread across a 300 mile area of Florida, and in other states, due to variations in instructional environment. Therefore the number of outcome assessment tasks was reduced from three to two, with an oral proficiency interview accounting for listening comprehension and speaking skills and a reading proficiency assessment. The results of the assessment activities will be correlated with interaction data collected within the instructional environments studied in order to determine any effect of interaction and instructional environment on language production and comprehension.

All participants were between the ages of 18 – 30 years of age of which 66.7% were female and 33.3% were male. The participants were distributed amongst 4 instructional environments at two institutions in the following manner: 4 – Online (26.67%), 4 – F2F (26.67%), 5 – Hybrid Full (33.3%), 2 – Hybrid Half (13.3%). The F2F environment is 100% real-time instruction, the Hybrid Full environment is 80% real-time instruction, the Hybrid Half environment is 30% real-time instruction, and the Online environment is 0% real-time instruction. Participation was voluntary and uncompensated. Participants were required to be non-native French speakers with limited or no knowledge of the French language. The mechanism by which students were invited to participate varied by institution and was dependent upon the privacy policies in place by the institution. In general, face-to-face and hybrid students were invited in person by the researcher via a presentation to the class. Online students were invited via a pre-prepared e-mail from the researcher sent to them via e-mail, or posted to their course web site, by their instructors.
Limitations and other factors regarding the recruitment of participants will be included in the discussion of study results.

**Design and Materials**

**Instructor Survey**

The instructor survey was administered in an online format in the 7th week of the Fall 2012 semester (See Appendix D). The following is an explanation of the data collected via the instructor survey and its relevance to the current study.

**Years of experience.** Participants indicated how many years of experience they have teaching foreign language. Experience levels are listed in years, as follows: 0-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20, 21-25, 26-30, 30+. General requirements to teach at a state or community college are either a master’s degree in the field in which one plans to teach or a master’s degree in another field plus 18 credit hours in the field in which one plans to teach. Knowledge of instructor experience is helpful in that it may be indicative of teaching style and type of preferred instructional environment.

**Teaching style.** Because teaching style can be an indicator of the type of interaction occurring within the instructional environment, a component of the instructor survey was designed to assess teaching style. According to Vivian Cook (2008), one’s teaching style tends to be a function of the methods and/or approaches used. While there are multiple methods and approaches, such as Total Physical Response (TPR), direct instruction (DI), and others, the four methods/approaches (styles) utilized within the instructor survey reflect those most often utilized by language instructors today either in total or in part (Cook 2008) which is the reason for their inclusion within the instructor survey of this study. The four teaching styles are as follows:
academic, audio-lingual, communicative, and task-based. A brief explanation of each method or approach used to determine teaching style is below.

**Academic or grammar-translation method.** The academic style of language teaching is also known as the grammar-translation method. This method began with the teaching of Latin during the 1500s and continued through the 19th and 20th centuries with the teaching of English, French, and Italian (Richards & Rodgers, 1986, 2001). For centuries, it was the only known method used to teach languages. As languages began to be taught in schools, this method was adapted for use in secondary and post-secondary language courses. Classes are generally conducted in the L1 focusing on L2 grammar drills, rote memorization, and translation. Arguments against the exclusive use of this method include that learning occurs in highly structured, teacher-controlled setting with heavy use of the L1 and that students are not actively engaged in free language production due to the lack of attention paid to communicative aspects of the language. Cook (2008) defines the academic setting as “acquisition of conscious grammatical knowledge and its conversion to use” and indicates that the language is treated as an academic subject rather than a means of communication. As it became clear that the academic method did not produce proficient speakers of the language, other methods emerged.

**Audio-lingual method.** Where the academic method focuses on grammar drills, translation, and written language relying heavily on the L1, the audio-lingual style focuses on spoken language in the L2. In this setting, use of the L1 is virtually nonexistent. This method developed largely due to the need for people who could speak multiple languages during WWII through the 1960s. It is similar to the academic method in that rote memorization is a necessity. Students listen to a dialogue within which grammatical structures would be modeled by a set of speakers on a recording or by the teacher. Within the dialogue, some new vocabulary would be
introduced. Students would then repeat the dialogue, essentially acting out what they had heard. This would be followed by exploitation activities to prompt students to incorporate the new structures into their own speech. With this method, grammar is taught implicitly, via the modeling of the structure, rather than explicitly as in the academic method. Lessons are based on mechanical drills focusing on a particular feature of the language. For example, if the students are working on negatives, they will repeat sentences in which negatives are used. This is a form of repetition in which the students have little or no control of their output and is designed to result in rote memorization. If the student doesn’t provide the response that the teacher is expecting, it results in negative feedback from the teacher. This method fits in with behaviorist theory which asserts that people learn largely through repetition and either positive or negative reinforcement (Cook, 2008; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). This method is stands in direct opposition to communicative language teaching.

**Communicative approach.** Called an approach rather than a method because of its set of characteristics, and often used as guidelines, rather than a clearly defined set of instructional practices, the communicative approach emphasizes L2 interaction as the main means of language instruction and learning. The teacher functions as a facilitator in an interactive setting where students learn collaboratively via activities such as pair activities, group activities, interviews, and role plays though instructors are not limited to these activities alone. When discussing the communicative approach, the most often referred to characteristics of the approach are those devised by David Nunan (1991, p. 279):

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on the language but also on the learning process itself.
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom.

Generally, there is no role for the L1 in a communicative setting; however, depending upon the approach, grammar instruction will occur either inductively or explicitly (Spada, 2007).

**Task-based Learning.** Task-based learning is the notion that learning and teaching should be organized around a set of tasks and that these tasks should be meaning-based with a specific short term goal (Cook, 2008). This approach emphasizes completion of tasks rather focusing on linguistic forms. Tasks must be highly structured by the teacher in order to meet a given goal, but the classroom itself is student-centered. Students are free to use the structures and vocabulary they already know in order to complete a given task. Some tasks, such as the info-gap task have been found to promote negotiation of meaning as well as output modification (Doughty & Pica, 1986; Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006). Ellis (2003) defines a task in the following manner: it has a primary focus on meaning, the task contains a ‘gap’, the participants control the choice of linguistics resources to complete the task, and the task has a clearly defined outcome. Task-based learning must be highly structured as it tends not to work for larger classes that are difficult to monitor. If tasks are not well thought out and planned in advance, the instructor runs the risk of losing the students as they veer off track or use the task as an opportunity to hide or rely on classmates to complete the bulk of the task. However, when done well, this type of learning can instill confidence in learners. The characteristics of the teaching methods and approaches are summarized in Table 3.
### Table 3

**Characteristics of FL Teaching Methods and Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Audio-Lingual</th>
<th>Communicative</th>
<th>Task-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td>Language learning as an academic subject via explicit grammar instruction</td>
<td>Getting students to behave appropriately in situations</td>
<td>Getting students to interact with others in the L2 both inside and outside of the classroom.</td>
<td>Language fluency, accuracy, and complexity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Techniques</strong></td>
<td>Grammar explanation, translation, drills</td>
<td>Dialogues, structure drills, exploitation activities</td>
<td>Partner/group activities, interviews, information gap, role-plays, simple tasks</td>
<td>Meaning-based tasks with definite outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>Conversion of grammatical knowledge to use</td>
<td>Learning via habit formation</td>
<td>Learning by L2 communication. Some explicit grammar.</td>
<td>Learning via meaning-based tasks with specific short term goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-controlled</td>
<td>Teacher-controlled</td>
<td>Teacher as facilitator, student controlled within activity parameters</td>
<td>Teacher organized, student controlled within task parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses from SLA perspective</strong></td>
<td>Inefficient for teaching language use, relies heavily on L1</td>
<td>Inadequate for teaching grammar and use</td>
<td>Lack of role for the L1, lacking in discourse processes and communication strategies</td>
<td>Lack of role for the L1, narrow field of engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine the style to which a language instructor leans most heavily, Cook (2008) devised a four question questionnaire (See Appendix E) designed to serve as an indicator of teaching style. This questionnaire also includes a ‘Mainstream English as Foreign Language
(EFL) category and an ‘other’ category. Responses pertaining to these two categories were left off of the survey as the EFL category does not necessarily pertain to French language instruction and it is unclear as to which methods or approaches the ‘other’ category designates. Participating instructors had the opportunity to explain the use of other methods or approaches within the instructor survey. The four questions pertaining to teaching style are below. Participants were asked to provide a ranking for each response from 1 – 4 in order of importance, with 1 being the most important. Ranking the responses, rather than simply choosing the most desired, provides valuable information on the most preferred teaching styles and those most likely to be observed within the instructional environment. The teaching style indicators are as follows, according to the letter of the response choice: a. academic, b. audio-lingual, c. communicative, d. task-based.

1. In your opinion, what are the most important aspects of language teaching?
   a. Teaching the rules of the language
   b. Teaching students to handle simple situations (i.e. booking a hotel, ordering in a restaurant)
   c. Fostering interaction and communication with other people in the target language
   d. Teaching students to complete specific tasks in the target language

2. Which of these teaching techniques do you value the most?
   a. Explaining grammatical rules
   b. Mechanical drills
   c. Communicative tasks
   d. Meaning-based goal oriented tasks

3. Which are the most prevalent in your French 1120 teaching?
   a. Rules about the language
   b. Grammatical patterns
   c. Language functions for communicating and solving tasks/problems
   d. Ability to carry out tasks

4. How are your French 1120 students learning the language? (In other words, which types activities do they spend the most time performing?)
   a. via activities which help them consciously understand the language rules
   b. via activities which help them form habits of using the language
   c. via activities which ask students to communicate with one another
   d. via activities which ask students to complete specific tasks
Instructional environment and technology inventory. Instructors were asked to indicate the instructional environment they prefer in addition to indicating in which instructional environment(s) they actually teach. Instructors were also asked to indicate the types of technological resources used within the instructional environment. The inventory list was constructed using technological tools specified by Meloni (2010) and Nielson and Gonzalez-Lloret (2010) along with the researcher’s own knowledge of common technological tools used in both online and face-to-face foreign language courses. The technology inventory includes asynchronous and synchronous communication tools. Instructors were asked to indicate which technological tools they use in the instruction of their courses. Within this section, instructors were also asked to explain how the tools are utilized. The technology inventory provides an indication of type of interaction occurring within each instructional environment, based on the tools utilized to deliver instruction.

The technology inventory is as follows:

- Smart board or similar
- Document camera
- White/Chalk board
- LCD projector
- Internet Sites
- Computer Programs
- Video Player
- Audio Player
- Online Chat Rooms
- Two-Way Video
- Course Website
- E-mail
- Online Discussion/Message Boards
- Online Gradebook
- Audio recording devices or programs
- Video recording devices or programs
- Interactive Online Textbook with audio, video, voice recording
**Student Survey**

The purpose of the student survey is to collect data which may serve to develop a profile of the type of student enrolled in French 1120 and indicate whether factors such as anxiety, motivation, lifestyle, learning readiness, language background, and overall satisfaction with the French 1120 course in which they were enrolled correlate with choice of instructional environment and linguistic outcomes. The student survey was comprised of thirty questions and administered online (See Appendix G).

**Learning readiness.** The first eleven survey questions specifically address the notion of learning readiness. The learning readiness portion of survey is provided by the Florida Distance Learning Consortium (FDLC) and is designed to assess a student’s readiness for online learning. This survey is publicly available (FDLC, 2011; See Appendix M) and potential online students who visit the FDLC web site to search for online and other distance learning courses offered throughout the state of Florida are encouraged to take the survey before registering for an online course. The following scoring rubric is provided by the FDLC and is used in the computation of survey results for online learning readiness in the current study.

3 points for each "a" selected, 2 for each "b", and 1 for each "c".

- **28 and over:** Well suited for the online environment
- **15 - 27:** Moderately suited for the online environment.
- **14 or less:** Not suited for the online environment.

According to the survey, a learner who earns fourteen or fewer points may be more suited for the face-to-face, traditional instructional environment. A learner who scores between fifteen and twenty-seven points may be best suited for either a face-to-face or a hybrid environment, while a learner who scores twenty-eight points or above is deemed well-suited for the online environment.
Instructional/learning environment. There were four questions (numbers 12-15) that addressed the instructional (learning) environment. Similar to the questions posed in the instructor survey, student participants are asked to indicate the type of instructional environment they prefer as well as the actual instructional environment of the French 1120 course in which they are enrolled. Students are then asked to provide feedback regarding overall satisfaction with their French 1120 course as well as level of satisfaction with eleven components of the course addressing the following: interaction with instructor and classmates; opportunities to speak, read, write, and listen to the French language; interesting activities; opportunities to be creative; timely instructor responses; adequate time to complete activities; and adequate information about the course.

Language background. There were four questions (numbers 16-20) addressing language background. Participants were asked to provide information about their native language and complete a self assessment of their own abilities in their native language. They were also asked to provide information about other languages they know and indicate the skills they have, providing a self assessment of skill level, or proficiency. Lastly, they were asked to indicate whether they have taken a French course previous to their current French 1120 course as well as to assess their current proficiency level with respect to the ability to read, write, comprehend, and speak the French language.

Affective factors. Research has shown that factors such as motivation, anxiety, self confidence, and attitude can have an effect on second language learning and acquisition and may be responsible for individual variation (Arnold, 2000; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993; Hartnett, St. George, & Dron, 2011; Krashen, 1988; Pichette, 2009). There is also evidence that language anxiety affects cognitive processing (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994) and that foreign language
anxiety (FLA) is a situation-specific type of anxiety similar to test anxiety or stage fright (Horwitz, 2010; Pichette, 2009). There were four questions (numbers 21-24) addressing these affective factors, all of which may affect choice of instructional environment as well as linguistic outcomes.

**Learning goals, lifestyle, and demographics.** Today, learners come from many different backgrounds and lifestyles. While the student population within major universities has experienced some variation, the state and community college system shows a much lower level of full-time enrollment than the universities. Within the Florida College System (FCS) part-time students comprised 69.8 percent enrollments in 2009-10, whereas within the State University System (SUS) 71.6 percent were enrolled full-time (FDOE, 2012; FBOG, 2012). Because the FCS serves students within their home communities, many students work either on a part-time or full-time basis while attending school. Because there is a possibility that lifestyle and the need for flexibility may dictate availability and choice of instructional environment, hence the hybrid and online environments being more prevalent within the Florida College System than the university system. There were 5 questions (numbers 25-30) which asked participants to provide demographic and lifestyle information such as employment status, age range, and gender as well as what they hope to achieve as a result of having taken a French 1120 course in order to compare desired achievement with actual outcomes.

**Classroom Observations**

The third component of the study involved observations of the instructional environment. Participating instructors consented to observations of their respective instructional environments. During each observation session, the researcher tracked the type of instructional technology in use, the number and type of L1 and L2 interactions occurring within the environment, according
the Model of Distance Learning Interaction (Moore & Kearsely, 2005). Level of cognitive presence (i.e. critical thinking) occurring within the instructional environment during the observed interactions was documented according to the modified Critical Thinking Process Coding Model (Chu, 2005) categorizing the critical thinking processes of observed interactions based upon the criteria for each of the five levels of critical thinking outlined within the model (See Table 4). Documenting the frequency and type of interactions occurring within the instructional environment may provide insight into student learning outcomes. Because the weekly frequency and length of class meetings varied, observation length was set at one hour per documented observation since each scheduled course with a face-to-face component met for at least one hour. Observations occurred four times during the course of the Fall 2012 semester for each course type observed, in the last 7 weeks of the semester. For face-to-face courses, or those with a face-to-face component, observations were conducted during the scheduled class period. For online courses, or those with an online component, observations were conducted via a special login provided by the participating institution. Because asynchronous online courses do not meet at scheduled times, the researcher logged in at random to observe the instructional environment. Observations were conducted randomly between October and December 2012. For hybrid courses, the face-to-face environment was observed for a total of 3 hours and the online environment was observed for a total of 3 hours, the equivalent of 3 observations of each environment, resulting in a total of six observations. Interaction and critical presence data were collected via the use of Chu’s (2005) Critical Presence Coding Chart. Because the descriptors and indicators specified within Chu’s model pertain to advanced language learners who are past the point of learning basic structures, during the course of collecting observational data for the current study, it became necessary to modify the definitions in order to accommodate the
concepts presented in a beginning language course. A revised Critical Thinking Process Coding Model for the current study is presented in Table 4.

Table 4

*Critical Thinking Process Coding Model for Beginning Language Learners*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 – Recognition</td>
<td>Initiative: A new L2 feature unknown to the learner poses a problem that is recognized and identified.</td>
<td>1.1 Recognizing a problem: information is passed on about the elements, resulting in a question</td>
<td>Ex. Learner recognizes a new verb, asks how to use it in a sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Sense of puzzlement: pose a question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 – Comprehension</td>
<td>Evocative: The nature of the feature is perceived, grasped, and aroused.</td>
<td>2.1 Demonstrating understanding of the meaning of the feature: describe, rephrase, and explain</td>
<td>Ex. The verb is used in combination with other elements to create a sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 – Exploration</td>
<td>Inquisitive: Information, knowledge, and alternatives that can provoke use of the feature are searched and selected.</td>
<td>3.1 Analysis-compare, contrast, and sequence ideas</td>
<td>3.5 Brainstorming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Divergence unsubstantiated contradiction and agreement of previous ideas</td>
<td>3.6 Leaps to conclusion -offers unsupported ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Brainstorming</td>
<td>Ex I don’t think that is correct…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 – Integration</td>
<td>Tentative: Knowledge is constructed into a new pattern by combining the ideas generated.</td>
<td>4.1 Convergence -reference to previous message followed by substantiated agreement and building on the ideas of the other</td>
<td>4.3 Connecting ideas, synthesis -integrating information Ex. Learner constructs an utterance/sentence in order to communicate with the new verb. Sentence is composed of other necessary elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Proposing tentative solutions which are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 – Resolution</td>
<td>Committed: Proposed solution/hypothesis is tested through experiments &amp; consensus building.</td>
<td>5.1 Vicarious application to real world</td>
<td>Ex. Learners integrate L2 feature into interaction via a situation, activity, or task mimicking real-world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Testing solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Defending Solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An observation coding rubric was developed to record frequency of interaction according to interaction type, critical thinking process, and frequency. Critical Thinking processes within each Learner-Teacher (LT) and Learner-Learner (LL) interaction were coded according to critical thinking process phase per the modified form of Chu’s Critical Thinking Process Coding Model, above. Interaction types were coded according to Moore and Kearsely’s Model of Distance Learning Interaction (2005). The following table provides an interaction coding model for the current study, including type of interaction, indicators, and sample codes.

Table 5
Interaction Coding Model for Beginning Language Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner – Content  (LC)</td>
<td>Voluntary (spontaneous) or Assigned (teacher directed) (V or A)</td>
<td>Codes: LCV, LCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner – Teacher  (LT)</td>
<td>L1 or L2 (1 or 2) Voluntary (spontaneous) or Assigned (teacher directed) (V or A)</td>
<td>Example: LT1VS, LT2AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner – Learner  (LL)</td>
<td>L1 or L2 (1 or 2) Voluntary (spontaneous) or Assigned (teacher directed) (V or A)</td>
<td>Example: LL1VS, LL2AW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spoken or Written (S or W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the classroom observations, interactions occurred quickly, frequently, and in multiple directions therefore it was necessary to develop a rubric allowing for quick and accurate categorization of interactions (See Appendix F). The horizontal axis of the rubric contained the
five categories of critical thinking according to the Critical Thinking Process Model. The vertical axis contained interaction types according to Moore and Kearsely’s Model of Distance Learning Interaction which were further subdivided into L1 and L2 interactions. As the observation process began, it became clear that it would be necessary to further subdivide the Learner-Teacher interactions in order to indicate the direction of the interaction. Therefore, the observation coding rubric was modified to include both Learner-Teacher and Teacher-Learner interactions in both the L1 and the L2.

**Administration of Assessments**

The initial intention of the study was to administer all outcome assessments within a proctored environment, however logistical issues resulted in implementation changes. While the oral proficiency assessment was conducted in real-time either face-to-face, by webcasting, or by phone, there were logistical issues involved in the administration of the reading comprehension assessment due to the fact that participants were spread over a 300 mile area of Florida across four campuses of two institutions. Further, some of the online students were not physically located within the state of Florida, which made it impossible to administer a proctored assessment. Ironically, these conditions mimic the conditions of the online environment within the Florida College System. Within this environment, assessments are rarely proctored and students are expected to practice honorable, ethical behavior. Of course, educators generally take issue with the high level of test security within the face-to-face environment and the lack thereof, in many cases, within the online environment. Such issues make it difficult to truly know what students are learning and it seems that very few in the field of research are asking this question. Of benefit to the current study is the fact that participants have nothing to lose or gain by the use of study aids in the completion of the reading comprehension activity since the activities related
to the study have no bearing on their respective French 1120 courses. Measures were taken, however, to further discourage the use of study aids. For the participants taking the assessment in an online environment, all questions and response activities were displayed as graphic images, rather than text, making it impossible for participants to copy and paste text into a search engine or online translator. Start and end times were recorded in order to collect data on the length of time spent completing the assessment. If a participant closed the testing window, they were unable to return to the activity in progress and were forced to start over. Participants completing the assessment in a face-to-face environment were also timed in order to allow comparison with online participants. Table 6 summarizes the sequence and timeline of tasks pertaining to the present study during the course of the 14 week Fall 2012 semester.

Table 6

Sequence and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Participants</th>
<th>Student Participants</th>
<th>Week of Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction</td>
<td>Informed Consent</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tasks</td>
<td>Instructor Survey</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observations of</td>
<td>Weeks 7 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaking Assessment</td>
<td>Weeks 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Comprehension Assessment</td>
<td>Weeks 13-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Oral proficiency assessment.** The first student assessment activity is the oral proficiency assessment. It is a speech production activity designed to assess overall oral proficiency in French. The method of proficiency assessment utilized in this study is based upon the Oral
Proficiency Interview method established by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (See Appendix H). The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) is an audio recorded 20-30 minute face-to-face or telephonic interview between a certified tester and a participant. The interview is interactive and continuously adapts to the interests and abilities of the speaker according to a proprietary method developed by ACTFL. The speaker’s performance is then given an initial rating by the tester and then rated a second time by another certified OPI rater. The interview is compared to the criteria outlined in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking in order to determine proficiency level. The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 for Speaking describe five major levels of proficiency: Distinguished, Superior, Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice (ACTFL, 2012). The description of each major level is representative of a specific range of abilities. Together these levels form a hierarchy in which each level subsumes all lower levels. The Advanced, Intermediate, and Novice levels are further divided into high, mid, and low sublevels to give a more precise assessment of oral proficiency level. According to ACTFL, the OPI is used for teacher licensure in more than twenty states. It is also used by numerous companies and governmental agencies for hiring and promotion of positions in which a foreign language is required. Further, ACTFL routinely trains K-12 and post-secondary teachers in the OPI method with a goal of assisting educators in the development of strategies which facilitate oral proficiency. This method of oral proficiency assessment has gained in popularity and has been recognized by the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), which holds an annual conference in order to collaborate with ACTFL and determine equivalencies with other types of language proficiency assessments widely used in Europe. According to research conducted for ACTFL by Surface and Dierdorff (2003), the study found high interrater consistency across raters from 19 different languages. As early as 1992,
Henning found a high level of interrater reliability for the raters of two languages evaluated for the study. Because the ACTFL oral proficiency interview is the most widely used method of oral language proficiency assessment in the United States, it is the method by which participants in the current study were evaluated. For the purposes of this study, and due to the fact that the oral proficiency interview is a conversation requiring participants to listen in order to respond, the oral proficiency interview encompasses both the listening and speaking skill sets. In order to prepare to adequately collect speech samples of study participants, the researcher participated in an intensive oral proficiency interview assessment workshop which took place over a four day period in July 2012 for a total of 28 hours in order to learn how to conduct the OPI. This session provided training on how to conduct and rate oral proficiency interviews and participants had extensive practice in both conducting and rating interviews. The researcher then conducted numerous practice interviews before beginning data collection and simultaneously beginning the 8-12 month process of official ACTFL OPI rater and tester certification. According to the ACTFL procedure, candidates must complete rater certification before moving on to tester certification. As of December 2012, the researcher had completed and passed rater certification, and was deemed to be a reliable OPI rater. Official tester certification is currently in progress. For the purposes of this study, the oral proficiency interviews were both conducted and rated by the researcher according to the ACTFL OPI method, however these interviews are not to be considered official by ACTFL standards. Because the current study could not employ a second rater, the researcher first conducted the interviews, audio recorded them, and coded them in order that participants would remain anonymous during any evaluation of the interviews. All of the completed interviews were then rated by the researcher, according to the proprietary ACTFL rating method and rubric. Approximately one week after completing the first round of ratings,
the researcher then blind rated the interviews a second time, to ensure some level of rating reliability. Ratings were then attributed to the specific participants and their respective instructional environments. All interviews were conducted according to the ACTFL OPI procedure, with the exception that all participants were asked to complete the same role play activity. This was done to ensure equitable treatment of all participants. Speaking assessment results are analyzed and discussed in terms of the ACTFL ratings and corresponding sublevels (Novice, Intermediate, etc.) as well as in terms of proficiency level equivalencies with accepted European standards according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (2012).

