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ABSTRACT

This study examined project-based, e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective (Lantolf, 2000; Parks, 2000; Wells, 1999), it sought to investigate (a) the strategies employed by secondary ESL and FSL students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool. One group of 30 intermediate-level French-speaking ESL students in a secondary school (Secondary 4) in Quebec was paired up with two groups of intermediate-level English-speaking FSL students (total 30) in a secondary school (Grade 11) in Ontario. The joint reading of articles taken from newspapers and magazines of interest to teenagers formed the basis for the e-mail discussions. Data, collected over an 18-week period during the 2004-2005 academic year, were obtained from four main sources: written documents, observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The main findings were the following: (1) Using a taxonomy adapted from Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of substrategies for providing scaffolding, analysis of e-mails showed that both ESL and FSL students provided scaffolding to one another by resorting to various strategies. In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as the NS tutor. (2) Findings from various sources of data collection methods showed that during the composing of their e-mails, both groups drew on a variety of resources. (3) An analysis of first and second drafts revealed that ESL students incorporated 91% of the corrections provided by their tandem partners, while the FSL students incorporated 74%. (4) Although the findings showed that the majority of the students participating in the e-mail tandem project had minimally completed the basic course requirements, the analysis of eight case study participants revealed individual differences in the way the latter oriented to the tasks and subsequently carried them out. These results were linked to the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory. (5) Although the teachers reported that their students had benefited from the authentic communication with native speakers and from the feedback they received from them, data also revealed that they had been confronted with a number of challenges. In contrast to previous research that has focused on adult L2 learners (e.g., Appel, 1997; Appel & Gilabert, 2002; Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Lee, 2004; Liaw & Johnson, 2001; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd, 2003), this study sheds light on the degree to which L2 secondary school students are capable of giving each other feedback.
Notre étude avait pour but d'examiner les échanges de courriels entre des apprenants de l’anglais et du français langues seconde dans le cadre d'une pédagogie par projet. Adoptant une perspective socioculturelle (Lantolf, 2000; Parks, 2000; Wells, 1999), nous avons examiné (a) les stratégies employées par les apprenants de l’anglais et du français pour fournir de l’étayage à leurs partenaires en tandem, (b) les ressources utilisées par les apprenants lors de la rédaction de leurs courriers électroniques, (c) l’utilisation de la rétroaction fournie par leurs partenaires pour réviser leurs rapports de lecture, (d) l’utilité de la notion de mobile (« motive »), telle que définie par la théorie socioculturelle, pour expliquer les différences dans la manière dont les partenaires orientent leurs messages et (e) la perception chez les enseignants de l’utilité du courriel en tandem comme outil d’apprentissage. Un groupe de 30 élèves francophones inscrits à un cours d’anglais dans une école secondaire à Québec (Secondaire 4) a été jumelé à deux groupes d’élèves anglophones (totalisant 30 élèves) inscrits à un cours de français dans une école secondaire en Ontario (Grade 11). Ils ont participé à un projet commun axé sur l’étude et la discussion d’articles de revues et de journaux provenant de la culture de l’autre, au moyen d’échanges par courrier électronique. Les données, recueillies sur une période de 18 semaines au cours de l’année scolaire 2004-2005, provenaient de quatre sources principales : documents écrits, observations, questionnaires et entrevues. Les résultats les plus saillants étaient les suivants : (1) En utilisant une taxonomie adaptée de celle élaborée par Villamil et Guerrero (1996), l’analyse des courriels a révélé que les deux groupes d’élèves avaient fourni de l’étayage à leurs partenaires en employant une variété de stratégies. Parmi ces stratégies d’étayage, la plus utilisée était la rétroaction explicite. (2) Les résultats provenant des divers instruments de cueillette de recherche ont montré que, pendant la rédaction de leurs courriels, les apprenants ont eu recours à une variété de ressources. (3) L’analyse des premier et deuxième brouillons a permis de constater que les apprenants d’anglais ont intégré 91% des corrections suggérées par leurs partenaires alors que les apprenants de français ont intégré 74% des corrections proposées. (4) Même si des résultats ont montré que la majorité des apprenants ont participé à l’échange en tandem au moins au niveau minimum exigé, l’analyse de huit études de cas ont fait ressortir des différences individuelles dans la manière dont les partenaires en tandem ont orienté leurs échanges. Ces résultats sont expliqués en fonction de la notion de mobile, telle que définie par la théorie socioculturelle. (5) En général, les enseignants qui ont participé à cette étude ont trouvé que leurs élèves avaient bénéficié de l’échange avec leurs partenaires. Cependant, nos résultats ont aussi montré qu’ils avaient dû faire face à certaines difficultés. Contrairement à la plupart des recherches antérieures qui ont été réalisées avec des adultes (e.g., Appel, 1997; Appel & Gilabert, 2002; Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Lee, 2004; Liaw & Johnson, 2001; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd, 2003), les données qui se dégagent de notre étude nous ont permis de cerner la capacité des élèves du secondaire à se donner mutuellement de la rétroaction.
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INTRODUCTION

Research on the use of computer-mediated communication (CMC) in second/foreign language learning has analyzed the potential of electronic networks for creating authentic communication opportunities for language learners since the 1980s (e.g., Chun, 1994; Connelos & Oliva, 1993; Kramsch & Thorne, 2002). Some of these studies have examined the use of CMC as a means of communication between second language (L2) students and their teacher (e.g., Bloch, 2002; Carey, 1999; Darhower, 2000; González-Bueno, 1998; González-Bueno & Pérez, 2000; Pérez, 2003; Pérez & González-Bueno, 2003). Others have focused on the use of synchronous and asynchronous communication to link up L2 students with each other (e.g., Abrams, 2003; Böhlke, 2003; Lamy & Goodfellow, 1999; Lee, 2001, 2002; Li, 1998; Liaw, 1998; Pelletieri, 2000; Sengupta, 2001; Smith, 2001, 2003; Sotillo, 2000; Spiliotopoulos, 2002, 2003; Spiliotopoulos & Carey, 2005; Warschauer, 1996). Still others have evaluated the benefits of computer networks to link L2 students with native speakers (NSs) (Appel, 1997; Appel & Gilabert, 2002; Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Gray & Stockwell, 1998; Greenfield, 2003; Lee, 2004; Liaw & Johnson, 2001; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd, 2003; Savignon & Roithmeier, 2004; Stockwell, 2000; Stockwell & Harrington, 2003; Ushioda, 2000). However, the settings of instruction where the majority of these studies were conducted have been limited to higher education and adult learners, confirming what Smith (2001) stated: “we seem to know a lot about university-age learners, and relatively little about younger learners” (p. 314). Similarly, based on a meta-analysis of computer-based technology use in second language learning, Zhao (2003) posited that

The fact that the studies were limited to college level students and language learners raises questions about the generalizability of the findings to other language learners who may differ in motivation, language background, learning style and ability, and instructional context. For instance, it is very likely that college students are generally more motivated and better learners than K-12 students as a whole. (p. 21)
The present study aims to fill this gap by examining the nature of the e-mail tandem exchanges between English as a second language (ESL) and French as a second language (FSL) secondary school students. The concept of tandem learning on which this study is based is used to refer to “organised language exchanges between two language learners, each of whom wishes to improve his or her proficiency in the other’s native language” (Appel & Mullen, 2000, p. 291). Tandem learning draws on three tenets: the principles of reciprocity, bilingualism and autonomy (Little & Brammerts, 1996; Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006). In its simplest version, the principle of reciprocity means that both partners benefit equally from collaborating with a native speaker of their respective target languages, and that they spend rather equal amounts of time using each of the two languages. On a more sophisticated level, however, it means that the learning objectives, and the means of achieving them, are negotiated between partners, so that each feels that he/she is deriving full benefit from the partnership. As well, reciprocity requires both partners to help each other and adjust to each other's proficiency levels; this could take the form of error correction, modification of input, the use of repair strategies, and so forth.

The second principle, linked with reciprocity, is bilingualism. In online tandem partnerships, each message must be bilingual, written half in the target language and half in the mother tongue. In this sense, tandem partners are equally committed to the roles of non-native speaker (NNS) learner and native speaker (NS) tutor. In such a partnership, learners need to understand that the success of the partnership relies on an equal effort by both partners. Learner autonomy, as a principle in tandem learning, implies that both learners need to take responsibility for their exchange and thus, their language learning, by planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning processes and outcomes. In this way, learners are not only responsible for the success of their own learning but are also in part responsible for the success of their partner's learning.

Findings of previous studies in the area of online tandem learning involving adult learners (e.g., Appel, 1997; Kötter, 2002, 2003; Little et al., 1999; Priego, 2002) have shown that due to the nature of tandem exchanges (i.e., where critique is part of the task), adult tandem partners provide each other extensive peer assistance and explicit feedback.
However, to date, very little research in this area has involved young learners (e.g., Dodd, 2001). The general purpose of this study is to investigate if L2 secondary school students can assume the role of native speaker (NS) tutor and thus provide feedback to their tandem partners as has being observed in adult learners. In particular, it seeks to investigate (a) the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool.

The thesis is organized into seven chapters. Following this brief introduction, in Chapter 1, I present the statement of the problem and the research questions that were investigated in this study. In Chapter II, I present the theoretical framework on which this study is based. In Chapter III, I review relevant literature that informed this study. In Chapter IV, I document the research methods that were used in this study. In Chapter V, I report on the findings related to each of the research questions. Following this, in Chapter VI, I discuss the findings with reference to previous studies on second language writing and on the application of digital technologies to second language learning.

Finally, in Chapter VII, I present the conclusions of this study. For this, I first summarize the findings for the five research questions. Then, in light of these findings, I review the pedagogical implications for computer-mediated communication and second language learning. Finally, I examine the limitations of this study and provide recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

1.0. Introduction

This study examined project-based, e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, it sought to investigate (a) the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool.

This chapter presents the statement of the problem (1.1) and the research questions that were investigated in this study (1.2).

1.1. The problem

Classroom-based research on CMC, both synchronous and asynchronous, has primarily focused on the examination of linguistic discourse based on psycholinguistic approaches to language learning (e.g., Blake, 2000; Chun, 1994; Kern, 1996; Lee, 2001; Pelletieri, 2000; Smith, 2001, 2003; Sotillo, 2000; Stockwell, 2000). Some of these studies (e.g., Chun, 1994; Smith, 2001, 2003) have revealed that in the context of these exchanges, learners produce a wide range of discourse structures and that to ensure mutual comprehension, learners use a variety of modification devices, such as clarification checks, confirmation checks, requests for help, and self-corrections.
Furthermore, the literature has shown that through negotiated input, corrective feedback, and modified output, learners develop their grammatical competence and expand their L2 lexicons (e.g., Blake, 2000; Flórez-Estrada, 1995; Pelletieri, 2000; Stockwell, 2000).

While these findings have offered valuable insights into the understanding of the role of online interaction, an increasing number of researchers (e.g., Appel, 1997; Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Blin & Donohoe, 2000; Chen, 2003; Chun et al., 2005; Cifuentes & Shih, 2001; Darhower, 2000; Harrington & Levy, 2001; Huang, 2002; Kinginger, Gourves-Hayward & Simpson, 1999; Lavry, 2003; Lee, 2004; Lim, 2002; Meskill & Ranglova, 2000; Salaberry, 1996; 1999; Sengupta, 2001; Spiliotopoulos, 2002, 2003; Thorne, 2003, 2006; Tolmie & Boyle, 2000; Ware, 2003, 2005; Warschauer, 1997, 1998, 2000) have started to investigate network-based language learning from a sociocultural perspective (Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978). As Salaberry (1999) claimed, "given that sociocultural theory emphasizes the role of individuals' interests and motivation as well as the role of inherently educational goals, it represents a new perspective that provides a contrast with strictly information-processing approaches" (p. 104). For researchers working within this perspective, interactive negotiation through individual input and output modification does not provide sufficient conditions for acquisition and mastery of a second language. For these researchers, language learning goes beyond what the individual produces (e.g., input and output) and focuses on how the individual interacts with others through joint activity (e.g., a collaborative online exchange). That is to say, language learning cannot be viewed as an immediate product of the individual; rather, it is the process by which learners engage in co-constructing their L2 knowledge (Lee, 2004). Furthermore, learners' experiences and motives for language learning and their linguistic, cognitive, and affective conditions shape and influence the social interaction.

Studies within this perspective posit that the major function of social interaction is to provide scaffolding by which the learners help each other to achieve a performance that they typically cannot execute alone. For instance, Donato (2000), Ohta (2000), and Swain and Lapkin (1998) in their studies of oral interaction demonstrated how in a collaborative learning environment learners showed social, cognitive and affective support for each other. Similarly, findings from Villamil and De Guerrero's (1996) study on in class peer
review revealed that providing scaffolding was a general strategy "whose main function was for the members of the dyad to assist each other verbally in achieving task goals" (p.61). Having approached this issue from a qualitative point of view, Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) suggest the importance of further studies to quantitatively investigate the use and frequency of scaffolding strategies among students. As well, these researchers posit that an important line of research to be pursued is the extent to which writers incorporate revision done in a peer review session in the final version of their essays.

Studies in the area of CMC (e.g., Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Lee, 2004; Thorne, 2003) have found that online social interaction with native speakers may afford opportunities for peer-assisted L2 performance. For instance, Belz and Kinginger (2003) examined specific instances of the development of address forms in German (du vs. Sie) for a group of U.S. American learners engaged in asynchronous communication with native speakers of German who were studying to become English teachers at the elementary or secondary levels. The results of this study revealed that for most learners, either gradually or abruptly, the participation in e-mail exchanges with L2 expert speakers led to an increase in appropriate pronoun use over time.

More recently, Lee (2004) conducted a study among students of Spanish as a foreign language at the intermediate level and NSs who communicated by synchronous chat. The researcher found that although focusing on the form was not the goal of the task, in many instances, the NSs assisted the NNSs in their linguistic problems. As explained by Lee, linguistic scaffolding from the NSs assisted the students in recognizing the incorrect usage of temporal and aspectual morphosyntax, such as the use of trabajo (I work) versus trabajé (I worked) and fui (I went) and fue (he went). Similarly, students realized that they had made an error in the conjugation of the verb form after the NSs used the recast to confirm the meaning in their response. Consequently, the NNSs immediately self-corrected it and wrote the correct form. Data also revealed that the NNS-NS online collaboration induced lexical scaffolding as students encountered difficulty understanding the words that the NSs used. As Lee posited, the evidence presented in this study revealed that synchronous exchanges offered a powerful forum for learners to use the target language to socially interact with the NSs.
In sociocultural theory terms, the results of such studies show that NNS and NS online collaboration promotes scaffolding by which the NSs assist the NNSs in composing meaning (ideas) and form (grammar), thus enhancing performance through their “zone of proximal development” (ZPD). However, in the majority of these studies, the NSs were in-service teachers (e.g. Lee, 2004) or in-training teachers (e.g., Belz, 2001, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Liaw & Johnson, 2001). Consequently, the data have also revealed that students’ motivation and comfort level with respect to the online collaboration was affected by the NSs superior language proficiency as well as by the age difference between the two partners. Furthermore, none of these studies has investigated the effectiveness of the feedback provided by the NSs or what resources (e.g., the NSs e-mails, feedback provided by their e-mail partners, dictionaries, online translators) students draw on when composing their e-mails. In fact, in some of these studies, the use of resources was banned. In Lee’s (2002) study, for example, participants “were advised not to use dictionaries or other resources during online interaction” (p. 278). Similarly, Spiliotopoulos (2002) stated: “I strictly monitored students in the computer lab to make sure they did not use the Word program before posting messages” (p. 142). Within sociocultural theory, the use of external tools and resources (e.g., dictionaries, online translators, on-the-spot revision that “Word” permits) are viewed as a fundamental part of learning (Roebuck, 2001).

Moreover, within a sociocultural framework, a number of studies in the area of language learning (e.g., Donato, 1994; Ohta, 2001; Parks, 2000; Swain and Lapkin, 1998) have stressed the importance of investigating the way students engage in a given task. In the area of CMC, a study by Ware (2003) involving university students in Germany and in Texas found that although both groups of students participated beyond course expectations in terms of the quantity of writing they produced, there was a surprisingly lack of real interpersonal interaction. In a qualitative analysis of student attitudes, Ware found that time pressures and institutional constraints negatively influenced students’ communicative choices, leading to what she calls “missed communication”, that is, moments of miscommunication, disengagement, or missed opportunities for intercultural leaning. However, to date, no research, to my knowledge, has investigated how L2 secondary school students engage and invest themselves in online exchanges. From a
sociocultural point of view, the degree of interaction and investment in a shared activity depends on learners’ motives, beliefs, and attitudes and their investment in the learning situation (Lantolf, 2000). In this respect, Parks et al. (2003a) concluded that activity theory may be used to discuss how students “invest themselves in classroom activities, that is, to explore the relationships between students’ construal of the motive or underlying purpose of an activity (how they orient to a task), the tools or mediational means selected, and the learning outcomes” (p. 42).

Despite the increased attention to collaborative language study in recent years, little attention has been given to the teachers’ perceptions on the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool. In the area of synchronous CMC between L2 learners and their instructor, Darhower (2000) found that although the teacher agreed that communicating in the chat room was a good way for learners to improve their Spanish, she had neutral feelings about whether the time spent chatting could have been used more productively as standard class discussion time. In addition, this teacher reported experiencing some frustration about not being able to be present in all the chat rooms, thus leaving many learners unattended. As concluded by the researcher, because of her beliefs in regard to her role as a teacher, she feared that learners were not learning anything if she was not present in the chat room with them. Another study conducted by Parks et al. (2003a) on ICT use in English as a second language teaching analyzed how teachers’ conceptualizations of teaching and other contextual factors related to their actual use of ICTs. These researchers found that the teachers in their study considered their pedagogical beliefs as being most important, while computer technology, although considered a powerful tool, was viewed as a means to an end.

Finally, little research has explored intra-national pairing of learners of complementary second languages (e.g., Sanaoui & Lapkin, 1992). In a recent article, Belz (2005) emphasized the need to explore socio-cultural and socio-institutional aspects of intercultural partnerships that do not cross national boundaries. The present study analyzed e-mail tandem exchanges between French-speaking ESL students and English-speaking FSL students in two provinces in Canada.
1.2. Research questions

In light of the above discussion, the present study is informed by a sociocultural perspective to language learning and addresses the following questions:

(1) What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?

(2) What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?

(3) When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?

(4) To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the e-mail exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchanges)?

(5) How do the ESL and FSL teachers in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.0. Introduction

In order to study the nature of the interactions taking place during the e-mail tandem exchange, this study draws on a sociocultural perspective to language learning that assigns a pivotal role to social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). To this end, this chapter first focuses on the theoretical frameworks of sociocultural theory (2.1) and activity theory (2.2). Then, the application of sociocultural theory to L2 research is discussed (2.3). The final section discusses the application of a sociocultural perspective to the present study (2.4).

2.1. Sociocultural theory

Sociocultural theory, a theoretical framework which originated in the work of the Russian psychologist, Lev Vygotsky (1978, 1986), describes learning as a social process. The major theme of Vygotsky's theoretical framework is that social interaction plays a fundamental role in the development of cognition. Vygotsky believed that development first occurs on an interactional and inter-mental plane (between individuals and between individuals and artifacts) and subsequently is available to individuals on an intra-mental plane:

Any function in the child's cultural development appears twice, or on two planes, first it appears on the social plane, and then on the psychological plane; first it appears between people as an interpsychological category, and then within the child as an intrapsychological category. This is equally true with regard to voluntary attention, logical memory, and the formation of concepts, and the development ofvolition. (Vygotsky, 1981, p. 163)
According to Vygotsky, higher mental functions appear as a result of transformations of the lower functions. Vygotsky saw the transformation of elementary processes into higher order ones as possible through the mediating functions of culturally constructed artifacts including tools, symbols, and more elaborate sign systems, such as language. Within Vygotskian theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1981, 1986), the construct tools refers, on the one hand, to material tools (e.g., hammers, pencils) and, on the other, to psychological tools (e.g., mnemonic techniques, algebraic symbols, diagrams, schemes, and language).

Within the interpersonal relations between adult and child, concept formation by a child is brought about in cooperation with the adult, who attempts to operate within the child’s zone of proximal development (ZPD), defined by Vygotsky (1978) as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). In working within the ZPD, the “expert” (e.g., an adult, a teacher, a more proficient peer, or a NS) helps the “novice” (e.g., a child, a learner, a less proficient peer, or a NNS) move from a state of being object-regulated to eventually becoming self-regulated (Vygotsky, 1978; Wertsch, 1998). This process is facilitated through scaffolding (Bruner, 1978; Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). In 1976, Wood, Bruner, and Ross introduced the term scaffolding in the context of an analysis of adult-child interaction. They described scaffolding as “a process that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (p. 90). These researchers offered an analysis of the critical features of the scaffolding provided by the adult during an interactive problem-solving session. They noted that the support provided by the adult served several key functions: recruitment of the child’s interest, reduction in degrees of freedom, maintaining goal orientation, highlighting critical task features, controlling frustration, and demonstrating idealized solution paths. They argued that in effective instances of scaffolding, the end result was greater individual mastery of the target task.

Similarly, Bruner (1978) used the expression scaffolding “to characterize what the mother provides on her side of the dyad in one of the regularized formats” (p. 254).
Bruner explained that when the mother provides scaffolding to her child, she reduces the degree of freedom with which the child has to cope, concentrates his attention into a manageable domain, and provides models of the expected dialogue from which he can extract selectively what he needs for filling his role in discourse. As noted by Stone (1993), in these early analyses of scaffolding, "emphasis was placed on the adult's role as a support for the child for accomplishing the goal via task analysis and practice with subcomponents" (p. 170). Stone (1993) proposed to move away from this view of asymmetrical structuring of the passive child and to analyze this scaffolding process in terms of semiotic mediation. These mechanisms are prolepsis, conversational implicature and presuppositional triggers. Stone (1993) cited Rommetveit (1974, 1979) and defined prolepsis as "a communicative move in which the speaker presupposes some as yet unprovided information" (p.171). Prolepsis challenges the listener to make assumptions of the speaker's intended meaning. The second communicative mechanism cited by Stone was Grice's (1989) conversational implicature. While prolepsis presupposes the speaker's intentions and implications in dialogues, conversational implicature enables the interlocutors to convey intentions and implications through the observance or the violations of "conversational maxims", which hold that "an utterance should be relevant, true, clear, and only as informative as is required" (p. 173). The third mechanism is the "constitutive" power of language which is realized through "prepositional triggers", a concept contributed by Bruner (1986). He defined the latter as words that trigger suppositions. Finally, Stone (1993) posited that besides these linguistic dynamics involved in effective scaffolding, nonverbal communicative devices, such as gestures, eye gazes, and pauses, have long been implicated by other researchers (Rogoff, 1990; Wertsch et al., 1980; Wood et al., 1976) as crucial components of the scaffolding process.
2.2. Activity theory

Cultural-historical activity theory was initiated by Vygotsky (1978) in the 1920s and early 1930s. It was further developed by one of his main collaborators, A.N. Leont'ev (1978, 1981). The first generation of activity theory, centered around Vygotsky, created the idea of *mediation*. This idea was crystallized in Vygotsky's (1978, p. 40) triangular model in which the conditioned direct connection between stimulus (S) and response (R) was transcended by a "complex mediated act" (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Vygotsky's (1978) model of mediated act](image)

According to Engeström (2001), the limitation of the first generation was that the unit of analysis remained individually focused. This was overcome by the second generation, centered around Leont'ev (1978, 1981). As originally posited by Leont'ev (1978), the explanatory framework of activity theory is viewed as being comprised of three levels: activity, action, and operations. These in turn correspond to motive, goal, and the conditions of psychological behavior (Leont'ev, 1978).

The highest level of analysis is *activity* that refers to specific human behavior, as this occurs in socioculturally defined contexts. Crucially, Leont'ev insisted that activity was not determined by mere physical surroundings. Instead, it is the sociocultural setting in which activity takes place that determines the appropriate properties of the activity. The concept of *motive* is intrinsically linked to activity, since activity is always undertaken in order to satisfy some need. Indeed, Leont'ev argued that without motive as
a driving force, there would be no activity. Thus, all activity comes about as a result of an intention to act, whether a motive is apparent or not. Leont’ev held that it is possible that a motive be concealed or even overlooked in some way. Nonetheless, it is always present: “activity does not exist without a motive; ‘nonmotivated’ activity is not activity without a motive but activity with subjectively and objectively hidden motive” (Leont’ev, 1978, pp. 62-63).

The second level of analysis involves the two inseparable concepts of action and goal. Actions, according to Leont’ev (1981), are the “basic components of activities which translate them into reality” (p. 59). Actions are goal-directed, performed in order to achieve certain goals. Goals, in turn, follow from motives and motives, which can be general, are operationalized as specific goals. Leont’ev (1978) argued that an individual action and a collective activity must be distinguished, since an action can vary independently of an activity:

One and the same action may accomplish various activities and may transfer from one activity to another, showing its relative independence in this way. (...) Let us suppose that I have a goal – to arrive at point N – and I do this. It is understood that the given action may have completely different motives, that is, to realize completely different activities. The opposite is also obvious, specifically, that one or another motive may be given concrete expression in various purposes and correspondingly may elicit various actions. (p. 64)

The third level of analysis, an operation, is concerned with the concrete conditions under which action is carried out. As explained by Leont’ev, the same goal can be achieved through a different set of operations depending on the situation. Unlike actions, operations are not directed at conscious goals. Rather, they are triggered by the contextual conditions of the task. The hierarchical structure of activity is depicted in Figure 2.
2.2.1. An expanded model of activity theory

Engeström’s (1991) expanded model of an activity system drew on Leontev’s analysis of activity. Engeström posited the *activity system* as the basic unit of analysis of behavior, individual and collective. He defined an activity system as any on-going, object-directed, historically conditioned, dialectically structured, tool-mediated human interaction. In Engeström’s (1991) model (see Figure 3), the targeted activity is viewed in terms of how the individual (*subject*) undertakes a certain number of actions in order to attain an objective (*object*). To do so, he is helped by a number of *tools* which are used as mediation between the subject and the object. The activity, which is determined by its object, is affected by the individual’s participation in the *community* to which he belongs. The relation of the individual to this community is mediated by a number of implicit or explicit *rules* or conventions, and by the tools placed at the disposal of this community. In addition, the relation of the community to the object is mediated by a *division of labor*. The result of the activity (*outcome*) is consequently the fruit of actions undertaken by an individual pursuing an object.
Engeström's (1991) expanded model of an activity system took the paradigm a huge step forward in that it turned the focus on complex interrelations between the individual subject and his or her community (Engeström, 2001). More recently, however, Engeström (2001) has underscored the need to develop conceptual tools to understand dialogue, multiple perspectives, and networks of interacting activity systems. In this third generation of activity systems, Engeström’s (1991) model is expanded to include minimally two interacting activity systems (Engeström, 2001). As Figure 4 shows, the object moves from an initial state of unreflected, situationally given ‘raw material’ (object 1) to a collectively meaningful object constructed by the activity system (object 2), and to a potentially shared or jointly constructed object (object 3). The object of activity is a moving target, not reducible to conscious short-term goals.
Engeström (2001) summarizes activity theory with the help of five principles. The first principle is that a collective, artifact-mediated and object-mediated activity system, seen in its network relations to other activity systems, is taken as the prime unit of analysis.

The second principle is the multi-voicedness of activity systems. An activity system is always a community of multiple points of view, traditions and interests. The division of labor in an activity creates different positions for the participants, the participants carry their own diverse histories, and the activity system itself carries multiple layers and strands of history engraved in its artifacts, rules and conventions.

The third principle is historicity. Activity systems take shape and get transformed over lengthy periods of time. Their problems and potentials can only be understood against their own history. History itself needs to be studied as local history of the activity and its objects, and as history of the theoretical ideas and tools that have shaped the activity.

The fourth principle is the central role of contradictions as sources of change and development. Contradictions are “historically accumulating structural tensions within and between activity systems” (Engeström, 2001, p. 137). According to Engeström (2001), when an activity system adopts a new element from the outside (e.g., a new technology), it often leads to an aggravated secondary contradiction where an old element (e.g., the rules or the division of labor) collides with the new one.
Finally, the fifth principle proclaims the possibility of *expansive transformations* in activity systems. Engeström explains that an expansive transformation "is accomplished when the object and motive of the activity are reconceptualized to embrace a radically wider horizon of possibilities than in the previous mode of the activity" (p. 137).

### 2.3. Sociocultural theory and L2 research


> If we are to understand more fully the language learning that occurs through interaction, the focus of our research needs to be broadened. We need to look beyond the comprehension of input to other aspects of interaction that may be implicated in second language learning. (p. 98)

In order to better understand the role of interaction in L2 development, researchers have begun to study both how native speakers or more proficient peers support "novices", as well as how L2 learners collaborate with one another as they work on assigned language learning tasks in their L2 classrooms (Donato, 1994, Gillette, 1994; Ohta, 1995, 2000, 2001; Parks, 2000; Swain, 2000; Thorne, 2000, 2003). For instance, Ohta (2000) investigated the interactional cues to which peers oriented in order to provide developmentally appropriate assistance. Her investigation drew on theoretical constructs from Vygotskian psycholinguistics theory to illuminate the role of assisted performance in the developmental processes of two learners completing an oral translation task in a university-level Japanese language class. As explained by Ohta, the
term “assisted performance” (Tharp & Gallimore, 1989), that describes the idea of scaffolding, captures both the assistance provided and the results of that assistance in facilitating performance; the effects of assistance are evident in the performance of the one assisted.

In completing a task, Hal and Becky, the two learners of Japanese participating in her study, engaged in form-focused collaborative activity that revolved around concerns for grammatical accuracy. In their interaction, the learners negotiated language form and the giving/receiving of form-related assistance. Analyses of the mechanisms of this assistance revealed that Hal, in helping Becky, was not oriented to her linguistic errors in general, but to her subtle bids for help with what she was specifically struggling. Hal did not help whenever Becky struggled, but episodes of assistance were most concentrated when she indicated she needed assistance, which she did by means of subtle interactional cues. Hal’s responsiveness to these bids resulted in help that was both developmentally appropriate and timely. It was only after Becky attained a level of proficiency with the task that Hal intervened to correct linguistic errors that persisted. These findings showed that through the process of receiving developmentally appropriate assistance, Becky, who had the greater difficulty with the task, dramatically improved in her use of a difficult construction. In addition, Hal, the partner who assisted Becky, also evidenced development through this process. An interesting finding was that the provision of developmentally appropriate assistance was not only dependent upon attention to what the peer interlocutor was able to do, but also upon sensitivity to the partner’s readiness to help, which was communicated through subtle interactional cues. In addition, analysis of the data revealed that as the learners’ activity proceeded, Becky evidenced increasing independence in her construction of L2 sentences, using them appropriately in a form-focused communicative task which followed the translation task. These findings provide evidence of how classroom interaction promotes L2 development in the ZPD. As well, the findings of this study underscored the importance of learner engagement. Ohta concluded that analyses of learner activity during task implementation are essential to understand the relationship between task design and how tasks are instantiated by particular learners.
In this regard, Brooks and Donato (1994) delineated three degrees to task-orientation (i.e., how individuals approach a given task and the steps they take in achieving the goals they have set for themselves). *Non-compliance* refers to a state in which learners have not achieved shared orientation regarding the task. *Compliance* is a coerced state of task-related shared orientation, in which learners perform the activity but are not engaged in it. Finally, *engagement* is a state of shared orientation in which interlocutors connect to each other and to the task as meaningful activity. Brooks and Donato pointed out that the actions taken to orient oneself to a task are highly idiosyncratic and can be defined only in reference to the individuals involved and not on the basis of externally defined and imposed task requirements. This study suggested that tasks are internally constructed through the moment-to-moment verbal interactions of the learners during actual task performance. Citing Coughlan and Duff (1994), Brooks and Donato concluded that “[…] we must be careful when we assume that “task” is indeed a constant in our measurements: while the task or blueprint may be the same, the activity it generates will be unique” (Coughlan & Duff, 1994, p. 190).

More recently, Platt and Brooks (2002) examined L2 learner data to identify task engagement as it emerged, unfolded in dialogic activity, and became associated with the transformation of task, self, and group. Using a microgenetic method of study (Vygotsky, 1978) that traces a task activity from its origins through historical processes to task completion, Platt and Brooks analyzed data from two pairs of L2 learners involved in jigsaw tasks, one pair using Swahili, the other Spanish. Taking this approach, Platt and Brooks searched for points in the activity when there was evidence that the participants had changed from lack of engagement to full engagement in the task. Findings from the Swahili data analyses revealed two kinds of development that this pair of students had not displayed previously. First, they used the L2 to help each other locate towns, mountains, and lakes on a map of East Africa. Second, they constructed the communicative strategies required to gain control of the problem-solving task, mediating by means of gesture, L1 and other known languages, and the L2. Platt and Brooks argued that these accomplishments contributed to creating the conditions for further language learning to take place. More specifically, they posited that the higher mental processes had become activated, particularly those of volition (effort) and selective attention.
Analysis of the Spanish data set demonstrated how one of the students came to frame the activity for herself and was thus able to control not only herself but the task and her partner as well. Thus, the activity was such that she and her partner had the opportunity to take on the roles to shape the learning activity to meet their own goals. Platt and Brooks concluded that these goals arose out of the synergistic nature of this interaction and constitute a byproduct of their interpsychological work (or acting-with-mediational-means) within what could be described as a ZPD. Platt and Brooks argued that the portal to the ZPD was task engagement. Consistent with Brooks and Donato’s (1994) study, the findings of this study revealed that achieving true engagement with and control over communicative tasks and how these activities are achieved are processes that need to be taken into consideration when analyzing tasks.

The role of learner goals in L2 success was also investigated by Gillette (1994). Situated within an activity theory perspective, this study traced how, based on individual differences in orientation, learners formed divergent goals in the language classroom. In particular, this study argued that the way students invested in the course was related to their initial motive for registering in it (e.g., genuine interest in learning French or the obligation to fulfill a course requirement). Drawing on a case study of six students enrolled in a French course in a United States university, Gillette attributed the positive orientation of the three effective learners to their personal histories and life experiences, which had made them aware of the “use value” of learning languages; in contrast, the three ineffective learners had no such experiences on which to draw. Gillette further observed that those learners who had a positive orientation to the course tended to use effective language learning strategies, whereas those who had a negative orientation proved ineffective in their use of strategies even when instruction in effective strategy use had been given. In view of the way the use of effective language learning strategies appeared to function as a means to an end (i.e., were a consequence of learners’ initial interest in language learning), Gillette challenged the belief implicit in much of the literature on learner strategies that effective strategies alone constitute an explanation of L2 achievement and individual differences.

Similar conclusions were reached by Parks (2000), who drawing on activity theory and the construct of investment (Norton, 1997; Peirce, 1995), explored how three
francophone CEGEP students variously invested in a task that involved producing short documentary-style videos in English. As noted by Parks (2000), although Norton’s (1997) notion of investment has evolved separately from activity theory, it provides interesting insights into the complex nature of L2 language learner engagement in specific social settings, including the classroom. As proposed by Norton (1997), the notion of investment draws attention to issues of agency and the learner’s sense of identity:

I have used the term *investment* to signal the socially and historically constructed relationship of learners to the target language and their sometimes ambivalent desire to learn and practice it. (...) The construct of investment conceives of the language learner as having a complex history and multiple desires. An investment in the target language is also an investment in a learner’s own social identity, which changes across time and space. (p. 411)

In her study, Parks (2000) found that, although all the case study participants completed the video project, differences in how they accomplished this task with respect to motive and the implementation of goals or actions were evident. Analysis of the data revealed that although three participants were positively oriented toward the learning of English, differences emerged concerning their motives for engaging in the video project, perceived either as the mere completion of a course requirement or as an opportunity to learn English. Consistent with previous studies drawing on a sociocultural perspective (e.g., Coughlan & Duff, 1994; Gillette, 1994), Parks concluded that although tasks as specified by teachers may set forth blueprints for pedagogical action, the socioculturally embeddedness of the tasks and how learners orient to these tasks based on their previous experiences may result in substantially different activities as to processes and outcomes.

Looking into learners’ agency in the construction of learning contexts, van Lier (2000) used ecological metaphors such as * affordances* (Gibson, 1979) and *emergence* in language learning in lieu of input and output, to represent the relationship that learners make with the learning environment. In Gibson’s (1979) ecological theory of perception, “the affordances of the environment are what it offers animals, what it provides or
furnishes, for good or ill" (p. 68). Van Lier posited that in terms of language learning, the environment is full of language that provides opportunities for learning to the active, participating learner. Thus, within the ecological perspectives of language learning the affordances consist of “demands and requirements, opportunities and limitations, rejections and invitations, and enablements and constraints” (van Lier, 2000, p. 253). As explained by van Lier, in Gibson’s ecological psychology, as in the work of Vygotsky (1978, 1986), Bakhtin (1981), and their respective followers, the unit of analysis is not the perceived object or linguistic input, but the active learner, or the activity itself. In these terms, van Lier concluded that learners can take up affordances, utilize them, disregard them, reappropriate them, or transform them.

2.3.1. Sociocultural theory and L2 writing research

Sociocultural theory has prompted L2 writing researchers to examine how working together promotes students’ progress (De Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Di Pardo & Freedman, 1988; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996; 1998). In their review of research on peer response groups, Di Pardo and Freedman (1988) suggested using the Vygotskian perspective for the analysis of peer interaction in the writing class: “Vygotsky’s theories suggest a close relationship between talk and writing and the importance of a research framework that leads to understanding how social interaction, in this case in the form of peer talk, can contribute to writing development” (p. 122). Similarly, Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) asserted that the concept of ZPD, which recognizes the importance of peer assistance in the solution of tasks and, consequently in learning, “seems particularly applicable to the kind of collaborative instructional activity that occurs during peer revision” (p. 54).

Other researchers have underscored the importance of situating L2 writing research on an activity theory perspective to document learners’ goals and motives in the contexts of their specific social conditions – to demonstrate how these relate to the actions people perform while composing, the uses they make of instruction and available
resources, the characteristics of the texts they produce, the achievements they make over time, and the major sources of variation with sociocultural contexts (Cumming et al., 2002; Haneda, 2000; Parks et al., 2003a, 2003b, 2005). In this respect, Parks et al. (2003a) pointed out,

Activity theory (of which Engeström’s model is one version) may be used to discuss how students invest themselves in classroom activities, that is, to explore the relationships between the students’ construal of the motive or underlying purpose of an activity (how they orient to a task), the tools or mediational means selected, and the learning outcomes. (p. 42)

In a more recent article, Parks et al. (2005) reported on how Quebec Francophone high school students, enrolled in a program which featured an environment rich in information and communication technologies (ICTs), appropriated the writing process over a four-year period (Grades 7-10) in the context of their ESL language arts courses. Drawing on a Vygotskian and Neo-Vygotskian perspective, Parks et al. ‘s study suggested that during this period students’ appropriation of the writing process was mediated by the teacher’s structuring of tasks which allowed for various degrees of scaffolding and guided participation. Their findings also revealed that although all 11 students completed the two projects in a satisfactory manner, a closer observation of the focal students revealed differences in level of personal investment, notably in terms of the degree to which they sought out and used substantive feedback to improve the content and language of their texts. In this regard, four of the students were considered fully engaged whereas two were viewed as functioning more at the level of task compliance. Taken together, Parks et al. ‘s study lent support to those who have argued for the need to understand strategy use and appropriation in relation to how individuals formulate goals within specific social and institutional contexts (Cumming et al., 2002; Haneda, 2000; Parks, 2000, 2001). More generally, as suggested by previous research (Parks et al., 2003a, 2003b), Parks et al. ‘s (2005) study demonstrated the utility of adopting Engeström’s activity system, as a theoretical framework, to appropriately situate four lines of inquiry: writing development as socially mediated practice, the appropriation of
the writing process as a psychological tool, issues of investment in terms of the way writers orient to the task at hand, and the relationship between teachers' perceptions of writing and classroom practice.

2.3.2. Sociocultural theory and CMC research

An increasing number of CMC researchers (e.g., Appel, 1997; Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Blin & Donohoe, 2000; Chen, 2003; Chun et al., 2005; Lee, 2004; Lim, 2002; O'Rourke, 2005; Shin, 2006; Spiliotopoulos, 2002, 2003; Thorne, 2003, 2006; Ware, 2003, 2005; Warschauer, 1997, 1998, 2000) have started to investigate computer-mediated interaction from a sociocultural perspective. As O'Rourke (2005) posited, the sociocultural perspective "is motivated by the conviction that interaction in CMC should be seen above all as a socially and culturally situated activity engaged in by learners as agents who co-construct not only shared meanings, but also their own roles" (p. 434). For example, looking into learners' agency in the construction of learning contexts, Shin (2006) focused on how a group of ESL students jointly constructed the context of their CMC activities through interactional patterns and norms, and how configured affordances (Gibson, 1979) within the CMC environment mediated their learning experiences.

In a sociocultural view of online communication, CMC environments are seen as artifacts, which therefore ought not to be seen as nonnegotiable objects with direct and predictable effects on user behavior. Rather, their features are exploited, and often subverted, by users making active, selective choices (O'Rourke, 2005; Thorne, 2003, 2006). The choices are shaped by the contingencies of task and interpersonal dynamics, which are constructed in negotiation. Thorne (2003) argued that factors relevant for analyzing CMC use in language classrooms include the historically sedimented characteristics that accrue to a CMC tool from its everyday use, what he termed the "cultures-of-use" (p. 40) of an artifact. Specifically, in an analysis of three case studies, Thorne suggested that e-mail, instant messenger, and forms of synchronous chat, are
deeply affected by the cultures-of-use evolving from the manner in which these tools mediate everyday communicative practice.