Reading comprehension assessment. The second student assessment activity is comprised of reading comprehension tasks (See Appendix I). Because ACTFL did not have an established reading proficiency test for French at the time of the development of this study, and due to the costs involved in administering a proprietary assessment to study participants, the reading comprehension assessments are excerpted from the previously administered DELF exams administered by the Centre International d'Etudes Pédagogiques (CIEP, 2011) in France and at locations around the world. The DELF, known as the Diplôme d’études en langue française (Diploma of French Language Studies), is an examination administered worldwide to assess proficiency level in listening, reading, speaking, and writing in French language learners. This examination, and subsequent diplomas, is endorsed by the French Ministry of Education and is in direct alignment with the proficiency levels established for all languages across Europe by the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) which provides “a practical tool for setting clear standards to be attained at successive stages of learning and for evaluating outcomes in an internationally comparable
manner” (CEFR, 2012). It was adopted by the European Union in 2002 as a tool to inform teaching and evaluation of all the languages of Europe. Table 7 shows the alignment between the European CEFR and the French DELF/DALF (CEFR, 2012, p. 24)

Table 7

European and French Proficiency Level Equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEFRL</th>
<th>DELF A1</th>
<th>DELF A2</th>
<th>DELF B1</th>
<th>DELF B2</th>
<th>DALF C1</th>
<th>DALF C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Beginner</td>
<td>DELF A1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Elementary</td>
<td>DELF A2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Threshold</td>
<td>DELF B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Upper Intermediate</td>
<td>DELF B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Advanced</td>
<td>DALF C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Mastery</td>
<td>DALF C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon examination of the course descriptions and general outcomes expected for students of French 1120 (Elementary French I) and French 1121 (Elementary French II) courses offered throughout public post-secondary institutions Florida (FLDOE, 2012), it was determined by the researcher that the proficiency levels covered by the DELF A1 and A2 exams are, respectively,
the approximate equivalent of these courses. For example, according to the general course
descriptions for French 1121 students are expected to have reached an intermediate level of
language use by the end of French 1121 in order to move into French 2220 (Intermediate French
1). Since 2010, ACTFL and the European Council have held annual conferences in order to
determine the equivalency levels for oral, reading, and writing proficiency. While an official
document has yet to be released by ACTFL and the CEFR, some organizations and institutions
have published equivalency charts. The American University Center of Provence (2009), located
in France considers the CEFR/DELF A1 level to be the equivalent of the ACTFL Novice rating,
emcompassing all of the sublevels: Novice Low, Novice Mid, and Novice High. The same
document shows the CEFR/DELF A2 level as being the equivalent of the ACTFL Intermediate
Low and Intermediate Mid ratings (See Appendix L). A document produced by Vandergrift
(2006) for the Department of Canadian Heritage, adds the ACTFL Intermediate High rating to
the CEFR/DELF A2 level. Because equivalency amongst the systems varies slightly, for the
purposes of this study, learner assessment activities for reading comprehension were conducted
at both the CEFR/DELF A1 and A2 levels in order to provide data on all possible skill levels
attained by any given learner during the 14 week time period of the French 1120 course in which
the student was enrolled. Because, it is unlikely that a learner would achieve advanced level
proficiency after just 14 weeks of language instruction, assessments testing intermediate to
advanced skills were not included in the study. The selected activities are excerpted from
previously administered DELF examinations at the A1 and A2 levels publicly available on the
CIEP web site. The DELF A1 reading comprehension activities consist of questionnaires dealing
with four or five written documents such as e-mails, invitations, and short advertisements dealing
everyday life. The DELF A2 reading comprehension activities consist of comprehension
questionnaires dealing with three or four readings such as articles, letters, and other texts dealing with everyday life. According to the CIEP, the minimum score required to be earned in order to receive any DELF diploma for a specific level (A1, A2, etc.) is a score of 50/100, or fifty percent. Scores on the DELF reading comprehension assessments utilized in this study will be analyzed statistically as well as in terms of a “passing” score as defined by the CIEP. The following chapter presents the results.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the present study conducted to investigate the impact of instructional environment on linguistic outcomes. This chapter will progress by detailing the results in an order in reflective of the order in which each data collection took place, first pertaining to instructor participants, then pertaining to student participants. Results will then be discussed in the context of each of the three research questions in the discussion section and when possible, inferential statistical tests will be conducted.

Instructor Survey

Years of Experience

Of the 7 French 1120 instructors surveyed, all hold a minimum of a master’s degree and have been qualified to teach French language per the requirements of the Florida College System. Likewise, all instructor participants have more than ten years of foreign language teaching experience. Of the three who teach F2F courses, two have 16-20 years of experience and one has been teaching for over 30 years. Of the three who teach online courses, two have 11-15 years of experience and one has 16-20 years of experience. The hybrid course instructor has 21-25 years of experience. Survey data indicate that, of the instructional environments with face-to-face components (F2F and Hybrid) 100% of the instructors have at least 16 years of experience. Contrarily, only 33.3 percent of the online environments have instructors with at least 16 years of experience, with 66.7% having taught foreign language for 11-15 years. This indicates that those teaching mostly online tend to have less teaching experience overall than those teaching courses with face-to-face components. Because instructor participants were not asked to identify their ages, it is unknown whether those teaching online were younger and
therefore assumed to be more comfortable using technology to deliver instruction. The survey results did reveal, however, that the online instructors participating in this study had less overall teaching experience than their face-to-face counterparts.

**Preferred Instructional Environment vs. Actual Instructional Environment**

When asked about the instructional environment in which they prefer to teach and the actual environment in which they teach, 5 of the 7 instructors indicated that their preferred instructional environment is the environment in which they teach. One instructor who indicated a preference for a Hybrid courses, currently teaches in a F2F environment and another instructor, who also indicated a preference for a hybrid environment, teaches within an online environment. Although these two instructors are not teaching within their preferred instructional environments, the courses they do teach are components of their preferred environment. While reasons for the difference in instructor experience between the F2F and Online environments are currently unknown, it may be that the less experienced instructors are matched with online courses by the institution for which they teach because online course materials are pre-prepared and put the instructor into more of a facilitator/grader role than a teaching role. Such a strategy may serve to maintain the high quality of instruction necessary for a F2F course. This is an issue worthy of further future investigation.

**Teaching Style**

On the survey questions relating to teaching style, instructors were asked to rank the response statements for each of the four questions from 1 – 4 in order of importance, with one being the most important and four being the least important. Each response choice correlates with a teaching style. To calculate the ranking of each teaching style, all response choices were assigned a weight. An individual response receiving a ranking of 1, was assigned a weight of 4, a
ranking of 2 was assigned a weight of 3, a ranking of 3 was assigned a weight of 2, and a ranking of 4 was assigned a weight of 1. This was done so that the rankings would be based on overall point totals from greatest to least, with the greatest number of points receiving the highest rankings. The total number of responses provided for a given rank was then multiplied by the weighted value assigned to that rank to determine a final value for each ranking. The ranking values were then added together to provide a final weighted value for each response category. The response categories receiving the highest point total were given a ranking of one, or first, the next highest point total was given a ranking of two, or second, and so on. Instructors were asked about the most important aspects of teaching, which teaching techniques they value, the techniques most prevalent in their language teaching, and the types of activities which are the most prevalent in the French 1120 courses they teach.

1. In your opinion, what are the most important aspects of language teaching?
   a. Teaching the rules of the language
   b. Teaching students to handle simple situations (i.e. booking a hotel, ordering in a restaurant)
   c. Fostering interaction and communication with other people in the target language
   d. Teaching students to complete specific tasks in the target language

   Question 1 addresses beliefs about language teaching. When asked about the most important aspects of language teaching, 6 of 7 (86%) instructors ranked choice “c”, communicative approach, first. Just one instructor, with more than thirty years of teaching experience ranked choice “a”, academic method as a top priority. Similarly, 4 of 7 respondents (57%) ranked choice “b”, audio-lingual method, as the second most important aspect of language teaching, with two respondents dissenting in favor of the task-based method and one respondent choosing the academic method as the second most important aspect. There was less agreement on third most important aspect of language teaching, with 3 of 7 respondents (43%) selecting choice “a”, academic method. Three of 7 (43%) selected choice “b”, audio-lingual method, and only one
(14%) selected choice “c”, communicative approach. Overwhelmingly, the task-based method, choice “d” was ranked of least importance by 5 of 7 (71.4%) respondents, with two dissenters (28.5%) selecting choice “a”, academic method as the least important of the four methods and approaches presented. Using the weighted values method of computing final rankings for the entire respondent group, the final teaching style ranking for question one is as follows: First – Communicative, Second – Audio-lingual, Third – Academic, Fourth – Task-based. Figure 2 provides the rankings by teaching style as determined by weighted values.

![Teaching Style - Aspects of Language Teaching](image)

Overall, respondents indicated that fostering interaction and communication in the target language and teaching students to handle simple situations are more important than focusing specifically on grammar and teaching students to complete specific tasks.

2. Which of these teaching techniques do you value the most?
   a. Explaining grammatical rules
   b. Mechanical drills
   c. Communicative tasks
   d. Meaning-based goal oriented tasks

Question 2 addresses the use of specific teaching techniques. When asked about the teaching techniques that instructors value most, results were not as clearly defined as for question 1. Three of 7 respondents (43%) favored choice “c”, communicative, 3 of 7 (43%) favored choice “a”,
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academic, and 1 of 6 (14%) favored choice “d”, task-based. The second most highly valued techniques were not clearly defined, as 3 of 7 (43%) respondents chose “b”, mechanical drills while another 2 of 7 (28.5%) respondents chose “a”, explanation of grammatical rules, as the second most valued teaching technique. The final two respondents were evenly split between the, choice “c”, communicative tasks and mechanical drills, choice “b”, (14% each). The third most valued technique was also not clearly defined, with choice “c”, communicative tasks, chosen by 3 of 7 (43%) respondents. Choices “a”, and “d” were each chosen by 2 of 7 (28.5) of respondents. The least valued of the techniques was choice “b”, mechanical drills, chosen by 4 of 7 (57%) respondents, and choice “d”, goal oriented tasks, chosen by 3 of 7 respondents (43%). Using the weighted values method of computing final rankings for the entire respondent group, the final teaching style ranking for question two is as follows: First – Academic, Second – Communicative, Third – Task-based, Fourth – Audio-lingual. Figure 3 provides the rankings as determined by weighted values.

![Teaching Style - Valued Teaching Techniques](image)

Figure 3: Teaching Style - Valued Teaching Techniques
The results indicate that French 1120 instructors value techniques which emphasize the development of both communicative skills and knowledge of grammatical rules in beginning language learners.

3. Which are the most prevalent in your French 1120 teaching?
   a. Rules about the language
   b. Grammatical patterns
   c. Language functions for communicating and solving tasks/problems
   d. Ability to carry out tasks

While questions 1 and 2 address perceived beliefs and values, questions 3 and 4 address what instructors perceive they actually do in their classes to provide an insight into how they teach French 1120.

Question 3 addresses the concepts instructors spend the most time teaching their students. Three of 7 (43%) respondents indicated that the most prevalent concepts taught are language functions for communication, choice “c”, and another 3 of 7 (43%) indicated that teaching rules about the language, choice “b”, is something they spend the most time doing. One respondent (14%) indicated that teaching grammatical patterns is the most prevalent. As for the second most prevalent concept taught in French 1120, 4 of 7 of respondents (57%) chose “b”, grammatical patterns, 2 of 7 (28.5%) chose “d”, ability to carry out tasks and one respondent (14%) chose “a”, rules about the language. The third most prevalent concept was “c”, language functions for communication, chosen by 4 of 7 (57%) of respondents. Two of 7 (28.5%) respondents chose “b”, grammatical patterns, and 1 of 7 (14%) chose “d”, ability to carry out tasks. Finally, the least prevalent concept was “d”, ability to carry out tasks, with 4 of 7 (57%) respondents having chosen it, followed by “a”, rules about the language, chosen by 3 of 7 (43%) respondents. Using the weighted values method of computing final rankings for the entire respondent group, the final teaching style ranking for question three is as follows: First – Communicative/Audio-
lingual, Third – Academic, Fourth – Task based. Figure 4 provides the rankings as determined by weighted values.
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Figure 4: Teaching Style - Prevalent Teaching Strategies

The results indicate that French 1120 instructors use techniques which emphasize the development of both communicative skills and knowledge of grammatical patterns in beginning language learners.

4. How are your French 1120 students learning the language? (Which types activities do they spend the most time performing?)
   a. via activities which help them consciously understand the language rules
   b. via activities which help them form habits of using the language
   c. via activities which ask students to communicate with one another
   d. via activities which ask students to complete specific tasks

Question 4 addresses how students are learning the language, via the types of activities they spend the most time performing. When looking at individual responses, three of 7 respondents (43%) each selected choice “c”, communicative activities. Two of 7 (28.5%) chose choice “a”, grammar rule activities, and 2 of 7 (28.5%) chose habit forming activities as those which student spend the most time performing. When choosing the second type of activity students perform most often, an equal number of respondents, 2 of 7 (28.5%) each chose “a”, “b”, and “d”
respectively. One of 7 respondents chose “c”. For the Third type of activity students do most often, 3 of 7 (43%) chose task based activities, 2 of 7 (28.5%) chose activities to help students understand grammatical rules. One of 7 (14%) chose communicative activities, and another 1 of 7 (14%) chose activities designed to help students form habits of using the language. For the fourth type activity, 2 of 7 each chose “b”, “c”, and “d” respectively, with 1 of 7 choosing “a”.

Using the weighted values method of computing final rankings for the entire respondent group, the final teaching style ranking for question four is as follows: First – Communicative/Academic, Third – Audio-lingual, Fourth – Task based. Figure 5 provides the rankings as determined by weighted values.

![Teaching Style - Student Activities](image)

Figure 5: Teaching Style - Student Activities

The results indicate that French 1120 students spend the most time taking part in activities which promote communication and the development of grammatical knowledge. To come up with a final ranking for preferred teaching style, based on responses to questions 1 – 4, the ranking values for each question were added together to provide a final weighted value for each response category. The response categories receiving the highest point total were given a
ranking of one, or first, the next highest point total was given a ranking of two, or second, and so on. Figure 6 provides a visual illustration of the overall preferred teaching style of French 1120 instructors as determined by weighted values.
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Figure 6: Teaching Style - Overall Preferred Teaching Style

Overall, French 1120 instructors indicated that their beliefs, values, teaching of concepts, and student activities most often reflect the communicative approach, with the academic method ranking second. This means that, generally, the beginning language learning environment tends to be one in which the instructor functions as a facilitator an interactive setting where students learn collaboratively and L2 interaction is the main means of language instruction and learning. In this environment, grammar rules may be taught explicitly and use of the L1 may occur, although to a lesser extent than the L2. Some attention may also be paid to repetition, mechanical drills, and positive/negative reinforcement from the instructor with occasional task completion activities.

Preferred teaching style was also examined within the context of instructional environment in order to determine whether there is a relationship between instructional environment and the type of teaching style employed within a particular environment. Because there was only 1
respondent from a hybrid environment, and in this case the hybrid environment was an instructional environment in which 80% of instruction took place face to face (F2F) with only 20% taking place online, the hybrid respondent was included in the face-to-face category. Table 8 illustrates the ranking of preferred teaching styles by instructional environment.

Table 8.

*Ranking of Preferred Teaching Style by Instructional Environment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Style</th>
<th>F2F Rank</th>
<th>Online Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audi-Lingual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-Based</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results provide evidence that, instructional environment does not necessarily dictate the methods and approaches used by the instructor and that regardless of the teaching environment, instructors in both face-to-face and online environments feel similarly about the manner in which language instruction should occur. In addition to ranking the specific methods and approaches used to determine teaching style, respondents were also asked to describe their teaching style as well as describe the activities which seem to yield the best results when it comes to student performance. Below are the comments made by respondents teaching within the F2F environment:

- **F2F 1:** I think results vary based on students learning styles. I address all styles in the classroom and vary activities to help students develop all language learning skills. I balance written and spoken activities. Something that may work well for someone may not for another one.
• **F2F 2:** The most successful activities are group activities in which students simply practice new vocabulary and/or grammar. Most of what we do is a combo of communication plus doing specific tasks.

• **F2F 3:** Group activities: each student, with a partner, will ask questions based on a certain theme and the other will respond.

The comments made by the majority F2F respondents (66.7%) indicate that interaction occurs within the instructional environment via group activities which encourage communication and interaction. The interaction is guided in that instruction is provided to encourage students to work within the parameters of a specific task or themed activity. While respondent F2F1 does not provide information regarding specific activities which may require interaction, the spoken activities may contain an interactive component. All F2F respondents indicated that students practice speaking via activities which require them to produce language and one respondent indicated that differentiating activities based on learning style is a strategy leading to student success. Although two-thirds of F2F instructors indicated a preference for an academic teaching style, the descriptions provided are indicative of a communicative, sometimes task-based environment in which grammar instruction may be more implicit than explicit. This will be further explored in the discussion of the results. Below are comments made by respondents teaching within the online environment:

• **Online 1:** Students tend to make the most effort in trying to speak the language. All my assignments are geared towards the speaking portion of the course. To reach that objective, I need to:
  - Have activities to explain and practice grammar.
  - Have students listen to audio to learn pronunciation and vocabulary.
  - Have students to practice comprehension by listening to videos and translation.
  - The combination of all the above activities will result in students learning the language.

• **Online 2:** Listening activities and short quizzes in narrated lecture notes.
• **Online 3:** Students complete online activities in this course. I do not interact with them unless they have questions.

The online respondent group provided information which indicates an instructional format with activities which encourage students to interact with pre-recorded and pre-written instructional content via a particular online delivery system which includes an interactive online textbook. None of the instructors provided an indication that either L1 or L2 interaction occurs between students, as seems to be the case in the F2F environment. Likewise, instructors do not indicate that interaction occurs between the instructor and students in any format other than pre-recorded content. There is also no evidence that online instructors consider the online discussion board useful in yielding the best results when it comes to student performance. The comment provided by the hybrid instructor, below, does not provide significant detail. It does show, however, that some type of interaction occurs between students within both the F2F and online components of the course, as indicated below:

• **Hybrid 1:** They practice in class and online. Communication with each other in class and via discussion board.

The respondent indicates that students “practice” in both environments and communicate with each other in both environments, but specific activities are not cited. It is important to note that 5 of the 7 instructor survey respondents were observed within their instructional environments for a total of five observed courses (Hybrid – 1, F2F – 2, Online – 2). Observation data compiled within the instructional setting was compared to the teaching style data in order to determine whether the actual instructional environment influences teaching style preference, as indicated by survey data.
**Instructional Technology**

Instructors were asked to indicate the type of instructional technologies they use in order to deliver instruction in their respective French 1120 environments. They did so via an instructional technology inventory, which was part of the instructor survey. Table 9 shows the percentage of respondents indicating the use of particular instructional tools for each instructional environment as well as the complete respondent group. Total number of respondents is indicated in parentheses.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Tool</th>
<th>F2F (3)</th>
<th>Online (3)</th>
<th>HyF (1)</th>
<th>All (7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart board /similar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document camera</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Chalk board</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCD projector</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Sites</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Player</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Player</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Chat Rooms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Video</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Website</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Discuss Board</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Grade book</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio recording devices/programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video recording devices/programs</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Online Textbook</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the F2F environment, 100 percent of respondents indicated that the following tools are used for instructional purposes in French 1120: white/chalk board, LCD projector, computer programs, course website, audio recording devices/programs, and interactive online textbook.

---

1 Percentages rounded to nearest whole number at .5
In addition, 67 percent indicated the use of internet sites and 33 percent indicated the use of the following: video player, e-mail, online grade book, and video recording devices. Figure 7 illustrates instructional tool utilization within the F2F environment.

![F2F (Face-to-Face) Instructional Tools](image)

When asked to explain how they use the technological tools, the F2F respondents indicated the following:

- **F2F 1:** I typically use a PowerPoint to go over the material I want to cover. I also post it online so students can revisit the lesson or have it if absent. At times, I use the audio to play songs. Students complete online activities for homework.

- **F2F 2:** I use the online book for some homework activities. I also sometimes show PowerPoint slides, YouTube videos, clips from DVDs, and so on.

- **F2F 3:** I assign about 6 -7 exercises online for students to do outside of class. This is mandatory. The students will learn how to conjugate verbs and use them to form complete sentences. For some exercises, the students must record them for pronunciation purposes. In class, I use the computer to show the vocabulary and the students will see, hear, and repeat.
None of the respondents indicated the use of real-time interactional tools, such as online chat rooms or two-way video (Skype, Google +, etc.) to interact with students or encourage students to interact with each other. Likewise, none of the respondents indicated the use of asynchronous interactive online tools, such as the online discussion board, to promote discussion with or amongst students. While the interactive textbook provides learners with the opportunity to interact with course content in the form of audio, video, voice recording, and online exercises, the standard interactive textbook does not provide tools for interaction with or among students. Given that none of the respondents indicated the use of tools to promote human interaction, either in a real-time or asynchronous manner, with or among students, it seems that the only opportunity for this type of interaction is within the confines of the classroom environment.

Observational data will reveal the frequency and type of any interaction occurring within this environment whether interaction frequency and type are significantly different from that which may occur in the hybrid and online settings. In the online environment, 100 percent of respondents indicated that the following tools are used for instructional purposes in French 1120: course website, online grade book, audio recording devices and programs, interactive online textbook. The same set of respondents indicated that the following tools are used 66.7 percent of the time. In addition, 66.7 percent indicated the use of the following: video player, audio player, e-mail, online discussion boards, and an interactive online textbook. The remaining 33.3 percent indicated the use of internet sites to deliver instruction in the online environment. Figure 8 illustrates instructional tool utilization within the online environment.
When asked to explain how they use the technological tools, the online respondents indicated the following:

- **Online 1**: I use the audio of the eBook for pronunciation and the online discussion board for culture. Students have to compare different aspects of French culture to any other culture that they are familiar with. I use recording devices for speaking assignments. With the video player, students watch a video about a situation that uses vocabulary and grammar of the lesson and they need to translate or write what they understood about the video. The online grade book is used to be aware of their "ongoing" grade. E-mail is used to communicate with students.

- **Online 2**: Some assignments are those I have recorded. Others are videos students must listen to and answer questions. Students do writing and speaking activities at a third party site.

- **Online 3**: No comment provided

Similar to the F2F group, the online group indicated that real-time interactional tools such as two-way video (Skype, Google +, etc.) and online chat rooms are not used within the instructional environment. While 2 of 3 online instructors indicated the use of asynchronous online discussion boards, neither respondent indicated whether the discussion board is used to provide L2 instruction or interaction. One respondent indicated that the discussion board is
utilized for culture discussions, however because it is a beginning level course, it is unlikely that these discussions take place, or provide opportunities for, interaction in the L2. Observational data will reveal the frequency and type of any interaction occurring within this environment whether interaction frequency and type are significantly different from that which may occur in the F2F and hybrid settings.

In the hybrid environment, the single respondent indicated the use of the following instructional tools: Smart board or similar (includes LCD projector), white/chalk board, internet sites, computer programs, course website, e-mail, online discussion/message boards, online grade book, audio recording devices/programs, interactive online textbook. When asked to explain how they use the technological tools, the online respondents indicated the following:

- **Hybrid 1:** This is to enhance students' learning.

The respondent indicated that real-time interactional tools such as online chat rooms and two-way video are not utilized, but did indicate the use of an asynchronous online discussion board. There are 3 instructional tools used across all instructional environments: course website, interactive online textbook and audio recording programs/devices. This indicates that all courses have some kind of online component regardless of its classification.

**Observation Data**

Observation data was collected primarily to evaluate the type and frequency of any interaction occurring within the instructional environment. A secondary purpose was to confirm the teaching style used within each environment as well as to observe the types of instructional tools used within specific environments. Knowledge of teaching style is important because it directly affects the type and frequency of interaction which occurs. The use of certain instructional tools may also serve to enhance, or detract from, interaction.
Observations were conducted within the following instructional environments: Online – 2, Hybrid Full – 1, F2F – 2, for a total of 5 classes over 3 environments. For the purposes of the observations and reporting of results, the Hybrid Full environment is split into the two components which make up the course: F2F and Online. Each observation was one hour in length. Each of the F2F environments were observed for a total of 4 hours, or four 1 hour observations, during the final 7 weeks of the Fall 2012 semester. The online environments were also observed for the same amount of time. The F2F component of the Hybrid Full course was observed a total of 3 hours, or 3 observations, and the online component was also observed a total of 3 times, for a total of 6 observations of the Hybrid Full environment. Observations were random and spaced about 2 weeks apart. As previously mentioned in Chapter 3, observations were conducted using a rubric designed to record type, frequency, and level of critical thinking. As observations began, it became clear to the researcher that it would be necessary to record observation data in a manner indicative of the initiator of the interaction, therefore the observation rubric was modified accordingly. Within the F2F and Online environments interaction with content is assumed, therefore it was not recorded. Additionally, access to the online environment included the main course website, not the online interactive textbook which provides Learner – Content interaction. For the online courses and course components, the researcher was privy to course announcements and interaction occurring via course discussion board. The researcher did review the online interactive textbooks and related course resources via publisher sites to evaluate any additional tools which may have been available to students via those platforms and not stated on the instructor survey. During the observation process the following categories of interaction were observed: Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teacher, and Learner – Learner. The first entry within each pair indicates the initiator of the interaction.
Interaction may be voluntary (spontaneous) or assigned (teacher directed). Within each category, subcategories were identified. Subcategories were both bidirectional and one-way. Although one-way communication may not be considered interaction if there is no response from the interlocutor, these instances were recorded in order to provide data on the overall L1 and L2 input received by learners. The bidirectional, or two-way, subcategories are indicative of language(s) used during each interaction. The first title within each subcategory indicates the language used by the initiator and the second title indicates the language used by the respondent. All interactions should be considered exchanges between two interlocutors, with the exception of the “unison” group in which the instructor engaged the class in an exchange which required students to respond, or repeat, in unison. For interaction classified as face-to-face, all interaction taking place within the environment is verbal. For interaction classified as online, all interaction is written. For the purposes of reporting, the L1 should always be considered English and the L2 should always be considered French. The bidirectional subcategories are as follows: L1 – L1, L1 – L2, L2 – L1, L2 – L2, Unison – L2. The one-way subcategories are as follows: 1– Way L1, 1– Way L2. The Teacher – Learner interactions were always teacher directed and therefore not spontaneous. One-way communication was also teacher directed and controlled. Unless otherwise indicated, these interactions occurred between one-to-one and were directed at specific students. The data will show that the largest number of interactions occurred from teacher to learner, when teacher directed. Observed Learner – Teacher interaction was always voluntary and Learner – Learner interaction was most often voluntary, but when the interaction was L2 – L2, it was always teacher directed. Students did not spontaneously use the L2 with one another. Table 10 illustrates interaction by category and type. Each interaction category will be presented in detail.
Due to small sample sizes, for the purposes of statistical analysis, all ANOVA results are reported via a nonparametric one-way analysis of variance (Kruskal-Wallis Test). The Kruskal-Wallis test is similar to an ANOVA in that it is a one-way analysis of variance for three or more groups of data. However, it is considered non-parametric because it does not assume a normal distribution and is typically used in place of a parametric ANOVA when sample sizes are small.