In their analysis of two case studies of learners engaged in telecollaborative language learning via electronic interaction with native speakers, Belz and Kinginger (2002, 2003) focused on the “microgenesis” or development of the T/V distinction in pronouns of address as a test case representation of broader L2 pragmatic concerns. As they explained, the rationale for this type of analysis emerges from Vygotsky’s (1978) developmental approach to cognition where it is emphasized that development can only be understood by specifying its history. Citing Donato (1994), Belz and Kinginger (2003) further explained that a microgenetic analysis (i.e., the observation of skill acquisition during a learning event) “allows us to observe directly how students help each other during the overt planning of L2 utterances, and the outcome of these multiple forces of help as they come into contact, and interact with each other” (Donato, 1994, p. 42, cited in Belz & Kinginger, 2003, p. 594).

2.4. Sociocultural theory in the context of this study

In order to study the nature of the interactions taking place during the e-mail tandem exchange, this study draws on a sociocultural perspective to language learning that assigns a pivotal role to social interaction (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986). Of importance for the present study is the understanding that language learning does not take place exclusively within the individual’s mind but is a socioculturally situated activity in a specific context, where interaction is mediated by material tools (e.g., computers, online translators, dictionaries) and psychological tools (notably in terms of language/discourse).

As well, this study is informed by Vygotsky’s concept of learning and teaching in the ZPD, that is to say, the claim that significant others, more capable peers and adults play a critical role in providing the guidance and assistance that enable the learner to become an increasingly autonomous participant in the activity in which he/she engages.
Within the context of the present study, tandem partners, in the roles of *NS tutors, NNS learner,* and *e-mail partner* can be expected to provide scaffolding with the purpose of helping each other achieve task goals.

Furthermore, this study draws on the notion of *motive,* as defined by sociocultural theory (i.e., the students’ underlying purpose for engaging in the activity), in order to explain how individual students oriented to the e-mail tandem project, that is to say, the degree to which he/she engaged in or failed to engage in it.

Finally, as this study involved two schools, students from the two classes were involved with two different activity settings, which could also have a bearing on how tasks were ultimately carried out.

**Summary**

This chapter first focused on the theoretical frameworks of sociocultural theory and activity theory. Then, the application of sociocultural theory to L2 research was discussed. Finally, the application of a sociocultural perspective to the present study was presented. The following chapter reviews relevant literature that informed this study.
CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3.0. Introduction

This chapter reviews relevant literature that informed this study. As the present study involved writing and revision in the context of an e-mail tandem project between ESL and FSL secondary school students in which learners were instructed to provide each other feedback, this chapter begins with a review of the research focusing on revision and peer feedback in the process approach to writing. Next, the general application of computers in L2 learning is discussed, followed by a review of tandem language learning. Finally, research on computer-mediated communication is reported on. At the end of the chapter, the implications of the previous research for this study are presented.

3.1. Revision and peer feedback within the process approach to writing

Since the 1980s researchers have stressed the need for L2 writing instruction to move to a process approach that would teach students not only how to edit but also to develop strategies to generate ideas, compose multiple drafts, deal with peer and teacher feedback, and revise their written work on all levels (Cumming, 1989; Krapels, 1990; Raimes, 1985, 1987; Zamel, 1983, 1985). Revision, or the transformation of text through multiple drafts, has been identified as a crucial factor in achieving quality in the final product (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Zamel, 1983). To help students with this process, a frequently used technique which allows for the intervention of other students as audience and collaborators is peer review (also called peer revision, peer response groups, peer-evaluation groups, and writing groups) (Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1992, 1993; Paulus, 1999; Stanley,
1992; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996; Zhu, 2001). The next sections present a review of studies that have focused on (a) the nature of interaction during peer review, (b) the impact of peer comments on students’ revision and quality of writing, (c) the types of revisions students make to their drafts in response to peer comments, and (d) the students’ perceptions of peer comments.

### 3.1.1. Peer feedback

During the last two decades, peer feedback has captured the attention of many second language writing researchers (Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1992, 1993; Paulus, 1999; Stanley, 1992; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996; Zhu, 1995, 2001). The essence of peer review is students’ providing other students with oral and written feedback on their preliminary drafts so that the student writers may acquire a wider sense of audience and work toward improving their compositions (Nelson & Murphy, 1993). Although some researchers have questioned the learners’ capacity to help each other in solving linguistic problems in their texts (Leki, 1990; Nelson & Murphy, 1993), the benefits of using peer feedback as an aid to revision in L2 language classrooms enjoys solid theoretical and empirical support (Lockhart & Ng, 1995; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Paulus, 1999; Stanley, 1992; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996; Zhu, 2001).

Supported by theories emphasizing the social nature of language learning (Vygotsky, 1978) and in response to the impact of collaborative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1987), peer review seems to hold considerable promise as a viable tool in writing instruction at multiple levels. Its potential to help students develop audience awareness and improve writing through negotiating peer feedback is particularly appealing (Zhu, 2001). Besides these beneficial effects, second language writing researchers within sociocultural theory (Guerrero & Villamil, 1994; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996, 1998) have posited that the value of joint activities carried out during peer review lies in their role as social precursors of individual processes that are necessary for independent writing production. Seen in this light, peer review “emerges as
a favorable instructional environment for readers and writers to work within their respective ZPDs” (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998, pp. 494-495).

### 3.1.1.1. Peer feedback: Nature of interaction

As mentioned in the previous section, peer review involves students working together and interacting with one another. Given this, a major line of research has examined the nature of interaction during peer review, addressing issues concerning language functions, comments and negotiations, aspects of writing attended to by students, and group dynamics. Nelson and Murphy’s (1992) research on one writing group over six different collaborative sessions was the first empirical ESL research on writing groups. Four students participated in the writing group. The research focused on the types of comments that students made about each other’s writing and the kinds of group dynamics that existed among the students. Findings showed that 73% of the total number of students’ comments were on ‘study of language’, 12% were on ‘procedure’, 9% were on ‘life personal comments’, 3% were on ‘life general knowledge’, and 2% were on ‘format’, with the remaining 1% classified as unclear comments. The study found that the group was not an ideal community of “writers helping writers” (p. 13). Four roles emerged: the attacker, the weakest writer, the best writer, and the mediator or the facilitator. These roles influenced the group members’ reactions to the group and their own feelings about themselves as writers.

Mendonça and Johnson (1994) investigated the types of negotiations L2 students engage in during peer review. The participants of this study were twelve advanced ESL learners enrolled in a writing course. Peer reviews took place between students in pairs as they gave oral feedback on each other’s papers. The students spent approximately 15 minutes reading their peers’ drafts and the teacher gave them guided questions before starting the peer review activity. As well, students were instructed to write down comments or underline ideas that were not clear on the drafts and to focus their discussions on the ideas in their peers’ drafts that they had difficulty understanding. Peer review protocols were analyzed using analytic induction procedures that involved
generating descriptive categories that encompassed all types of negotiations found in their data. This analysis revealed that five different types of negotiations occurred during peer review: (1) questions (requests for explanation and comprehension checks), (2) explanations (unclear point, opinion or content), (3) restatements, (4) suggestions, and (5) grammar corrections. It was found, however, that grammar corrections rarely occurred in the peer reviews. Indeed, only 2 out of the 578 (1%) occurrences of negotiations coded were grammar corrections.

A similar study conducted by Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) among 54 Spanish-speaking ESL university students investigated the types of strategies students employ in order to facilitate the peer revision process. Students were paired for each revision session. In each pair, there was a “writer”, whose composition would be revised, and a “reader”, whose task was to help the author revise his/her paper. Writers were instructed to focus first on content and organization and then on language use and mechanics. They were also instructed to read the composition aloud before joint revision began. Findings revealed that peers made use of five different mediating strategies in order to cope with task demands: (1) employing symbols and external resources, (2) using the L1, (3) providing scaffolding, (4) resorting to interlanguage knowledge, and (5) vocalizing private speech. Of these mediating strategies, providing scaffolding was found to be a general strategy whose main function was for the members of the dyad to assist each other verbally in achieving task goals. The nature of this scaffolding was further analyzed into substrategies (requesting advice, advising, responding to advice, eliciting, responding to elicitation, reacting, requesting clarification, clarifying, restating, announcing, justifying, instructing, giving directives, and making phatic comments). Among these scaffolding substrategies, the most salient were advising and responding to advise, eliciting and responding to elicitation, reacting and requesting clarification. Having analyzed the use of these strategies from a qualitative point of view, Villamil and De Guerrero suggest that further research should quantitatively investigate the use and frequency of scaffolding strategies among the students.

Within this line of research, some studies have examined the effects of training students for peer response tasks (Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995). In these studies, students are trained and helped to develop strategies for peer response. Stanley (1992), for example,
conducted a study that sought to examine the types of peer-group interactions that can occur in the ESL writing classroom and to investigate whether more elaborate student training resulted in more fruitful conversations about writing. The interactions of 15 college students who had received training in peer responding were analyzed and compared to the interactions of students who had only participated in a short demonstration session. Students in each of the two sections wrote 6 essays during the semester. Peer evaluations of all the drafts for the 6 essays were audiotaped. The evaluation sessions averaged about 40 minutes in length. For each transcript, the peer evaluators’ responses were assigned into seven categories: pointing, advising, collaborating, announcing, reacting, eliciting, and questioning. The writers’ responses were assigned into four categories: responding, eliciting, announcing, and clarifying. Findings showed that the coached groups produced far more conversation about their drafts than did the groups who had not received coaching. Students who had received coaching offered their partners substantially more specific responses to their writing, they pointed to problematic portions of the text, alerted writers to lapses in coherence, offered specific advice for solving these problems, and collaborated with the writer on more suitable phrases far more often than did the uncoached students.

The studies reported on so far have involved L2 learners working in pairs or in groups. A study conducted by Zhu (2001) examined student interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups involving both NSs and L2 learners. The specific research question addressed was: What are the language functions of native and non-native speakers’ utterances during peer response? Participants in this study were 11 students in 3 peer response groups in 2 freshman composition classes. Each group was formed by an ESL student and at least 2 NSs. Students were told to provide oral as well as written feedback on peer writing. They were provided with response sheets to record written feedback and were instructed to fill out the response sheets in class and give them to the writers at the end of the response session. Transcripts of tape-recordings of peer discussions of six papers and students’ written comments were analyzed. Language functions were coded using an adapted version of Stanley’s (1992) coding scheme. Findings showed that some functions were performed by NS readers exclusively: confirming, pointing, hedging, elaborating, and eliciting. As well, it was found that NS
readers reacted more to peer writing and advised more on peer writing. By contrast, non-native speakers tended to announce or question when providing feedback. These findings seem to suggest that NSs tended to provide suggestions more directly through advising while L2 learners tended to point out (announcing) and imply (questioning) problematic areas. Zhu (2001) underscores the need for future studies to examine (a) native and L2 students' perceptions of each others' feedback, (b) to what extent and how L2 learners use feedback provided by NSs and vice versa, and (c) the impact of direct (e.g., through advising) versus indirect (e.g., through questioning) peer feedback on revision.

3.1.1.2. Peer feedback: Effectiveness

Another line of research has focused on the impact of peer response on students' revision and quality of writing (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Stanley, 1992; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). The guiding question of these studies is: Do students use the peer feedback in their revisions? To answer this question, Nelson and Murphy (1993) conducted a study involving university students enrolled in a 10-week intermediate ESL writing course. A primary course objective was to enable students to write a focused and coherent paragraph. Instructional procedures included the use of writing groups in which students first wrote comments on other students' drafts and then participated in peer-group discussions. After the discussions, students were to revise their paragraphs. The same four-person peer response group was videotaped once a week for 6 consecutive weeks. Peer review protocols as well as students' rough and final drafts were analyzed. Students' final drafts were coded using a 5-point scale, with a score of 1 indicating that students had used none of their peers' comments in revising their drafts and a score of 5 indicating that students had implemented all or nearly all of their peers' suggestions. Findings revealed that the mean score across all six sessions was 3.2, suggesting that students made some changes in their drafts based on responses by their peers. However, it was found that students were not necessarily consistent in the extent to which they used their peers' responses. For example, one student received a score of 5 one week and a score of 2 the following week.
In order to explore why students at times incorporated their peers' suggestions into their papers and at other times did not, the transcripts of final drafts coded as 4 or 5 (i.e., where writers made significant changes based on peer responses) and those coded as 1 or 2 (i.e., where writers did not make significant changes based on peer responses) were reread and coded as (a) interactive or noninteractive and (b) cooperative or defensive. Findings of this analysis showed that when writers interacted with their peers in a cooperative manner, they were more likely to use their peers' suggestions in revising than when the writers interacted with their peers in a defensive manner or when they did not interact at all.

Mendonça and Johnson's (1994) study also investigated how L2 students use their peers' comments in their revision activities. The students' first draft (written before the peer review) of an assigned essay and second draft (revised after the peer review) were analyzed to identify evidence of revisions in the written text. The drafts were first compared to identify what the students had and had not revised. Then, the parts of the second draft that had been discussed during the peer reviews were identified. Findings showed that in 53% of the instances of revisions, students incorporated their peers' suggestions. In 10% of the instances students did not revise a given part of their texts even if it had been discussed in the peer review. Finally, in 37% of the instances, students revised parts of their essays that had not been discussed in the peer reviews. The findings of this study indicated that students used peer comments to revise, but they used suggestions selectively, deciding ultimately what to accept.

Similar results were found by Villamil and De Guerrero (1998) in a study involving intermediate-level Spanish-speaking university students that investigated the impact of peer revisions on writers' final texts in two rhetorical modes: narration and persuasion. Seven pairs of students were tape-recorded as they interacted on drafts for each of the modes. Writers read their texts aloud; readers focused first on content and organization and then on language and mechanics. Tape-recordings, drafts and final versions were analyzed and trouble sources were categorized as 'incorporated', 'not incorporated', 'further revised', and 'self-revised'; false repairs were also noted. Findings showed that the majority of revisions for both peer sessions (74%) were incorporated in the final versions, 8% were further revised and 18% were not incorporated. A finding
supported by other studies (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993) was the addition of self-revisions, demonstrating the writer's authorial control. Indeed, findings showed that 39% of the revisions adopted were self-revisions. In contrast to Nelson and Murphy (1993), Mendonça and Johnson's (1994) and Villamil and Guerrero's (1998) studies, a study by Connor and Asenavage (1994) showed that only 5% of text-based revisions resulted from peer comments, whereas 35% of the revisions resulted from teacher comments and 60% from self and tutors' comments.

3.1.1.3. Peer feedback: Types of revisions

Second language writing researchers have also examined the types of revisions students make to their drafts in response to peer comments (Connor & Asenavage, 1994; Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Paulus, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998). In Connor and Asenavage's (1994) study, the students' first drafts were compared with the second drafts in terms of revisions. Revisions were also analyzed between drafts 2 and 3. All revisions were marked and coded using Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revisions. This taxonomy categorizes revisions in two types: surface changes and meaning changes. Surface changes made to a text are those that do not bring new or delete old information from the text, but only alter the surface structure. Surface changes are divided into two categories: formal changes, which are copyediting or proofreading changes in areas such as spelling, tense, and punctuation, and meaning-preserving changes, which paraphrase existing concepts in a text but do not alter the essential meaning from one version to the next. Meaning changes are those that affect the information present in the text, by either adding, deleting, or rearranging the ideas. Meaning changes are also divided into two types, both of which affect the text on a global level. Microstructure changes are those that alter the information structure but do not affect the overall gist or direction of the text. Macrostructure changes are major changes that affect the overall meaning. In Connor and Asenavage's study, 70% of the peer-influenced changes and 22% of the teacher-influenced changes were found to be meaning-level changes.
Like Connor and Asenavage (1994), Paulus (1999) analyzed the revisions made to their essays according to the type and source of each individual change. Using Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revisions, each revision made to the first and second drafts of the essay was categorized as either surface change (formal change or meaning-preserving change) or meaning change (microstructure change or macrostructure change). Results showed that 63% of total revisions were surface changes. Formal changes accounted for 22% of these surface changes and 41% were categorized as meaning-preserving changes. The remaining changes (38%) were meaning changes, categorized as either microstructure changes, which accounted for 22% of these changes, or macrostructure changes, which accounted for 16% of these revisions. In addition, the source of each revision made to the first and second drafts of the essays was determined by comparing the revisions made with the peer and teacher feedback given to the student. Each revision was coded as either resulting from the peer review session (peer), the teacher feedback (teacher), or some other source such as the writer’s own ideas (self/other). The results indicated that of the total number of revisions made to both drafts of the essays, peer feedback influenced 13.9% of these changes, teacher feedback influenced 34.3% and 51.8% were attributed to some other source besides peer and teacher feedback (self/other).

In Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1998) study, results showed that students focused almost equally on grammar and content when revising in the narrative mode and predominantly on grammar in the persuasive mode. The authors suggest three possible explanations for these results. One explanation may be that ESL learners at the intermediate level are still quite unstable in their command of language structure and, consequently, feel the need to deal with aspects of form. Another explanation may be that the students may have considered necessary to first repair the linguistic anomalies that might have obscured the meaning of the text. A third explanation is, according to the authors, that regardless of the course emphasis on higher level textual concerns, students simply followed their habitual tendency to focus on grammar, as probably learned throughout much of their previous language instruction.
3.1.1.4. Peer feedback: Students’ perceptions

Literature on peer feedback has also investigated the students’ perceptions of peer comments (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994). To determine whether the students had found the peer review activity beneficial, Mendonça and Johnson (1994) conducted an individual interview with the students. Findings showed that all the students in the study reported that they found the peer review beneficial. Among the benefits of peer review, students claimed that having another person read their drafts helped them see points that were clear in their essays and points that needed revision. As well, some students pointed out that they had enjoyed reading their peers’ essays because it allowed them to compare their writing with that of their peers and to learn some new ideas about writing.

Although the bulk of the studies conducted on peer feedback have been done with tertiary L2 learners, a study by Tsui and Ng (2000) evaluated the degree to which peer comments and teacher comments facilitate revision among secondary L2 learners in Hong Kong. Students were introduced to a process-oriented approach to writing in which for each writing task, they were engaged in a "writing cycle". Each writing cycle lasted 6 weeks and consisted of the production of a first draft after a whole-class brainstorming session. This was followed by the teacher giving whole-class feedback on common problems found in the first draft. Students then read the first draft of their peers' compositions and provided written comments. This was followed by a peer response session during which peer comments were discussed in groups. On the basis of the written and oral peer comments, students had to produce second drafts that were read and commented on by the teacher. In response to the teacher's written comments, the second drafts were revised by students to produce the final drafts. Data from the last two cycles in the year were analyzed. These included audiotapes of peer review sessions, impressionistic and detailed analyses of incorporation of peer and teacher comments, a questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews with 6 students. The questionnaire showed that students favoured teacher comments significantly more than peer comments and liked reading peers’ compositions significantly more than reading their written comments or getting their oral feedback. The students reported incorporating more teacher than peer comments into their revisions, a finding which was corroborated by impressionistic
analysis of texts. The interviews further revealed that students who had incorporated both types of comments felt they had gained a sense of audience more from working with their peers than through teacher feedback. They felt they had found out 'how', not just 'where' their drafts needed improving and had gained a sense of ownership in being able to assess whether or not to include a comment. On the other hand, those students who incorporated more teacher than peer comments felt that the experience of the teacher was paramount but did not dismiss the value of peer comment, finding it useful in raising their own awareness. Those incorporating fewer peer comments did not trust their peers' ability to make judgements. Although this study suggests that secondary level students varied in their willingness to use peer feedback, it nonetheless demonstrates that the latter could benefit from such a strategy.

3.1.2. Summary

Taken together, the studies reported on in this section point to (1) the importance of peer feedback to help students develop audience awareness and improve writing; (2) the importance of peer feedback to help L2 learners to work within their respective ZPDs; (3) the value of joint activities carried out during peer review as social precursors of individual processes that are necessary for independent writing production; (4) the capacity of secondary level students to benefit from peer review procedures; (5) the need for further research to be conducted on secondary L2 learners.
3.2. Computers and second language learning

Computers have been used for second language learning since the 1960s (Chapelle, 2001; Kern & Warschauer, 2000; Levy, 1997; Salaberry, 1996; Warschauer, 1996; Warschauer & Healey, 1998). The history of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) can be divided into three phases, which Warschauer and Healey (1998) term behavioristic CALL, communicative CALL, and integrative CALL. The first phase occurred during the 1960’s and 1970’s. During this time, computers were used primarily for drill and practice in the language classroom. This reliance on technology for providing language practice was consonant with the then prevailing behaviorist learning methodologies.

During the late 1970’s and 1980’s, demands to redefine the role of computers in the language classroom were triggered by the microcomputer revolution on the one hand, and the notion of communicative competence, notional/functional syllabi, and language teaching methodologies based on the communicative approach on the other. Communicative CALL corresponded to cognitive theories which stressed that learning was a process of discovery, expression, and development. As explained by Warschauer and Healey (1998), popular CALL software developed in this period included text reconstruction programs (which allowed students working alone or in groups to rearrange words and texts and to discover patterns of language learning), and simulations (which stimulated discussion and discovery among students working in pairs or groups).

By the late 1980s and early 1990s, communicative CALL began to come under criticism. Critics pointed out that the computer was still being used in an ad hoc and disconnected fashion. This criticism corresponded to a broader reassessment of communicative language teaching theory and practice. Many teachers and researchers were moving away from a cognitive view of teaching and learning to a more sociocognitive view, which placed greater emphasis on language use in authentic social contexts (Warschauer & Healey, 1998). Task-based, project-based, and content-based approaches were implemented to integrate learners in authentic environments, as well as to integrate the various skills of language and use. It was the advent of the Internet that has reshaped the uses of computers for language learning at the end of the 20th century.
(Eastment, 1996; Warschauer & Healey, 1998). As Levy (1997) argued, “a decade or so after the introduction of the microcomputer, the Internet has produced another leap forward in terms of great access to materials, people, and learning environments” (p. 31). This new perspective on the use of computers in L2 learning that has been termed integrative CALL, shifted the dynamic from learners’ interaction with computers to interaction with other humans via the computer (Kern & Warschauer, 2000). Recently, a number of terms and acronyms have been coined to index the intersection of technology and language learning: computer-mediated communication (CMC), technology-enhanced language learning (TELL), network-based language teaching (NBLT), networked collaborative interaction (NCI), networked language learning (NLL), online language learning, telecollaboration, and tandem learning.

Of these terms, three are of particular importance for the present study. The term computer-mediated communication (CMC) is used to refer to “communication that takes place between humans via the instrumentality of computers” (Herring, 1996, p. 1). CMC may be either synchronous (e.g., chat, video chat, object-oriented multi-user domains - MOOs-) or asynchronous (e.g., e-mail, discussion forums) depending on whether or not the system requires the sender and the receiver to be logged on at the same time in order for communication to take place. A third type of CMC is hybrid systems that combine options for real-time and asynchronous CMC. Environments such as Blackboard and WebCT, for example, give learners access to an e-mail system, a chat facility, a bulletin board, and to a number of other facilities (Kötter, 2002).

The term telecollaboration involves the application of global computer networks to foreign and second language learning and teaching in institutionalized settings (Belz, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2005, 2006; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O'Dowd, 2003). In telecollaborative partnerships, “internationally-dispersed learners in parallel language classes use Internet communication tools such as e-mail, synchronous chat, threaded discussions, and MOOs, in order to support social interaction, dialogue, debate, and intercultural exchange with expert speakers of the respective language under study” (Belz, 2003, p. 1). In this bilingual type of intercultural partnerships, students read parallel texts, one in their first language and one in the language they are learning. Parallel texts are linguistically different renditions of a particular story or topic in which
culturally-conditioned varying representations of that story or topic are presented. The pedagogical goal is not to only get the students to simply notice the differences, but to examine how the differences are construed linguistically, to explore the socio-historical factors which may have led to differences, and to critically reflect on the ways in which others might evaluate the students’ own culture(s) based on the texts produced by that culture (Belz, 2005).

The term **tandem learning** is used to refer to “organised language exchanges between two language learners, each of whom wishes to improve his or her proficiency in the other’s native language” (Appel & Mullen, 2000, p. 291). As the present study was carried out following the principles of tandem language learning, this concept will be further explained in the following section.

### 3.2.1. Tandem language learning

Tandem language learning takes place when two language learners with complementary combinations of L1 and L2 (e.g., a Francophone ESL student and an Anglophone FSL student) work together in order to learn their partner’s language and also to learn more about his or her culture (Little & Brammerts, 1996). As can be seen on the **Tandem City** website (available at [http://www.tandemcity.info/index2.html?direccion=general/en_history.htm](http://www.tandemcity.info/index2.html?direccion=general/en_history.htm)), tandem learning first developed as face-to-face meetings between two learners with different L1s learning each other’s mother tongue. Learners used to team up with a NS, such as an exchange student, and learn each other’s language while being supported by a framework of counselling sessions and collaborative tasks and activities. In 1979, Jürgen Wolff implemented Spanish-German tandem partnerships in Madrid, forming the basis of what was to become the TANDEM® Network in 1983. Originally involving language schools in 16 countries, these schools offered tandem learning experiences in conjunction with the classroom language courses offered to their students. Another major development occurred in 1992 when the Internet was first employed for tandem learning, initially in
the form of an English-German online discussion group created by Helmut Brammerts who, in 1994, founded the International Email Tandem Network in which 11 European universities originally participated. This network became the International eTandem Network in 1996 in which the use of other forms of electronic communication was also explored. Now known as the International Tandem Network (see http://www.enst.fr/tandem/learning/idxeng11.html), it includes a total of 12 European universities. The first online tandem language learning projects involved the use of email (Appel, 1997; Appel & Gilabert, 2002; Appel & Mullen, 2000; Dodd, 2001; St. John & Cash, 1995). In recent years, however, tandem partnerships have also been implemented using synchronous environments such as MOOs (Kötter, 2002, 2003; O’Rourke, 2005; Schwienhorst, 1998, 2002, 2004; Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006). Online tandem exchanges usually take the form of language learners spending half their time writing in each language. This gives each partner practice in writing the L2 and provides written models by a native speaker. As well, students are explicitly instructed to correct their partners’ mistakes in their L2. Thus, the two distinct roles that each learner is required to adopt are those of NS tutor on the one hand and NNS learner on the other hand. Three fundamental principles are taken as axiomatic in most work on tandem learning (e.g., Kötter, 2002, 2003; Little & Brammerts, 1996; Little et al., 1999; Schwienhorst, 1998; Schwienhorst & Borgia, 2006):

- **Reciprocity**: Each learner has to support their partner as much as they wish to receive support themselves; this could take the form of error correction, modification of input, the use of repair strategies, and so forth.

- **Bilingualism**: Both partners should use the two languages in equal amounts to insure they profit equally from the exchange.

- **Autonomy**: Learner autonomy implies that each learner is responsible for their own and their partner’s learning. As both learners are in a partnership, there is also mutual responsibility to make the partnership as rich and beneficial to each partner as possible by negotiating topics, arranging working methods, and generally planning, monitoring, and evaluating learning processes and outcomes.
A number of potential benefits of tandem learning can be derived from these principles. First, the principle of reciprocity underlines one of the great advantages of tandem learning partnerships compared with other situations in which learners and native speakers communicate. Whereas in the latter the learner is usually the only beneficiary (e.g., Lee, 2004), in the case of tandem learning both partners are in the role of learners and may thus both benefit from the exchange. Second, the fact that both partners depend on each other and are on the same level as learners and native speaker tutors can increase motivation and puts both in a similar position (Little & Brammerts, 1996). Third, the fact that both participants have to adopt the roles of NS tutor and NNS learner offers learners an opportunity to discuss their linguistic and metalinguistic difficulties in a less face-threatening context (Kötter, 2003). Fourth, the double role of NS tutor and NNS learner can be particularly effective in encouraging metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness. In particular, research has shown that the contrastive analysis of both languages develops metalinguistic awareness and thus learner autonomy (Appel, 1997; Schwienhorst, 2002). Finally, the principle of bilingualism that dictates that partners use both their L1 and their L2 in equal proportion, ensures both exposure to comprehensible input and the production of 'pushed' output (Schwienhorst, 1998). Moreover, the process of correcting the partner's output has been reported to lead to increased awareness of L1 structures (Appel, 1997).

3.2.1.1. The role of e-mail in tandem language learning

Researchers have identified three potential benefits of using e-mail as a communication tool for tandem language learning exchanges. The first benefit of e-mail relates to its characteristic as a written medium. Compared to face-to-face communication and synchronous CMC (e.g., chat), the use of e-mail gives students more time to think and compose their messages (Kötter, 2002). E-mail provides learners with the opportunity to look back at their own and their partners' messages and analyse them, thus facilitating reflective learning and fostering awareness. For example, students have the
option of printing out their e-mails after a session and looking up unknown vocabulary produced in the course of the conversation. Drawing on their e-mails, learners might create their own glossaries that contain only personally meaningful material produced in collaboration with the tandem partner (Little et al., 1999; St. John & Cash, 1995). The second benefit relates to the bilingual aspect of the exchange. Schwienhorst and Borgia (2006) report that a recurrent problem in tandem partnerships communicating by synchronous CMC (e.g., chat or MOOs) is that the more proficient L2 learner often takes over and imposes his/her L2 as the exclusive language of communication. By contrast, in asynchronous exchanges (e.g., e-mail), learners may find it easier to arrive at a reasonable estimate of the bilingual proportions in an e-mail and act accordingly. Finally, Schwienhorst (1998) argues that in comparison with other text-based communication resources such as Internet Relay Chat (IRC), that are characterized by their relative anonymity and temporary nature, e-mail promotes the development of more consistent social relationships between learners.

3.2.2. Research on computer-mediated communication

In the CMC literature, research into students' use of online networks has seen a shift from essentially quantitative studies in single classrooms (e.g., Chun, 1994; Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995; Lee, 2002; Pelletieri, 2000; Smith, 2001; Warschauer, 1996) to qualitative studies aimed at exploring the interaction between groups of learners in different locations (e.g., Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Kötter, 2002, 2003; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O'Dowd, 2003; Thorne, 2003; Ware, 2003).

The present study contributes to this growing body of research into the educational potential of CMC by examining project-based, e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. In the following sections, I report on relevant literature in the area of synchronous and asynchronous CMC that informed this
study in regard to two key themes: linguistic interaction (3.2.2.1) and intercultural learning (3.2.2.2).

3.2.2.1. Linguistic interaction

Some researchers have suggested that CMC provides an ideal medium for students to benefit from interaction, since the written nature of the discussion allows greater opportunity to attend to and reflect on the form and content of the communication (Belz, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Kern, Ware & Warschauer, 2004; Kötter, 2003; Lee, 2004; Thorne, 2003). These studies have looked at a variety of issues related to linguistic interaction, including the nature of online student interaction, the types of computer-mediated peer feedback, the modifications learners make in response to peer feedback, and the students' perceptions of the feedback received.

3.2.2.1.1. CMC: Nature of interaction

Several studies have explored the nature of online student interaction by investigating quantifiable aspects of online communication such as the occurrence of particular discourse functions or the frequency of repair strategies and corrective feedback. For instance, drawing on interactionist theories of language acquisition, Sotillo (2000) investigated discourse functions in ESL learners' synchronous and asynchronous discussions of reading assignments. Two groups of university-level students from two ESL academic writing classes that used computers as part of the instructional program participated in the study. The researcher, who was responsible for group A, and the ESL instructor, who was responsible for group B, coordinated the discussions. Transcripts from the synchronous and asynchronous discussions for both groups were analyzed for discourse functions using a taxonomy adapted from Mendonça and Johnson's (1994) scheme of peer review negotiations. With respect to the synchronous documents, 14 different discourse functions were identified: greetings, topic initiation,
assertions/imperatives, requests, responses, adversarial moves/challenges, off topic
comments, topic shift moves, humor, information requests, floor holding moves/topic
continuation, corrective moves, reprimands, and closing moves. Responses to teacher-
and student-initiated requests accounted for 44% of all discourse functions.
Comprehension questions, requests for explanations and clarification accounted for 14%
of all moves, and these were evenly divided between teachers and students.

Analyses showed that the discourse functions identified in the asynchronous
threaded discussion forum were qualitatively and quantitatively different from those
present in the synchronous discussions dealing with similar topics. For the asynchronous
discussions, 22% of the discourse functions coded were classified as topic initiation
moves and teacher response/comments on students’ postings. Student-initiated moves
consisted of topic initiations, responses to teacher questions, and comments on responses
to other student-initiated postings. As with the synchronous discussions, student-initiated
moves accounted for 78% of all electronic moves. The results of this study showed that
most discourse moves identified in the synchronous discussions were similar to those
present in informal conversations. In contrast, discourse functions identified in
asynchronous discourse were similar to those found in traditional classroom discourse:
teacher request – student response – teacher evaluation.

More recently, Sotillo (2005) examined peer feedback in NS-NNS and NNS-NNS
dyads while participants were engaged in communicative and problem-solving activities
via chat instant messaging. The participants of this study were three NSs of English and
three advanced or highly competent NNSs who were enrolled in an undergraduate course
required for ESL teacher certification. Their six ESL counterparts were volunteers who
were not enrolled in ESL classes at the time of the study. In contrast to Sotillo (2000),
nor the teacher nor the researcher joined any of the sessions under investigation. To
investigate the nature of interaction between the NNS-NNS and NS-NNS dyads
communicating by chat, transcripts for each of the five learning activities for five of the
six dyads were analyzed. Error correction episodes (ECEs) were then identified using
Ellis et al.’s (2001) definition of focus-on-form episodes (FFE). In the learning activities
designed for this study, error correction could be initiated by either the NS or more
advanced NNS in reaction to a linguistic error produced by the ESL learner. Reactive
FFEIs (i.e., error correction initiated by either NS partner or advanced NNS interlocutor) and student-initiated FFEIs were also analyzed. A major finding of this study was that the more advanced NNSs who were enrolled in ESL teacher certification courses provided corrective feedback on 46 occasions to ESL learners in the NNS-NNS dyads, compared with the significantly fewer instances (19) of corrective feedback provided to ESL learners by NSs in the NS-NNS dyads. Analyses of data also showed that NSs were more keenly focused on the message or information being conveyed by their ESL partners and less so on lexical items or linguistic forms. To explain her finding, Sotillo suggests that “NS partners were following politeness forms of American culture that discourage the correction of regional or foreign language use patterns” (p. 486).

Drawing from a sociocultural perspective, Lee (2004) analyzed negotiation through collaborative scaffolding between NNSs and NSs of Spanish in the interactional context of synchronous communication. The NSs participating in the study were Spanish teachers at secondary schools and graduate students at George Mason University. They were enrolled in the course “Integrating Technology into Language Teaching” and were required to chat online with Spanish students at the University of New Hampshire. Their ages ranged from 28 to 50. The NNSs were undergraduates enrolled in a third-year advanced Spanish course. Their ages ranged from 19 to 20. The online exchange was carried out using Blackboard. Topics drawn from the Spanish course readings served as a point of departure for online discussions. No particular instructions were given to the two institutional groups, but they were encouraged to focus on the topic, to share ideas with each other, and to allow their partners to contribute as much as possible. Data from the online exchanges were analyzed to investigate the scaffolding provided by the NSs to their NNS partners. Additional data were obtained from the end-of-semester surveys and final oral interviews. The analysis of the chat logs showed that the NSs used multiple negotiation devices, such as request for more information, clarification checks, and confirmation checks to challenge their partners’ opinions. These findings showed that these negotiation devices enabled the NNSs to articulate their thoughts and clarify their points of view by offering additional information. Findings also revealed that linguistic scaffolding from the NSs assisted the students in recognizing the incorrect usage of temporal and aspectual morphosyntax. The results of the end-of-semester surveys
revealed that overall the Spanish students had appreciated the experience of communicating with NS partners. However, they experienced some difficulty and disaffection with the exchange with their NS partners. From a linguistic point of view, they did not believe their NS partners benefited from chatting with them. In the final interviews, some students acknowledged that their self-confidence while chatting with their NS partners was affected by their inferior language proficiency. Some students expressed their preference for working with their own peers, NNSs, because they felt that they were at the same level as their partners in their mutual ability to express themselves even though their language skills were not perfect. Finally, some students expressed their opinion that the chat interaction was dominated by the NSs due to their superior language proficiency. The study concludes that learners’ language proficiency and age differences are important factors to be considered when incorporating institutional CMC as these may linguistically and socially affect the quality of online negotiation and students’ motivation toward online interaction with NSs of the language under study.

Little et al. (1999) reported on an e-mail tandem exchange between Irish students taking German language modules at Trinity College Dublin and German students taking the English for International Communication course given at the University of Bochum. The linguistic data analysis focused on error correction, use of metalanguage, and accuracy of corrections. Negotiation and co-ordination between partners were manifested in the data as a particular kind of metatalk, which is referred to as tandem-related metatalk, that included discussion of error-correction procedures and conventions (including requests to correct errors, reminders about error correction, etc.), thematic content of the correspondence (i.e., what to talk about), and frequency of the correspondence, among other aspects. Findings showed that slightly more than half of the instances of tandem-related metatalk related to error correction. However, close examination of the e-mails showed that the issue of error correction dealt with by the students seemed to reflect a spectrum in terms of their actual engagement with it. At the most basic level, students made brief allusions to the need for corrections and requests for corrections that never led to any further discussion. Further along the spectrum of apparent engagement with the issue of error correction were instances where partners negotiated, or attempted to initiate negotiation of, basic error-correcting procedures. This
study concluded that “while there is clearly a conviction among the students sampled that correction should take place, this consciousness did not often go beyond the individual partner to become a shared focus of attention and discussion within the partnership” (p. 39). A further analysis of errors and corrections showed that the majority of students were able to identify each other’s deficits appropriately. Out of 42 students who corrected their partners, 29 quite adequately identified major and minor problem areas compared to the actual deficits students displayed in their messages. As well, findings showed that in general corrections were accurate, and that although some spelling mistakes occurred, the expertise of the NSs was at no point doubted by the NNSs.

Kötter (2002) investigated learner interactions between 29 tandem partners from a German and a North American university, who collaborated in groups of three and four students via MOOssigang, a text-based online environment that allowed them to communicate in real time with each other, with the purpose of preparing a presentation of their choice. Kötter drew on the analyses of the online exchanges and the students’ self-evaluations to investigate which strategies students employed to ensure that their partners were able to decode their messages, which strategies they used to request lexical assistance, and which repair strategies (other than the use of corrective feedback and codeswitching) they employed to prevent communication breakdowns. Findings showed that 77% of the German students declared that they had deliberately used simple structures, and more than two thirds of them, as well as almost half of their American partners, also felt that they had tried to avoid the use of specific idiomatic expressions or phrases to make it easier for others to understand them. Kötter notes that these observations are particularly noteworthy with regard to the students’ “ability and willingness to scaffold their partners’ tasks because they indicate that many learners appear to have used at least some of the classic features of foreigner talk discourse” (p. 161). Findings also showed that 93% of the students asked their partners to help them with unknown words or advise them on the use of specific items or phrases in their target language. However, the transcripts of the online encounters showed that on average, students only asked each other once or twice per session for a translation, a paraphrase, or other advice on the use of their target language. Findings also showed that 70% of these requests were made by the less advanced American students. Compared to research
results in face-to-face contexts (Long & Porter, 1985; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Pica & Doughty, 1985), Kött found several differences in students' communicative choices: no repetitions, few recasts, few comprehension checks, and many more requests for clarification, elaboration, or reformulation of their partners' ideas. Like Little et al. (1999), the results of this study revealed that although all students agreed that it was important for them to negotiate a joint strategy for the provision of feedback, not only did several students feel that the negotiation of corrective feedback should be secondary to the negotiation of content, but several German students also indicated that it was difficult for them to decide on an appropriate strategy because of the imbalance between their own and their partners' L2 proficiency.

The review of the literature on CMC revealed that there have been few studies examining the extent to which learners develop awareness of the social meaning of linguistic forms (Belz, 2002a; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Belz & Vyatkina, 2005). Belz and Kinginger (2002), for example, focused on two case studies involving the development of address form use: the use of the informal (T) versus formal (V) forms in French and German (tu vs. vous in French, and du vs. Sie in German), in the context of interactions between students in a telecollaborative learning arrangement. The US French learners were linked with an English language class at a graduate school of telecommunications in France, while the US German learners were linked with a Teacher Education Proseminar for apprenticing English teachers at a German university. Using e-mail and synchronous chat, the linked classes collaboratively engaged in a series of tasks based, in part, on their common reading and/or viewing of parallel texts, such as films, fairy tales, and juvenile literature, for the expressed purpose of improving communicative competence and intercultural awareness. Drawing from a sociocultural perspective, this study examined the understanding and use of the T form for the expression of solidarity by two American students (Jennifer, a French learner, and Joe, a German learner) as electronically documented in the context of telecollaboration. Data for the analysis were selected if the participants a) used the V form to address their individual partners at the outset of the study, and b) received explicit peer assistance in the formal and/or sociopragmatic aspects of the second person pronouns. Findings showed that Jennifer and Joe presented differential responses to moments of peer assistance. Jennifer appeared to
persist longer in her use of V forms after her partner pointed out to her her inaccurate use of them, whereas Joe exhibited a relatively abrupt change from V to T use. The researchers contended that the medium, the nature and quality of peer assistance may account for these differences. In Jennifer’s case, the explicit peer correction occurred in the medium of asynchronous e-mail correspondence. Furthermore, her partner’s directive to use T was accompanied by the following hedge: “it’s not a big mistake but any French person may see it”. In contrast, the critical incident for Joe surrounding T/V disambiguation occurs in synchronous chat with a female interlocutor “on the tails of a flirtatious episode” (p. 210). His partner’s assistance was quite direct: ‘Joe PLEASE call me DU.’ Belz and Kinginger (2002) concluded that the quality of interlanguage restructuring may be sensitive to the socio-pragmatic context of its occurrence.