During the course of the observation process, it became clear that the type of interaction dictated the type of communication within each interaction. For example, L1 – L1 was used to check for comprehension, discuss culture, and discuss language use; L1 – L2 was used to request definitions and translations of L1 words and phrases to the L2 and to check for comprehension of grammatical rules via a request for L2 output (i.e. conjugating a verb); L2 – L1 was used to check for comprehension of French words and expressions via translation to English; L2 – L2 was used to model the use of L2 features via question/response activities, integrating what students were learning at the time into their L2 output, as well as provide feedback and error correction; Unison L2 interaction involved the teacher asking questions to which a group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-way</th>
<th>Teacher - Learner</th>
<th>Learner - Teacher</th>
<th>Learner - Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigned</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - L1</td>
<td>L1 - L1</td>
<td>L1 - L1 (Voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - L2</td>
<td>L1 - L2</td>
<td>L1 - L2 (Voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - L1</td>
<td>L2 - L1</td>
<td>L2 - L1 (Voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - L2</td>
<td>L2 - L2</td>
<td>L2 - L2 (Assigned)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unison - L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| One - way      |                   |                   |                   |
| L1             |                   |                   |                   |
| L2             |                   |                   |                   |
response was expected or asking students to repeat in unison to practice pronunciation and usage of L2 features.

**Teacher – Learner Interaction**

**Teacher – Learner interaction in the traditional F2F environment.** Table 11 shows frequency of Teacher – Learner interaction within the F2F classroom setting, by category and type.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>L1 - L1</th>
<th>L1 - L2</th>
<th>L2 - L1</th>
<th>L2 - L2</th>
<th>Unison L2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2F 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each of the 3 classroom, face-to-face environments observed, interaction tended to be teacher directed. On average, 239 interactions occurred per 1 hour class session, 25.3 % of

---

2 Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
which contained the L1 while 74.7% contained the L2. In other words, for every interaction in which the L1 was used in any part of the interaction, there were close to 4 interactions (3.96) in which the L2 was used in any part of the interaction. Looking specifically at L1 – L1 interactions compared to L2 – L2 interactions, the data show that only 5.3% took place in the L1 while 94.7% took place in the L2. In other words, for every interaction which took place in English only, there were 18.6 interactions which took place in French only. Furthermore, over the course of the observation period, use of the L1 declined by 48%, while the use of the L2 increased by 29%. Although the use of the L2 increases over time, its increase is not as sharp as the decrease in use of the L1 due to the fact that L2 use was already being used close to 75% of the time within the instructional environment. In order to determine whether the 3 face-to-face classroom environments were significantly different from one another with regard to type and frequency of interaction, an ANOVA was conducted. The data revealed no significant difference between 3 face-to-face classrooms observed. Results for each interaction type are as follows: L1 – L1: H(2) = .0134, (p = .993); L1 – L2: H(2) = .6811, (p = .711); L2 – L1, H(2) = .5864, (p = .745); L2 – L2: H(2) = .5864, (p = .745); Unison L2: H(2) = .5810, (p = .797). To confirm these results, a final ANOVA was conducted to determine whether the frequency of interaction was significantly different between the 3 face-to-face classroom environments across all interaction types. Again, results show no significant difference between the face-to-face environments observed, H(2) = 3.775, (p = .151). These findings suggest that beginning level foreign language face-to-face environments are not different from one another in terms of interaction occurring within the environments. Within the face-to-face environment, one-way L1 and L2 Teacher-Learner communication was also observed. Table 12 shows frequency of one-way Teacher – Learner communication in the face-to-face environment.
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Table 12<sup>3</sup>

*Frequency of One-way Teacher - Learner Communication in F2F Environment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>1 Way (L1)</th>
<th>1 WAY (L2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2F 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the face-to-face environment, one-way communication occurred in specific circumstances. The Teacher used the L1 to communicate course information and provide assignment and activity directions. One-way communication in the L2 took the form of praise, commentary, and providing simple directions. Similar to the L1 and L2 interaction described previously, Use of the L1 occurred in 38% of the one-way communications while the L2 was used 61.6% of the time. In other words, for every 1 interaction in the L1 there were 2.6 in the L2. Instances of the teacher speaking to the students in the L1, without expectation of response, declined 56% over the observation period while one-way use of the L2 increased 30% over the observation period. In order to determine whether the 3 face-to-face classroom environments

<sup>3</sup> Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
were significantly different from one another with regard to type and frequency of one-way communication in the L1, an ANOVA was conducted. The data revealed no significant difference between 3 face-to-face classrooms observed, $H(2) = .0530$, ($p = .981$). The same type of analysis was also conducted for one-way L2 communication and again, results showed no significant difference between the three face-to-face environments, $H(2) = .5619$, ($p = .755$).

**Teacher – Learner interaction in the online environment.** Table 13 shows frequency of Teacher – Learner interaction within the online virtual classroom setting, by category and type.

Table 13 \(^d\)

*Frequency of Teacher - Learner Interaction by Online Instructional Environment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>L1 - L1</th>
<th>L1- L2</th>
<th>L2- L1</th>
<th>L - L2</th>
<th>1 Way L1</th>
<th>1Way L2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HyF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^d\) Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
The online instructional environment is one in which interaction takes place asynchronously. Although Teacher – Learner interaction and one-way communication do take place, all instances occurred in the L1, with 0 instances occurring in the L2. L1 – L1 interaction in Online 1 took the form of cultural discussion. The instructor posted 17 discussion topics to which students were to reply by a given due date. The interaction is teacher directed in that it is the post by the teacher which prompts the response from the student. Of note is the fact the instructor does not comment further on student cultural discussion posts within the discussion board environment, therefore the instructor is not an interlocutor as there is no opportunity for students to receive feedback, clarification, or praise. Within the discussion topics, students are directed to reply to the cultural discussion posts of at least 2 other students. This interaction is Learner – Learner interaction.

In Online 1, there were 25 students and 17 topics, thus there were 425 total L1 student responses to the teacher over the 7 week observation period. One-way communication took the form of course announcements in the L1. Students did not reply to these announcements. The data show a decline in all interaction types as the semester progresses and as students complete the remaining discussion assignments posted to the discussion board. Students are not prompted by the teacher to hold L2 discussions, therefore discussions using the L2 do not occur, indicating that this type of environment results in exposure to the L2 via interaction with online textbook content rather than with the instructor. Review of the online materials related to this reveal that learners do not have access to an additional discussion mechanism within the online textbook environment. Per the instructor survey, real-time discussions via chat or two-way video do not take place in this environment, therefore all interaction is 100% asynchronous. Within the Online 2 environment, the instructor posted discussion topics designed to permit students to ask the instructor for help and assist another with information about the course and contact one another.
Students did voluntarily post responses to those topics, completing the interaction, but did not receive a return response from the teacher. Instead, they received responses from other students. The majority of the student posts were those indicating that the student had tried to contact the teacher for assistance, and having received no response, was therefore posting to the discussion board for peer assistance. Similar to the Online 1 environment, 1 way communication was teacher initiated and took place via the form of course announcements. Students did not respond to the announcements. Again, online materials in use for this course were examined by the researcher and the online materials did not contain any other mechanisms for human interaction. Results of the instructor survey also confirm that no real-time tools to promote interaction were in use in the Online 2 class. The online environment of the Hybrid Full class was one in which course announcements and materials were posted in a 1-way format. There was no use of the online discussion board within this environment, however the online textbook does provide a discussion board area of which the instructor indicated use on the instructor survey. Because 80% of the Hybrid Full course takes place within the face-to-face environment, there is minimal expectation of asynchronous interaction when the students have access to real-time interaction for 80% of their course. An ANOVA was conducted to assess whether the three online environments were different from one another with respect to online L1 – L1 interaction. Results indicated a significant difference among the 3 online environments, \( \text{H}(2) = 9.116, (p = .010) \), with the significant difference being between the Online 1 and Hybrid Full environments, \( (p = .<.01) \). There was no significant difference between any of the other environments. Even though the results suggest no difference between the Online 1 and Online 2 environments, the raw data clearly show an abundance of interaction within the first online group and an almost non-existent level of interaction within the second online group. Results suggest that frequency of interaction
across different online environments is more likely to vary than the frequency of interaction which occurs across face-to-face environments. Further, results thus far suggest that the online environment is not an environment in which one can expect to interact with the instructor or peers in the L2.

**Teacher – Learner interaction: F2F vs. Online vs. Hybrid.** In order to determine whether the 3 instructional environments (Online, Hybrid Full, and F2F) examined are significantly different from one another with regard to the frequency of L1 – L1 interaction occurring within the environment, an ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of instructional environment on interaction in the F2F, Hybrid Full, and Online environments. There was no significant effect of instructional environment, \(H(2) = 1.070, (p = .585)\) with regard to Teacher – Learner L1 – L1 interaction. Examining the mean rank differences, the data show that the greatest differences are between the Online vs. Hybrid environments (2.729) and the Online vs. F2F environments (2.688). Of the three environments, the F2F vs. Hybrid environments were the most alike (-.04167). The results show that the online environment relies more heavily on L1 – L1 interaction than do the other two environments.

For L1 – L2, a significant effect of instructional environment was found, \(H(2) = 14.51, p = .000\). An examination of the mean rank difference shows the greatest difference between the F2F vs. Online (10.000, p<.001) and Hybrid vs. Online (8.167, p<.001) environments. There was no significant effect of instructional environment in F2F vs. Hybrid (1.833, p>.05) environments. For L2 – L1, a significant effect of instructional environment was found, \(H(2) = 14.367, p = .000\). The greatest mean rank difference was between F2F vs. Online (9.250, p<.01) and Hybrid vs. Online (10.167, p<.01). There was no significant difference between F2F vs. Hybrid (.9167, p>.05). For L2 – L2 interaction, the test revealed a significant effect of instructional environment
on L2 – L2 interaction (H(2) = 14.31, (p = .000). A closer look at the mean rank difference for each pair reveals the most significant difference is between the F2F and Online environments (9.250, p<.01) and Hybrid vs. Online (10.167, p<.05). There was no significant difference between F2F vs. Hybrid (.9167, p>.05). The results indicate that the F2F and Online environments are the most different from one another when it comes to L2 – L2 interaction in that the F2F environment is rich in L2 – L2 interaction, whereas the online environment shows no evidence of L2 – L2 interaction at all.

Another ANOVA was conducted to compare all interaction types containing the L2 across the three instructional environments and the results were similar to the previous findings for the L2 – L2 interactions. The results show a significant difference between the instructional environments (H(2) = 59.29, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank differences shows the most significant difference being between F2F and Online (38.141, p<.001) and Hybrid vs. Online (37.62, p<.001) and Hybrid vs. F2F showed no significant difference (.5156, p>.05).

Finally, an examination of Teacher – Learner interaction occurring across all interaction types, regardless of language, indicates a significant effect of instructional environment on frequency of overall interaction (H(2) = 49.683, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank difference shows a significant difference between the F2F and online environments (39.650, p<.001) and Hybrid vs. Online (39.458, p<.001). There is no significant difference between the F2F and Hybrid environments (0.1917, p>.05).

Overall, the observational data indicate that the Hybrid and F2F environments, which utilize L2 interaction as a basis for instruction, use the L1 sparingly, and mainly to clarify assignments and provide directions. Although the online environment contains interaction, it is L1 and is not an L2 interaction-centered environment. In addition, the frequency of L1
interaction varied across all online environments, whereas the interaction taking place across F2F environments was fairly constant. This may be indicative of the more established nature of face-to-face foreign language education as compared to the newer online environment in which teachers may be experimenting with strategies for encouraging interaction.

**Learner – Teacher Interaction**

**Learner – Teacher interaction in the F2F environment.** Learner – Teacher interaction within the face-to-face environment, including Hybrid Full, occurs less often that Teacher – Learner interaction. Learner – Teacher interaction tends to be of a spontaneous nature for all interaction types. Table 14 shows the frequency of Learner – Teacher interaction in the face-to-face environment.

### Table 14

**Frequency of Learner - Teacher Interaction in the F2F Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L1</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L2</th>
<th>L2 -&gt; L1</th>
<th>L2 -&gt;L2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2F 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>5</sup> Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
The L1–L1 interactions consisted of clarification of directions, requests for correct spelling, and questions relating to culture. The L1–L2 interactions consisted of pronunciation and translation requests. The L2–L1 interactions occurred rarely and consisted of a student’s attempt to engage the professor in an exchange resulting in an L1 response from the instructor indicating a need to reformulate the question. The L2–L2 interactions consisted of spontaneous questions to the teacher and thinking aloud/commentary to which the teacher responded in the L2. Similar to the previously examined Teacher–Learner interactions, L1–L1 interactions decreased over time. L1–L1 interactions decreased by 41% over the observation period while L1–L2 interactions increased by 35%. Likewise, L2–L1 interactions decreased by 54%, while L2–L2 interactions increased by a remarkable 156%. When the teacher was the respondent, interactions containing L1 as the response language decreased and interactions containing the L2 increased, indicating that even when the learner prompted the interaction, it was the teacher who took control of the interaction. By controlling his or her own language of output, the teacher increased learner exposure to the L2. The ratio of interactions containing L1 to those containing L2 was 1 to 1, as was the ratio of exclusively L1 interactions to those which were exclusively L2. An ANOVA was conducted for each of the interaction types in order to examine differences between the three face-to-face environments. The only effect for instructional environment was found in the L1–L1 interaction type where an examination of the mean rank difference revealed a significant difference between F2F 1 and F2F2 environments (5.875, p<.05), rather than between either of the F2F environments and the Hybrid environment. There were no significant differences found between environments for any of the other interaction types with regard to Learner–Teacher interaction. The following are the ANOVA results for each interaction type: L1–L1 (H(2) = 6.848, p = .032); L1–L2, (H(2) = 2.070, p = .355); L2–L1, (H(2) = .2416, p =
.886); L2 – L2, (H(2) = .4611, p = .794. When examining overall Learner – Teacher interaction containing the L2 use across all interaction types, ANOVA results again revealed no significant difference between the face-to-face environments (H(2) = 2.978, p = .225), indicating that frequency of overall Learner – Teacher interaction is similar across the three F2F environments.

Learner – Teacher interaction in the online environment. Within the three online environments: Online 1, Online 2, and Hybrid Full, there was no observed Learner – Teacher interaction. In other words, students did not start threaded discussion board discussions to communicate with the instructor. As previously mentioned, some instructors set up discussion board topics to encourage students to interact with one another. It may be that students did not have the ability to begin a discussion topic, due to the permissions settings within the online environment. It is also possible that students engaged instructors via private e-mail rather than via the discussion board.

Learner – Teacher Interaction: F2F vs. Hybrid vs. Online. An examination of Learner – Teacher L1-L1 interactions across all instructional environments (F2F, Online, Hybrid), revealed an ANOVA result of (H(2) = 14.469, p = .000), indicating a significant effect of instructional environment on L1 – L1 Learner – Teacher interaction. An examination of the mean rank difference revealed a significant difference between the F2F vs. Online environments (9.938, p<.001) and a mean rank difference approaching significance between the Hybrid vs. Online (8.333, p>.05) environments. There was no significant mean rank difference between F2F vs. Hybrid (1.604, p>.05). For L1 – L2, there was an extremely significant effect of instructional environment, (H(2) = 14.541, p = .000). An examination of the mean ranks difference showed the most significant difference between F2F vs. Online (10.000, p>.001) environments with a difference approaching significance in Hybrid vs. Online (8.167, p>.05) environments. Again,
F2F vs. Hybrid (1.833, p>.05), showed no significant difference in mean ranks. For L2 – L1, there was a significant effect of instructional environment, (H(2) = 14.26, p = .000) with significant differences being between F2F vs. Online (9.563, p<.01) and Hybrid vs. Online (9.333, p<.05). No significant effect of instructional environment on F2F vs. Hybrid (.2292, p>.05). When examining L2 – L2 Learner – Teacher interactions across the three instructional environments, the data show a significant difference between the environments, (H(2) = 8.717, p = .012). However, an examination of the mean rank differences between environments shows a significant difference between the Hybrid vs. Online environments (7.500, p<.05) and the F2F vs. Online environments (6.688, p<.05) with no significant difference between the F2F and Hybrid environments (.8125, p>.05).

Another ANOVA was conducted in order to examine the effect of instructional environment on overall interactions containing the L2 across all Learner – Teacher interaction types containing the L2 (L1 – L2, L2 – L1, L2 – L2). Once again, the results reveal a significant effect of instructional environment (H(2) = 37.906, p = .000). The data indicate significant mean rank difference between the Hybrid vs. Online (26.278, p<.001) environments and the F2F vs. Online environments (25.771, p<.001). The F2F vs. Hybrid environments again showed no significant difference (.5069, p>.05).

Finally, an ANOVA was conducted in order to examine the effect of instructional environment on overall Learner – Teacher interaction in general between the F2F, Online, and Hybrid Full environments. Results are exactly the same as those for overall L2 Teacher - Learner interaction (H(2) = 52.81, p = .000. Findings indicate that a significant mean rank difference is between the F2F and Online environments (35.125, p<.001) and the Hybrid vs. Online (35.125, p<.001). The F2F vs. Hybrid environments show no significant difference (.3906, p>.05).
Of note is that, in a Learner – Teacher L2 – L2 interaction, it is the learner who must initiate use of the L2. The data show that this happens less often than L1 initiated Learner – Teacher interactions across all F2F environments and not at all in the online environment.

Furthermore, when the learner initiates an interaction using the L1, in a F2F environment, the data show that the teacher is more likely to respond in the L2, thus giving greater control of the interactional environment to the teacher. The ANOVA results are reflective of learner hesitancy to initiate interactions in the L2 and the desire of the instructor to increase L2 interaction by choosing to use the L2, even when the learner initiates the interaction with the L1.

Learner – Learner Interaction

Learner – Learner interaction in the F2F environment.

Table 15\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L1 Voluntary</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L2 Voluntary</th>
<th>L2 -&gt; L1 Voluntary</th>
<th>L2 -&gt; L2 Assigned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2F 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
Learner – Learner interaction within the face-to-face environment was spontaneous in all interaction types except L2 – L2, which was teacher directed. Table 15 shows frequency of Learner – Learner interaction within each of the F2F environments observed.

Learner – Learner L1 – L1 interaction consisted of asking for course information and commentary. At times, the commentary was off topic. The L1 – L2 interaction consisted of requests for assistance and asking for translations of vocabulary. The L2 – L1 interaction consisted of instances when a student attempted to engage a neighbor in an L2 exchange, but received a response in the L1. The L2 – L2 interactions were always teacher directed and always took place with a partner as a group activity. These activities generally consisted of interviews in which students would ask a set number of L2 questions to one another, receiving L2 responses in return. It was in this setting that students would work together to negotiate meaning if something was not understood. Over the observation period, L1 – L1 interactions decreased by 47%, while L1 – L2 interactions increased by 337%. The L2 – L1 interactions increased by 277% and the teacher directed L2 – L2 interactions remained fairly constant, with a slight decrease of .02% over the observation period. The increase in L1 – L2 and L2 – L1 interactions may be attributed to an increased comfort level with the L2 as the course progressed, prompting students to engage each other using the L2 and/or respond in the L2. It also suggests that as the semester continued, students became more comfortable with one another and were more likely to collaborate with one another. The L2 – L2 interactions remained constant due to teacher direction. The teacher would dictate the number of questions to be asked and answered by partner dyads. Fluctuations only occurred when all students in the class were not present or the teacher assigned fewer questions to each dyad.
An ANOVA conducted to examine Learner – Learner L1 – L1 interactions within the F2F environments revealed a not quite significant effect of instructional environment on L1 – L1 interaction (H(2) = 5.733, p = .056). The same analysis conducted on the L1 – L2 interaction type also revealed no effect of instructional environment on interaction, (H(2) = 2.184, p = .335). There was a significant effect of instructional environment on L2 – L1 interaction (H(2) = 5.932, p = .043) and for L2 – L2, (H(2) = 8.423, p = .014). In both cases, an examination of the mean rank differences showed the largest differences occurring between the F2F1 and Hybrid environments. For the L2 – L2 interaction type, an examination of the mean rank differences showed a significant difference between the F2F1 and Hybrid environments (6.833, p<0.05). This is most likely due to the fact that Learner – Learner L2 – L1 and L2 – L2 interactions were dependent on class size. A smaller class yields fewer interactions and, in the case of the F2F1 and Hybrid courses, the F2F1 course was less than half the size of the Hybrid class, with only 11 total students compared to 23 students in the Hybrid class whereas the F2F2 and Hybrid courses had similar class sizes. Additionally, L2 – L2 interaction always took place at the direction of the teacher and would also be affected by class size. The data show that learner – learner interaction did occur in each of the three face-to-face environments, but because of the differences in class size between the F2F1 and the other observed environments, the F2F2 and Hybrid environments were the most alike when it came to learner – learner interaction.

**Learner – Learner interaction in the online environment.** Within the three online environments, Learner- Learner interaction occurred in two. As previously mentioned, online Teacher – Learner interaction took place via the posting of discussion board topics. In the Online 1 environment, the topics were about different aspects of the French culture. Students were required to respond directly to the teacher and then respond to the posts of two other students. In
the Online 2 environment, students interacted with each other on order to assist with locating
course information. The Online 2 environment did not have posted discussions to which students
were required to respond and the Hybrid environment had zero Learner – Learner interactions.
So, in the Online 1 environment, student interactions with one another were assigned. In the
Online 2 environment, they were voluntary. Table 16 shows the frequency of Learner – Learner interaction in the three online environments.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L1</th>
<th>L1 -&gt; L2</th>
<th>L2 -&gt; L1</th>
<th>L2 -&gt; L2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Online 2    |          |          |          |          |       |
| 1           | 9        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 9     |
| 2           | 3        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 3     |
| 3           | 4        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 4     |
| 4           | 1        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 1     |
| Total       | 17       | 0        | 0        | 0        | 17    |
| Mean        | 4        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 4     |

| Hybrid      |          |          |          |          |       |
| 1           | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |
| 2           | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |
| 3           | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |
| 4           | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |
| Total       | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |
| Mean        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0     |

In the Online 1 environment, interactions decreased as students completed the assigned
discussion board topics. Seventeen topics were posted to which students were required to
respond over the 14 week semester. Because the Online 2 Learner – Learner interactions were
voluntary, interactions tended to decrease. This may be because students became more familiar
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Means rounded to nearest whole number at .5
with the course itself as the semester progressed. Both environments showed an 83% and 88% decrease over time, respectively. Similar to the data collected for Teacher – Learner interactions, all Learner – Learner interactions took place L1 – L1. There were no other documented interaction types, thus there was no interaction in the L2. An ANOVA was conducted to examine the L1 – L1 interaction between the three online environments and the results revealed a significant effect for instructional environment (H(2) = 9.074, p = .010). An examination of the mean rank differences between environments indicated a significant effect of instructional environment between the Online 1 vs. Hybrid environments (7.500, p<0.01) with no significant difference between the Online 1 vs. Online 2 environments or the Online 2 vs. Hybrid environments. This is expected since the Online 1 environment was the most interactive while the Online 2 environment was much less interactive and the Hybrid environment showed no interaction occurring between learners within the online component of the course.