In Belz and Kinginger (2003), direct peer assistance in the use of the T of solidarity was further analyzed in terms of type, quality, and quantity, and learner approximation of expert speaker norms. The U.S. group consisted of 14 students who were enrolled in an intermediate-level German conversation and composition class, and the German group was made up of 16 students who were enrolled in a teacher education seminar at a German teacher’s college. The German students were studying to become English teachers at the elementary or secondary levels in the German educational system; the US students were pursuing various undergraduate degrees.

To trace the history of particular learners’ pronoun use over time, T and V uses were recorded separately for each exchange under the name of each student. For each U.S. student, explicit peer assistance by the German partners with respect to the pronoun of address was then indicated by “PA” next to the date on which it was given. In addition to the developmental histories, accuracy of T and V uses in terms of both number (e.g., du vs. ihr for T) and case (e.g., Sie vs. Ihnen for V) for each individual occurrence was documented. The accuracy of morphological endings on the possessive adjective (e.g., dein, euer, Ihr) for these same categories was also recorded. The data showed that for most learners, either gradually or abruptly, telecollaboration with L2 expert speakers of German led them to an increase in appropriate pronoun use over time. Findings also revealed that pragmatic awareness in this domain is also reflected in learner performance that develops toward approximation of the expert norm for interaction among peers.
3.2.2.1.2. CMC: Types of peer feedback

Some researchers examining the nature of interaction in CMC have also focused on the types of feedback provided by partners when communicating online. In the study cited above, Sotillo (2005) investigated the type of corrective feedback (e.g., explicit/direct or implicit/indirect) that is more readily available to L2 learners and the aspect of language (e.g., vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, spelling) targeted in synchronous CMC. Findings showed that indirect feedback (e.g., implicit negative evidence in the form of recasts, confirmation checks, clarification requests, and comprehension checks) was more readily available to the ESL learners in the Yahoo! Instant Messenger (YIM) chat environment of this exploratory study. NSs provided more indirect corrective feedback to L2 learners than NNSs. In contrast, of 24 direct error corrections in both types of dyads, 92% were found in the exchanges between partners in the NNSs-NNSs. Direct error correction by NSs in NS-NNS dyads accounted for only 8% of all direct corrective feedback. Sotillo found that learner-initiated error correction episodes were primarily queries about lexical items (e.g., “What’s the word?”) or examples of self-correction made by ESL learners who were assigned to the NNS-NNS dyads. The findings of this exploratory study showed that NNSs provided more corrective feedback of an explicit nature to ESL learners than NSs. Sotillo suggests that it is possible that NNSs who have themselves undergone the process of language learning, which includes interlanguage restructuring, felt compelled to overtly point out the erroneous features in their partners’ output. These, however, are just speculative conclusions and were not confirmed by interviewing the participants.

Findings also indicated that 28% of all types corrected by the NNSs participating in the study focused on grammar, primarily morphosyntactic errors such as past participle marker (-ed) omission, third person singular marker (-s) omission, and inaccurate word order. However, of all error types corrected by the NSs, only 14% focused on grammar. Vocabulary errors were also corrected in L2 learner output by both NNSs and NSs and represented 38% of all error types targeted for correction. Finally, spelling errors were often targeted for correction by advanced NNS partners but mostly ignored by NS...
partners (17% vs. 2%, respectively). In general, the findings of this study showed that both NSs and NNSs reacted primarily to learners’ grammatical and lexical errors.

In the study conducted by Kötter (2002), tandem partners provided each other with a total of 127 overt corrections (direct feedback) in the course of the eight successive MOO sessions included in the corpus. Almost 40% of all direct feedback was triggered by different kinds of grammatical errors. Several students made each other aware of their erroneous use of certain items of vocabulary (29% of the cases of direct feedback), and some made corrections referring to the spelling of individual lexical items (21% of all direct feedback). Only 51% of the vocabulary-related corrections were accompanied by a rationale for the suggested improvement. Similarly, a mere 30% of the grammatical-related corrections contrasted incorrect items with more target-like alternatives, or included an explanation for the correction offered. Findings also showed that implicit corrections (indirect feedback) played virtually no part in the learners’ online interactions: only 29 implicit corrections were found in the eight sessions included in the data, most of them being vocabulary (48%) and grammar (41%) corrections. In contrast, 236 self-corrections were found. The bulk of self-corrections (56%) referred to misspellings of individual words in their previous utterances. The second most frequently corrected type of mistake was flaws in the syntax of students’ turns. Kötter noted that this finding provides some indication of the students’ language awareness and their respective target language competence. An interesting finding was that although the German students participating in this study were more proficient in their L2 than their American counterparts, almost 75% of the self-corrections in the data were made by the American students.

Another study conducted by O’Rourke (2005) in the tandem learning setup analyzed spontaneous interactions of tandem partners during a synchronous exchange based in a MOO. Twenty-six tandem partnerships and eight unpaired German students participated in this study. Both sides of the exchange were second-year undergraduates taking degrees in information and communication technologies and were learning their target language as a compulsory part of their course of study. Negotiations were analyzed according to the home country of the hearer (coded IR for the Irish students or GE for the German students), and according to his or her role with respect to the language of the
trigger utterance, which O’Rourke calls “tandem role”: native speaker (NS) or nonnative speaker (NNS). In contrast to speech-based negotiation studies (e.g., Varonis & Gass, 1985), this study found that MOO users employed more direct than indirect failure signals, which may be due in part to the complete reliance on the verbal channel. O’Rourke also noted that it may have been the case that partners’ awareness of the learning purpose of the exchange and their shared status as learners, led them to use direct failure signals.

The review of the literature in this section has revealed that the majority of the studies in electronic peer feedback have been carried out in adult contexts. However, a study conducted by Morris (2005) examined the types of peer feedback provided by 46 Spanish immersion fifth-grade children who interacted by synchronous chat. Using Blackboard, the instructor randomly paired students and created a chat room for each pair. Each pair was asked to interact and complete a jigsaw activity in their private chat room. All pairs worked on the same jigsaw, a set of pictures that represented La rutina de Esteban (Esteban’s routine). Each dyad member got half of the pictures and were asked to work together to produce one collaborative essay that represented “Esteban’s routine” in 25 minutes. Blackboard recorded the pairs’ interactions which were later coded for types of errors (syntactic, lexical, unsolicited uses of L1) and types of feedback (explicit correction, recasts, and negotiation of form). Results from the analyses showed that the majority of errors (64%) were syntactic, whereas 33% were lexical, and 3% were L1 uses. A chi-square test showed that the differences were statistically significant. Results also showed that 56% of the errors were followed by peer feedback. The majority of feedback moves (58%) followed lexical errors, 40% followed syntactic errors, and 2% followed uses of L1. These differences were statistically significant. As for types of feedback, findings showed that 95% were negotiations, 5% were recasts, and none were explicit corrections. In general, the results showed that when the children in this study engaged in CMC, they provided feedback in response to their peers’ L2 errors. This study fails to explain, however, why students did not provide any corrections in the form of explicit feedback.
3.2.2.1.3. **CMC: Effectiveness of peer feedback**

Other research has attended specifically to the effectiveness of computer-mediated peer feedback in second and foreign language classes. Pellettieri (2000) studied the interaction of 10 dyads of English-speaking intermediate adult students of Spanish in *ytalk*, a UNIX software program that supports synchronous network-based communication. She examined task-based real-time computer interaction by analyzing the modifications that learners made in response to negotiation signals as well as to corrective feedback. The following question was asked: Do the negotiated interactions foster the provision of corrective feedback and the incorporation of target-like forms into subsequent turns? To investigate the effect that negotiated modifications had on the quality of the learner output, negotiation *triggers* containing nontarget forms were calculated. The responses of these routines were then analyzed, first with respect to whether a modification had been made, second, the type of modification made (i.e., lexical, morphosyntactic, or semantic), and third the direction of the modification (i.e., toward the target language or not). For the analysis of incorporations, corrective feedback was identified as being explicit or implicit. Instances of corrective feedback were tallied and evaluated for linguistic type (lexical, morphosyntactic, semantic) and for quality (target-like or not). The total instances of incorporation of both target-like and nontarget-like feedback were similarly tallied. However, in calculating the incorporation rate, a consideration was made for whether or not the learner had the opportunity to incorporate the feedback. Transcripts of the interactions showed that learners were indeed attending to form in their output and produced lexical, syntactic, and semantic modifications in response to negotiations as well as corrective feedback. Findings also revealed that learners incorporated 70% of the target-like explicit feedback and 75% of the target-like implicit feedback where incorporation was possible and conducive to conversation.

The study conducted by Sotillo (2005) also aimed at investigating learner uptake following peer feedback. Transcripts of chat discussions were analyzed and instances of *uptake* (i.e., general learner response to corrective feedback), *successful uptake* (i.e., learner incorporates targeted linguistic form or lexical item into his/her output immediately after corrective feedback or subsequently during negotiation work) and *topic*
continuation (i.e., unsuccessful uptake; learner does not respond and continues with activity at hand) were coded. Findings showed that of the total number of instances of uptake, 63% occurred in the NNS-NNS dyads, of which 58% were successful. Uptake in NS-NNS dyads accounted for 37% of all uptake in both types of dyads. Topic continuation (unsuccessful uptake) was more prevalent in the NNS-NNS dyads than in the NS-NNS dyads (26 instances vs. 7 instances, respectively). In the NS-NNS dyads, successful learner uptake accounted for 31% of all instances of uptake in both groups and for 42% of all instances of successful uptake in the NS-NNS dyads; successful uptake in the NNS-NNS dyads accounted for 44% of all the instances of learner uptake in both groups and 58% in the NNS-NNS dyads. In general, the findings of this study indicate that learner response or uptake occurred in these online interactions. ESL learners not only responded to corrective feedback provided by both NSs and NNSs but also appeared to successfully incorporate corrective feedback by their partners into their subsequent interlanguage production.

However, ESL students also missed some opportunities for error correction. Indeed, 51% of the corrective feedback was neither acknowledged nor incorporated by the learners into their output following the ECEs in NS-NNS and NNS-NNS dyads. The chat logs showed that when negotiating information, ESL learners would often continue to focus on the semantic content of their partner’s electronic message. In contrast, when engaged in problem-solving activities, they would carry on with the task at hand rather than acknowledge or incorporate their partner’s lexical or grammatical corrections into their output. Analysis of length of corrective moves or turns (simple or complex) showed that simple moves, or moves immediately following the learner’s erroneous output characterized the length or duration of most of the corrective moves. Simple moves occurred 82% of the time. In other words, advanced NNSs and NSs collaborating with less experienced L2 learners in the online learning activities provided immediate feedback to the learners. Moves of a more complex nature (i.e., error correction or negative feedback which is spread out beyond one or two moves) accounted for only 18% of the total length or duration of corrective moves. Results from the analyses showed that when either the NS or the more advanced NNS partner extended the provision of corrective feedback beyond two or three moves, the learner often chose to ignore it. This
observation led the researcher to conclude that not taking advantage of opportunities for error correction or delaying error correction in this type of closely focused online interaction diminishes its effectiveness in encouraging learners to incorporate the feedback into their subsequent output.

Morris' (2005) study also investigated the degree to which Spanish immersion school children working in synchronous CMC repaired the original ill-formed utterances following the feedback provided by their peers. Once learners received feedback from their peers, their immediate responses to feedback were coded as repair or not repair. Findings showed that of the 76 feedback moves, 58 (68%) led to learner repair within the error treatment sequence. Of the 52 errors repaired, the majority (71%) were lexical, 25% were syntactic, and 4% were L1 uses. These differences were statistically significant. Data also showed that the highest rate of repair was for lexical errors: 86% of the lexical errors with feedback, 50% of the L1 errors with feedback, and 45% of the syntactic errors with feedback were repaired. Finally the results showed that all repairs resulted from negotiations, and that recasts did not lead to repairs. In contrast to Morris (2005), Pellettieri (2000), and Sotillo (2005), Little et al. (1999) found that there were very few indications that corrections were picked up or recycled in the course of the e-mail exchanges.

Using a control group experimental design, Schultz (2000) compared face-to-face with computer mediated peer feedback by examining the revisions that intermediate and upper-intermediate French students made across their writing in a classroom with a process-oriented approach. The Interchange component of the Daedalus integrated writing component allowed for real-time interaction on a local area network. Students wrote comments about one another’s essays in real time, and they also received a written transcript of these online sessions so that they could more easily draw upon their peers’ comments. Schultz then analyzed essays from a pool of 54 students and conducted attitude surveys across 106 students. Her unit of analysis was the number and type of changes that students made between their rough drafts and their final essays following two types of feedback: that provided in face-to-face discussion and that provided in online real-time discussion.
Schultz found that students made more specific, local changes in the online mode as writers were able to save and follow the detailed suggestions made in writing. However, students made more global changes in the face-to-face mode, which seemed to facilitate more rapid feedback and better exploration of the writer’s intentions and goals. The findings suggest that the computer-mediated discussion focused attention on matters other than content and gave valuable practice in writing. Schultz suggested that different cognitive processes are involved in the two modes. The face-to-face mode is non-linear and interactive, whereas the computer fosters a linear form of discussion.

3.2.2.1.4. CMC: Students’ perceptions of peer feedback

Greenfield (2003) examined secondary ESL students’ attitudes toward and perceptions of a collaborative e-mail exchange between a Form 4 (10th grade) ESL class in Hong Kong and an 11th grade English class in Iowa. The exchange was based on an anthology of student writing that was cooperatively planned, negotiated, and carried out by the ESL and the American students. In particular, after both classes negotiated a topic for an imaginative essay, students wrote their first draft in class and received peer critique in cooperative groups. Students were given 8 minutes to read an essay, 15 minutes to give written comments on the rubric form, and 5 minutes for oral feedback. Essays were exchanged until all group members had read and commented on each essay. Teachers made additional written and verbal comments on first drafts before students sent revisions to their partners by e-mail. Using the same shared rubric, all students gave reciprocal written feedback (via e-mail) on their partners’ essays. Additional drafts were written and revised in respective classes until a final copy was published in the jointly-produced anthology. Data were collected primarily from pre- and post-model surveys and personal interviews at the end of the study. Salient themes that emerged from interview data were categorized and reported. Attitudinal responses, particularly likes and dislikes about the project’s different features, were later quantified. Findings revealed that the activity most frequently mentioned as “least fun” was ‘writing imaginative essays’. The most common reasons were that they took “too much time” and that plots were “difficult to imagine”.
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However, imaginative essay writing ranked fourth in a list of 14 choices for being “most helpful” for learning English and third in a list of 14 choices for being “useful to repeat again”. Greenfield concludes that “this ambivalence shows that Hong Kong students clearly appreciated the fact that academically ‘helpful’ activities are a lot of work” (p. 53). ESL students considered speaking in small groups and getting comments from your Iowa partners about your essay as the most helpful activities for learning English. However, in a list of 15 choices to answer “What were the least fun activities during this project?, getting comments from Iowa partner about your essay was ranked fourth and writing comments to your partner about their essay was ranked 10th. These findings seem to indicate that students enjoyed giving feedback to their partners more than receiving feedback from them.

Quantitative data from pre- and post-surveys showed a small but significant increase in the students’ general confidence in the four skills (“I am confident about my English ability in general, including reading, writing, speaking, and listening”) after exposure to this project ($p=0.031$). As for the usefulness of receiving feedback from their classmates (“My classmates in Hong Kong can help me improve my English writing by discussing my compositions in groups”), on average students reported to be “neutral” in the pre- and post- surveys (means 3.02 and 3.16, respectively), the most frequent reason being “some students are too shy/quiet”. However, one of the least frequently cited reasons ($n=2$) was “cannot correct oral mistakes”. These results seem to indicate that although students had neutral feelings about the usefulness of their classmates’ feedback to improve their English writing, in general they did not question their capacity as peer evaluators.

3.2.2.2. Intercultural learning

Online intercultural projects take as their goal not only the enhancement of learners’ language development but also the enrichment of their cultural and intercultural competence. Early accounts of online collaborative projects (e.g., Cononelos & Oliva, 1993; Warschauer, 1995, 1996) emphasized their potential for supporting intercultural
understanding as well as language acquisition. However, recent research (e.g., Belz, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Müller-Hartmann, 2003; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006; Ware, 2003, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005) has demonstrated that intercultural understanding does not automatically result from contact in synchronous or asynchronous communication.

The studies reported on in this section are divided into two categories: research that focuses on the pedagogical structure and design of online intercultural projects and studies that document the tensions that may arise in such telecollaborative projects.

3.2.2.2.1. Online intercultural projects: Pedagogical structure and design

Researchers in the area of CMC have argued that online exchanges should be part of an integrated process (Gonglewski, 1999; Greenfield, 2003; Pérez, 2003; Warschauer, 1996). This refers not only to the integration of computer technology with L2 methodology, but a more thorough integration of classroom organization, syllabus, and curriculum. As well, instructors and researchers agree that in order to sustain students’ motivation, such projects should consist of a series of tasks (Appel & Gilabert, 2003; Barson et al., 1993; Gray & Stockwell, 1998; O’Dowd, 2003; Ushioda, 2000). In this respect, a number of descriptive reports have focused on the pedagogical structure and design of online intercultural projects. Müller-Hartmann (2000), for example, investigated the role of tasks in promoting intercultural learning in e-mail projects organized between 11th- and 12th-grade high school classes in Germany, the United States and Canada. In particular, this study focused on how task properties, setting, teacher and learner roles, and the structure of interpersonal exchanges affected students’ intercultural learning. The joint reading of literary texts formed the basis for discussion on the networks. Students exchanged posted reader-response e-mail messages discussing their interpretations of the literary texts. Students then had the opportunity to engage in peer-response by questioning or challenging other students’ interpretations and perspectives of the literary texts. Data were gathered from the e-mail exchanges, field notes, interviews, and questionnaires. Findings from qualitative analysis of the data seem to indicate that the joint reading of literature in such a project-oriented approach is one possibility for
ensuring that negotiation of meaning takes place. Furthermore, the task-based approach used in the exchange allowed learners to develop and express their views thus making real communication possible and consequently setting the stage to initiate processes of intercultural learning. Finally, this study showed that the tasks in electronic learning networks supported all aspects of intercultural learning as outlined by Byram (1997): attitude, knowledge, skills, and critical cultural awareness.

Appel and Gilabert (2002) examined the effects of motivation on task performance in tandem e-mail exchanges between one group of university students attending an EFL class at the Communication Studies department in Barcelona and a group attending a class of Spanish as a foreign language in Dublin. The exchange lasted for a full academic year and consisted of four tasks: (1) doing a review of a film in the target language; (2) drawing a route and a budget for a night out in Barcelona (for the Irish students) and in Dublin (for the Spanish students); (3) choosing a current topic of interest and preparing a Power Point presentation; (4) taping from local TV channels a number of advertisements that exemplified the use of stereotypes in their countries and sending them to their tandem partners. The researchers found that the task that produced the most words in the e-mail exchange, *A night out in Barcelona/Dublin*, was also the task that was the most popular. According to Appel and Gilabert, this result may suggest that “the increase in a participation for a more popular task occurs by means of longer messages and perhaps higher engagement with what they write, rather than in more frequent communication between tandem partners” (p. 23). They concluded that resource directing (such as reasoning demands) and resource depleting factors (such as prior knowledge) which belong to task complexity in Robinson’s (2001) model are closely connected to affective variables which, as is the case with motivation, belong to task difficulty. Motivational factors like interest in the meanings to be exchanged, involvement in the discussion-making process, students’ expertise in the topic, media and the materials used, and the diffusion of outcomes among others have strong effects on task performance, and should therefore be considered together with complexity variables.

More recently, O’Dowd (2003) carried out an e-mail exchange between five university students enrolled in a second-year course of English as a foreign language in Spain and five students enrolled in a second-year class of Spanish as a foreign language
in London, with the purpose of investigating which characteristics of e-mail exchanges lead to intercultural learning. Taking into account Byram’s (1997) model of intercultural competence, teachers agreed on a series of tasks, which would serve as a springboard for discussion and interaction. Some of these were based on material already placed online by the Tandem Network, while other activities were adapted from the Cultura project (Furstenberg et al., 2001). As explained by O’Dowd, the tasks reflected the components of Byram’s (1997) model in that they involved interacting with members of the target culture in order to acquire knowledge and subsequently become more aware of the different interpretations of cultural products or practices which members of another culture may have. In some of the tasks, students also had the opportunity to become more aware of their own culture and how it was viewed by members of the foreign culture. For each task, students were required to write at least two messages to their partner. In the first message they were to present their own opinion and in the second they were to discuss and react to the message they had received from their partner. Analyses of field notes, e-mail data, questionnaires, interviews, and peer-group feedback revealed that not only is task important for the development of intercultural communicative competence, as pointed out by Müller-Hartmann (2000), but also the learners’ ability to take part effectively in e-mail exchanges. In particular, O’Dowd found that the students who were able to develop a successful and interculturally rich relationship with their partner had written e-mails which had the following elements: (a) they took into account the socio-pragmatic rules of the partner’s language when writing in that language; (b) apart from the basic information on the topic in question, they also provided their partner with analysis and personal opinions about the topic; (c) they asked questions which encouraged feedback and reflection from their partner; (d) they tried to develop a personal relationship with their partner, as opposed to simply focusing on the tasks they had been given; and (e) they recognized and reacted to the needs and interests of their partners, answering their questions and encouraging them to write more about the topics which interested them. These findings underscore, according to O’Dowd, the need for teachers to take a greater role in helping students in analysing and composing effective e-mails for their foreign partners.
3.2.2.2. Online intercultural communication: Conflict and misunderstanding

A number of recent studies have started to examine the reasons why online intercultural communication between language learners in such projects often fails to achieve the intended pedagogical goals (Belz, 2001, 2002b, 2003; Belz & Müller-Hartmann, 2002, 2003; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd, 2003; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006; Ware, 2003). For instance, Belz’s (2001) examination of a German-American partnership showed how the lower social and economic value of German in the US compared to English in Germany led to a proficiency mismatch between partners. As a result, a lower level of fluency in the foreign language meant that American students often wrote shorter e-mails than the German students. This was interpreted by their partners as a lack of friendliness and motivation and thereby led to negative evaluations of the exchange. A key feature of Belz’s (2001, 2002b) analysis is interpreting these findings by linking structure (e.g., institutional affordances and constraints) and agency (e.g., individual initiative in regard to language learning and use) in students’ interactions. For example, she attributes the brevity of some of the Germans’ e-mails partly to their limited access to the Internet, which made it difficult for them to write outside of class time.

In another study, Belz and Müller-Hartmann (2003) identified four instances of how socioinstitutional affordances and constraints can affect German-American partnerships: (a) the misalignment of academic calendars, (b) culture-specific assessment patterns, (c) differences in the educational backgrounds of each teacher and the particular aims which they each have for the exchange and, (d) the differences which exist between both countries as regards student contact hours and the physical organization of each university. Such differences, the researchers posited, can lead to disagreement on the amount of student work considered appropriate, on the setting of deadlines and on the functionality of online partnerships.

Belz (2003) provided a linguistically grounded analysis of what successful intercultural competence (Byram, 1997) might look like focusing on the interaction of three students (two German and one American). Student messages were analyzed using a range of discourse analytic tools including rates of positive and negative appraisal,
epistemic modality, and question types. Belz found that German interactional style tends to accentuate the information-conveying function of language and notes more negative evaluation in the two Germans' discourse than in the American's. She concluded that learners should retain their "natural" discourse style, but each side crucially needs to become aware of the existence of culturally dominant patterns and how they may affect their intercultural interactions.

Belz's (2003) study was complemented by that of Ware (2003, 2005), whose qualitative study of an exchange between advanced students of English and German in the US and in Germany underscored the connection between the students' communicative choices online and lack of communication. Ware found that Americans asked fewer questions than their partners and also made fewer attempts to establish personal rapport. This type of to-the-point, task-oriented interaction led to what she calls 'missed communication' (i.e., moments of miscommunication, disengagement, or missed opportunities for intercultural learning). Through the examination of in-depth interviews with members of both groups, Ware identified certain social and cultural factors which determined students' online behavior in each case. The first factor was seen to be the different levels of prior experience with online writing. The American group reported being quite used to using digital technologies for communication and learning and was therefore more critical of the technologies than their German partners who were found to be more enthusiastic about what was, for them, a novel way of language learning. A second influential factor was the differing social contexts in which each group was operating. The Germans were seen to be more motivated in their language learning than the Americans due to the different status of English and German in their respective countries. The Americans were also found to be much more grade focused than their counterparts. As such, their level of interaction was much more limited than that of their partners who were more motivated by an intrinsic desire to improve their English and make international contacts. In her study, Ware (2003, 2005) also identified individual differences in motivation as being an important factor in the low functionality of the exchange. Findings showed that success in the asynchronous exchange required students to spend a substantial amount of time reading and replying to correspondence, and this often clashed with the amount of time students had put aside for such an academic
activity. Ware concluded that missed communication can be exacerbated by the CMC medium. For example, the delayed response time and the lack of social consequences for dropping topics in many online contexts allows participants to be less active conversational partners. Furthermore, expectations about appropriate communication in the online medium may pose challenges to the development of intercultural competence; the ability to engage in communication at a deep level of intercultural inquiry may be impeded by an online discourse norm that often favors brevity over sustained attention.

Like Ware (2003, 2005), Thorne (2003) posited that when computer users from different cultures communicate online with one another, they may have different views as to what genre (i.e., discourse type and discourse style) is appropriate for the exchange. These differences play into what Thorne has termed “cultures-of-use” (i.e., norms and attributions that evolve out of everyday use of a medium). As he demonstrated with examples from three case studies of telecollaborative projects, students are influenced by their previous experiences with Internet communication, and these prior uses affect their communicative choices. As well, Thorne found that some of the American students participating in the study felt that e-mail was a much less appropriate medium for personal exchange with peers than instant messaging, and that their personal relationships with e-mail partners improved after switching to instant messaging.

Some of these studies have also looked at the important role which teachers can play in avoiding or dealing with low functionality and misunderstandings in online intercultural projects (Belz, 2002b, 2003; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd & Eberbach, 2004; Ware, 2003; Ware & Kramsch, 2005). These researchers argued that teacher involvement, far from being peripheral in online language learning, has been made even more important, precisely because students engage across complex linguistic and cultural lines in their computer-mediated discourse. For instance, Müller-Hartmann (2000) underscored the need for teachers to be able to identify problematic or provocative correspondence from the partner group which can then be brought into class and discussed in groups or as a whole class. He suggested that it is vital for exchanges to be integrated within the context of regular classes so students can learn to reflect on and learn from their partners’ correspondence. Similarly, Belz (2003) showed how instructors
can help raise their students' awareness of culturally specific discourse styles by showing them how patterns of discourse affect their intercultural interactions.

In a similar vein, O'Dowd and Eberbach (2004) highlighted how students require both support and training in order to participate successfully in online intercultural exchanges. These researchers identified various key tasks which confront teachers who wish to exploit the potential for intercultural learning in online exchanges. These included developing students' awareness of how culture and language are interconnected and training learners how to write effective, culturally rich online messages. Like Müller-Hartmann (2000) and Belz (2003), O'Dowd and Eberbach (2004) posited that teachers must play an active role in the telecollaboration by integrating the exchange into their contact classes and establishing a good working relationship with their partner teacher.

### 3.2.3. Summary

Taken together, the studies reported on in this section suggest that (1) CMC provides an ideal medium for students to benefit from interaction, since the written nature of the discussion allows greater opportunity to attend to and reflect on the form and content of the communication; (2) learners' language proficiency and age differences are important factors to be considered when incorporating institutional CMC; (3) online exchanges should be integrated into the students' regular class activities and consist in a series of tasks; (4) from a linguistic point of view, in online tandem exchanges both partners benefit from the exchange (in terms of receiving input, producing output, and receiving feedback from a native speaker); (5) in tandem partnerships, students' awareness of the learning purpose of the exchange and their shared status as learners leads them to use direct failure signals; (6) intercultural understanding does not automatically result from contact in synchronous or asynchronous communication; (7) dysfunction in online exchange has been attributed to a number of factors related to the students and the sociocultural contexts in which they are operating; (8) the teacher plays an important role in avoiding or dealing with low functionality and misunderstandings in online intercultural projects; (9) few studies have been conducted on secondary L2
learners; (10) little attention has been given to how or why learners might differentially invest in online projects; (11) more research needs to be conducted on the benefits of NS feedback in e-mail tandem exchanges; (12) research has virtually neglected the intra-national pairing of learners of different L1s.

3.2.4. Review of the literature: Implications for this study

This chapter has reviewed relevant literature that informed this study. In the first section, I reported on relevant research on revision and peer feedback into the process approach to writing. It was argued that peer review holds considerable promise as a viable tool in writing instruction at multiple levels. Aside from its potential to help students develop audience awareness and improve writing through negotiating (Zhu, 2001), peer review emerges as a favorable instructional environment for readers and writers to work within their respective ZPDs (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998).

Certain limitations relative to the research on revision and peer feedback were outlined as well. Indeed, the majority of the studies reviewed occurred at the college level, with few in K-12 language classes. This fact raises questions about the generalizability of the findings to younger language learners who may differ in motivation, learning style and ability, and instructional context.

In the second section of this chapter, I outlined the research on computers and second language learning, focusing more specifically on e-mail tandem learning. This research has suggested some potential benefits to using tandem learning in the language classroom including increased exposure to comprehensible input, increased opportunities for peer feedback, and increased production of ‘pushed’ output. It was also argued that compared with other situations in which learners and native speakers communicate, in tandem partnerships both partners are in the role of learners and may thus have equal opportunities to benefit from the exchange.

Research has also suggested that intercultural understanding does not automatically result from contact in synchronous or asynchronous communication.
Dysfunction in online exchange has been attributed to a number of factors related to the students and the sociocultural contexts in which they are operating: recent studies have underscored the important role the teacher plays in avoiding or dealing with low functionality and misunderstandings in such intercultural projects.

Despite the fact that a great deal of attention has been paid to CMC from both pedagogical and theoretical perspectives, many areas remain underexplored, while other aspects are unexplored. First, there have been few studies exploring the use of online language learning among secondary L2 learners. Secondly, the strategies (other than corrective feedback) used by NSs to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners have not been investigated. Thirdly, little attention has been given to the resources used by students when composing their e-mails. Fourthly, more research needs to be conducted on the benefits of NS feedback in e-mail tandem exchanges. Fifthly, little attention has been given as to how or why learners might differentially invest in online projects. Finally, there is a lack of empirical research on teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool in school contexts.

Building on existing research and informed by a sociocultural perspective to language learning, the present study attempted to rectify this situation, through the examination of project-based, e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. In particular, the present study sought to investigate (a) the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool.
Summary

This chapter reviewed relevant literature that informed this study. First, it presented a review of the research focusing on revision and peer feedback in the process approach to writing. Next, the general application of computers in L2 learning was discussed, followed by a review of tandem language learning. Finally, research on computer-mediated communication was reported on. Following this review, the implications of the previous research for this study were presented. The following chapter documents the research methods that were used in this study.
CHAPTER IV

METHOD

4.0. Introduction

This section documents the research methods that were used in this study. First, the overall research design is presented, followed by the description of the participants, the institutional contexts and the e-mail tandem project design. Then, in separate sections, each of the types of data and procedures of data collection is described. Finally, the research questions and procedures for data analysis are explained.

4.1. Research design

As explained in the previous sections, the current study sought to investigate (a) the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool.

This study falls within the definition of a qualitative approach in that it sought to explore the issues mentioned above without controlling or manipulating the research setting. According to Patton (1990), qualitative research “is an effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context” (p.1). In addition, as Merriam (2002) explains, qualitative research “attempts to understand and make sense of phenomena from the participant’s perspective” (p. 6).
There are three major sources of data for a qualitative research study: interviews, observations and documents (Merriam, 2002). As will be explained in detail in section 4.4., the data for this study included written documents (i.e., e-mails, first and revised drafts of reports and reflection forms), observations, and interviews. In addition, quantitative data were derived from analyses of certain aspects of the written documents and the questionnaires. The information obtained from these various sources proved useful for the purposes of triangulation of the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Within the parameters of qualitative research, the case study approach was used in this research project. By concentrating upon a single phenomenon or entity, this approach seeks to describe the phenomenon in depth (Stake, 1995). In the present research project, the case study focused on two groups of students involved in an e-mail exchange. Additional data were obtained by interviewing six students in each of the classes.

4.2. Institutional contexts

The research reported on in this thesis involved two secondary schools: a Francophone high school in Quebec and an Anglophone high school in Ontario. The ESL group was located in a public high school in the province of Quebec. The school consisted of two buildings, one for the first cycle (Secondary 1, 2 and 3), and one for the second cycle (Secondary 4 and 5). As reported by the ESL teacher, Catherine Dubé, there were about 1150 students and most came from Francophone families. The school had two networked computer rooms, each with 17 computers. The computers were located along the walls of the room, one station behind the other one. Teachers were asked to reserve the computer rooms in advance and were not allowed to reserve both for the same date. Reservations were done via e-mail. Students were also allowed to have access to the labs during lunch time. The students in the ESL group were enrolled in the Core ESL, secondary 4 program. At the time of this study, the ESL program for the second cycle was in transition. This program, which was officially an objectives-based program (i.e., the four skills were taught separately), was moving into the competency-based program.
that was already in use in the first cycle (*Programme de formation de l’école québécoise: Enseignement secondaire, premier cycle. Version approuvée, 2001*). As reported by the ESL teachers who participated in this study (Catherine Dubé and David Connolly), they were well aware of these changes and tried to incorporate them into the secondary 4 English class. In the new Quebec Ministry of Education’s ESL program, one of the objectives stressed was the use of ICTs as a source of information and as a means for authentic communication with native speakers.

The FSL group was located in a public high school situated in the province of Ontario. As reported by the FSL teacher, Callie Mady, the school consisted of 2300 students, from Grades 9 to 12, who came from a variety of ethnic backgrounds. The school had one networked computer room with 30 computers. The computers were located side by side along the walls of the room. Teachers were only allowed to reserve seven times during the course of an academic year. However, there was also a computer room at the library with 30 computers, that the teacher could reserve unlimited times. Reservations for this computer room were made by signing up on the reservation book. Just outside this computer room, there were another 18 computers for students to use without any reservation.

The FSL students were enrolled in the Core FSL, Grade 11 program. According to the Ontario Curriculum, the *Core French, Grade 11 program* drew on a variety of themes to promote extensive development of reading and writing skills and to reinforce oral communication skills. Students gained a greater understanding of French-speaking cultures in Canada and around the world through their reading of a variety of materials, including a short novel or a play. Students produced various written assignments, including a formal essay. The use of correct grammar and appropriate language conventions in both spoken and written French was emphasized throughout the course. The role of technology in the FSL curriculum included both the use of French computer programs as a source of language practice and information, and the use of the Internet as a means of communication with French native speakers (*The Ontario Curriculum: Grades 11 and 12, 2000*). The FSL students who participated in this study were registered in the International Baccalaureate (IB). The FSL teacher reported that this school “forces them
[students registered in the IB program] to take French. The program is academically demanding. It also demands more community hours. They have to do 150 hours of service. Also, they have to do an essay so it’s more academically demanding than other programs” (FSL teacher/Callie Mady, interview; April 7, 2005). According to the school’s promotional and informational website, to be accepted in the IB program, candidates must meet the following requirements:

- Be a dedicated, motivated student who demonstrates intellectual curiosity and zest for learning.
- Accept challenges readily and demonstrate personal initiative.
- Be able to learn independently, while demonstrating strong interpersonal and cooperative skills essential to effective team-building.
- Display solid academic potential, high academic standing (honors' student: 80-85% minimum average) and a broad range of academic and other interests.
- Grade 8 students applying should have at least 80% in English and Mathematics
- Display an excellent command of spoken and written language and a commitment to second-language (French) learning.
- Be actively involved in the extracurricular life of the school and the broader community and demonstrate a capacity and willingness to assume a leadership position.
- Have a global perspective with an interest in international issues and demonstrate an appreciation of sensitivity to other cultures and perspectives.

During the end-of-study interview, the FSL teacher acknowledged that most students in the IB program were academically-oriented and that many of them wanted to become doctors, in part by family pressure. However, she reported that her students were not necessarily more motivated to learn French than students in the regular program. Thus, in response to the following question, she commented:

*Researcher:* In your opinion, are students registered in the International Baccalaureate programme generally more interested in learning French than students registered in the regular program?
FSL teacher: Not necessarily. I think part of the reason students are drawn into the program is because there are opportunities to get good marks, which can get them scholarships. And I think it’s part of their motivation. Because they write their exam as a world-wide exam. So the Americans write the same exam, on the same day. The people in Europe write the same exam on the same day. And I think that in terms of French, Canada can perform better than some other countries. So therefore students can perform well. Because they’ve had more opportunities to learn French than maybe someone in the United States.

4.3. Participants

This study involved one group of ESL secondary 4 students, two groups of FSL Grade 11 students and their L2 teachers.

4.3.1. ESL and FSL students

One group of 30 intermediate-level French-speaking ESL students in a secondary school (Secondary 4) in Quebec was paired up with two groups of intermediate-level English-speaking FSL students (total 30) in a secondary school (Grade 11) in Ontario. Four students in the ESL class were secondary 5 students taking secondary 4 English. One of the FSL groups consisted of Grade 12 students who had not taken French the previous academic year. For this reason, both FSL groups were taking the same Grade 11 FSL program and were taught by the same teacher.

Before the e-mail exchange commenced, all students were given a background questionnaire (see Appendix A for the ESL students and B for the FSL students) that touched upon their general, personal and linguistic backgrounds as well as their computer skills. Students were asked to express their preference regarding the gender of the student they wished to communicate with. Pairing up of students was established on the basis of age and gender-expressed preference. Both groups consisted of the same number of boys
(n=14) and girls (n=16) aged 15 to 17. The average age of the ESL and FSL students was 15.6 and 16.4, respectively. Student profiles are shown in Table I.

### Table I.
**Profile of participants**

| Tandem partnerships | ESL students | | | FSL students | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Age | Gender | Age |
| 1 | F | 15 | M | 15 |
| 2 | F | 15 | M | 16 |
| 3 | F | 15 | M | 15 |
| 4 | M | 16 | M | 17 |
| 5 | F | 15 | M | 16 |
| 6 | F | 15 | M | 16 |
| 7 | F | 16 | M | 17 |
| 8 | M | 17 | M | 17 |
| 9 | M | 16 | F | 17 |
| 10 | F | 15 | M | 16 |
| 11 | F | 15 | M | 17 |
| 12 | M | 16 | M | 17 |
| 13 | M | 16 | F | 17 |
| 14 | M | 15 | F | 16 |
| 15 | M | 17 | F | 17 |
| 16 | F | 15 | M | 17 |
| 17 | F | 15 | F | 16 |
| 18 | F | 16 | F | 16 |
| 19 | M | 16 | F | 17 |
| 20 | M | 15 | F | 17 |
| 21 | F | 15 | F | 16 |
| 22 | F | 16 | M | 16 |
| 23 | M | 15 | F | 17 |
| 24 | F | 17 | F | 17 |
| 25 | F | 15 | F | 16 |
| 26 | M | 15 | F | 16 |
| 27 | F | 17 | M | 17 |
| 28 | M | 15 | F | 16 |
| 29 | M | 16 | F | 16 |
| 30 | M | 17 | F | 17 |

All the ESL students and their parents were native French speakers. With the exception of two students, all of them had a computer at home and most of them (83.3%) had an Internet connection. Most of them reported feeling “very comfortable” (63.3%) or “comfortable” (23.3%) when using e-mail. Three students (10%) reported using computers for e-mail “every day”, nine (30%) “very often”, and nine (30%) “often”. Four
students (13.3%) reported “almost never” using e-mail, and 5 (16.7%) “never”. Only one (3.3%) student reported having already corresponded with a native English speaker by e-mail. Only three (10%) students reported having gone to a summer camp in English but most (73.3%) reported having travelled to a place where English was spoken. Most students reported “never” (43.3%) or “almost never” (50%) speaking with English speakers outside of school. With respect to the importance given to learning English, nineteen students (63.3%) considered it “very important”, 10 (33.3%) “important”, and only one student (3.3%) considered it “more or less important”. When asked how they considered their level of written English, nine (30%) of them said it was “very good”, ten (33.3%) “good”, nine (30%) “fair”, and two (6.7%) “poor”. With respect to their level of oral English, three (10%) students said it was “very good”, twelve (40%) “good”, nine (30%) “fair”, and six (20%) “poor”. Finally, most of them (90%) reported believing that the e-mail tandem project could help them improve their English.