**Learner – Learner interaction: Online vs. Hybrid vs. F2F.** A comparison of the three instructional environments (Online, Hybrid, and F2F) revealed no effect of instructional environment for L1 – L1 interaction (H(2) = 3.216, p = .200). For L1 – L2 interaction there was a significant effect of instructional environment (H(2) = 15.516, p =.000). An examination of the mean rank difference shows significant difference between the Online vs. Hybrid environments (12.500, p<.01) the F2F vs. Online environments (8.375, p<.01) with the least variation occurring between the F2F vs. Hybrid environments (4.125, p>.05). Likewise, for L2 – L1 interaction, the same exact result occurred (H(2) = 15.516, p =.000), showing a significant effect of instructional environment. An examination of the mean rank differences shows the most variation between the Hybrid vs. Online environments (12.500, p<.01) and the F2F vs. Online environments (8.375, p<.01) with the F2F and Hybrid environments showing the least variation.
from one another (4.125, p>.05), and is not considered significant. For L2 – L2 interaction, there was a significant effect of instructional environment, (H(2) = 16.040, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank difference shows that the two environment pairs which differ significantly are Hybrid vs. Online (12.833, p<.01) and F2F vs. Online (8.250). There is no significant difference between with the F2F and Hybrid environments (4.583, p>.05). When looking at any interaction in which the L2 was utilized within Learner – Learner interactions, across all interaction types, the data show a significant effect of instructional environment (H(2) = 45.531, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank difference shows that the two environment pairs which differ significantly are Online vs. Hybrid (33.556, p<.0001) and F2F vs. Online (26.604, p<.0001) with the F2F and Hybrid environments being the most similar (6.951, p>.05).

To examine overall Learner – Learner interaction for all interaction types, ANOVA results indicated a significant effect of instructional environment, (H(2) = 47.086, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank difference shows the most significant difference between the Online vs. Hybrid environments (41.568, p<.001) and F2F vs. Online environments (30.984, p<.001). The F2F vs. Hybrid environments showed no significant difference (10.583 p>.05), indicating that the Hybrid environment is more closely related to the F2F environment than to the Online environment.

The Overall Interactional Environment: F2F v. Hybrid v. Online

The following results are reported to include all interactional categories (Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teacher, and Learner – Learner) and types (L1 –L1, L1 – L2, L2 – L1, L2 – L2) by instructional environment (F2F, Online, Hybrid). Table 17 shows the overall frequency of interaction for all interactional categories (Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teacher, Learner – Learner) together by instructional environment and interaction type.
Overall, between instructional environments, the use of L1 and L2 vary. Within the F2F and Hybrid environments, its use tends to take the form of comprehension checks, requests for information/clarification, commentary, and discussions. Within the Online environment, its use takes the form of presentation of information, commentary/discussion, and requests for help. In the F2F environment, the L1 is used in 35.1% of all interactions. In the Hybrid environment, the L1 is used in 34.9% of all interactions. In the Online environment, the L1 is used in 100% of all interactions. With regard to L1 use within each group, L1 use within the F2F and Hybrid environments are equal, and are approximately 35% of the total interactions occurring within that environment, whereas L1 use occurs within the Online environment 100% of the time. An ANOVA was conducted to assess the variation between groups in order to determine any effect of instructional environment on L1 use within interactions. There was a significant effect of instructional environment on the use of L1 within interactions (H(2) = 20.051, p = .000). An examination of the mean rank difference indicated that the most significant variations occurred between the F2F and Online environments (18.056, p<.001) as well as the Hybrid and Online environments (16.667, p<.01). The mean rank difference between the F2F and Hybrid environments was not significant (1.389, p>.05).
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Critical Thinking within Interaction

A secondary focus of this study is on how critical thinking may differ from the online to the face-to-face formats and whether there is a correlation with learner outcomes. Because the environments observed in the face-to-face format (F2F, Hybrid Full) were highly interactive, and interaction within instructional environments was not video recorded, it was difficult to document frequency of interaction for category (Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teachers, Learner – Learner) and type (L1 – L1, L1 – L2, L2 – L1, L2 – L2) as well as the corresponding cognitive process code for each interaction, therefore the researcher concentrated on documenting frequency of interaction category and type while making general observations about the cognitive processes in use and when they occurred. In doing so, a general pattern emerged which tended to be reflective of interaction type. As mentioned previously, during the course of the observation process, it became clear that the type of interaction influenced the type of communication within each interaction. For example, L1 – L1 was used to check for comprehension, present cultural information, and discuss language use (i.e. grammar). L1 – L2 was used to request definitions and translations of L1 words and phrases to the L2 and to check for comprehension of grammatical rules via a request for L2 output (i.e. conjugating a verb). L2 – L1 was used most often to check for comprehension of French words and expressions via translation to English, using French as the main language to do so via questions such as, “Comment dit-on ‘book’?” (How does one say ‘book’?) L2 – L2 was used to model the use of L2 features via question/response activities, integrating what students were learning at the time into their L2 output, as well as provide feedback and error correction. Unison L2 interaction involved the teacher asking questions to which a group response was expected or asking students to repeat in unison to practice pronunciation and usage of L2 features. The characteristics of the
interactions taking place were compared to the revised Cognitive Process Coding Model for Beginning Language Learners adapted from Chu’s model for advanced learners. Table 18 shows the observed critical thinking processes by interaction type. It also presents the average number of interactions occurring within each interaction type by instructional environment. The F2F and Hybrid Full environments were grouped together as they contained a classroom component. The online environments are displayed separately due to the variation in interaction type, frequency, and related cognitive process occurring in these environments. Critical thinking process codes are aligned with characteristics of corresponding interaction. The final two columns only display data for the L1 – L1 interaction type as this was the only category in which interaction occurred. Note that there were 3 face-to-face environments observed, therefore the number provided represents the average frequency for each interaction type. Because so little interaction occurred within the online environments, both environments are listed separately. Recall that no interaction occurred within the online component of the Hybrid Full environment. Within the face-to-face environments, the average frequency is not further divided by critical thinking phase, rather, they are listed together as it was not always possible to separate each individual interaction by phase. Within the face-to-face environments, the resolution stage was reached during partner activities which were designed to provide opportunities for real-world application. Note that within the face-to-face environments, each of the 5 stages was reached. All interaction types and associated critical thinking process phases were observed during each observation period. Within these environments, every interaction type containing the L1 includes phases 1 and 2, recognition and comprehension, however when the L2 was used exclusively, all 5 phases were observed. By contrast, within Online environment 1, phases 1, 2, and 3 were observed during use of the L1.
Table 18  

*Critical Thinking by Instructional Environment and Interaction Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Critical Thinking Process Code</th>
<th>Avg F2F and HyF</th>
<th>Avg for Online Environ 1</th>
<th>Avg for Online Environ 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 - L1</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td>P1: 66</td>
<td>P1: 15</td>
<td>P2: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide course information</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td>P2: 69</td>
<td>P3: 425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present cultural information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain Grammar</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension Check</td>
<td>P2: Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 - L2</td>
<td>Request definitions/translations</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension Checks</td>
<td>P2: Comprehension</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - L1</td>
<td>Request definitions/translations</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension Checks</td>
<td>P2: Comprehension</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 - L2</td>
<td>Model correct usage</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide feedback/error correction</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling/Repetition</td>
<td>P1: Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions/Responses focusing on use of L2 features and forms</td>
<td>P3: Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews and situational partner activities mimicking real world application</td>
<td>P5: Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 3, exploration, occurred because students presented cultural information after which they compared and contrasted the information with information about their native culture. Peer comments also spanned the first three phases, however because the L2 was not used, there were
no opportunities for real-world application of information and students did not build upon the information provided in the culture posts, thus the integration and resolution stages were not reached. Online environment 2 had very little interaction overall, and what there was correlated with phases 1 and 2. The data collected provide useful information about the phases of critical thinking, or critical presence, which take place in a beginning foreign language course. In this case, the data indicate that the face-to-face environment is a linguistically and cognitively rich environment in which students are able and, by the interactive nature of the environment, encouraged to think critically in order to facilitate learning and L2 acquisition. By contrast, the online interactional environment seems to be limited in scope and, as a result, critical thinking.

Student Survey Results

Participants enrolled in a full semester, 14 week, French 1120 course completed the survey in an online format during the 7th week of the Fall 2012 semester. Students enrolled in a half semester, 7 week, course completed the survey in the 5th week of instruction.

Learning Readiness

Questions 1 – 11 pertain to learning readiness. Although the questions are designed to determine whether a learner is suited for the online environment, the results also determine suitability for the F2F and hybrid environments. A score of 28 or above indicates that a student is well-suited for the online environment, 15 – 27 indicates moderate suitability for the online environment, perhaps better suited for a hybrid environment, and 14 or fewer indicates lack of suitability for the online environment and someone more suited for the F2F environment, which is the default environment. Of the 15 study participants (4 online, 2 HyH, 5 HyF, 4 F2F), 14 (93.3%) achieved a score of between 20 and 25, indicating moderate suitability for the online environment. One (6.67%) achieved a score of 28, indicating that this student is well-suited for
the online environment. With regard to specific learning environments, all four categories achieved scores indicating moderate suitability for the online environment, thus also suitable for the F2F and Hybrid environments, with the exception of 1 student from the online group of 4 (25%) who was rated well suited for the online environment, with the remaining 3 of 4 (75%) rated as moderately suited for the online environment. Zero participants were rated not suited for the online environment. Results indicate that all study participants have a reasonable chance of success in all instructional environments.

**Language Background**

Study participants were distributed across the following native languages of 7 – English (46.7%), 7 – Spanish (46.7%), and 1 – Haitian Creole (6.7%). All participants (100%) self rated as “advanced” in all skills of their respective native languages. Likewise, all participants self rated as “beginner” in French with none having studied the language previous to the French 1120 course in which they were enrolled. Interestingly, survey data revealed that language background may be a factor in choice of instructional environment. Of the student participants whose native language was one other than English, 78% enrolled in a face-to-face (F2F or Hybrid Full) French 1120 course whereas only 43% of those who speak English as a first language chose a face-to-face French 1120 course with the other 57% of English speakers choosing an online (Online or Hybrid Half) French 1120 course. While other factors such as lifestyle and affective factors were considered as a possible influence on choice of instructional environment during the design of the study, language background was not. This finding may merit future investigation into possible cultural and economic factors affecting choice of instructional environment.
Instructional Environment

Participants were asked to provide information about the learning environment in which they were enrolled for French 1120. The participants are distributed amongst 4 instructional environments at two institutions in the following manner: 4 – Online (26.67%), 4 – F2F (26.67%), 5 – Hybrid Full (33.3%), 2 – Hybrid Half (13.3%). When asked about overall satisfaction with their French 1120 course, participants indicated the following: 7 – satisfied, 6 – moderately satisfied, 2 – not satisfied. Table 19 provides the results by percentage and number of respondents.

Table 19

Overall Satisfaction with French 1120 Course Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Classmates</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>60 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Teacher</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>53 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Speak French</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>20 (3)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Read French</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
<td>67 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Write French</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
<td>67 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Listen to French</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>53 (8)</td>
<td>47 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Activities</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
<td>53 (8)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to be Creative</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>47 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Responses to Questions from Teacher</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>53 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Complete Course Requirements</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>60 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the Course</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>60 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those who indicated that they were “not satisfied” with opportunities to interact with classmates and teacher, 4 of 5 (80%) respondents were from the online environment. One of 5 (20%) respondents was from the Hybrid Half environment. This is significant because, of the 15 total study participants, 6 (40%) were from an environment in which the majority of instruction
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took place online. Five of the 6 (83.3%) indicated that they were not satisfied with the level of interaction between themselves and classmates as well as between themselves and their instructor. Similarly, of the 6 respondents who indicated a dissatisfaction with opportunities to speak French, 4 (66.7%) of them were online students, effectively making up 100% of the respondents from a purely online environment. The remaining 2 dissatisfied respondents were students from the Hybrid Half environment which is a course conducted online 70% of the time. This indicates that 100% of participants from an environment in which the majority of instruction takes place online were dissatisfied with opportunities to speak the language in their French 1120 course. The single respondent citing a lack of interesting activities was from the online environment, while those citing a lack of opportunities to be creative were participants from both the online and the F2F environments. Of those not satisfied with timely responses from the instructor, indicating that responses from the instructor do not come in a timely manner, 4 of the 5 (80%) respondents were from the online environment and 1 of the 5 (20%) respondents was from the Hybrid Half environment. Of those indicating dissatisfaction with interaction, and timely responses from the teacher, 100% came from an environment in which the majority of the course is conducted online while those who indicated moderate to high levels of satisfaction came from the Hybrid Full and F2F environments, both environments in which the majority of instruction takes place in a real-time environment.

**Affective Factors**

When asked about whether or not they felt motivated to learn French, all 15 respondents indicated that they are motivated to learn with 4 respondents (26.7%) indicating moderate motivation and 11 (73.3%) indicating high motivation. Zero participants indicated a lack of motivation. Since 100% of the participants from the Online and Hybrid Half environments
indicated that they were highly motivated, and the four respondents indicating moderate motivation were distributed across both the F2F and Hybrid Full environments, it is unlikely that choice of instructional environment was influenced by level of student motivation. To confirm, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between choice of instructional environment and motivation to learn French. Results indicated no significant positive relationship between the two variables \( r(15) = .3208, p = .243 \), indicating that level of motivation to learn is unlikely to influence choice of instructional environment and vice versa.

When asked about their feelings toward interaction with others, 14 respondents (93.3%) indicated positive feelings toward interaction with others and only 1 respondent (6.7%) indicated negative feelings toward interaction with others. Responses were as follows: 11 – I like to interact, I am a social person; 3 – I like to interact, I’m a little shy at times; 1 – I do not like to interact, I am not social. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between feelings toward interaction and general feelings toward motivation to learn French. Results indicated a statistically significant, positive relationship between the two variables \( r(15) = .8292, p = .000 \), indicating that feelings toward interaction are likely to influence motivation to learn French. Taking a closer look at feelings toward interaction, the response distribution is as follows: 4 F2F and 3 Hybrid Full respondents indicated they like to interact and are social, 1 Hybrid Full indicated he or she likes to interact but is shy at times, 1 Hybrid Full indicated that he or she is not social and does not like to interact 3 Online respondents indicated that they like to interact, but are shy at times, 1 Online respondent indicated very social behavior in interaction, and 2 Hybrid Half respondents indicated that they like to interact and are social. To investigate whether a relationship exists between the
choice of instructional environment and feelings toward interaction, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed. Results indicated no positive relationship between the two variables \( r(15) = .1269, p = .652 \), indicating that feelings toward interaction are unlikely to affect choice of instructional environment.

When asked how they feel about learning French, 4 (26.6%) participants indicated that they felt anxious, while the remaining 11 (73.4%) of respondents indicated feelings of happiness and excitement. Those who felt anxious were distributed across the learning environments in the following manner: 1 – Online, 1 – F2F, 1 – Hybrid Full, 1– Hybrid Half. The even distribution of results relating to anxiety indicates that it is unlikely participants chose their instructional environment based on feelings of anxiousness toward learning French. To investigate whether a relationship exists between the choice of instructional environment and feelings toward learning French, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed. Results indicated no positive relationship between the two variables \( r(15) = .0140, p = .960 \), indicating that feelings toward learning French are unlikely to affect choice of instructional environment.

**Learning Goals**

Table 20 provides data on the skills students would like to attain as a result of having taken French 1120, in order of importance. For the purposes of this study, a distinction is made between understanding written French and reading, with understanding written French being a survival skill for communication and reading French being an academic skill pertaining to literature. Clearly of highest importance to all participants is the ability to speak and understand spoken language, as well as understand written French. Of lowest importance is the attainment of knowledge about the French culture.
Table 20<sup>10</sup>

*Desired Skills of French 1120 Students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Skills of French 1120 Students</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak French</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand spoken French</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand written French</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write French</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read French</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attain knowledge about French culture</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These desired skills will be discussed in relationship to skills that French 1120 learners actually attain.

**Lifestyle and Demographics**

Similar to enrollment data indicating that 70% of state and community college students are enrolled in classes on a part-time basis, 60% of students participating in this study were also enrolled in a state or community college on a part-time basis, while the remaining 40% were enrolled full-time. Table 21 shows enrollment by instructional environment by percentage and actual number enrolled. Of the 6 students enrolled full-time, all were enrolled in a French 1120 class in which the majority of instruction took place in a face-to-face environment. Of those enrolled part-time, 66.7% were enrolled in a French 1120 course in which the majority instruction took place online. The other 33.3% of part-time students were those enrolled in a course in which the majority of instruction took place face-to-face. Given that zero Online and Hybrid Half students were enrolled full-time, the data indicate that Online and Hybrid Half students tend to be part-time students while those enrolled F2F and Hybrid Full courses are likely to be full-time students. Although Pearson product-moment correlation indicated a
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negative relationship between the two variables $[r(15) = - .5238, p = .045]$, suggesting that level of overall enrollment in college courses is unlikely to affect choice of instructional environment for French 1120, the raw data indicate the unlikelihood that a full-time student would take a fully, or majority, online course.

Table 21

*Participation by Enrollment Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Enrolled Full time</th>
<th>% Enrolled Part time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Full</td>
<td>27 (4)</td>
<td>7 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Half</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the raw data, part-time students were most likely to favor an online course, or a course with a 70 - 100% online component, such as the Hybrid Half or Online French 1120 courses. Full-time students seemed most likely to choose a F2F course, or a course with an 80% face-to-face component, such as the Hybrid Full French 1120 course. Because some part-time students also chose a course in which a majority of instruction took place face-to-face, a statistical correlation between enrollment status and choice of instructional environment was not possible; however this could be due to the size of the data sample and is worthy of further investigation. With regard to employment status, 40% of participants were employed part time, 26.7% were employed full-time, and 33.3% were not employed. The table below illustrates employment status by instructional environment.
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Table 22

Employment by Instructional Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Employed Full time</th>
<th>% Employed Part time</th>
<th>% Not Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Full</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Half</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Respondents</td>
<td>27 (4)</td>
<td>40 (6)</td>
<td>33 (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examining the table, it does not seem that employment status is a factor which clearly determines the choice of instructional environment; however it does seem to have an influence. Of the 4 students employed full-time, 50% were enrolled in a Hybrid full course in which at least 80% of instruction was delivered face-to-face. The other 50% were students functioning within environments in which at least 80% of instruction was delivered online. Although both types of environments contain an on-campus, face-to-face component, none of the participants employed full-time chose a fully face-to-face class. Those employed part-time were distributed evenly amongst two on-campus environments (F2F and HyF) and the fully online environment. A closer look reveals that the majority of those who worked part-time (66%) enrolled in a class in which at least 70% of the instruction was delivered face-to-face. Likewise, those who were not employed were distributed amongst the 4 instructional environments, with 60% choosing an environment in which 80% of instruction took place face-to-face. Looking exclusively at online participants, 50% were employed part-time with only 25% employed full time and the remaining 25% not employed. With the inclusion of the Hybrid Half respondents into the online category, the 6 participants taking classes in a majority online environment are evenly distributed across
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the 3 levels of employment, seemingly indicating that employment status is likely not a significant factor in choice of instructional environment. To confirm, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed. Results indicated no positive relationship between employment and choice of instructional environment \[ r(15) = .1814, p = .517 \]. This provides additional evidence that employment status is unlikely to affect choice of instructional environment. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also computed to investigate whether a relationship exists between enrollment status and employment status for students enrolled in French 1120. Results indicated no significant relationship between the two variables \[ r(15) = .07053, p = .802 \].

**Student Assessment Data**

**Oral Proficiency**

Two examine whether there is an effect of instructional environment on learning outcomes, student participants completed two outcome assessments, an oral proficiency assessment and a reading proficiency assessment. As mentioned previously in the presentation of research methodology, all oral proficiency assessments were conducted by the researcher according to the established ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview method of assessing oral speech proficiency. Assessments were double blind rated by the researcher at intervals of one week between ratings, thus the researcher was both tester and rater. Assigned ratings are not official ACTFL OPI ratings and should not be construed as such, however they do provide information as to the skills students may attain in French 1120 courses in various instructional environments. Assessments occurred during the final two weeks of the Fall 2012 semester. Oral proficiency assessment results are as follows: Novice Low – 2, Novice Mid – 4, Novice High – 6,
Intermediate Low – 3. Table 23 shows oral proficiency assessment scores by instructional environment. The table also indicates the percentage of real-time instruction each environment provides along with percentage of L2 – L2 interaction.

Table 23

Oral Proficiency Assessment Scores for All Instructional Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Real-time Instruction</th>
<th>% L2 - L2 Interaction</th>
<th>Novice Low</th>
<th>Novice Mid</th>
<th>Novice High</th>
<th>Intermediate Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Full</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid Half</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Participants</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that of the 15 participants, 60% scored in the Novice High to Intermediate Low range, meeting course expectations as described in the course descriptions publicly available in the Statewide Course Code Directory (FDOE, 2012) and 40% scored in the Novice Low to Novice Mid range, not meeting expectations. Those who were assessed at Novice High and Intermediate were enrolled in French 1120 courses in which 80 – 100% of course instruction took place in a face-to-face, real-time environment in which 65% of interaction within each instructional environment included the L2. Participants in these environments did not receive an assessment score lower than Novice High. Of those achieving a Novice High or Intermediate Low rating, 50% of F2F students achieved a rating of Intermediate Low while 20% of Hybrid Full students achieved the same rating. Likewise, 50% of F2F students received a rating of Novice High, while 80% of Hybrid Full students received rating of Novice High. By contrast, those who were assessed at Novice Low and Novice Mid were enrolled in French 1120
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courses in which 0 – 30% of instruction took place in a real-time, face-to-face setting. In the Online environment, 0% of the interaction occurring within that environment was L2 interaction. Because the Hybrid Half environment was not observed, interaction data is not available. Of those achieving a Novice Low or Novice Mid rating, 100% of Hybrid Half students earned a Novice Mid rating while 50% of Online students earned a Novice Mid rating and 50% of Online students earned a Novice Low rating. Given that the percentage of real-time instruction taking place within each instructional environment seems to correlate with the percentage of L2 interaction within each environment, one might expect that a reduction in interaction, specifically L2 interaction may affect acquired skills. In order to determine whether there is an effect of instructional environment on oral proficiency, an ANOVA was conducted and a significant effect of instructional environment was found (H(3) = 11.50, p =.009). An examination of the mean rank difference showed a significant difference in oral proficiency outcomes occurring between the F2F and Online environments (8.750, p<.05). Although determined to be not significant, the following environments showed large mean rank differences, indicating that these environments differ in terms of learner oral proficiency: Hybrid Full vs. Online (7.400, p>.05), F2F vs. Hybrid Half (7.250, p>.05), and Hybrid Full vs. Hybrid Half (5.900, p>.05). The instructional environments with the least difference in mean ranks are: Online vs. Hybrid Half (1.500, p>.05) and F2F vs. Hybrid Full (1.350, p>.05). These findings indicate that these environment pairs are the most alike in terms of learner oral proficiency. A closer look at the table reveals that these same environments are also similar with regard to percentage of real-time interaction occurring within each environment and percentage of L2 interaction occurring within each environment, with the caveat that no observation data is available for the Hybrid Half environment. Furthermore, oral proficiency assessment scores are also distributed by the
percentage of real-time instruction occurring within each environment. For example, the F2F and Hybrid Full environments had the highest percentage of participants earning a rating of Intermediate Low or Novice High while the Online environment had the highest percentage of participants earning a Novice Mid or Novice Low. To investigate the possibility of a correlation between percentage of real-time instruction and oral proficiency assessment scores, a Pearson product moment correlation was conducted. Results show a significant positive relationship between percentage of real time instruction within an instructional environment and oral proficiency ratings \( r (15) = .8866, p < .000 \). Because the percentage of real-time instruction is directly related to instructional environment, the results of the Pearson correlation provides additional evidence that learner oral proficiency is related to the instructional environment in which one chooses to enroll in a beginning level language course, in this case French 1120.

A brief examination of language background and resulting oral proficiency scores was also conducted in order to account for any influence language background may have on French 1120 oral proficiency. Research has shown that language learners will rely on knowledge of their first language to assist with decoding the new language. This is generally referred to as language transfer or cross-linguistic influence (Chang & Mischler, 2012; Gass & Selinker, 1992; Nitschke, Kidd & Serratrice, 2010; Odlin, 1989). Recall that of the 15 student study participants, 53% indicated a language other than English as a native language. As mentioned previously, while language background may affect choice of instructional environment, it does not seem that it does the same for oral proficiency in beginning level French. Of the 9 participants receiving instruction in a face-to-face environment (F2F and Hybrid Full), 55% were native Spanish and Haitian Creole speakers. All of the F2F participants were assessed at a proficiency level of either Novice High (NH) or Intermediate Low (IL), considered high proficiency for the French 1120
level. Similarly, of the 6 participants receiving instruction in an online environment (Online or Hybrid Half), 33% were native Spanish speakers. All online participants were assessed at an oral proficiency level of either Novice Low (ML) or Novice Mid (NM), considered to be low proficiency for the French 1120 level. In other words, 100% of F2F students, regardless of language background, exhibited oral proficiency at the higher levels whereas 100% of online students exhibited oral proficiency at lower levels. Therefore, language background and any role that language transfer may play on overall language acquisition, do not seem to be factors when it comes to speaking ability in beginning French.