The two FSL classes consisted of 25 students born in Canada, four in India, and one in Jamaica. For five students, the first language learnt at home was not English. However, the years they had been studying in an English-speaking school ranged from 9 to 14 years. English was their parents’ mother tongue in 50% of the cases. All FSL students reported having a computer and an Internet connection at home. Similarly to the ESL group, most of the FSL students reported feeling “very comfortable” (73.3%) or “comfortable” (6.7%) when using e-mail. However, they used the e-mail more often than their francophone counterparts. Almost half of the group (40%) reported using computers for e-mail “every day”, and 60% of them reported using it “very often” (n=11), or “often” (n=7). Only two (6.7%) students in this group reported having already corresponded with a native French speaker by e-mail and three (10%) students reported having gone to a summer camp in French. However, twenty students (66.7%) reported having travelled to a place where French is spoken. Over 80% reported “never” (46.7%) or “almost never” (40%) speaking with French speakers outside of school. Eleven students (36.7%) considered learning French “very important”, nine (30%) “important”, nine (30%) “more or less important”, and one (3.3%) “not important”. Six (20%) of them considered their level of written French to be “very good”, twelve (40%) “good”, seven (23.3%) “fair”, and five (16.7%) “poor”. With respect to their level of oral French, five (16.7%) students
said it was “very good”, twelve (40%) “good”, six (20%) “fair”, and seven (23.3%) “poor”. Finally, like their tandem partners, most of them (96.7%) considered that the e-mail tandem project could help them improve their French.

4.3.2. ESL and FSL teachers

The ESL class was initially taught by Catherine Dubé. For personal reasons, after the Christmas vacation Catherine had to take a leave of absence from her classes. For this reason, David Connolly substituted for Catherine and collaborated in the project from January 12 to April 5, the last day of the project. The two FSL classes were taught by Callie Mady.

Catherine

At the time of this study, Catherine had recently graduated from a BA in TESL program and had been teaching ESL for only two years. She got interested in participating in this project as she viewed it as an opportunity to not only provide her students with authentic communication with native English speakers, but also to incorporate peer feedback as part of the writing process.

David

David held a degree in TESL and at the time of this study, he had been teaching ESL in secondary school for five years, after several years of teaching ESL to adults. Prior to becoming involved in this e-mail tandem project, David had never organized an e-mail project in his classes before. The fact that this type of project was a novelty for him and that Catherine had showed her enthusiasm for it made him initially view it as a
good opportunity to get ideas for future exchanges. Like Catherine, David valued this project for the authentic contact with native English speakers.

**Callie**

At the time of this study, Callie had been teaching FSL for 17 years, of which two in the IB programme. Callie was concerned about the little interest that many of their students had in learning French. As she explained, this challenge motivated her to find ways to make the studying of FSL relevant to her students. As she reported, she got interested in this e-mail tandem project because it represented an opportunity for her students to communicate with native French speakers.

4.4. My role as researcher

I became interested in the idea of tandem learning during my M.A. studies. I was particularly interested by the potential benefits of this type of online communication. Indeed, the review of the CMC literature had revealed to me that compared to other situations in which L2 learners and native speakers communicate and where the former are usually the only beneficiaries, in the case of tandem learning both partners are in the role of learners and thus may both benefit from the exchange. Drawing on this interest, my M.A. study (Priego, 2002) examined the nature of the interaction and the provision of feedback in the context of e-mail tandem exchanges between university students of Spanish and French as a foreign language. Similarly to previous studies in the area of online tandem learning involving adult learners (e.g., Appel, 1997; Kötter, 2002; Little et al., 1999), my M.A. study revealed that due to the nature of tandem exchanges (i.e., where critique is part of the task), all the participants provided explicit corrective feedback to their tandem partners.

Drawing on this previous research, the present study was motivated by my interest in investigating if L2 secondary school students could assume the role of “tutor” and thus
provide corrective feedback to their tandem partners as had been observed in studies involving adult learners. During the present study, I mainly positioned myself as a participant observer (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Merriam, 2002). Observations were only done in the ESL classroom since I was located in Quebec city (for further comments see section 4.6.1).

4.5. Pilot project

Prior to conducting the present study, a pilot project was carried out with the collaboration of one ESL (Catherine Dubé) and two FSL teachers (one of whom was Callie Mady). Catherine and Callie also participated in the present research project. This pilot project was conducted during the school term, from February 4th to May 5th, 2004. During this collaboration, my role was limited to working with the teachers to plan the tasks. The teachers were in charge of all the instructions and activities. This collaboration was useful in terms of working out certain tasks used in the project presented here.

4.6. E-mail tandem project design for this study

The present study was conducted during the 2004-2005 academic year, from November 4, 2004 to April 12, 2005. Following the recommendation of similar previous studies (e.g., Gonglewski, 1999; Greenfield, 2003; Pérez, 2003; Warschauer, 1996), in order to ensure accountability of the students, this e-mail tandem project was integrated into the students' regular class activities. In addition, in order to sustain students' motivation, the e-mail project consisted of a series of tasks (Appel & Gilabert, 2003; Barson et al., 1993; Gray & Stockwell, 1998; Hedderich, 1997; Ushioda, 2000). For an overview of the tasks included in this project see Table II.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>PART I- TASK 1 - Send “Hello” e-mail (50% in French, 50% in English). After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>PART I- TASK 2 - Reply to your tandem partner’s “Hello” e-mail (50% in French, 50% in English). After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **3** | PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #1. Use **reader response form** (blue sheets).  
PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article.  
PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **4** | PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2. Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French.  
PART V. TASKS 1 to 5. Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **5** | PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2. In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use **report form #1-Draft 2** (green sheets). |
| **6** | PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #2. Use **reader response form** (blue sheets).  
PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article.  
PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **7** | PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2. Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French.  
PART V. TASKS 1 to 5. Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **8** | PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2. In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use **report form #2-Draft 2** (green sheets). |
| **9** | PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #3. Use **reader response form** (blue sheets).  
PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article.  
PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **10** | PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2. Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French.  
PART V. TASKS 1 to 5. Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
| **11** | PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2. In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use **report form #3-Draft 2** (green sheets). |
| **12** | PART VII. TASKS 1 to 4. Send « good bye/thank you » e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use **reflection form** (yellow sheets). |
**B) PREPARING THE FINAL ORAL PRESENTATION**

| 13 | **PART VII. TASK 5.** Read your tandem partner's good-bye e-mail. **PART VIII. TASKS 1 to 4.** Take one oral presentation note-taking form (pink sheets). Compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Ontario for each of the articles you discussed. |
| 14 | **PART IX. TASKS 1 and 2.** Prepare your oral presentation. |
| 15 | **PART IX. TASK 4.** Oral presentation in teams. |

On the first day of the project, the ESL and FSL teachers participating in the study introduced the project to the students. Students received a binder containing the description of the project (See Appendix C for the ESL students and D for the FSL students) and all the tasks sheets pertaining to the project. Each task sheet was of a different color to facilitate its identification. The teachers also showed students how to use the WebCT (Web Course Tools) technology that served as the software platform during this project. Over the course of the project, students were asked to read three articles. The selection of readings was done with the collaboration of the ESL and FSL teachers (See Table III).

**Table III**

**Articles read by the ESL and the FSL students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
For each of these three articles, students were required to complete a *reader response form* (See Appendix E for the ESL students and F for the FSL students) in which they identified several points they found of interest in the article they read and gave their opinion about it, trying to illustrate their point of view taking examples from their personal experience. They also wrote down several questions they would ask their partners in order to find out their opinion about the topic they had read about. Prior to sending their e-mails, topics drawn from the assigned reading were discussed in teams in their respective L2 classes. When working in teams, students were expected to help each other to understand the text better. Consequently, they were asked to note down points raised by their peers. Students then sent their partners an e-mail using their reader response forms. When they received an e-mail from their partner, they reacted to their partner’s message. Students were also instructed to discuss on a topic of their choice if they had leftover time.

Following the principles of tandem learning (Appel, 1997, 1999; Brammerts, 1996), students were instructed to compose their e-mails both in their target language (L2) and in their first language (L1). However, based on observations done during the pilot project, an adjustment to the traditional 50/50 use of the students’ first language and target language, as has been suggested in the tandem language learning literature, was made. During this previous collaboration, it was observed that it would be preferable for both groups of students to write about the L2 text they had read, to give their opinion and ask for their partners’ opinions about the article’s topic in their L2, but to respond to their tandem partners’ questions in their L1. In this way, students could more easily use the input provided by their partners to write their reports in their L2. Students were also explicitly instructed to correct the mistakes made by their tandem partners in previous correspondence. Students could use their L1 or their L2 when correcting their partners’ mistakes. Following the suggestion given by DiGiovanni and Nagaswami (2001) and Schwienhorst (2003), after students corrected their partners’ first e-mail, the L2 teacher used printouts of selected students’ e-mails as a training tool to sensitize them to effective ways to give feedback. After sending their e-mails, students were asked to use a

---

2 For the purpose of this study, L1 will be used to refer to the language of schooling (i.e., English for the FSL students and French for the ESL students).
reflection form to reflect on strategies and processes used in composing their messages (See Appendix G for the ESL students and H for the FSL students).

In keeping with writing process pedagogy, students were instructed to keep all their e-mails in their binder. In the case of the ESL group, printouts of the e-mails were sometimes done at the school computer lab. At other times, the researcher did the printouts for the students. As for the FSL students, printouts were done at the school computer lab. Following the discussion of each topic, students were instructed to write a report (a minimum of half a page) in which they compared and contrasted their opinions with those of their tandem partner regarding the topic they had read about in their L2. They then sent this report by e-mail to their partners and asked them to correct it. Students were next instructed to rewrite their reports (on the Report form – Draft 2), using the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and to make any other changes they deemed appropriate (See Appendix I for the ESL students and J for the FSL students). As had been done in the case of provision of feedback, after students had sent their reports for the first article, teachers selected one of the best reports and used it as a “training tool” for revising their reports. This “model” included the original report sent by e-mail by one of the students in the class, the feedback provided by his/her tandem partner, and the revised version of the report.

At the end of the project, students were asked to prepare a final oral presentation in teams in which they compared their opinions on the three topics they had discussed with those of their counterparts (See Appendix K for the ESL students and L for the FSL students). This final oral presentation was presented in front of the whole group. A detailed calendar of activities is presented in Table IV.
## Table IV
### Calendar of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FSL</strong></td>
<td><strong>ESL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 4</td>
<td>Teachers introduced the project to the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td><strong>PART I - TASK 1</strong> Send “Hello” e-mail. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td><strong>PART I - TASK 2</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s “Hello” e-mail. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 25</td>
<td>Read and reply your partner’s e-mail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 9</td>
<td><strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 16</td>
<td>Read your correct partner’s report and give him/her feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 20</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #1 - Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td><strong>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, read article #2. Use reader response form (blue sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td><strong>PART III. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> In class, sit with your team and talk about the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 13</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-A. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 20</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #2-Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDTERM EXAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #2-Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, read article #3. Use reader response form (blue sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART III. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> In class, sit with your team and talk about the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 24</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-A. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.1. Procedures for starting off the study

I first established communication with Catherine Dubé and Callie Mady by e-mail and explained the procedures for carrying out the study. I then met with the ESL class involved in the study. As the project was part of the regular class work, Catherine distributed the binder containing the description of the project and all the tasks sheets pertaining to the project (for contents, see Appendix C) and explained what the e-mail tandem project consisted of. I distributed participant consent forms and answered student questions. As for the FSL class, I sent the binders (for contents, see Appendix D), background information questionnaires, and consent forms to Callie by mail. She
distributed them in class and sent them back to me. During this project, I attended the ESL classes in the Quebec school on days when the project was being done. When observing in the classroom, my main objective was to take notes on how the project was carried out by the teacher. However, due to the school constraints with respect to the number of computers available in each computer lab, on the days students wrote their e-mails, the ESL teacher divided the class in half, allowing one group to work in the lab with me for the first "shift" while the other group worked in the classroom with the teacher. At the end of the first 30 minutes, the two groups switched places so that everyone had the chance to do the same work. Although I positioned myself mainly as a participant observer while in the lab, I also responded to students’ questions regarding the tasks or the language. As well, I helped students to deal with technical problems with WebCT and to show them how to make use of the digital resources offered by this platform such as the HTML editor to modify the size and color of letters. Finally, during the course of the project, I kept constant communication with the teachers and served as a link between them.

4.7. Data collection

Data, collected over a 18-week period during the 2004-2005 academic year, were obtained from four main sources: written documents (4.7.1), observations (4.7.2.), questionnaires (4.7.3), and interviews (4.7.4). Data from these various sources were gathered in the context of regular class activities.

4.7.1. Written documents

Data from written documents were gathered from different sources: (a) e-mails, (b) first and revised drafts of reports based on each of the three readings and (c) reflection forms. As explained in section 4.3, e-mail exchanges were carried out using a WebCT site. WebCT was selected for the present study because (a) it integrates a range of
communication tools, including a bulletin board, private e-mail, and calendar available only to the students, teachers of the involved groups, and the researcher, (b) it ensures the privacy of the student from external parties, (c) it facilitates the teachers’ monitoring of class progress, (d) it has huge capacity of storage of messages, (e) it allows the researcher to have access to all the students’ e-mails, facilitating research data collection, (f) it provides a student’s profile containing statistical data that may be useful for the study (e.g., quantity of e-mails sent, read, and replied to; date of the first and last connection), and (g) it can be accessed from almost any computer connected to the Internet.

In accordance with the project design, students were required to send a minimum of 10 e-mails. In addition, for each of the selected readings, students were required to send a report to their tandem partners and then revise it based on the feedback received. Comparison of first and revised drafts allowed me to observe the degree of incorporation of feedback provided by their tandem partners. In addition, students were asked to complete a reflection form after sending their e-mails. This reflection form provided information as to the resources used by students while composing their e-mails. This information also shed light on the investment of the students during the course of this project.

4.7.2. Observations

Observational data represent “a firsthand encounter with the phenomenon of interest rather than a second hand account obtained in an interview” (Merriam, 2002, p. 13). During this project, I attended ESL classes in the Quebec school on days when the project was being done. My main objective was to take notes on how the project was carried out by the teacher. Observations could not be done in the FSL classroom in Ontario as I was located in Quebec City.
4.7.3. Questionnaires

The participants in this study answered two different questionnaires. The background information questionnaire (see Appendix A for the ESL students and B for the FSL students) was administered before the commencement of the project. This questionnaire touched upon their general, personal and linguistic backgrounds as well as their computer skills. It also served to identify students’ motivations for learning the target language and their initial perception of the usefulness of the tandem exchange as a L2 learning tool. The last item in the questionnaire asked students to express their preference regarding the gender of the student they wished to communicate with. As mentioned in section 4.3.1., pairing up of students was established on the basis of age and gender-expressed preference.

The end-of-project questionnaire (See Appendix M for the ESL students and N for the FSL students) was administered during the last week of the project. It sought to obtain information on the following issues: (a) the students’ use of resources when composing their e-mails, (b) the students’ attitudes to giving feedback to their tandem partners, (c) the students’ perceptions and reactions to the kind of feedback they received from their tandem partners, (e) the students’ general reasons for learning the target language, (f) the students’ opinions about the topics discussed, the e-mail exchanges, and the project in general.

Both questionnaires included Likert-type and yes-no or yes-no-I can’t remember/I can’t say items. Each was phrased in the form of a statement. For the Likert-type items, 5 options were given, ranging, for instance, from “I strongly disagree” to “I strongly agree”. Some open-ended questions were also included. Both questionnaires were administered during the first portion of a regular class period to ensure that students had adequate time to respond to them. Both questionnaires were administered in the students’ L1 to reduce rate of nonresponse due to language problems.
4.7.4. Interviews

One of the advantages of interviews within qualitative research is that the researcher can clarify and check with respondents for accuracy of interpretation (Merriam, 2002). Within qualitative research (e.g., Cresswell, 1998; Lessard-Hébert, Goyette & Boutin, 1996; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Merriam, 2002; Patton, 1990), interviews can be carried out in various ways. As Merriam (2002) explains, there are three types of interviews. In a highly structured interview, specific questions and the order in which they are asked are determined ahead of time. By contrast, in an unstructured interview, one has topic areas to explore but neither the questions nor the order are predetermined. As Merriam explains, most interviews fall somewhere in between. The semi-structured interview contains a mix of more or less structured questions. In such instances, specific information is usually desired from all the participants; this forms the structured section of the interview. However, the larger part of the interview is guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored, and neither the exact wording nor the order of the questions is determined ahead of time (Merriam, 2002).

In this study, I conducted one semi-structured, open-ended interview with a limited number of selected ESL and FSL students at the end of the project. Semi-structured interviews are well suited for case studies because they include specific, well-defined questions determined in advance, while at the same time allow for elaboration of responses on subsidiary questions. They are also useful tools for eliciting opinions, feelings, and values (Merriam, 2002; Patton, 1990). As research question #4 sought to investigate to what degree students invested in this project, interviews were conducted with three students who were very interested and three who were not very interested, in each of the two sites. This selection was based on the teachers and my observations of students as well as on information gleaned from e-mail messages and other documents.

The information gained from the interviews provided for a more comprehensive case study of students. The interviews were conducted in the students' L1 so they could express themselves with ease and lasted 15-20 minutes. In the interviews, I sought to determine whether the students found the e-mail tandem project beneficial, if they used
the feedback provided by their tandem partners when revising their reports, and if they used other resources to compose their e-mails. I also asked students to talk about their attitudes and motivation in regard to learning the L2, in general, and to participating in the e-mail exchange, in particular. More specifically, the student interview included the following sections and sub-sections (See Appendix O for the ESL students and P for the FSL students):

I. Background
   a. Schooling
   b. Language learning history

II. French /English class

III. Tandem exchange
   a. Communication with tandem partner
   b. Tasks
   c. Feedback
   d. Resources

IV. Specific questions for individual students

The teachers were also interviewed with the purpose of investigating their perceptions of the usefulness of this e-mail tandem project as a language learning tool. More specifically, the teacher interview included the following sections and sub-sections (See Appendix Q for the ESL teachers and R for the FSL teacher):

I. E-mail tandem project
   a. Context
   b. Communication with tandem partner
   c. Tasks
   d. Feedback
   e. General perception
   f. Questions about specific students (i.e., case study students)

II. Approach to teaching English

III. Background
I conducted the interviews with the ESL teachers on April 1 and with the ESL students on April 12. In order to conduct interviews with the FSL students and teachers, I travelled to Ontario; interviews were conducted on April 7.

4.8. Overview of the e-mail tandem exchange: Database

In order to provide a general overview of how the e-mail tandem exchange unfolded, quantitative analyses of the frequency and number of e-mails were conducted. The quantitative assessment of the frequency in terms of the number of days on which e-mails were sent and the total number of e-mails sent by both groups during the project (as more than one e-mail may have been sent on the same day) is presented in a Table (see section 5.1.1).

These findings were complemented with the analysis of the quantity of writing as measured by the total number of words and the average number of words per e-mail. T-tests were performed on the means and standard deviations of paired samples in order to determine whether or not there were significant differences in terms of the number of e-mails sent by the two groups. The total number of e-mails sent by each student was then compared to the minimum number of e-mails required. As well, the total number of words written by each student was compared to the group’s average. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.1).

4.9. Research questions and data analysis

The following sections present the research questions investigated in this study. In each of the corresponding sections, the data sources and the methods of data analysis for each question will be explained.
4.9.1. **Research question #1**: What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?

The purpose of this question was to find out which strategies ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners. The term *scaffolding*, which has its origins in Vygotsky's (1978, 1986) concept of zone of proximal development, has been traditionally used in the literature (Bruner, 1978; Rogoff, 1990; Searle, 1984; Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) to refer to the kind of help that a more expert partner provides to a less skillful one in collaborative problem solving.

In the present study, scaffolding was defined as the strategies used by students to assist their tandem partners to extend their current L2 skills and knowledge. This assistance may enable an L2 student, as originally posited by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976), to “carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts” (p.90). In other words, within the context of the present study, tandem partners in the role of NS tutor and NNS learner were expected to provide guided support to each other through the e-mail interaction with the purpose of helping each other achieve task goals (e.g., improve their L2 written skills, understand the texts, and revise the reports). Data to answer this question were gathered through the analysis of the e-mails sent by the ESL and the FSL students. For this question, there were three levels of analysis: (1) scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students; (2) direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (*tu/vous*); (3) use of affordances offered by digital technologies.