**Reading Proficiency**

The second outcome assessment completed by participants was an assessment designed to assess reading comprehensions skills. Participants completed the reading assessment during the final two weeks of the Fall 2012 semester, at approximately weeks 13 and 14 of the 14 week semester. Administration took place both online and in person. As previously mentioned, the chosen assessment is the DELF, one which is routinely used throughout France, Canada, and the francophone world to determine the reading proficiency level of a learner. Because it was determined that French 1120 is the approximate equivalent of the DELF A1 Beginner level and the subsequent French 1120 is the approximate equivalent of the DELF A2 Elementary level, since French 1120 and 1121 are both pre-intermediate courses, both the A1 and A2 reading comprehension assessments were administered to participants. These assessments were excerpted from publicly available previously administered exams. Because the DELF scoring rubric was not clearly explained regarding the distribution of partial points, the researcher assigned one point to each response choice, therefore the A1 assessment had a value of 12 points and the A2 assessment had a value of 23 points, for a total value of 35 points. Responses
consisted of multiple choice and short response. Table 24 presents the reading scores, completion time, and administration format for all 15 participants by instructional environment.

Table 24

Reading Assessment Scores for All Instructional Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Minutes to Complete</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>A1 (Score of 12)</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>A2 (Score of 23)</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>Total Score of 35</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
<th>Mean % A1/A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>in person</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HyH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The columns labeled A1 and A2 show raw scores alongside its corresponding column showing percentage correct for each of the two assessments. The final two columns indicate the total raw score for both the A1 and A2 level assessments along with the overall percentage correct for both assessments together. Keeping in mind that the “passing” score in the United States is 60% and the passing score in France is 50%, the data show that 100% of participants who took the A1 assessment would be considered “passing” by both American and French standards, whereas only 60% who completed the A2 would be considered “passing” by American standards while 93% would be considered “passing” by French standards. The mean score for the A1 assessment
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was 83.9% while the mean score for A2 was 63.8%, a decline of 23%. This may be expected
given that the A2 assessment aligns most closely with the French 1121 course rather than the
French 1120 course. ANOVAs were conducted to determine any effect of instructional
environment on reading proficiency scores for the A1, A2, and overall A1/A2 scores by
instructional environment. In each case, no significant effect of instructional environment was
found: A1 (H(3) = .5805, \( p = .900 \)), A2 (H(3) = 1.971, \( p = .578 \)), Overall A1/A2 (H(3) = .8569,
\( p = .835 \)). An examination of the mean rank differences did not provide any additional
information. For each of the three assessment groups, F2F vs. Online showed the least difference
in mean rank, indicating no significant difference between reading proficiency scores in these
environments. In other words, when it comes to reading comprehension, it is unlikely that choice
of instructional environment will affect a beginning level learner’s ability to recognize and
comprehend written language.

Also included in the table is information on the manner of assessment and completion
time. Although the completion time ranged from 17 – 40 minutes, the average time it took for a
participant to complete the assessment was 28.2 minutes. Because the reading assessment was
delivered in two different formats, online and in person, it is necessary to consider whether
assessment administration time and format may correlate with assessment scores. In order to
determine the existence of a correlation between these two sets of conditions, a Pearson product-
moment correlation was conducted. No relationship was found between the time it took for a
participant to complete the reading assessment and the assessment format \( r(15) = .02171, \( p = .938 \)\] indicating that those taking it online did not spend more or less time on the assessment than
those taking it in person. Additionally, a negative relationship was found between manner of
assessment and overall reading scores \( r(15) = -.1865, \( p = .505 \)\]. This is important because when
taking an assessment in an online environment, learners are generally not proctored whereas in the F2F environment, test security is of importance and the environment tends to be proctored. The results of the correlation test provide evidence that participants completing the assessments in an online format did not receive outside assistance.

When considering language background as a possible influence of reading proficiency, the mean score was 24.2 or 69% for native Spanish speakers. It was only slightly higher for native English speakers with a mean score of 25.7, or 73%. Similarly, the lone native Haitian Creole speaker scored 24, or 69%. Looking at French reading proficiency scores by instructional environment and language background, the data show that, across all languages and instructional environments French reading proficiency scores were similar. Scores by language group for the face-to-face environment are as follows: Spanish, 24 (67%); Haitian Creole, 24 (69%); and English, 28 (80%). Scores by language group for the online environment are as follows: Spanish, 24.5 (70%); Creole, 0; English, 24 (69%). In the F2F group, the native English speakers scored slightly higher on measures of French reading proficiency than both the Spanish and Creole speakers, however in the online group, the native English speakers were on par with the Spanish speakers, scoring only .5 points lower. A Kruskal-Wallis non-parametric ANOVA was conducted to examine the difference in mean ranks between native language groups in the F2F environment. Although the native English speakers receiving instruction in the F2F environment did score slightly higher than the other language groups on measures of French reading comprehension, the difference in scores between language groups was not significant, (H(3) = 4.496, p = .105) indicating that language background does not seem to influence reading proficiency in beginning French. Returning to the issue of instructional environment, recall that a significant effect for instructional environment was found with regard to oral proficiency.
assessment ratings and no significant effect for instructional environment was found for reading proficiency. A Pearson product moment correlation was computed in order to determine whether a correlation exists between oral proficiency ratings and reading proficiency scores and no significant positive relationship was found \([r(15) = .2460, p = .376]\), indicating that oral proficiency does not seem to be a predictor of reading proficiency, and vice versa, for beginning level L2 French 1120 students. The following chapter provides a discussion of the results.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study investigated the role of interaction within a variety of instructional environments on linguistic outcomes for beginning level French language learners via a comparison of interaction data (category, type, and frequency) to skills acquired by learners (speaking and reading comprehension) within those instructional environments as assessed by measures of proficiency. The study also investigated the role of critical thinking within instructional environments and its effect on linguistic outcomes. Lastly, affective factors were also examined for any potential effect on linguistic outcomes. Through the course of the study, a profile of the modern beginning foreign language instructional environment has emerged and will be discussed.

The three research questions that guided this study are re-stated below. Each question is answered on the following pages, and conclusions are drawn. Implications for future research will also be discussed.

Research Questions

(1) What is the relationship between the type of interactional environment and linguistic outcomes for students in the following types of beginning level foreign language courses: asynchronous online, face-to-face, and hybrid?

(2) Is there a relationship between type of interaction and demonstrated level of critical thinking (i.e. cognitive presence) within each interactional environment? If so, how might this affect linguistic outcomes for learners?

(3) Is there a relationship between other factors such as enrollment status, lifestyle, anxiety, motivation, and learning readiness on choice of instructional environment and linguistic outcomes?
Interaction vs. Linguistic Outcomes

To answer the first question, a combination of survey data, interaction data, learner outcome data, and data pertaining to instructional time was analyzed. Through an examination of real-time instructional time assigned to French 1120 courses throughout the state of Florida, four instructional environments were determined: F2F, Hybrid (Full and Half) and Online. Each environment corresponds to a percentage of time during which face-to-face real-time instruction is expected to occur. Percentage of real-time instruction taking place within each environment is as follows: F2F – 100%, Hybrid Full – 80%, Hybrid Half – 30%, Online 0%. Instructional time allocated to each environment also implies a certain potential for interaction, but does not provide information on the type and frequency of interaction which occurs. It also does not provide information on the type of interaction which may take place within the online environment. While zero percent face-to-face, real-time instruction implies the absence of opportunities to interact with students and instructors, it does not provide information on the type of interaction which may actually be occurring within an online environment. Although the French 1120 courses in Florida are classified as asynchronous, due to the delivery of instruction taking place via the internet, instructors may, at their discretion, decide to promote interaction via the use of both synchronous and asynchronous online tools. To investigate the extent to which interaction may occur within a given instructional environment, including via the use of synchronous and asynchronous interactional tools, instructors of French 1120 responded to survey questions designed to determine teaching style and how interaction may occur within a given instructional environment. When it came to teaching style, respondents teaching in both face-to-face and online environments indicated a preference for the communicative approach, with the more traditional academic method ranking second, followed by the audio-lingual and
task-based methods. However, when asked about instructional tools for interaction, the respondents teaching within an online environment did not indicate the use of any synchronous tools to promote interaction, but all three referenced the use of asynchronous discussion boards. Those teaching within face-to-face environments did not indicate the use of any asynchronous or synchronous interactional tools; however one might assume that this is due to the fact that the face-to-face environment is already likely to be interactive and was, in fact, found to be highly interactive.

In order to determine the extent to which interaction takes place within each environment, and via which mechanisms, observational data was collected within three types of instructional environments: F2F, Hybrid Full, and Online. The observational data is also used to confirm teaching style as stated within the instructor survey. The data revealed that each of the three face-to-face environments (2 F2F and 1 Hybrid Full) are all highly interactive environments in which interaction may be teacher initiated or learner initiated (Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teacher, Learner – Learner) and occur in a variety of language combinations (L1 – L1, L1 – L2, L2 – L1, L2 – L2). These environments also provided evidence that one-way communication also takes place in L1 and L2. By contrast, observational data within the three online environments observed (2 Online and 1 Hybrid Full) indicated that a high level of interaction only took place within one of the online environments and that the interaction was also teacher or learner initiated, however interaction occurred only in the following categories: Teacher – Learner and Learner – Learner. No observed Learner – Teacher interaction was recorded. Furthermore, the data also revealed that interaction within the online environment occurs in the L1 only, thus providing no opportunities for L2 interaction in the online environment. Overall, the data revealed that within each interaction category (Teacher – Learner, Learner – Teacher, Learner –
Learner) there is a significant difference between the face-to-face and online environments in category, type, and frequency of interaction. In every category, the significant differences were between, F2F vs. Online environments and Hybrid Full vs. Online environments. Likewise, in every interaction category, environments with the least significant difference were the F2F vs. Hybrid Full. Overall, interaction data provide confirmation that the real-time instruction percentages allotted for each interactional environment (F2F – 100%, Hybrid Full, 80%, Online 0%) are also indicative of the potential for interaction within each environment. In addition, survey information provided by participating instructors confirmed that no real-time interaction occurs within the online environment and therefore cannot be considered a communicative environment. Although online instructors indicated a preference for a communicative teaching style, interaction data did not provide support for the use of this style in the online environment whereas observation data collected in the face-to-face environments provide evidence for use of a communicative approach resulting in a communicative teaching style in which use of the L2 is prevalent. Within each face-to-face environment, interaction was largely teacher directed and the means by which instruction occurred relied most heavily on the use of the L2 to convey information to students. Evidence of the academic, audio-lingual and task-based activities was also observed. Though these methods were used to provide clarification and targeted practice, they were not the means by which the majority of instruction occurred within each environment. Within the face-to-face environments, learners were provided with over 345 opportunities for L2 – L2 interaction during each one hour observation period, resulting in an average of 18 opportunities per student per one hour of class time to be individually engaged in exclusively L2 communication with the instructional setting, opportunities which do not seem to exist in the asynchronous online environment. This is important because within these interactions
interlocutors are focusing on meaning, form, negotiating for meaning, providing feedback, engaging in error correction, and modifying output all of which develop implicit and explicit knowledge in the L2 and are all are important elements in instructed second language acquisition (Ellis, 2008) for the acquisition of an L2 (Long, 1996). Because this interaction does not occur in the online environment, the natural conclusion is that the absence of L2 interaction will affect linguistic outcomes and, in fact, it did. Via measures of proficiency in speaking and reading comprehension, data on linguistic outcomes for learners was collected. Learner participants came from four instructional environments: F2F, Hybrid Full, Hybrid Half, and Online. Although interaction data was not collected for the Hybrid Half environment, because of its 62% reduction in real-time instruction and opportunity for interaction as compared to the Hybrid Full environment, one might expect that linguistic outcomes in the Hybrid Half environment may align more closely with those in the Online environment. Data collected on oral proficiency assessments, given to assess speaking skills, show that learners who receive instruction in an environment with reduced opportunities for interaction, such as the Hybrid Half and the Online environments do not exhibit proficiency levels as high as those who receive instruction in an 80 - 100% face-to-face environment, such as the F2F and Hybrid Full Environments. Results showed a significant difference between the F2F vs. Online environments along with a large mean rank difference between the following environments: F2F vs. Hybrid Full, Hybrid Full vs. Online, Hybrid Full vs. Hybrid Half and the Hybrid Full vs. Online environments. The least difference in mean rank was between the following environments: Online vs. Hybrid Half and F2F vs. Hybrid Full, providing evidence that the environment pairs are very similar to one another in terms of interaction and learner speaking proficiency. It also indicates that instructional environments with low percentages of real-time instruction do not provide the same opportunities for L2
interaction and that this lack of L2 interaction is reflected in the speaking skills learners ultimately attain. Online and Hybrid Half learners were less proficient speakers than those from the Hybrid Full and F2F environments. With regard to speaking skills, learners from the Online and Hybrid Half environments were assessed at a Novice Low to Novice Mid level by the end of the French 1120 course whereas learners from the F2F and Hybrid Full environments achieved ratings of Novice High to Intermediate Low, indicating movement toward intermediate proficiency after just one semester in the face-to-face environment. When compared to stated expectations of achievement of a Novice High oral proficiency level by the end of French 1120 (FDOE 2011; CEFR 2012), Online learners performed 1-2 sub levels lower than expected while F2F learners performed on level or one level higher. As learners continue to move forward with instruction at the 1121 level and beyond, one might expect the gap in oral proficiency skills between Online and F2F learners to widen over time. Because Online foreign language instruction stops at the Intermediate 2200 level in Florida, Online students wishing to continue instruction must move into a F2F environment, putting Online learners at a disadvantage when it comes to oral L2 communication with instructors and peers. While the current study does not explore later levels, anecdotal information from F2F instructors indicates that seems to occur, making a case for further future investigation into long term effects of instructional and subsequent interactional environments. A closer look at the oral proficiency data also provides evidence for differences in proficiency between learners in the traditional F2F environment, in which 100% of instruction takes place in real-time and the Hybrid Full environment, in which 80% of instruction takes place in real time. Learners in the F2F environment were more likely to reach a proficiency level of Intermediate Low than the Hybrid Full learners. In the current study, 50% percent of F2F students reached the IL level whereas only 20% of the Hybrid Full students
did. Likewise, within the online environments, Hybrid Half students performed better on assessments of oral proficiency than the Online students. In the Hybrid Half environment, 100% of learners reached the Novice Mid level whereas only 50% of online learners achieved the same ratings. Although statistical tests showed no significant differences between these environment pairs, it may be worthy of further investigation in a future study with larger samples sizes.

In addition to an oral proficiency assessment, learners also completed a reading proficiency assessment. In contrast to the results of the oral proficiency assessment, there was no statistical difference in measures of reading comprehension between any of the instructional environments from which learners came. Recall that all learners, regardless of instructional environment have access to the same 3 instructional resources: interactive online textbook, audio recording programs/devices, and a course website. Both the course website and the online textbook provide opportunities for students to interact with course content. All students read and complete activities from the online textbook, which tends to focus on grammar and reading skills although some listening comprehension and speaking do occur via asynchronous means such as video and audio recording. For the online students, online textbook activities make up 100% of the instruction. For Hybrid and F2F learners, the online textbook provides grammar instruction and reading practice in supplement to the interaction happening within the instructional environment. Results from the reading proficiency assessments indicate that, regardless of instructional environment, all learners seem to have equivalent access to reading and grammar instruction which provide opportunities for L2 input. However, relying solely on an interactive textbook and videos providing input does not provide learners with the interaction required to form comprehensible output, which seems to be a factor in the difference in speaking skills across instructional environments.
Speaking and reading proficiency was also examined in the context of language background in order to assess the possibility of first language influence, or transfer, which may assist some learners in becoming more proficient in certain skills than other learners. Because 8 of the 15 student participants came from a native language background other than English (Spanish and Haitian Creole), and the fact that these languages are closely related to the French language, one might expect that these participants may score higher on measures of proficiency than native English speakers. In fact, because Spanish is a romance language, like French, and the Haitian Creole language system is strongly influenced by the French language, it does not seem unusual that these participants may perform better than their native English speaking counterparts. When the oral and reading proficiency scores of these speakers of other languages were compared to those of their native English speaking counterparts, it became evident that oral proficiency was more closely related to instructional environment than to language background. Similarly, just as the data showed that instructional environment did not seem to influence reading proficiency, the same was observed for language background. Across all L1 groups and instructional environments, reading proficiency scores were fairly evenly distributed, indicating that neither instructional environment nor language background affected reading proficiency levels for French 1120 students. Considering that the reading proficiency findings of the current study showed no statistical difference between instructional environments, reading proficiency seems less dependent upon the presence of L2 oral interaction, or interaction conducted via real-time textual methods such as could be delivered via a discussion board or chat room, than on interaction with L2 content/text provided in the asynchronous environment. Interaction with L2 content occurs within both the asynchronous online L2 environments and face-to-face environments via print materials, including an online textbook and instructional video. Research
has shown that reading is an interactive process and that the interaction occurs between the reader and the text, prompting interaction of cognitive processes (Koda, 2005, 2013) involving working memory (Baddeley, Eysenck and Anderson, 2009). In addition, there is interaction between L1 and L2 reading skills in that L1 reading skills contribute to L2 reading proficiency (Sparks, Patton, Ganschow, & Humbach, 2012; Bernhardt, 2011; Cummins, 1991; Grabe, 2009) and that L1 reading strategies assist L2 reading (Grabe, 2009). Bernhardt (2011) also found that L2 knowledge of vocabulary is a main component in reading proficiency. Given these findings, along with the findings of the current study, it seems that the asynchronous online environment and the face-to-face environment provide similar opportunities for the acquisition of reading skills and that the acquisition of these skills may not be dependent upon real-time or asynchronous conversational interaction.

Looking at student survey results, when asked about the skills students would most like to attain as a result of having taken a French 1120 course, 100% of respondents indicated that speaking was the skill they most wanted to acquire. In addition 100% of the online students and 50% of the Hybrid Half students indicated that they were dissatisfied with opportunities to interact with both classmates and instructors. Likewise, 100% of Online and Hybrid Half students indicated that they were dissatisfied with opportunities to speak French. In fact, all of the data relating to the online environment reflect lack of opportunities to interact and speak, resulting in the dissatisfaction these students feel. Both student feedback and performance indicate that the resources available to students in online instructional environments in French 1120 courses in Florida do not seem to be enough to provide students with the interaction required to produce output, resulting in a disconnect between the skills students would most like to acquire and the skills they actually do acquire.
In summary, the current study provides evidence of a relationship between interaction and linguistic outcomes when it comes to speaking skills, as evidenced by survey, interaction, and assessment data. However no relationship was found between instructional environment, interaction, and reading comprehension skills. From the evidence, one may conclude that L2 interaction between human beings is not a factor in the acquisition of reading comprehension skills, but is an important factor in the acquisition of speaking skills. Thus, the asynchronous online French 1120 environment seems to be more suited to those for whom speaking is not a desired skill but would like to learn to read the language, similar to a reading knowledge course.

This study focused on speaking and reading proficiency, but did not specifically measure aural comprehension and writing skills. Although evidence of aural comprehension is provided during an Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), it is difficult to measure to what extent this may occur due to the fact that confirmation of comprehension in an OPI is provided via speech output only, rather than tasks which do not require speech. Because of this, an OPI is not a reliable measure of aural comprehension. While the current study provides a basis for further investigation of the skills examined here, a future study might include larger sample sizes, additional languages, as well as measures of aural comprehension and writing proficiency to provide a clearer picture of how instructional environment may play a role in the kinds of skills students attain as the result of having taken a beginning level language course such as French 1120. Future research may also include comparisons of the face-to-face and asynchronous online environments currently available in Florida public post-secondary institutions to courses delivered elsewhere using synchronous, real-time online formats.
Evidence of Critical Thinking within Interaction vs. Linguistic Outcomes

Interaction data collected within the instructional environments was found to correspond with critical thinking processes. When the L1 was used within any interaction in the face-to-face environment, the critical thinking processes occurring correlated with phases 1 and 2, recognition and comprehension. However, once the interactions became L2 – L2, there was evidence of phases 3 – 5: exploration, integration, and resolution within those exclusively L2 interactions. By contrast, in the online environment, interaction took place only in the L1, but did reach the exploration stage in teacher directed presentations of cultural information. Similar to the findings of Garrison et al. (2001), learners in the online environment did not have the opportunity to take part in interactions which would allow them to integrate what they had learned about the L2 and take part in interactions mimicking real-life application, thus interactions between learners in the online environment did not have the opportunity to reach Phase 4 - integration and Phase 5 resolution. Because being able to integrate information and apply it to the real world is important to the process of learning (Mason, 2007), and since no evidence of L2 interaction was found in the asynchronous online environment, it seems that online beginning language learners do not have opportunities to apply advanced critical thinking skills to their beginning language learning environment. Because the phases of critical thinking align with interaction type, and 65% of those interactions occur in the L2 within face-to-face environments, we can say that learners have the opportunity to reach the integration and resolution phases in 65% of their interactions, thus promoting oral proficiency within those environments. No significant difference was found between the instructional environments on measures of reading proficiency, so it is possible that the process of critical thinking, and resulting critical presence which occurs during real-time and asynchronous conversational interaction, is more beneficial to the acquisition of speaking skills.
than to reading skills at the beginning level. Because there was no access to observe learner interaction with instructional materials such as the electronic textbook and activities used in the Online environment, an analysis of critical presence was not possible beyond what was available in the asynchronous discussion board forum therefore future investigation into the relationship between critical presence and reading proficiency for beginning language learners is warranted.

**Affective Factors vs. Choice of Instructional Environment and Linguistic Outcomes**

Recall that research has shown that factors such as motivation, anxiety, self confidence, and attitude can have an effect on second language learning and acquisition and may be responsible for individual variation (Arnold, 2000; Krashen, 1988; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). Evidence also indicates that language anxiety affects cognitive processing (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994) and that foreign language anxiety (FLA) is a situation-specific type of anxiety similar to test anxiety or stage fright (Horwitz, 2010). In order to investigate whether affective factors may play a role in language, participants were asked about the following factors on the student survey: motivation, feelings toward interaction, feelings toward learning French, enrollment, and employment status. With regard to motivation to learn French, 73.3% of participants indicated high motivation and 26.7% indicated moderate motivation. Zero percent of participants indicated no motivation. There was no evidence of a relationship between motivation and choice of instructional environment. Participants were asked about their feelings toward interaction and 96% (14 students) indicated positive overall feelings toward interaction. Of those indicating positive feelings, 7% (4 students) also indicated that they are shy a times. Although 3 of 4 participants indicating shyness were online students, there was no correlation between feelings toward interaction and choice of instructional environment. There was, however, a correlation between feelings toward interaction and motivation, in that the majority
of participants who indicated they were highly motivated also like to interact. So, if a student likes to interact, chances are that he or she will also be highly motivated and vice versa. When participants were asked how they feel about learning French, 26.7% reported feeling anxious and 73.3% indicated feeling happy and excited. There were no participants who indicated they were unhappy to learn French. The 4 participants who indicated anxiousness were distributed evenly across each of the 4 instructional environments, thus there was also no correlation between feelings toward learning French and choice of instructional environment. Although it seems that affective factors such as motivation and anxiety did not play role in choice of instructional environment, it’s also important to consider lifestyle factors. When asked about employment status, responses indicating part-time, full-time, or unemployment were spread almost evenly across all instructional environments, therefore no correlation was found between employment status and choice of instructional environments. Of the 15 participants, 60% were enrolled part-time and 40% were enrolled full-time. Of those enrolled full-time, 100% were enrolled in either a F2F or Hybrid Full course. By contrast, of those enrolled part-time 67% were enrolled in either an Online or Hybrid Half course. Of the 6 students enrolled in Online or Hybrid Half courses, 100% were part-time students. Although the relationship between employment status and enrollment status, as well as that between enrollment status and choice of instructional environment, could not be statistically correlated, the raw data did suggest that choice of instructional environment may be moderately influenced by overall enrollment and employment status. Given that 100% of Online and Hybrid Half students earned low oral proficiency ratings (Novice Low, Novice Mid) on assessments of oral proficiency, it is likely that choice of instructional environment affects overall success in a beginning level French course.
Although one may expect factors such as anxiety, shyness, unwillingness to interact, or negative feelings toward learning French to play a role in overall student success, results of this study indicate that the single most important factor affecting choice of instructional environment, and ultimate attainment of skills, seems to be choice of instructional environment. Further investigation revealed that language background seemed to play a role in the choice of instructional environment for the participants of this study with 78% of non-native English L1 participants choosing one of the face-to-face environments (F2F or Hybrid Full) for their French 1120 course. Conversely, only 43% of L1 English speakers were enrolled in a F2F French 1120 course. Because other affective and lifestyle factors were not found to be significant influences on choice of instructional environment, it may be this choice is culturally influenced. At this point, it is conjecture but worthy of future investigation. The current study provides a springboard from which future studies with larger samples sizes may succeed in providing a clearer picture of how choice of instructional environment is made by foreign language learners.

**Review of the Hypotheses**

Based on research from the field and before undertaking this study, I hypothesized that beginning level French language students in the asynchronous online learning environment would not perform as well on assessments of linguistic outcomes pertaining to speaking and reading comprehension as the students who have the opportunity to interact in the real-time, face-to-face courses with access to a supplemental asynchronous environment. The results of this study provide partial support for the hypothesis in that a significant effect of interaction and instructional environment was found for speaking proficiency, but not for reading proficiency. The evidence suggests that learners in an online environment, or a majority online environment, are not exposed to the L2 interaction important to the process of language acquisition and
subsequent comprehensible output on the part of the learner. Interaction is an active process which promotes output via speech production, whereas reading requires interaction with text, or content, without requiring synchronous or asynchronous interaction with people. Because all participants received access to the same instructional materials and were successful on assessments of reading proficiency, it seems that, consistent with recent research on L2 reading, Learner – Content interaction and transfer of L1 reading skills may be more influential to the process of reading comprehension than synchronous or asynchronous human interaction. Because I was not provided full access to the online course materials in use by the online learners participating in this study, I was not able to evaluate the delivery mechanisms for the course content, however instructor survey data show that, in addition to an online textbook and activities and materials posted by the instructor, learners had access to audio and video tutorials. Given that the results of this study show that online learners were on par with face-to-face counterparts, Learner – Content interaction within the online environment seems to be worthy of further investigation.

I also hypothesized that, although studies focusing on intermediate to advanced level students have indicated that asynchronous interaction provides a less time restricted environment, thus yielding evidence that advanced levels of higher order thinking are more likely to be attained as compared to the face-to-face environment, the interaction taking place within both the traditional and asynchronous beginning level environments would likely reveal lower levels of cognitive presence due to the fact that these students possess a lower level of overall L2 linguistic knowledge to begin with. I also expected that determining level of cognitive presence would be difficult in the online courses, given that interaction may have been severely reduced compared to the level of interaction expected in the traditional classroom. This
hypothesis is also partially supported by the findings of this study. Evidence suggests that, in a beginning language course such as French 1120, there are consistently high levels of overall interaction as well as L2 interaction in the face-to-face environments (F2F, Hybrid Full).

Comparatively, the online environments tend to vary in levels of interaction, with 100% of any occurring interaction taking place in the L1. While both the face-to-face and online environments are teacher directed, there is more freedom within the face-to-face environments for students to start discussions, ask questions, and interject, whereas the asynchronous online environment does not seem to enable or encourage students to begin discussions on topics of their interest nor does it promote L2 interaction. Data collected on interaction and critical thinking processes suggest a correlation between the 5 phases of critical thinking for beginning language learners, per the researcher’s revised version of Chu’s Critical Thinking Process Coding Model and the type of interaction occurring within the instructional environment. Contrary to the research on critical thinking in advanced language courses, at the beginning level, the highest phases are reached exclusively via L2 – L2 interaction in the face-to-face environments. By contrast, the online environment for beginning language learners was found to be one in which learners may reach phases 1 – 3, recognition, comprehension, and exploration. However, these phases were reached via use of the L1 only. When considering the beginning language learning environment, it would be expected that learners would have the opportunity to interact in the L2, utilizing critical thinking skills to recognize, comprehend, explore, integrate, and apply what they have learned to the real world. Unfortunately, it does not seem that these opportunities exist within the asynchronous online environment in its currently available form in Florida post-secondary institutions. The evidence suggests that it is the face-to-face environments (F2F and Hybrid Full) which yield high levels of interaction, evidence of higher order thinking, and subsequent high
level oral proficiency skills meeting expectations set forth in course descriptions, as well as student expectations. The asynchronous online environment does not currently seem to be an environment which promotes interaction, higher level thinking, and acquisition of speaking skills.

**What about Rosetta Stone?**

While the highly advertised and seemingly popular language learning software called Rosetta Stone was not part of this study, recent developments in the Rosetta Stone online delivery system and recent research, albeit scarce, provides evidence that even well-known online language learning platforms are changing to incorporate real-time interaction. Although highly criticized in media for the lack of mainstream research to support the Rosetta Stone online language instruction delivery platform, Rosetta Stone’s own commissioned studies provide evidence of learner gains in oral proficiency (Rockman et al., 2009; Vesselinov, 2009). A closer look into these studies reveals that the learner gains, upon which Rosetta Stone bases its claims of quick and easy language acquisition, are less than stellar for its traditional, asynchronous online language learning platform (Rockman et al., 2009; Vesselinov, 2009) when compared to the results of the current study and expectations for beginning level foreign language courses at the post-secondary level in Florida. The traditional Rosetta Stone platform is a completely online, asynchronous delivery system focusing on what the company calls Dynamic Immersion (Rosetta Stone, 2013) a process which the company says “simulates a real-life immersion experience by carefully crafting sequences of words and images” enabling learners “to intuitively derive the meaning of each new language concept”. Although the Vesselinov (2009) study of oral proficiency in Spanish language learners shows that novice learners, with no prior exposure to the target language, tend to gain one proficiency sub-level (from zero to Novice
Low) as measured by the ACTFL OPI-C, a less-adaptive and computerized version of the ACTFL OPI, these results showed less improvement in oral proficiency than the asynchronous online participants of the current study of whom 66% earned a score of Novice Mid and 33% earned a score of Novice Low. Recall that beginning level language courses in Florida state and community colleges are intended to contain about 2,800 minutes, or 46 hours, of instruction. The participants of the Vesselinov (2009) study completed 55 hours of instruction using the asynchronous Rosetta Stone Spanish program and ACTFL OPI results showed lower overall oral proficiency than for the asynchronous online group in the current study, who are estimated to have spent fewer hours within the instructional environment. Furthermore, the participants of the current study were evaluated for oral and reading proficiency before the instructional period had finished and still exhibited higher overall proficiency than those in the asynchronous Rosetta Stone environment. The participants of the Rockman et al. (2009) study received 64.5 hours of asynchronous instruction with an additional 6 hours of real-time interaction with a native speaker. As a result, the participants in this study fared slightly better on measures of oral proficiency than the participants of the Vesselinov study with 22% reaching an oral proficiency of Novice Low, 47% reaching Novice Mid, and 22% reaching Novice High. When compared to the oral proficiency results of the current study, the data show that the Rosetta Stone online learners fared slightly better than the asynchronous online group, with some results reaching the Novice High sub-level, approaching the oral proficiency levels of the face-to-face participants of the current study, who reached the Novice High and Intermediate Low sub levels. Comparing the 2009 Vesselinov and Rockman et al. studies, one can theorize that the higher oral proficiency ratings in the Rockman et al. study may be attributed to the 9 hour increase in instructional time along with the addition of 6 hours of real-time L2 native speaker interaction. A more recent,
currently unpublished, 2013 study conducted by Gillian Lord of the University of Florida (UF), provides additional evidence that adding a component which allows students to interact with target language speakers in the L2 plays a role in the level of oral proficiency one might expect to attain. Results of this study are publicly available as an online presentation, entitled: Software vs. The Teacher: An Exploration of Classroom and Digital Language Learning (Lord, 2013). The study compared the overall proficiency of beginning level of Spanish language learners enrolled in a traditional beginning Spanish course at UF with learners using only the Rosetta Stone delivery system. The Rosetta Stone delivery system included 6 hours of the new Rosetta Stone interactive component, Rosetta Stone Studio, allowing learners to interact face-to-face and in real-time in the target language via internet video with a native speaker. There were 3 participant groups in the study and it is important to note that all groups contained face-to-face components. There was no single group which functioned in an exclusively asynchronous online environment. The participants of the control group received instruction via a traditional beginning class using course materials determined by the university (face-to-face). The second group was a completely online group, using exclusively the Rosetta Stone delivery system with the previously mentioned interactive component and no assigned professor. The third group was a traditional face-to-face environment with a professor which utilized the Rosetta Stone as the course materials in place of the university’s instructional materials. It is important to note that the Rosetta Stone materials included 14 hours of total possible interaction, 6 of which were synchronous in real-time with a native speaker and 8 of which provided access to interactive online content as well as synchronous peer group speaking and messaging sessions. The 3 groups were evaluated using two measures of proficiency, the CLEP exam, to assess reading and listening comprehension, and the Versant proficiency test to assess oral proficiency. Results showed that all subject groups
performed statistically similarly on the CLEP test, indicating that there was no difference in the ability to comprehend written and spoken language. Likewise, oral proficiency scores showed no statistical difference between participant groups, with a mean score of 34, which is the estimated equivalent of an ACTFL OPI rating of Intermediate Low, according to the Versant equivalency chart provided by Lord (2013) in her presentation of study results. These results are better than the oral proficiency results for the face-to-face environment in the current study in which 66% of participants were evaluated at the Novice High level and 33% were evaluated at the Intermediate Low level. One might theorize that because the participant groups in the Lord study were all environments in which real-time, face-to-face L2 interaction took place, they performed similarly on assessments of oral proficiency, outperforming both the F2F and online groups of the current study. Differences in oral proficiency ratings for participants of the face-to-face environments of both the current and Lord studies may be due, in part, to the timing of the oral proficiency evaluations. The proficiency evaluations for the current study took place 2 – 3 weeks prior to the end of the semester in which students were enrolled in French 1120. In the Lord study, the evaluations took place after the completion of the semester in which students were enrolled in Spanish 1130, thus the timing of the evaluation period may play a role in the slight differences in results between the two studies. Similar to the current study, the listening and reading proficiency CLEP results of the Lord study showed no statistical difference between 3 groups representing different instructional environments, however because each of the 3 groups contained components in which students interacted orally with an instructor or a native speaker interlocutor as well as other students in the L2, it is unknown whether the absence of such interaction would have had an effect on reading proficiency.
In summary, the findings of the studies examining oral proficiency levels of learners within both the asynchronous and interaction-enhanced Rosetta Stone environments (Lord, 2013; Rockman et al., 2009; Vessilinov, 2009) provide support for the current study. When the instructional environment contains face-to-face L2 interaction (Lord, 2013; Rockman et al., 2009), oral proficiency ratings can be expected to increase by three to four sublevels, from complete beginner to Novice High and Intermediate Low, as measured by the ACTFL OPI and OPI-C. As interaction time increases, oral proficiency levels also increase. When face-to-face L2 interaction does not occur, such as in the asynchronous environments, oral proficiency remains at the lowest level, Novice Low, in the Rosetta Stone study (Vessilinov, 2009), and does not rise above Novice Mid as in the current study. While recent reviews of Rosetta Stone point out that its approach to language instruction is problematic as it is not based on research in the field of SLA, along with other issues, (DeWaard, 2013; Krashen, 2011) the few existing empirical studies involving Rosetta Stone provide evidence that the addition of a face-to-face L2 interaction component results in better oral proficiency for learners than for the asynchronous environment alone, an expected finding given the plethora of SLA research indicating that interaction is a critical component for language acquisition to occur. While it is too early to recommend the use of Rosetta Stone as a solution to online foreign language learning, there is certainly opportunity for continued research of publicly available platforms, as well as those utilized in post-secondary institutions, to inform pedagogical practices for providers of online language instruction.
Conclusion

Recent studies focusing on the role of instructional environment in second language acquisition, such as those conducted to examine the Rosetta Stone delivery platform, and the current study examining learner outcomes by instructional environment, suggest that real-time, face-to-face interaction, an important component in SLA (Ellis, 2008; Freiermuth, 2002; Hatch 1978; Gass and Selinker, 2008, Gass et al., 2012) Long, 1996; Pica 1994, 1996; Yuan, 2003), results in better oral proficiency regardless of instructional environment. The small body of current research (Lord, 2013; Rockman, 2009, Vesselinov, 2009) and the current study focusing on the links between learner proficiency, type of instructional environment, and the levels of interaction occurring within instructional environments not only provide additional evidence for the extensive body of research indicating that face-to-face interaction is a critical component of Second Language Acquisition, it can and should inform course design and subsequent pedagogical practices as it makes a case for the inclusion of real-time, face-to-face interaction in all instructional environments, especially those conducted online. Participants of the current study, across all instructional environments, indicated that the skill they most wanted to attain was the ability to speak in the target language. The results presented herewith, along with those of the studies involving Rosetta Stone, show that the asynchronous online instructional environment does not provide the L2 interaction needed for students to attain their primary goal to the extent expected. In other words, the primary goal of language is to speak and interact with one another. Currently, asynchronous online foreign language courses and platforms do not provide learners with the opportunity to develop oral proficiency skills to the extent that the traditional face-to-face environment does. Survey results show that students are aware that these courses are not meeting institutional or personal goals. Results of the current study also show
that the current online language learning environment promoted in Florida post-secondary institutions is not aligned with course objectives as stated in the course descriptions filed by Florida post-secondary institutions in the Statewide Course Numbering System course database and thus begin to make a case for differentiation between asynchronous online and face-to-face foreign language courses in title, stated objectives, credit allocated, and course number. Because interaction is an important component of the second language acquisition process, perhaps more so than in other subject areas, it seems appropriate to encourage continued research in this area and to convene discussion among language professionals regarding the development of an effective, research-based framework for foreign language courses in all current instructional environments (online, hybrid, and face-to-face) as well as instructional environments which may be developed in the future. Online courses should be enhanced with appropriate technology designed to promote L2 interaction and meet the educational needs and desires of students.

**Implications.** This study was undertaken in response to my own questions, as well as to those of colleagues at the secondary and post-secondary levels who, from professional experience, noticed that students transferring from online to face-to-face foreign language course environments were lacking in knowledge and skills at which both students and instructors expressed dissatisfaction and displeasure. There is very little data available on learning outcomes from the online education world as a whole, but there is a plethora of data available on enrollment. It is interesting that traditional education places an importance on data reflecting outcomes, yet the online world seemingly tends not to. This is not to say that there are no institutions that handle online education appropriately, examining its effectiveness internally, but the general feeling amongst educators and researchers is that there is a lack of methodology in the development of online courses which reflect sound, research-based pedagogical practices and
that the collection and reporting of outcome data is rare. When I was personally asked to teach an asynchronous online French course a few years ago, my response was “How?” feeling that, based on what I knew about language acquisition, an important factor would be missing – interaction. In fact, although evidence suggests that interaction is missing from the beginning level online environments as offered by post-secondary institutions in Florida, this does not imply that beginning level online foreign language courses are bad, only that there is room for improvement and/or differentiation from face-to-face courses. There are indications that the institutions offering beginning level online foreign language courses should consider re-examining and aligning the curriculum with expected outcomes. The outcomes of this study and those commissioned by Rosetta Stone suggest that asynchronous online beginning level language courses should be considered more as reading knowledge courses, rather than fully developed language courses leading to the development of all related skills. Recall that researchers in both the fields of CMC and SLA have found that tools for synchronous communication can be highly beneficial (Meloni, 2010; Nielson & Gonzalez-Lloret, 2010) as their use can serve to most closely mimic the interactional environment needed to promote L2 acquisition, encouraging communication and collaboration between learners (De la Fuente, 2003). For this reason, features such as web and video conferencing providing real-time two-way video, online chat and whiteboards, and instant messaging are in many ways, preferable to asynchronous tools. Payne and Whitney (2002) found that text-based CMC, such as online chat, may help improve L2 speaking ability because it employs the same cognitive mechanisms involved in spontaneous conversational speech, therefore serving to help learners negotiate for meaning, obtain feedback, and ultimately improve overall language skills (Lee, 2002). Based on these findings, as well as those of the Rosetta Stone studies and the current study it would seem that the introduction of a
real-time target language component, such as two-way video (via Skype, Google+, or similar) to the asynchronous online environment would be appropriate.

**Limitations.** Although three post-secondary institutions in the state of Florida consented to participate in this study, the sample size of 15 student participants was small. Sample size was negatively affected by restrictions placed on recruitment by the participating institutions after the approval of an IRB application. For example, at all of the institutions, the researcher was prohibited from contacting students directly since the institutions were either not able, or unwilling, provide student email addresses to the researcher. At all three institutions, the researcher was restricted to contacting students through the instructor, therefore if the instructor did not want to participate or did not find the study to be of value, students were not informed of the study. This policy resulted in zero student participants from one institution and just 15 from the two others combined. While a small sample size is better than no sample, and is a starting point, a recommendation for future research would be to work with an institution in which there is institutional and faculty support for such a study, thus increasing access to potential participants, and to replicate the current study with larger data sets across multiple language groups in order to ascertain whether similar outcomes would occur. Because the current study was conducted on a very limited budget, the researcher utilized publicly available testing resources and received training on the administration and rating of the oral proficiency interviews utilized in this study.

**Future Research.** To further validate the results of the current study, a replication might include an examination of the Spanish instructional environment along with other languages currently offered across multiple instructional environments. A well-funded study could include the administration of official ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interviews, or similar assessments such as
the Versant assessment utilized in the Lord (2013) study, involving raters other than, or in addition to, the researchers. At the time of the design of the current study, access to the ACTFL Reading Proficiency Test (RPT) was not possible since the examination is proprietary and previous assessments are not publicly available. A replication of the study may also replace the DELF exams with the ACTFL (RPT) or Versant exam, both scored by parties other than or in addition to, the researchers. An expansion of the study might include proficiency assessments of listening and writing skills in addition to the oral and reading skills already examined. Additionally, observation of learner-content interaction, via proprietary electronic instructional materials used across all instructional environments, may provide useful information about critical presence in the context of an L1/ L2 reading environment. Finally, a closer look at the frequency of learner interaction with L1 and L2 content may provide insight into any relationship which may exist between Learner-Content interaction and the attainment of speaking, reading, listening, and writing proficiencies.

Future studies may also include comparisons of the current post-secondary asynchronous instructional environment in Florida with proprietary delivery systems, such as Rosetta Stone and others, along with other post-secondary institutions offering foreign language courses online. Likewise, longitudinal studies measuring proficiency gains over time, across multiple course levels, in online and face-to-face environments would also provide useful information. Another type of longitudinal study might consider the long term effects of instructional environment by examining the attrition, retention, or improvement of linguistic skills over time, after instruction has been completed. This would allow for comparison of attained and usable skills in learners whose sole instructional environment was either face-to-face or online. An interesting experiment might be to examine the performance of learners in real-life immersive situations
post instruction. For example, taking learners who have completed a given level of language
instruction, in either the face-to-face or online environment, and observing their ability to
navigate real-life situations in the context of an immersive L2 environment (i.e. study/trip
abroad, interaction with native speakers, etc.). Lastly, examination of various online
environments in comparison with one another, changing a variable, will provide information
regarding the types of interaction and interactional tools which may be most beneficial for online
learners. For example: a control group of an asynchronous online class compared to a similar
class with access to the asynchronous platform and one of the following tools to communicate
with advanced L2 and peer interlocutors: online text chat, face-to-face video chat, thoughtfully
directed asynchronous online discussions, one-way audio recordings with response recording
from a native or advanced speaker, etc.
APPENDIX A

FRENCH 1120 COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

The following list provides French 1120 course descriptions and objectives. It is categorized by institution and was retrieved from the online database of the Florida Department of Education entitled: Statewide Course Numbering System (2011). All descriptions are listed exactly as they appear in the database. The database is searchable and publicly available at the following link: http://scns.fldoe.org/scns/public/pb_index.jsp. A list of institution abbreviations is also available at this site.

BRO FUNDAMENTALS OF SPEAKING, LISTENING-COMPREHENSION, READING, WRITING, AND FRANCOPHONE CULTURE. CLASSROOM PRACTICE AND EXERCISES SUPPLEMENTED BY LABORATORY AND/OR MULTI-MEDIA DESIGNED TO DEVELOP COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND CULTURAL SENSITIVITY. STUDENT EXPECTED TO CONTINUE FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION AND EXPANSION OF THEIR PROFICIENCIES IN FRE 1121 AND FRE 2220. STUDENTS ARE ENCOURAGED TO STUDY ABROAD. SPECIAL FEE CHARGED. 1. BASIC FRENCH PRONUNCIATION AND COMMUNICATION 2. IDENTIFYING AND DESCRIBING PEOPLE, PLACES, AND THINGS. 3. EXPRESSING PRESENT REALITY 4. IDIOMS AND CULTURE 5. COMMUNICATING TIME, NUMBERS, AND WEATHER 6. CULTURAL READINGS

CC THE ESSENTIALS OF FRENCH, WITH EMPHASIS ON ORAL EXPRESSION. OPEN TO STUDENTS WHO ENTER COLLEGE WITHOUT ANY OR WITH ONLY ONE YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH.


DSC FUNDAMENTAL GRAMMAR AND BASIC SPEECH PATTERNS WITH INTENSIVE DRILLS IN LISTENING AND SPEAKING FOLLOWED BY READING AND WRITING OF THE LANGUAGE. THREE-HOUR CLASS INSTRUCTION AND TWO-HOUR LANGUAGE LABORATORY. THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO: 1.DISCUSS IN GENERAL TERM THE FRANCOPHONE WORLD. 2.USE BASIC FRENCH GRAMMAR LIMITED TO
THE PRESENT TENSE OF REGULAR VERBS, A FEW IRREGULAR VERBS, PASS - COMPOS WITH ____/TRE.

3. READ AND WRITE BEGINNING FRENCH. 4. USE BASIC MODERN FRENCH CONVERSATION. A. EMPHASIS ON CONVERSATION. B. PRONUNCIATION.

**EFSC**
BEGINNING COURSE, FIRST HALF, PROVIDES BASIC COMMUNICATION SKILLS FOR STUDENT INTERESTED IN THE FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE LANGUAGE IN EVERYDAY SITUATIONS AND/OR STUDENTS IN AA AND AS PROGRAMS REQUIRING ESSENTIAL SKILLS AS PREPARATION FOR UNIVERSITY PARALLEL PROGRAMS. THE USE OF THE LANGUAGE LAB, TUTORIAL AND INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION ARE INTEGRAL ELEMENTS OF THE COURSE.

**ESC**
DESIGNED FOR BEGINNERS OR THOSE WITH ONE YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH, THIS HIGHLY INTERACTIVE COURSE FOCUSES ON THE DYNAMICS OF SPEECH, LITERATURE, AND CULTURE. (I) INTERNATIONAL OR DIVERSITY FOCUS.  

**TOPIC OUTLINE:**  
- UNDERSTANDING BASIC SPOKEN FRENCH  
- SPEAKING LIMITED BASIC FRENCH  
- WRITING LIMITED FRENCH  
- UNDERSTANDING ASPECTS OF FRENCH CULTURE  

**LEARNING OUTCOMES:**
1. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE AND DEMONSTRATE SPEAKING SKILLS IN FRENCH CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE BY ASKING AND ANSWERING QUESTIONS AND EXPRESSING IDEAS IN CORRECTLY STRUCTURED SIMPLE SENTENCES PRIMARILY USING PRESENT TENSE.
2. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE AND DEMONSTRATE WRITING SKILLS IN FRENCH CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE BY EXPRESSING THEIR IDEAS IN USING CORRECT SIMPLE SYNTAX PRIMARILY USING PRESENT TENSE.
3. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE AND DEMONSTRATE READING SKILLS IN FRENCH CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE BY CORRECTLY INTERPRETING INTRODUCTORY LEVEL TEXTS.
4. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE AND DEMONSTRATE COMPREHENSIVE LISTENING SKILLS IN FRENCH CONSISTENT WITH THE NATIONAL STANDARDS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE BY CORRECTLY RESPONDING TO CLASSROOM DISCUSSION/LECTURE, QUESTIONS, AND BASIC CONVERSATIONS PRIMARILY IN PRESENT TENSE.
5. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE AND DEMONSTRATE FAMILIARITY WITH TECHNOLOGIES ALLOWING THEM TO CORRECTLY COMPLETE PRACTICE EXERCISES.
6. STUDENTS WILL ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE FRENCH CULTURE BY READING INTRODUCTORY LEVEL TEXTS.

**FAMU**
INTRODUCTION TO THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE; BASIC GRAMMAR LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING. LECTURE/LABORATORY.

**FAU**
EMPHASIS ON SPEAKING AND AURAL COMPREHENSION. PRACTICE IN READING AND WRITING. FOR STUDENTS WITH LITTLE OR NO EXPERIENCE IN THE LANGUAGE. NOT OPEN TO NATIVE SPEAKERS OR THE EQUIVALENT.

**FAU**
BEGINNING STUDY OF FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE. FOR STUDENTS WITH LITTLE OR NO EXPERIENCE IN THE LANGUAGE. NOT OPEN TO NATIVE SPEAKERS OR THE EQUIVALENT. COURSE AVAILABLE FOR REGULAR GRADE ONLY. OBJECTIVES: STUDENTS LEARN THE INDICATIVE PRESENT TENSE TO SPEAK AND WRITE ABOUT THEMSELVES AND OTHERS. DURING THE SEMESTER, THEY WILL ALSO ACQUIRE CULTURAL, GEOGRAPHICAL, AND HISTORICAL INFORMATION. THIS COURSE IS FOR STUDENTS WITH LITTLE OR NO EXPERIENCE IN THE LANGUAGE.
FGC  THIS IS A COURSE FOR ABSOLUTE BEGINNERS. IN THIS COURSE ALL FOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS (LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING) ARE DEVELOPED. THE CLASS IS TAUGHT IN FRENCH, FOLLOWING THE NATURAL APPROACH. ON COMPLETION OF THIS AND THE SUBSEQUENT COURSE, FRE 1121, MOST STUDENTS WILL HAVE ATTAINED A SURVIVAL PROFICIENCY IN FRENCH. INCLUDES MANDATORY TWO HOURS PER WEEK IN LEARNING LAB.

FGCU  FIRST COURSE IN THE FIRST-YEAR FRENCH SEQUENCE AND INTRODUCES STUDENTS TO THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE. INCLUDES GRAMMAR, SYNTAX, VOCABULARY BUILDING, CULTURAL READINGS. NOT OPEN TO NATIVE OR BILINGUAL SPEAKERS OF FRENCH.

FLAC  INCLUDES PRONUNCIATION, ELEMENTARY CONVERSATION, READING, AND COMPOSITION. THE READING SELECTIONS PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT THE FRENCH PEOPLE AND THEIR CULTURE.

FSCJ  THIS BEGINNING COURSE CONSISTS OF THE FUNDAMENTALS OF FRENCH SPEECH AND GRAMMAR TAUGHT BY INTEGRATING THE BASIC COMMUNICATION SKILLS OF HEARING AND UNDERSTANDING, SPEAKING, READING AND WRITING. FIVE CONTACT HOURS: FOUR LECTURE HOURS, ONE UNSUPERVISED LABORATORY HOUR.

FSU  ORAL COMPREHENSION, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING ARE STRESSED. MAY NOT BE TAKEN BY NATIVE SPEAKERS. MAY NOT BE TAKEN CONCURRENTLY WITH FRE 1121 AND/OR 2200.

GCSC  THIS COURSE AIMS TO DEVELOP BASIC COMMUNICATIVE SKILLS IN FRENCH, INCLUDING SPEAKING, LISTENING, WRITING AND READING, AND TO APPLY THOSE SKILLS TO GAIN KNOWLEDGE OF OTHER CULTURES. BY THE END OF THIS COURSE STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE IN FRENCH ABOUT A VARIETY OF TOPICS. A MINIMUM GRADE OF "C" IN FRE 1120 MUST BE ATTAINED IN ORDER TO ENROLL FOR FRE 1121.

HCC  COVERS THE FUNDAMENTALS OF LISTENING, READING AND WRITING THE LANGUAGE, WHILE DEVELOPING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE FRENCH CULTURE. NATIVE SPEAKERS OF FRENCH WILL BE ASKED TO CREDIT CREDIT BY EXAM.

IRSC  THIS COURSE TEACHES FUNDAMENTALS OF SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING. THE COURSE ALSO FOCUSES ON INTRODUCING STUDENTS TO THE CULTURES OF THE FRENCH-SPEAKING WORLD. THIS COURSE IS FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE HAD LESS THAN 2 YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH.

LSSC  THE COURSE EMPLOYS FOUR PRIMARY LANGUAGE-LEARNING SKILL SETS: LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING IN THE STUDY OF FRENCH GRAMMAR. THE LESSONS IN CLASS ARE PRESENTED IN A MULTI-CULTURAL CONTEXT WITH FREQUENT USE OF ONLINE CONTENT IN ORDER TO FOSTER AN APPRECIATION FOR THE CULTURES OF FRENCH SPEAKING SOCIETIES. TO IMPART TO THE STUDENT FUNDAMENTAL FRENCH READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING SKILLS WITHIN A MULTI-CULTURAL CONTEXT IN AN INTERNET-ENABLED CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT.

MDC  AN INTEGRATED (MULTI-MEDIA) APPROACH TO ACQUIRE PROFICIENCY IN THE BASIC SKILLS (OF THE LANGUAGE) LISTENING/UNDERSTANDING, SPEAKING, READING, WRITING, AND CROSS-
CULTURAL AWARENESS. EMPHASIS ON PRACTICAL VOCABULARY AND ACCURATE PRONUNCIATION. PRACTICE IN CLASS AND LABORATORY IN UNDERSTANDING AND USING THE SPOKEN LANGUAGE; READING AND WRITING WITH PROGRESSIVE GRAMMATICAL EXPLANATIONS.

NFCC FOR THE BEGINNING STUDENT IN FRENCH: A FOUNDATION IN THE LANGUAGE AND CIVILIZATION, STRESSING AN ORAL-AURAL APPROACH. THE COURSE IS OPEN TO STUDENTS WITH NO LANGUAGE BACKGROUND AND TO THOSE WITH LESS THAN ONE YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH WHOSE LANGUAGE PLACEMENT TEST INDICATES A NEED FOR FURTHER FOUNDATION WORK.


PBSC THIS COURSE HELPS STUDENTS DEVELOP PROFICIENCY IN THE FOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS. STUDENTS WHO HAVE COMPLETED FRENCH 1120 WILL HAVE MASTERED THE BASIC VOCABULARY AND STRUCTURES OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND WILL HAVE ACHIEVED AN APPRECIATION OF THE BREADTH OF THE FRENCH SPEAKING WORLD. HONORS CREDIT IS AVAILABLE. COURSE CORE OBJECTIVES 1. ABILITY TO COMPREHEND AND RESPOND TO BASIC CONVERSATIONAL PATTERNS. 2. PROFICIENCY AND KNOWLEDGE OF BASIC GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES AND TERMINOLOGIES. 3. BASIC PROFICIENCY IN READING AND WRITING THE LANGUAGE. 4. KNOWLEDGE OF SIGNIFICANT CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL EVENTS IN FRENCH INTELLECTUAL HISTORY. 5. ABILITY TO USE TECHNOLOGY FOR E-MAIL AND RESEARCH OF SELECTED TOPICS IN FRENCH. COURSE CORE OUTLINE 1. GREETINGS, THE ALPHABET, GENDER OF NOUN AND ADJECTIVES, COGNATES. 2. PRESENT TENSE OF -ER VERBS; NEGATION; NUMBERS; THE VERB ETRE; INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS; POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE QUESTIONS; THE IMPERSONAL PRONOUN "ON"; STRUCTURE OF THE INFORMATION QUESTIONS; STRESSED PRONOUNS. 3. THE VERB AVOIR; THE USE OF INDEFINITE ARTICLES; NOUN PLURAL FORMATION; THE WORD "DES"; THE PHRASE "IL Y A"; ARTICLES AND NEGATIVE PHRASES; THE USES OF DEFINITE ARTICLES; DESCRIPTIVE ADJECTIVES; POSITIONS OF ADJECTIVES; THE VERB "ALLER" AND THE FUTURE; THE PREPOSITION "CHEZ"; INVERTED QUESTIONS. 4. "PAYER" AND VERBS THAT CONJUGATE SIMILARLY; EXPRESSIONS WITH "ETRE A"; POSSESSION USING "DE"; POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVES; THE VERBS "ACHETER" AND "PREFERER"; THE INTERROGATIVE "QUEL"; THE DEMONSTRATIVE "CE"; COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES; THE VERB "FAIRE"; THE SUPERLATIVE. 5. EXPRESSIONS USING "AVOIR"; REGULAR VERBS IN -IR AND -RE; COMPOUND PAST TENSE WITH "AVOIR" AND "ETRE"; THE FORMATION OF QUESTIONS.
THE PURPOSE OF THIS COURSE IS TO INTRODUCE STUDENTS TO THE FOUR (4) SKILLS (LISTENING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING) OF THE TARGET LANGUAGE AND TO ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO APPRECIATE THE CULTURAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE COUNTRIES IN WHICH THE LANGUAGE IS SPOKEN. MAJOR LEARNING OUTCOMES: 1. LISTENING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE SPOKEN TARGET LANGUAGE (FRENCH), ON A BEGINNING LEVEL, TO INCLUDE BOTH LEARNED AND NEW LANGUAGE CONSTRUCTIONS. 2. SPEAKING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO MATERIAL WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE COURSE PRESCRIPTION (BEGINNING LEVEL) AND TO INITIATE BASIC, LEARNED SPEAKING SITUATIONS. 3. READING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO READ AND COMPREHEND SELECTED MATERIAL ON A LIMITED RANGE OF TOPICS DEALING WITH EVERYDAY SITUATIONS. 4. WRITING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO WRITE BASIC, SIMPLE SENTENCES BASED ON ASSIGNED MATERIAL GIVEN PRACTICE, CUES, AND A LIMITED RANGE OF POSSIBLE TOPICS. 5. GRAMMAR USAGE: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO APPLY THE PRINCIPLES OF GRAMMAR AND SYNTAX IN A LIMITED MANNER. 6. CULTURE: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE KNOWLEDGE OF AND APPRECIATION FOR THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS OF HISPANIC CULTURE: CULTURAL MORES, IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS, MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN THE AREAS OF HISTORY, GEOGRAPHY, LITERATURE, CIVILIZATION, MUSIC, ART, SPORTS, ENTERTAINMENT, AND THE LIKE. COURSE OBJECTIVES: 1. LISTENING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO UNDERSTAND THE SPOKEN TARGET LANGUAGE (FRENCH), ON A BEGINNING LEVEL, TO INCLUDE BOTH LEARNED AND NEW LANGUAGE CONSTRUCTIONS, AS MEASURED BY THE ABILITY TO: 1.1 UNDERSTAND THE SPOKEN LANGUAGE RELATED TO LEARNED SITUATIONS. 1.2 UNDERSTAND CLASSROOM COMMANDS AND DIRECTIONS GIVEN IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE. 1.3 UNDERSTAND BASIC ORAL NARRATIVES BASED ON LEARNED MATERIAL, RESPONDING TO VARIOUS TYPES OF QUESTIONS. 1.4 COMPREHEND, IN A LIMITED WAY, THE FRENCH OF NATIVE SPEAKERS. 2. SPEAKING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO MATERIAL WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE COURSE PRESCRIPTION (BEGINNING LEVEL) AND TO INITIATE BASIC, LEARNED SPEAKING SITUATIONS, AS MEASURED BY THE ABILITY TO: 2.1 RESPOND APPROPRIATELY TO QUESTIONS, UTILIZING LIMITED KNOWLEDGE OF GRAMMATICAL PRINCIPLES. BEGINNING RESPONSES WILL BE SHORT OR YES/NO AT THE OUTSET. 2.2 FORMULATE BASIC QUESTIONS IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE. 2.3 INITIATE CONVERSATIONS BASED ON LEARNED SITUATIONS. 2.4 RESPOND CORRECTLY TO REALISTIC SITUATIONS. 3. READING PROFICIENCY: THE STUDENT WILL BE ABLE TO READ AND COMPREHEND SELECTED MATERIAL ON A LIMITED RANGE OF TOPICS DEALING WITH EVERYDAY SITUATIONS, AS MEASURED BY

SCF THIS COURSE INCLUDES FUNDAMENTALS OF GRAMMAR WITH EMPHASIS ON READING, SPEAKING AND LISTENING. 1. PRONOUNCE MOST WORDS ACCURATELY IN FRENCH. 2. UNDERSTAND ELEMENTARY LEVEL SPOKEN FRENCH. 3. UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO USE BASIC FRENCH VOCABULARY IN SIMPLE CONVERSATIONS. 4. UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO USE REGULAR VERBS IN THE PRESENT TENSE. 5. UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO USE SOME IRREGULAR VERBS. 6. UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO USE NOUNS, PRONOUNS, VERBS, ADJECTIVES, ADVERBS, PREPOSITIONS, DIRECT OBJECTS, AND INDIRECT OBJECTS IN SIMPLE SENTENCES. 7. UNDERSTAND AND BE ABLE TO CARRY ON A SIMPLE CONVERSATION IN INTRODUCTORY COMMUNICATION AREAS, SUCH AS: GREETINGS, EXCHANGE OF NAMES, PERSONAL INFORMATION, FAMILY MEMBERS, DESCRIBING HABITS AND DAILY ROUTINES, MENTAL AND PHYSICAL STATES, FAVORITE PASTIMES, WEATHER, EMPLOYMENT, DESIRES AND WANTS, TIME, SHOPPING, ETC. 8. FEEL RELATIVELY COMFORTABLE CONVERSING IN FRENCH ON A LIMITED RANGE OF BASIC SUBJECTS.

SEMINOLE THIS IS A BEGINNING COURSE CONSISTING OF THE FUNDAMENTALS OF FRENCH FUNCTIONAL GRAMMAR AND SPEECH TAUGHT BY DEVELOPING SKILLS IN HEARING AND UNDERSTANDING, SPEAKING, READING, AND WRITING. THROUGH A MULTI-MEDIA APPROACH, STUDENTS WILL DEVELOP PROFICIENCY AND CONFIDENCE IN THE LANGUAGE. IN ADDITION, THE COURSE PROVIDES A BASIS FOR UNDERSTANDING THE CULTURE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING AREAS.

SFC FRE1120 INTRODUCES STUDENTS TO THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND TO THE CULTURES OF FRENCH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES. THE COURSE IS DESIGNED FOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE NO OR LIMITED KNOWLEDGE OF EITHER FRENCH OR LINGUISTICS. INSTRUCTION WILL BE BASED ON A COMMUNICATIVE

THIS COURSE STRESSES THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE AND FUNCTIONAL LANGUAGE USE AT THE BEGINNING LEVEL. THIS COURSE GIVES THE STUDENT THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP A BASIC ABILITY TO READ, WRITE, SPEAK AND COMPREHEND MODERN FRENCH. UPON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THIS COURSE, THE STUDENT WILL A.COMPREHEND AND SPEAK IN FRENCH AT AN ELEMENTARY LEVEL. B.READ AND COMPREHEND BASIC FRENCH WRITINGS. C.WRITE SHORT COMPOSITIONS IN FRENCH USING A LIMITED VOCABULARY AND FUNDAMENTAL KNOWLEDGE OF FRENCH SYNTAX.

THIS COURSE IS DESIGNED TO HELP YOU ACQUIRE VOCABULARY, GRAMMAR, AND CULTURAL INPUT NECESSARY FOR MEANINGFUL AND APPROPRIATE COMMUNICATION IN THE FRENCH LANGUAGE. UPON SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THIS COURSE, YOU SHOULD BE ABLE TO: 1.COMPREHEND, WITH SOME REPETITION, SIMPLE QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS; 2.READ AND UNDERSTAND THE INFORMATION PRESENTED IN A SIMPLE PARAGRAPH; 3.PRONOUNCE THE LANGUAGE WELL ENOUGH TO BE INTELLIGIBLE TO NATIVE SPEAKERS; 4.DEAL WITH EVERYDAY SITUATIONS SUCH AS GREETINGS, LEAVE-TAKINGS, BUYING FOOD AND ASKING DIRECTIONS; 5.ASK AND ANSWER QUESTIONS AND MAINTAIN A SIMPLE CONVERSATION IN AREAS OF IMMEDIATE NEED ON VERY FAMILIAR TOPICS; 6.WRITE A SHORT PARAGRAPH ON A FAMILIAR TOPIC; AND 7.DEMONSTRATE LIMITED SOCIAL COMPETENCE IN THE FOREIGN CULTURE BY SHOWING COMPREHENSION OF COMMON RULES OF ETIQUETTE, CUSTOMS AND SENSITIVITIES, AND A KNOWLEDGE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES BY THE PEOPLE WHO SPEAK THE TARGET LANGUAGE.

TCC  BASIC ELEMENTS OF FRENCH USAGE TAUGHT IN CONTEXT. EMphasis is on pronunciation and comprehension.

UNF  THIS COURSE STRESSES THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE AND FUNCTIONAL LANGUAGE USE AT THE BEGINNING LEVEL. THIS COURSE GIVES THE STUDENT THE OPPORTUNITY TO DEVELOP A BASIC ABILITY TO READ, WRITE, SPEAK AND COMPREHEND MODERN FRENCH.

USF  THE FIRST COURSE IN THE STUDY OF ELEMENTARY FRENCH. EMPHASIS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF BASIC SKILLS IN COMPREHENSION, SPEAKING AND READING.

VC  FOR STUDENTS WITHOUT TWO YEARS OF RECENT HIGH SCHOOL FRENCH COMPLETED WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS OR DEPARTMENT APPROVAL. EMphasis on everyday use of the language; integrating basic grammar, vocabulary, composition and culture through a
CONVERSATIONAL APPROACH TO FRENCH. NOT OPEN TO NATIVE SPEAKERS. A MINIMUM GRADE OF C IS REQUIRED TO PASS THIS COURSE IF BEING USED TO SATISFY THE GENERAL EDUCATION FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT. 1. STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE VERBALLY IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE AT A NOVICE HIGH PROFICIENCY LEVEL FOLLOWING GUIDELINES BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES; 2. STUDENTS WILL BE ABLE TO COMMUNICATE IN WRITING IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE AT INTERMEDIATE LOW PROFICIENCY LEVEL FOLLOWING GUIDELINES BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES; 3. STUDENTS WILL DEVELOP LISTENING COMPREHENSION SKILLS IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE AT INTERMEDIATE LOW PROFICIENCY LEVEL FOLLOWING GUIDELINES BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES; 4. STUDENTS WILL DEVELOP READING SKILLS IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE TO ACHIEVE INTERMEDIATE LOW PROFICIENCY LEVEL FOLLOWING GUIDELINES BY THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES; 5. STUDENTS WILL DEVELOP A MATURE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CULTURAL DIFFERENCES
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT: INSTRUCTOR

Informed Consent for Instructional Participants: French Language Acquisition Study

Your institution is serving as a location for a study investigating the way people learn and process language. The study focuses on beginning level French 1120 courses, examining the methods and materials that teachers may use, the type of interaction taking place, and the kinds of skills students attain.

As an instructor of French 1120, you are invited to voluntarily participate in two components of this study: random observations of the instructional environment and a teaching survey. If you agree to participate, your French 1120 class will be observed 4-6 times during the course of the semester. Observations will not be disruptive in any way and the researcher will not interact with you or your students during this time. During the observations, the researcher will observe teaching methods/materials, interactions, and the general dynamic of the instructional environment. As a participant, you will also complete a teaching survey. The teaching survey is expected to take 30 minutes of your time. This survey will take place outside of your regularly scheduled class time and will allow you to provide insight into teaching methods, best practices, technology, and other aspects of your classroom environment.

Participation in this study is voluntary. There is no monetary compensation offered for participation in this study, however, there are benefits to participating in this research project. By participating, you are providing second language researchers with valuable information about how people process language, becoming bilinguals, and how teachers contribute to this process. This knowledge will contribute to language teaching and materials in the future.

Participation in this study will be treated with confidentiality to the extent allowed by law. Names of specific institutions at which any of the observed courses are being taught, instructors, and students will be replaced with a code containing numbers and/or letters for coding and analysis of the data. At no time will the names of the institution, instructor, or students be used in the publication or presentation of this research. Only the primary researcher will have access to these codes. The data will be locked in a file cabinet, with electronic data being password protected. All data will be destroyed within 1 year after the conclusion of this study.

You are encouraged to ask any questions you may have about this study before, during, or after your participation. However, answers which could affect the outcome of this experiment will be deferred until the completion of the experiment. This study is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Gretchen Sunderman, who can be reached at (850) 644-8186 and at gsnuderman@fsu.edu. Questions can be addressed to Nicole Flesevig Bruland at

I understand the above information and have been offered a copy of this consent form.

Please print name

______________________________

Signature

______________________________

Date

The Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board can answer any questions about the general rights of research subjects (2010 Levy Ave, Suite 276, Tallahassee, Fl 32310, 850-644-7900)

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved on 8/15/2012. Void after 8/14/2013. HSC # 2012.8583
Informed Consent for Student Participants: French Language Acquisition Study

Your institution is serving as a location for a study investigating the way people learn and process language. The study focuses on beginning level French 1120 courses, examining the methods and materials that teachers may use, the type of interaction taking place, and the kinds of skills students attain.

As a French 1120 student, you are invited to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, you will complete a background questionnaire, a learning readiness survey, and two language-related activities. Researchers would like to learn about the kinds of skills beginning level language students attain during a beginning level language course. Thus, the two language-related activities involved in this study are designed to assess French language skills and will provide researchers with information regarding what the typical beginning level French language student is able to do as a result of having taken a French 1120 course. The first activity will assess speaking and listening comprehension skills via interaction with the researcher. The second activity will assess reading and writing skills via a series of short reading passages and writing activities. All activities combined are expected to take no more than 3 total hours, over the 3 month period of the semester of the French 1120 course in which you are enrolled. All parts of this study will take place outside of your regularly scheduled class time.

Participation in this study is voluntary and will in no way affect your grade in the French class(es) in which you are enrolled. There is no monetary compensation offered, however, there are benefits to participating in this research project. First, you may increase your awareness of your second language abilities. Second, you will be providing second language researchers with valuable information about how people process language and become bilinguals. This knowledge will contribute to language teaching and materials in the future.

Your participation in this study will be treated with confidentiality to the extent allowed by law. At no time will your name, your instructor's name, or name of the institution you attend, be used in any publication or presentation of this research. All names will be replaced with a letter and/or number for coding and analysis of the data. Only the primary researcher will have access to these codes. The data will be locked in a file cabinet, with electronic data being password protected. All data will be destroyed within 1 year after the conclusion of this study.

You are encouraged to ask any questions you may have about this study before, during, or after your participation. However, answers which could affect the outcome of this experiment will be deferred until the completion of the experiment. This study is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Gretchen Sunderman who can be reached at (850) 644-8186 and at gszagnerman@fsu.edu. Questions can be addressed to Nicola Flaszig Bruland at

_____________________________________________________

I understand the above information and have been offered a copy of this consent form.

________________________________________

Please print name

________________________________________

Signature

________________________________________

Date

The Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board can answer any questions about the general rights of research subjects (2010 Levy Ave, Suite 276, Tallahassee, Fl 32310, 850-644-7900)

F3U Human Subjects Committee approved on 8/15/2012. Void after 8/14/2013. HSC # 2012.8583
### Language Acquisition Study Instructor Survey

1. Please provide the information requested below.

   Last Name: __________________________

2. Indicate your overall foreign language teaching experience in years:
   - [ ] 0-5
   - [ ] 6-10
   - [ ] 11-15
   - [ ] 16-20
   - [ ] 21-25
   - [ ] 26-30
   - [ ] 30+

3. Which is your preferred instructional environment? (Choose one)
   - [ ] I prefer to teach on campus, in a classroom as the main format of instruction.
   - [ ] I prefer to teach online, exclusively via the computer/internet with no on-campus meetings.
   - [ ] I prefer to teach hybrid courses with the class meeting both on campus and online.

4. In your opinion, what are the most important aspects of language teaching? Rank the aspects below from 1-4, with 1 being the most important and 4 being the least important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching the rules of the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students to handle simple situations (e.g., booking a hotel,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ordering in a restaurant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering interaction and communication with other people in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students to complete specific tasks in the target language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which of these teaching techniques do you value the most? Rank them from 1-4, with 1 being the most valued and 4 being the least valued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explaining grammatical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicative tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning-based goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oriented tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Which are the most prevalent in your French 1120 teaching? Rank them from 1-5, with 1 being the most prevalent and 5 being the least prevalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules about the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language functions for communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and solving tasks/problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to carry out tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical structures and functional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Are you currently teaching a Traditional on-campus French 1120 course?

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
8. Indicate the types of technologies you utilize to teach traditional French 1120 courses. (Check all that apply)

- Smartboard or similar
- Document camera
- WhiteChalk board
- LCD projector
- Internet Sites
- Computer Programs
- Video Player
- Audio Player
- Online Chat Rooms
- Two-Way Video
- Course Website
- E-mail
- Online Discussion/Message Boards
- Online Gradebook
- Audio recording devices or programs
- Video recording devices or programs
- Interactive Online Textbook with audio, video, voice recording

Briefly explain how you use the technology checked above.

9. How are your French 1120 traditional students learning the language? (In other words, which types activities do they spend the most time performing?)

Rank them from 1-4, with 1 being the most time spent and 4 being the least time spent.

- via activities which help them consciously understand the language rules
- via activities which help them form habits of using the language
- via activities which ask students to communicate with one another
- via activities which ask students to complete specific tasks

10. Describe your teaching style for traditional on-campus French 1120 courses. Which types of activities seem to yield the best results when it comes to student performance?
11. Are you currently teaching an Online French 1120 course?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

12. Indicate which types of technologies you utilize to teach online French 1120 courses. (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Smartboard or similar
- [ ] Document camera
- [ ] White/Chalk board
- [ ] LCD projector
- [ ] Internet Sites
- [ ] Computer Programs
- [ ] Video Player
- [ ] Audio Player
- [ ] Online Chat Rooms
- [ ] Two-Way Video
- [ ] Course Website
- [ ] Email
- [ ] Online Discussion/Message Boards
- [ ] Online Gradebook
- [ ] Audio recording devices or programs
- [ ] Video recording devices or programs
- [ ] Interactive Online Textbook with audio, video, voice recording

Briefly explain how you use the technology checked above.

13. How are your French 1120 online students learning the language? (In other words, which types activities do they spend the most time performing?)

Rank them from 1-4, with 1 being the most time spent and 4 being the least time spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity (e.g., help them understand language rules, use language)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>via activities which help them understand the language rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via activities which help them form habits of using the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via activities which ask students to communicate with one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via activities which ask students to complete specific tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Describe your teaching style for online French 1120 courses. Which types of activities seem to yield the best results when it comes to student performance?

15. Are you currently teaching a Hybrid French 1120 course?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
16. Indicate which types of technologies you utilize to teach hybrid French 1120 courses. (Check all that apply)

- Smartboard or similar
- Document camera
- WhiteChalk board
- LCD projector
- Internet Sites
- Computer Programs
- Video Player
- Audio Player
- Online Chat Rooms
- TwoWay Video
- Course Website
- Email
- Online Discussion/Message Boards
- Online Gradebook
- Audio recording devices or programs
- Video recording devices or programs
- Interactive Online Textbook with audio, video, voice recording

Briefly explain how you use the technologies checked above.

17. How are your French 1120 hybrid students learning the language? (In other words, which types activities do they spend the most time performing?)

Rank them from 1-4, with 1 being the most spent and 4 being the least spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>via activities which help them consciously understand the language rules</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>via activities which help them form habits of using the language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via activities which ask students to communicate with one another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>via activities which ask students to complete specific tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Describe your teaching style for hybrid French 1120 courses. Which types of activities seem to yield the best results when it comes to student performance?

Thank you for participating in this study! Please click below to submit your responses.
## What is your Style of Language Teaching?

Tick the answer that suits your own style of language teaching best (even if it is not the one you are supposed to be using). Try to tick only one answer for each question: then fill them in on the grid that follows.

1. **What is the chief goal of language teaching?**

   (a) the students should know the rules of the language  
   (b) they should be able to behave in ordinary situations  
   (c) they should be able to communicate with other people by understanding and transmitting information  
   (d) they should be able to carry out a range of tasks in the L2  
   (e) they should both know the rules and be able to behave and to
Communicate □

(f) they should become better people, emotionally and socially □

2. Which of these teaching techniques do you value most highly?

(a) explaining grammatical rules □

(b) mechanical drills □

(c) communicative tasks □

(d) meaning-based goal oriented tasks □

(e) presentation and practice of functions, structures, etc. □

(f) discussion of controversial topics □

3. How would you describe the language you are teaching the students in the classroom?

(a) rules about the language □

(b) grammatical patterns □

(c) language functions for communicating and solving tasks □

(d) ability to carry out tasks □

(e) grammatical structures and functional elements □
Now fill in your answers on the grid and add them up to get your teaching style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Teaching style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) audiolingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>audiolingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) communicative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) task-based learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>task-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) mainstream EFL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mainstream EFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Do you think the students are learning language chiefly by:

(a) consciously understanding the language rules

(b) forming habits of using the language

(c) communicating in the classroom

(d) achieving tasks in the classroom

(e) understanding rules, forming habits and communicating
# APPENDIX F

## OBSERVATION CODING RUBRIC

Institution:  
Class Meeting Number:  
Category:  F2F  
On  
Hy  
Observation Date:   

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Teacher 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Learner 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Teacher 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-Learner 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Learner 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner-Learner 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLIVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI4S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLIVW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLI4W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key  
V - Voluntary  
A - Assigned  
S - Spoken  
W - Written
APPENDIX G

STUDENT SURVEY

Language Acquisition Study Student Survey

My need to take this French 1120 course now is...
- High - I need it immediately for degree, job, or other important reason
- Moderate - I could take it on campus later or substitute another course
- Low - It's a personal interest that could be postponed

Feeling that I am part of a class is:
- Not particularly necessary for me
- Somewhat important to me
- Very important to me

I would characterize myself as someone who:
- Often gets things done ahead of time
- Needs reminding to get things done on time
- Puts things off until the last minute

Classroom discussion is:
- Is not necessary for me to understand what I have read
- Sometimes helpful to me
- Almost always helpful to me

When an instructor provides directions for an assignment, I prefer:
- Figuring out the instructions myself
- Trying to follow the instructions on my own, then asking for help if I need it
- Having the instructions explained to me

I need instructor comments on my assignments:
- Within a few days, so I can review what I did
- Within a few hours, or I forget what I did
- Right away, or I get frustrated

Considering my job and personal schedule, the amount of time I have to work on any course is:
- More than enough for a campus class or a Distance Learning class
- The same as for a class on campus
- Less than for a class on campus
When I am asked to use computers, VCRs, voice mail, or other technologies that are new to me:

- I look forward to learning new skills
- I feel apprehensive, but try anyway
- I put it off or try to avoid it

As a reader, I would classify myself as:

- Good - I usually understand the text and other written materials without help
- Average - I sometimes need help to understand the text or other written materials
- Needing help to understand the text or other written materials

As a writer I would classify myself as:

- A strong writer - I am comfortable with writing and have strong organizational, grammar, punctuation and spelling skills
- An average writer - I am moderately comfortable with writing and occasionally need help with organization, grammar, punctuation and spelling
- Needing help with my writing, especially with organization, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

In my college career, I have dropped a college class after the term has started:

- Never
- Once
- More than once

The overall learning environment that I prefer is:

- Traditional, face-to-face, in a classroom with teacher/classmates
- Online, no meetings in a classroom
- Hybrid, with some class meetings online and some in a classroom with teacher/classmates

What type of French 1120 course are you currently enrolled in?

- Traditional, face-to-face, in a classroom with teacher/classmates
- Online, no meetings in a classroom
- Hybrid, with some class meetings online and some in a classroom with teacher/classmates

How do you feel about your current French 1120 course experience?

- Satisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Not Satisfied
Please rate your satisfaction with the following components of your current French 1120 course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Not Satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Speak French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Read French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Write French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to Listen to French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to be Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely Responses to Questions from Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Complete Course Requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about the Course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is your native language?

- [ ] English
- [ ] Spanish
- [ ] Creole
- [ ] French
- [ ] Italian
- [ ] German
- [ ] Chinese
- [ ] Japanese

Other (please specify)

Indicate what you are able to do in your native language and estimate your ability level for each skill below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>No knowledge</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicate your skill level in any other languages you may know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>No knowledge</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a language you know isn’t listed above, please provide it here and indicate your level (Beginner, Intermediate, Advanced)

Did you study French in high school? Please indicate the highest level of French you studied.

- [ ] I didn’t take French in high school
- [ ] French 1
- [ ] French 2
- [ ] French 3
- [ ] French 4
- [ ] French 5
- [ ] Advanced Placement (AP) French

Estimate your current French language level in each of the skills listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>Beginner</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why are you taking this French 1120 course? Check all that apply.

- [ ] I want to learn French for personal and/or professional benefit.
- [ ] I need this course to fulfill a requirement for graduation or transfer to another institution.
- [ ] I’m taking this course because Spanish, or another language, was not available.
- [ ] I’m taking this course because I think it will help my GPA.
How motivated are you to learn French?

- Not motivated
- Moderately motivated
- Very Motivated

In general, how do you feel about interacting with people? (Check all that apply)

- I like to interact - I am a social person
- I like to interact - I am a little shy at times
- I do not like to interact - I am not a social person
- I do not like to interact - Interacting with others makes me feel anxious

How do you feel about learning French? Check all that apply.

- Happy
- Excited
- Anxious
- Unhappy

What would you like to be able to achieve after having taken French 1120? Check all that apply.

- Read French
- Write French
- Speak French
- Understand written French
- Understand spoken French
- Attain knowledge about the French culture

Are you currently a high school student taking French 1120 via a dual enrollment program?

- Yes
- No

Indicate your level of enrollment at your college.

- Full time (12 credit hours or more)
- Part time (less than 12 credit hours)
Are you currently employed?
- Yes, full-time
- Yes, part-time
- No, not employed

What is your age range?
- 14-17
- 18-21
- 22-25
- 26-30
- 30-35
- 36-40
- 40+

I am a:
- male
- female

To validate your survey, enter your participant code and click SUBMIT.
APPENDIX H

ACTFL ORAL PROFICIENCY INTERVIEW METHOD & GUIDELINES

The following is excerpted from the following source: http://www.actfl.org/professional-development/certified-proficiency-testing-program/testing-proficiency

The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview

As the demand for proficiency testing expands in both the academic and professional communities, the ACTFL Certified Testing Program continues to distinguish itself as the nation's most recognized and comprehensive.

About the ACTFL OPI

The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview, or ACTFL OPI as it is often called, is a standardized procedure for the global assessment of functional speaking ability. It is a face-to-face or telephonic interview between a certified ACTFL tester and an examinee that determines how well a person speaks a language by comparing his or her performance of specific communication tasks with the criteria for each of ten proficiency levels described in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines 2012 – Speaking. The ten proficiency levels are:

- Superior
- Intermediate Mid
- Advanced High
- Intermediate Low
- Advanced Mid
- Novice High
- Advanced Low
- Novice Mid
- Intermediate High
- Novice Low

Since the ACTFL OPI is an assessment of functional speaking ability, independent of any specific curriculum, it is irrelevant when, where, why and under what conditions the candidate acquired his/her speaking ability in the language.

The ACTFL OPI takes the form of a carefully structured conversation between a trained and certified interviewer and the person whose speaking proficiency is being assessed. The interview is interactive and continuously adapts to the speaking abilities of the individual being tested. The
topics that are discussed during the interview are based on the interests and experiences of the test candidate.

Through a series of personalized questions, the interviewer elicits from the test candidate examples of his or her ability to handle the communication tasks specified for each level of proficiency in order to establish a clear 'floor' and 'ceiling' of consistent functional ability. Often candidates are asked to take part in a role-play. This task provides the opportunity for linguistic functions not easily elicited through the conversational format.

Uses of the OPI

The ACTFL OPI is currently used worldwide by academic institutions, government agencies, and private corporations for purposes such as: academic placement, student assessment, program evaluation, professional certification, hiring and promotional qualification. The ACTFL OPI is recognized by the American Council on Education (ACE) for the awarding of college credit.

More than 10,000 OPIs in 37 different languages are conducted through the ACTFL Testing Program. OPI Testing is currently available in the following languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodian</td>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Hmong</td>
<td>Punjabi</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Urdu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is excerpted from the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines – Speaking, 2012. See this link for the complete document:

Intermediate Low
Speakers at the Intermediate Low sublevel are able to handle successfully a limited number of uncomplicated communicative tasks by creating with the language in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to some of the concrete exchanges and predictable topics necessary for survival in the target-language culture. These topics relate to basic personal information; for example, self and family, some daily activities and personal preferences, and
some immediate needs, such as ordering food and making simple purchases. At the Intermediate Low sublevel, speakers are primarily reactive and struggle to answer direct questions or requests for information. They are also able to ask a few appropriate questions. Intermediate Low speakers manage to sustain the functions of the Intermediate level, although just barely.

Intermediate Low speakers express personal meaning by combining and recombining what they know and what they hear from their interlocutors into short statements and discrete sentences. Their responses are often filled with hesitancy and inaccuracies as they search for appropriate linguistic forms and vocabulary while attempting to give form to the message. Their speech is characterized by frequent pauses, ineffective reformulations and self-corrections. Their pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax are strongly influenced by their first language. In spite of frequent misunderstandings that may require repetition or rephrasing, Intermediate Low speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors, particularly by those accustomed to dealing with non-natives.

**Novice High**
Speakers at the Novice High sublevel are able to handle a variety of tasks pertaining to the Intermediate level, but are unable to sustain performance at that level. They are able to manage successfully a number of uncomplicated communicative tasks in straightforward social situations. Conversation is restricted to a few of the predictable topics necessary for survival in the target language culture, such as basic personal information, basic objects, and a limited number of activities, preferences, and immediate needs. Novice High speakers respond to simple, direct questions or requests for information. They are also able to ask a few formulaic questions. Novice High speakers are able to express personal meaning by relying heavily on learned phrases or recombinations of these and what they hear from their interlocutor. Their language consists primarily of short and sometimes incomplete sentences in the present, and may be hesitant or inaccurate. On the other hand, since their language often consists of expansions of learned material and stock phrases, they may sometimes sound surprisingly fluent and accurate pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax may be strongly influenced by the first language. Frequent misunderstandings may arise but, with repetition or rephrasing, Novice High speakers can generally be understood by sympathetic interlocutors used to non-natives. When called on to handle a variety of topics and perform functions pertaining to the Intermediate level, a Novice High speaker can sometimes respond in intelligible sentences, but will not be able to sustain sentence-level discourse.

**Novice Mid**
Speakers at the Novice Mid sublevel communicate minimally by using a number of isolated words and memorized phrases limited by the particular context in which the language has been learned. When responding to direct questions, they may say only two or three words at a time or give an occasional stock answer. They pause frequently as they search for simple vocabulary or attempt to recycle their own and their interlocutor’s words. Novice Mid speakers may be understood with difficulty even by sympathetic interlocutors accustomed to dealing with non-natives. When called on to handle topics and perform functions associated with the Intermediate level, they frequently resort to repetition, words from their native language, or silence.
Novice Low
Speakers at the Novice Low sublevel have no real functional ability and, because of their pronunciation, may be unintelligible. Given adequate time and familiar cues, they may be able to exchange greetings, give their identity, and name a number of familiar objects from their immediate environment. They are unable to perform functions or handle topics pertaining to the Intermediate level, and cannot therefore participate in a true conversational exchange.
APPENDIX I

STUDENT READING COMPREHENSION ASSESSMENT


You receive this ad. Respond to the following questions.

**Loca-vélos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jour de semaine</th>
<th>Week-end</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de 9h à 19h</td>
<td>de 9h à 19h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prix</strong></td>
<td>9 euros</td>
<td>14 euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Un week-end</strong></td>
<td>Du samedi au dimanche</td>
<td>26 euros.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You wish to rent a bike for the Saturday of the week.

**Combien ça coûte?**

- 9 €
- 14 €
- 26 €

**A partir de quelle heure est-ce que vous pouvez prendre le vélo?**

- 9h
- 11h
- 17h

**Vous devez rapporter le vélo au plus tard:**

- Lundi à 11 heures
- Dimanche à 10 heures
- Samedi à 10 heures

Read the following situation and respond to the questions accordingly:

You are looking for an apartment. You live alone and you like to go out in the evening. You find these ads in the newspaper.

**Studio 23 m² à la campagne. Lac à 4 km. Tous confort. Prix : 366 €.**
Tel : 05 21 45 66 78.

**Appartement 40 m², centre ville, près de tous commerces, quartier animé. 360 € par mois.**
Tel : 05 56 78 90 76.

**Maison de 200 m², mer à 2 km. Très calme, idéal pour les enfants. Prix / mois : 1500 €.**
Tel : 05 59 34 12 32.

**Appartement 62 m². Trois chambres. 630 € par mois.**
Tel : 04 03 02 20 10.

**A quel numéro téléphonez-vous?**

**Quel est le prix d’un mois de location?**

- 366 €
- 360 €
- 630 €
Florida State University Language Acquisition Study - Activity

Read the following situation and respond to the questions accordingly:

Un enfant rapporte ce message de l'école à ses parents.

Vendredi 15 Octobre

Madame, Monsieur,

Votre fils l'a à l'heure, il est en retard à l'école. Je vous propose un rendez-vous mardi prochain à 17 heures. Vous pouvez me joindre au 04 45 77 09 42.

Merci, la directrice.

Qui a écrit ce message?

La personne:

- doit un retard
- est sur une réunion
- fait une invitation à la fête de l'école

Elle souhaite parler:

- u n nouveau professeur
- des retards de l'enfant
- de la fête de l'école

Florida State University Language Acquisition Study - Activity

On peut le joindre par:

- courriel
- e-mail
- téléphone

Match the letter of each image with the appropriate corresponding statement:

- Ralentir Sortie d'école
- Club de sport Ouvert le soir
- Petit déjeuner
- Mailots de football à moitié prix Fin des soldes ce soir !
- Plongez ouverts l'après-midi
- Adultes : 3 euros
- Enfants : 2 euros
- Réservé aux scolaires de 8 h 30 à 10 h 30
- Attention Peinture fraîche
- Peinture fraîche
- Réservé aux voitures de police

184
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**Read each headline and choose its corresponding news category.**

1. Le chef du gouvernement appelle à des élections anticipées
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie
2. Avec 2 752 personnes tuées, le nombre sur les routes françaises a diminué de 27% en 2003
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie
3. Les exportations de cacao ont doublé par rapport à l'année dernière
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie
4. Le tremblement de terre provoqué par une nouvelle éruption volcanique
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie
5. Le grand froid continue dans les montagnes du Parc
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie
6. Marine au titre du championnat de France
   - Politique
   - Culture
   - Société
   - Sciences
   - Sport
   - Economie

---

**Florida State University Language Acquisition Study - Activity**

**Read the text and respond to the questions.**

**À Visan, les touristes vont à la ferme**

Pas un villageois n’y échappe. « La ferme » de TF1, est aujourd’hui le principal sujet de discussion à Visan (Var), un salon de thé à la boulangerie. C’est dans ce village de 1650 habitants que sont implantées les locaux de la nouvelle émission de télé-réalité. Une vingtaine de célèbres sont enfermées dans une ferme pour y travailler.


Certains bénéficient déjà de retombées économiques. « La boulangerie : « On trouve de 30 à 80 braises par jour à la production, c'est rentable. » Théo, la cave de Visan, livre à la ferme entre 50 et 60 bouteilles les deux ou trois jours : « Notre commerce dans une région viticole. Si seulement 10% des téléspectateurs retiennent que les célèbres boivent du vin de chez nous, on aura réussi. »

D'autres sont plus critiques. Raphaël, aide-soignant, espère que la ferme donnerait une meilleure image de Visan. Mais les journalistes nous suivent et nous écoutent “paysans”. Vivement que tout soit fini, que le village redonne ce qu’il était. Il ne reste donc plus qu’à attendre, attendre de retrouver la tranquillité pour certains, attendre les retombées financières pour d’autres.

2014, jeudi 20 avril 2004

*implantés* *installés* *envisageons* *trop nombreux* *snob**

Ce texte visait:
- Parlé.
- Parlé bilingue francophone.
- Parlé.
Florida State University Language Acquisition Study - Activity

Les touristes sont attirés à Viseu par:

- son architecture.
- ses produits fermiers.
- une emission de télévision.

Choisissez si la phrase est Vrai ou Faux.

"La ferme" est un documentaire sur la vie des paysans.
Vrai/Faux

Viseu n’a jamais eu autant de visiteurs.
Vrai/Faux

Les habitants de Viseu sont tous contents de la présence de TF1.
Vrai/Faux

La boulangerie est heureuse de vendre davantage de pain.
Vrai/Faux

Les journalistes contribuent à donner une bonne image de Viseu.
Vrai/Faux

Read the text and respond to the questions.

Nouveau Message

De: info@aventure-globales.com
Copie...
Objet: Vous aimeriez les voyages ?

Tous aimeriez les voyages ? Vous aimeriez l’aventure ? Alors, lisez ce message :

AVENTURE GLOBALE vous invite à faire le tour du monde en bateau, à bord d’un magnifique voilier. La mer des Caraïbes, les plages du Pacifique Sud et les myriades îles de la Méditerranée vous attendent ! Mîchez plus et prenez contact avec nous, vous allez vivez l’expérience la plus incroyable de votre vie.

Enregistrer-vous immédiatement et participez à notre grand tirage au sort à la couverture de vos rêves à. Vous receivez sans obligation d’achat notre catalogue de voyages à des prix sans concurrence.

Si vous êtes intéressé, cliquez ici.

Il s’agit:

- d’un message publicitaire.
- d’une autre annonce.
- d’un article de presse.
Florida State University Language Acquisition Study – Activity

"Aventure Globale" est le nom:

☐ d'un film.
☐ d'un magazine.
☐ d'une agence de voyages.

Si vous cliquez à l'emplacement indiqué, que va-t-on vous envoyer?

On peut gagner un voyage gratuit:

☐ Un
☐ Tour

Justifiez votre réponse en citant une phrase du texte:

Please enter your participant code in the box below to validate your submission.

You did it! Please, click below to submit your completed activity. Thank you for your participation!
APPENDIX J

DEBRIEFING FORM

Language Acquisition Study Debriefing Form

Thank you for participating in this study about how beginning level language learners enrolled in French 1120 courses learn language. Because instructional environments have evolved in recent years from the traditional classroom environment to include online and hybrid courses, language researchers are interested in learning more about how beginning level language learners acquire language in these instructional environments. This involves examining the methods and materials that teachers may use, the type of interaction taking place, and the kinds of skills students attain.

In study in which you just participated, information was gathered via classroom observation, student and teacher surveys, and assessment of student language skills. From this information, the researcher hopes to learn about similarities and differences in teaching methods, technologies used, and the skills that learners acquire by examining each environment alone as well as in comparison to the other environments in which French 1120 may be taught.

All the information collected in this study is confidential, and there will be no way of identifying individual responses in the data archive. The researcher is not interested in any one individual’s responses. The purpose is to look at the general patterns that emerge when the data are aggregated together.

Should you have any questions regarding this study, you may contact the researcher and/or the supervisor of this study. This study is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Gretchen Sunderman, of the FSU Modern Languages & Linguistics Department, who can be reached at (850) 644-8186 and at g.sunderman@fsu.edu. Questions can be addressed to the researcher, Nicole Flesvig Brueland at Nicole.Flesvig.Brueland@fsu.edu. If you have any questions about subjects’ rights, you may contact the FSU IRB Secretary at (850) 644-8633. If your participation in this study has caused you concerns, anxiety, or otherwise distressed you, you may contact the FSU Counseling Center at (850) 644-1234.

Your participation in this study gives language researchers a more complete picture of how beginning level foreign language students learn in a particular instructional environment.

Thank you for your participation!
APPENDIX K

HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Office of the Vice President for Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32309-2742
(850) 644-8073 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 08/15/2012
To: Nicole Fleitig

Address:

Dept.: MODERN LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS
From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research

Examining the relationship between interactional and linguistic outcomes: In the asynchronous online learning environment: is there viable alternative to traditional face-to-face classroom instruction for beginning level second language

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(b) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 08/14/2011, you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to ensure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with OHRP regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00000446.

Cc: Gretchen Sundeman <gsunderman@fsu.edu>, Advisor
HSC No. 2012.3358
### APPENDIX L

**CEFR/ACTFL EQUIVALENCY CHART**

#### COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

**Level Breakdown and Equivalencies - French**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEFR*</th>
<th>TEF Levels</th>
<th>Level Descriptions</th>
<th>ACTFL**</th>
<th>ILR***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Superior  6 834-900</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarize information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can address himself/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating fine shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
<td>Distinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Superior  5 699-833</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognize implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic, and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organizational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Intermediate  4 541-698</td>
<td>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialization. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</td>
<td>Advanced Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Intermediate  3 361-540</td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken.</td>
<td>Intermediate High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Elementary  2 204-360</td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</td>
<td>Intermediate Mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Elementary  1 69-203</td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and avoids too many expressions.</td>
<td>Novice High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Novice Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages)

**ACTFL (American Council on Teaching Foreign Languages) and ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable) estimated equivalencies provided by certified ACTFL administrator.
APPENDIX M

DISTANCE LEARNING READINESS SURVEY & PUBLIC EVIDENCE OF REDUCED INTERACTION IN ONLINE COURSES

I. Public advertisement of reduced interaction in online foreign language course by the University of South Florida, available here: http://www1.usfsp.edu/coas/scl/french-online.htm

II. Distance Learning Readiness Survey: Am I ready for distance learning?

Are online courses for me? Take this quick questionnaire to find out.

1. My need to take this course now is:
   - [ ] a. High - I need it immediately for degree, job, or other important reason
   - [ ] b. Moderate - I could take it on campus later or substitute another course
   - [ ] c. Low - It’s a personal interest that could be postponed

2. Feeling that I am part of a class is:
   - [ ] a. Not particularly necessary for me
   - [ ] b. Somewhat important to me
   - [ ] c. Very important to me
3. I would characterize myself as someone who:
   a. Often gets things done ahead of time
   b. Needs reminding to get things done on time
   c. Puts things off until the last minute

4. Classroom discussion is:
   a. Is not necessary for me to understand what I have read
   b. Sometimes helpful to me
   c. Almost always helpful to me

5. When an instructor hands out directions for an assignment, I prefer:
   a. Figuring out the instructions myself
   b. Trying to follow the instructions on my own, then asking for help if I need it
   c. Having the instructions explained to me

6. I need instructor comments on my assignments:
   a. Within a few days, so I can review what I did
   b. Within a few hours, or I forget what I did
   c. Right away, or I get frustrated

7. Considering my job and personal schedule, the amount of time I have to work on an online class is:
   a. More than enough for a campus class or a Distance Learning class
   b. The same as for a class on campus
   c. Less than for a class on campus

8. When I am asked to use computers, VCRs, voice mail, or other technologies that are new to me:
   a. I look forward to learning new skills
   b. I feel apprehensive, but try anyway
   c. I put it off or try to avoid it
9. As a reader, I would classify myself as:
   - a. Good - I usually understand the text and other written materials without help
   - b. Average - I sometimes need help to understand the text or other written materials
   - c. Needing help to understand the text or other written materials

10. As a writer I would classify myself as:
    - a. A strong writer - I am comfortable with writing and have strong organizational, grammar, punctuation and spelling skills
    - b. An average writer - I am moderately comfortable with writing and occasionally need help with organization, grammar, punctuation and spelling
    - c. Needing help with my writing, especially with organization, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

11. I have dropped a college class after the term has started:
    - a. Never
    - b. Once
    - c. More than once

III. Distance Learning Facts (Florida Distance Learning Consortium, 2011)
    Highlighted areas reflect general comments about interaction and instruction.
    
    1. Distance Learning students sometimes can end up neglecting their course work because of or professional circumstances, unless they have compelling reasons for taking the course.
    
    2. Some students prefer the independence of Distance Learning; others find it uncomfortable.
    
    3. Distance Learning gives students greater freedom of scheduling, but it can require more self-discipline than on-campus classes.
    
    4. Some people learn best by interacting with other students and instructors, but Distance Learning may not provide much opportunity for this interaction.
    
    5. Distance Learning requires you to work from written directions without face-to-face instructions.
    
    6. It may take as long as two or three days to get comments back by e-mail from your instructor (such as over a weekend or holiday).
    
    7. Distance Learning requires at least as much time as on-campus courses and in many instances up to three times as much.
    
    8. Distance Learning uses computers and other technology for teaching and communication.
9. Printed and/or online materials are the primary source of directions and information in Distance Learning.

10. Distance Learning classes often require written assignments and projects.

11. Students who have dropped a college class often don't have the self-discipline or motivation to work independently and complete an online course.

Based on IS ELI FOR ME?
© 1989 – 2003, Extended Learning Institute, Northern Virginia Community College. Adapted for this use with permission.
Return to the main menu.

Florida Distance Learning Consortium © Copyright 1997-2011
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