**4.9.1.1. Scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students**

In order to prepare for the data analysis, all e-mails were photocopied and stored in a binder with dividers for each of the tandem partnerships. The taxonomy used to code the e-mails was adapted from Villamil and Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of substrategies for providing scaffolding. Villamil and Guerrero’s taxonomy was chosen because it...
provides a sufficiently wide range of strategies with a limited number of categories. In Villamil and Guerrero’s study, which examined the strategies employed by English as a foreign language (EFL) students to facilitate the peer revision process, “providing scaffolding” was one of the five different mediating strategies used by students in order to cope with task demands. Their taxonomy included the following categories: requesting advise, advising, responding to advise, eliciting, responding to elicitation, reacting, requesting clarification, clarifying, restating, announcing, justifying, instructing, giving directives, and making phatic comments. For the present study, Villamil and Guerrero’s scheme was adapted as follows:

(1) Definitions of some categories were adapted to better fit the data of the present study (advising, reacting, requesting clarification, giving explicit feedback, instructing, requesting advice, clarifying).

(2) Some categories were added (checking comprehension, giving implicit feedback, face-giving strategies) drawing on taxonomies and definitions from Mendonça and Johnson (1994), Morris (2005), Sotillo (2000), Stanley (1992), and Zhu (2001).

(3) Other categories were added based on my own database (offering help with L2 writing, asking for feedback, face-saving strategies, thanking, and responding to apologies).

(4) One category used by Villamil and Guerrero to categorize scaffolding (making phatic comments) was not present in my database because of the nature of my study (i.e., e-mail exchanges), and was therefore dropped.

(5) Two categories in Villamil and Guerrero’s taxonomy (justifying and responding to elicitation) were regrouped under the category responding to elicitation.

(6) Although in Villamil and Guerrero’s study there was a writer (whose composition would be revised) and a reader (whose task was to help the author revise his/her paper) in each dyad, strategies used by the reader and writer in their study were not coded separately. In the e-mail tandem project, writing in both languages gave students an opportunity to present themselves both as language learners (non-native speaker role) as well as language tutors (native-speaker role). In order to better understand this reciprocal relationship, strategies were coded separately for the two roles: the non-native speaker (NNS) learner role and the native-speaker (NS) tutor role.
Based on the analysis of the data, when taking the role of the *NS tutor*, students advised, elicited, reacted, requested clarification, offered help with L2 writing, gave explicit feedback, used face-giving strategies, gave directives, and responded to directives/apologize.

When taking the role of the *NNS learner*, students requested advice, responded to advice, responded to elicitation, clarified, asked for feedback, used face-saving strategies, thanked, gave directives, responded to directives/apologized and responded to apologies.

A third role was also identified in instances where students did not position themselves either as NS tutor or NNS learner. These strategies were categorized as *e-mail partner role* and had as their sole purpose to keep the e-mail communication going.

The final taxonomy, with the changes as indicated above, was derived as a result of a reiterative verification of the coding scheme. This taxonomy with definitions of categories and unedited examples taken from the present study is shown in Table V. Examples provided in this Table were taken from the English e-mails to facilitate reading. However, some examples in French were included if no instances had been found in the English e-mails. The original definitions by Mendonça and Johnson (1994), Morris (2005), Sotillo (2000), Stanley (1992), Villamil and Guerrero (1996), and Zhu’s (2001) are included as a reference.
### Table V

**Final taxonomy of scaffolding strategies in function of NS tutor role, NNS learner role and e-mail partner role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy for providing scaffolding (Definitions and examples from previously published taxonomies)</th>
<th>Definitions (In the present study)</th>
<th>Examples (Taken from the database of the present study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NS tutor role</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villamil &amp; Guerrero, 1996 <em>(Suggesting revision or recommending that changes be made; going beyond advising by composing new sentences for the writer or offering specific solutions: “You can put this in another paragraph”)</em></td>
<td>NS makes general suggestions that do not pertain to one specific item in the text.</td>
<td>A comment about your English, try not to just translate the French version of what you want to say into English (FSL 11, message #632).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu, 2001 <em>(Readers make general or specific suggestions. For example, “Give a picture about their lives.”)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley, 1992 <em>(Advising is more directive than pointing. In this case, evaluators outline changes that they think the writer should make. The advice can be either specific or general. A specific advising example is “You need to give an example to explain that idea.” General advising takes two forms: a) a blanket remark, such as, “You need more ideas in this paper”; or b) a representation of the audience, such as, “You have to write this to people who are not using journals, so you can convince them.”)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eliciting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villamil &amp; Guerrero, 1996 <em>(Drawing out opinion or reaction, additional information or content, background knowledge or understanding of)</em></td>
<td>a) NS draws out opinion or reaction, additional information or content, background knowledge or understanding of</td>
<td>So tell me more about “la tourtière”!! I’m interested in how it tastes!! (FSL 20, message #905).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95
| additional information or content, background knowledge or understanding of text from peer: “What’s your point of view?”; “Keep telling me, keep telling me other negative factors.”) | This is an error. | However, I don’t agree with you when you say “that’s what really counts”. It’s not less important if you cheat at a small exam that a major. You cheated that all. No matter the exam. (ESL 28, message #887). |
| Zhu, 2001 (Readers elicit feedback explicitly from the writer or other group members. Feedback can center on a particular essay or the peer response process. For example, “What do you have to say?” [Reader A to Reader B]) | | |
| Stanley, 1992 (Eliciting is the term borrowed from Gère and Stevens (1985) to describe situations when an evaluator attempts to “draw out” the writer and encourage his or her participation, for example, “Yumi, what do you really want to say about people who follow these diets?” A second type of eliciting occurs when one evaluator calls on the other evaluators for opinions, for example, “Jae, do you think her conclusion is OK?” | | |
| Reacting | | |
| Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (Making evaluative comments about specific or general aspects of the text: “It is well written”; “This is an error.”) | NS makes evaluative comments about specific or general aspects of the NNS’s email (regarding the form –L2– or the content); purely evaluative remarks that neither point nor advise. There is never any feedback that follows. | Some other phrases were a bit difficult to understand, but hopefully in time both of our writing skills will improve. (FSL 26, message #830) |
| Zhu, 2001 (Readers respond to the essay or other readers’ comments by providing evaluative remarks. For example, “I though it was very well written.”) | | |
| Stanley, 1992 (Reacting is the label that is given to purely evaluative | | |
| Remarks that neither point nor advise. Evaluative remarks can be general or specific. Reacting general, for example, “This is really good.” Reacting specifically, for example, “Pretty good introduction. It covers your main point and it has a thesis.” | Requesting clarification  
Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (Asking interlocutor to clarify illegible handwriting or intended meaning: “What do you mean here?”; “Unwanted pregnancy?”)  
Stanley, 1992 (Pointing: Pointing, as described by Brady and Jacobs (1988), occurs when an evaluator verbally points to particular words or phrases from the text and responds to them. For example: “Where you say, ‘These European cars have better advantages for people who like elegance but not sportiness and high performance’, what do you mean?”)  
Mendonça & Johnson, 1994 (Request for explanation: Reviewers try to get further explanation of what writers have said or what is not clear to them in the essays (e.g., an unknown term, an idea). This request can be either an explicit question or a statement saying that something is not clear. For example, “I didn’t understand very well this Word.”)  
Restating  
Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (Interpreting interlocutor’s response or paraphrasing text on NS interprets NNS’s response or paraphrases text on the basis of understood meaning. Often preceded by phrases such as “What you are trying to say  
| NS asks NNS to clarify intended meaning. Often preceded by: “I don’t understand this sentence”; “What did you mean by....?”  
The article it’s a crime. (I don’t understand what you mean in this sentence) (FSL 8, message #1311).  
| “If you want cheat you must perfom.” I am not sure what this means but I think you were trying to say “If you want to cheat you must act well.” (FSL 15, message #808).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>the basis of understood meaning:</strong> “Do you mean all students?”; “So what you are trying to say is that it’s a debatable opinion.”</th>
<th>is...?”; “I think what you were trying to say is...”; “Are you trying to say that...”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Mendonça & Johnson, 1994**  
(Re-statements: Reviewers or writers restate (summarize or rephrase) what has been written or said to show understanding or reread sections of the essay:  
“Ahh...understand that...that should use both solutions, not problems but solutions.”) |  |
| **Morris, 2005**  
(Clarification requests include statements such as “What did you say?”) |  |
| **Checking comprehension**  
Mendonça & Johnson, 1994  
(Writers ask reviewers if they have understood the meaning of a term or idea in the essay: “Do you know what is parent involvement?”) | NS asks NNS if he/she has understood the meaning of a term or idea.  
*“Est-ce que tu comprends quand je dis « testeurs » ????* (ESL 10, message #1400). |
| **Offering help with L2 writing** | a) NS offers NNS to help him/her improve his/her L2.  
b) NS offers NNS a model for his/her L2 writing.  
If you want, I can help you for your french. (ESL 14, message #739).  
If you notice, I talked with really complex language (in English). Just to help you get familiar with it or so you could see it. (FSL 11, message #1350). |
| **Giving explicit feedback**  
Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (Dealing with troublesources —social cognitive activity: We define troublesources as perceived or potential problems, errors, or deficiencies in the text, and they could range from grammar to mechanics to high-level concerns such as organization and content.) | NS corrects NNS’s troublesources (i.e., perceived problems, errors, or deficiencies in the text). Feedback may belong to content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics. Feedback may be at the level of word, phrase, or complete sentence. No explanation of rules is given.  
It should be “I weigh” as opposed to “I weight” (FSL 3, message #656). |
| Ex: “You don’t say “I didn’t have not even. ...You are supposed to say “I didn’t have even...”

Mendosça & Johnson, 1994 (Grammar correction): Reviewers or writers correct grammatical structures in essays. Grammar corrections can be related to subject-verb agreement, verb tense, singular-plural, and so on. For ex. “Oh, The tense of the verb. Advances.”

Sotillo, 2000 (Corrective moves. For example. [Original message: “But don’t you remember the nice time that you spent at school with children your edge?” Corrective move: “I remember those days, at that AGE, NOT EDGE!”)

Morris, 2005 (Explicit correction directly and clearly indicates that what the learner has said is incorrect. For example, S1: Comer mucho todos los dias. S2: Don’t say comer. Say como.

| Instructing |
| Villami & Guerrero, 1996 (Giving mini-lessons on grammar, vocabulary, stylistic conventions, or other aspects of writing. For ex. “[Text says: 3 months] Don’t use figures to express numbers; figures are used in math. You’d better write them in letters. That’s what my teachers have told me.”) |

| Giving implicit feedback |
| NS rephrases a part of a sentence or a sentence without signalling it in any other way, such as

a) NS gives “mini” lessons on grammar, vocabulary, stylistic conventions, or other aspects of writing.

b) NS provides a synonym, an explanation or a translation of a supposedly difficult word or expression.

c) NS resorts to English-French comparisons

You should say “I live in...” because live is a verb but life is a noun. (FSL 4, message #669);

Even so, don’t you find it annoying (fatiguant) to always be adding accents when you’re writing in french? (FSL 26, message #659);

I know in French, it’s “Le Trichage”, but in English, you don’t say “the cheating”, it’s just “cheating”. So you would say “What do you think about cheating”.(FSL 20, message #811). |
Morris, 2005: (Recasts are immediate implicit reformulation of an ill-formed utterance and reformulate all or part of the utterance as a recast of the incorrect, for example, S1: Ella corre en el parque (She to run in the park). S2: Ella corre en el parque (She runs in the park). S1: Oh...yeah.corre.)

**underlining.**

message #646). NS’s implicit feedback: Salut, je crois avoir vu l’émission où Jessie James modifie une Celica en y rajoutant un moteur à réaction (ESL 12, message #725).

**Face-giving strategies**

Zhu, 1992: (Hedging. Readers soften the tone of the critique using phrases such as « I don’t know. »)

Belz, 2003: (Face-giving strategies. Use of softeners in the correction of NNS’s mistakes).

Brown & Levinson, 1987 (Face-giving strategies. Attempts to counteract the potential face damage of the face threatening acts).

**NS softens the tone of the critique.**

Your English is good, there are just a few corrections. (FSL 18, message #1529).

**Giving directives**

Villamil & Guerrero, 1996: (Ordering peer to take action (read, write, ask, comment, continue with the task, etc. For example: “Let’s go now to the introduction.”: “You read now, so I can start grasping the ideas.”)

NS asks NNS to take action.

Can you read your third article and send me your opinion about it please !!!!!!! (ESL 1, message #1463)

**Responding to directives and /or apologizing**

a) NS responds to directives

b) NS apologizes for having interrupted communication.

c) NS apologizes for writing a long / short e-mail.

I already read your first article and commented with my opinion when you first posted it. (FSL 8, message #1608, Re: message #1479)

Sorry I didn't e-mail you but I was on March Break. (FSL 2, message #1531, Re: message #1502)

Je suis désolé si je n’ai pas répondu à toutes tes questions, c’est que je n’ai pas beaucoup de temps devant moi, nous avions seulement 15 minutes pour écrire notre lettre, mais je vais t’en envoyer une bientôt. (ESL 30, message #626)
| NNS learner role | 
|------------------|---|
| **Requesting advice** | 
| Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (asking for suggestions, for example, "Is the title OK?"; "Tell me what it needs") | a) NNS asks for some information regarding rules.  
J'aimerais savoir si le nom "I" s'écrit toujours avec une majuscule parce que je n'en suis pas certaine. (ESL 11, message #851);  
What do you think about my english? It's good or bad? (ESL 11, message #1386).  
Stanley, 1992 (Eliciting occurs when the writer asks for some specific advice, for example, "Are my examples clear enough?" or for some information regarding "rules", such as. "Is it OK to state only the advantages, or do we have to give both sides?")  
b) NNS asks for opinion about his/her L2. |  
| Responding to advice |  
| Villamil & Guerrero, 1996 (Accepting changes or solutions; questioning the rationale or validity of the advice; rejecting the suggestions made. For example: "Yes, that's true"; "Why should I put a colon?"; "I don't think so.") | NNS accepts, rejects or questions the rationale or validity of the advice, explicit feedback or instructing provided by NS.  
Stanley, 1992 (Responding occurs when the writer answers the evaluator. a) Responding or accepting the evaluator's remark, for example, "OK, so that's not clear to you";  
b) Responding to restating or interpreting the evaluator's remark, for example, "OK, so what you are saying is..."; c) Responding by requesting clarification, for example, "What do you mean?"; d) Responding by justifying a draft, for example, |  
| Zhu, 2001 (Responding: Writers reacts to readers' comments. For example, "Alright, I see what you are saying.") | [NS's advice : Fais attention à tes accents et au genre (masculin/féminin) des noms! (ESL 26, message #1419)]  
NNS’s response : merci pour les corrections de français.. mais, comme j'ai dit auparavant, je m'excuse mais je n'écris pas souvent les accents quand j'écris les emails. (FSL 26, message #1447, Re : message #1419) |
**Responding to elicitation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villamil &amp; Guerrero, 1996 (Giving opinion or reaction, additional information or content, or background knowledge, giving response about meaning as requested by peer. For example, “Uh, football is one sport where you have full contact with not one but maybe fifteen persons.”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) NNS gives opinion or reaction, additional information or content, or background as requested by NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#"><strong>NS’s elicitation:</strong> So what efforts do <em>you</em> make to preserve the heritage of different cultures? Have you ever defended a non-white person from racial comments or hate-crimes? (FSL 20, 1341)</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS’s response to elicitation: I have already defend my friend from racist action. But this is happened there are 7-8 years, when I was to the primary school. Sometimes the childrens dont know what is the consequence of their racial comments. (ESL 20, Re: 1341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) NNS explains or défends choices or decisions made about the text, in response to an elicitation from NS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<strong>NS’s elicitation:</strong> However, I don’t agree with you when you say “that’s what really counts”. It’s not less important if you cheat at a small exam that a major. You cheated all. (ESL 28, 887)].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS’s response to elicitation: Selon moi, c’est moins mal de tricher sur un quiz que sur un examen. (FSL 28, message #918)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Clarifying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villamil &amp; Guerrero, 1996 (Offering clarification of handwriting or meaning. For example, “What I wanted to say there was...”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS offers clarification of meaning, as requested by NS. Frequently preceded by phrases such as “What I wanted to say is...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="#"><strong>NS’s clarification request:</strong> Also, what did you mean by &quot;I like lost my time in my computer&quot;?? (FSL 20, 637)</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS’s clarification : Quand j’ai écrits &quot;I like lost my time on my computer&quot; cela voulait dire que je passe souvent, pendant la semaine, la soirée sur mon ordinateur. (ESL 20, message #741 Re : 637)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writers explains intentions or brings in extra information to help the reader understand what has been written. For example, “We were in this place and my mom and I had a deal.”)**

**Stanley, 1992 (Clarifying occurs when the writer attempts to clarify the evaluators’ understanding. Two types of clarification were offered: original and reiterative. Original clarifications are as follows: 1. Clarifying by elaborating on the text, such as, “See, it’s easy for everybody because snorkelers don’t have to**
swim very well."; 2) Clarifying by describing intentions, such as "What I wanted to say was..."; 3) Clarifying by describing scope of text, such as, "This essay is not only about skill-faster, its also about understanding-better thinking-too."; 4) Clarifying by describing the writer process, such as, "I decided this was two different ideas, so I separated it into two paragraphs.".

Reiterative clarifications include the following: 5) Clarifying by quoting from text, for example, "Everyone should daydream, because, like I say, 'think of the great inventions that come from daydreams..."; 6) Clarifying by reiterating major points, for example, "I said each student should have a personal computer because, first, you can do your math homework better, second, if you need word processor in your English, last..."

**Mendonça & Johnson, 1994 (Explanation of an unclear point in the text: Writers explain the meaning of a term or idea that is not clear to reviewers, for example, "Oh. Yeah...the procedures about this...yeah...about the experiment I have done").**

| Asking for feedback | NNS explicitly asks NS to correct his/her e-mail. Frequently cued by: “Could you please correct my English?”; “Let me know about my French mistakes”. | Could you please correct my English? (ESL 8, message #952) |
| Face-saving strategies | NNS attempts to save his/her own positive face. | Write back soon and don't laugh too hard at all my French mistakes. (FSL 7, message #545). |

Belz, 2003 (Positive face. Desire to be appreciated, respected, and liked by others).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thanking</th>
<th>Giving directives</th>
<th>Responding to directives and/or apologizing</th>
<th>Responding to apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS thanks NS for giving feedback.</td>
<td>Thank you for your corrections, they were quite helpful. (FSL 13, message #1121)</td>
<td>NNS asks NS to take action.</td>
<td>I would really appreciate it if you could respond to my article. (FSL 30, message #1129)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Villamil & Guerrero, 1996** *(Ordering peer to take action (read, write, ask, comment, continue with the task, etc. For example: “Let’s go now to the introduction”; “You read now, so I can start grasping the ideas.”)*)

**E-mail partner role**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving directives</th>
<th>Responding to directives and/or apologizing</th>
<th>Responding to apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Asking tandem partner to take action with the purpose of keeping the e-mail communication going. | a) Tandem partner responds to directives and/or apologizes for having interrupted the communication.  
b) Tandem partner apologizes for writing a long/short e-mail. | I hope that I will receive something from you next week. (FSL 15, message #1030)  
Excuse me for my delay! I was much sick!! :-s. (FSL 10, message #1207)  
Sorry, I don’t have much time for wrote this e-mail so it is short. (ESL 1, message #574).  
Je suis content que tu m’aies répondu! Ouais paspire pas d’école les jeudis! (ESL 26, message #1428, Re: message #1366) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responding to apologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tandem partner accepts or refuses apologies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To determine the reliability of the coding of the scaffolding strategies as analyzed by the researcher, two raters (a native English speaker for the English e-mails, and a native French speaker for the French e-mails) independently coded 70% of the data; the remaining 30% of the items had been used for a training session with the researcher. The raters selected both taught second languages and were involved in graduate studies in applied linguistics. Results of the analysis revealed a 97% rate of agreement for the English e-mails and a 89% rate of agreement for the French e-mails. With both raters, discrepancies were resolved by mutual consent after discussion. Following this, occurrences of each type of scaffolding strategy were counted.

T-tests were performed on the means and standard deviations of paired samples in order to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the two groups in terms of the types of scaffolding strategies provided when functioning as the NS tutor and the NNS learner. Additional t-tests were performed on the means of the number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by both groups when adopting the role of the NNS learner and of the NS tutor. Finally, as no students in any of the two groups performed all types of functions, a Fisher’s exact test was performed in order to test whether significant differences existed among the proportion of ESL and FSL students that employed a given strategy at least once. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.2).

4.9.1.2. Direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (tu/vous)

E-mails were also analyzed for instances of direct assistance in the use of address forms in French (tu/vous). As this strategy was solely related to the French language, it was not included in the taxonomy presented in Table V and was not considered for purposes of statistical comparison between the two groups of students.

As a first level of analysis, all the first, second and final e-mails written by the FSL students were examined in order to quantify the proportion of FSL students who had addressed their Francophone partners with tu, vous, or a mixture of tu/vous. As well, all the e-mails written by the Francophone students were examined in order to quantify the
number of students who had provided direct assistance to their tandem partners with regard to *tu/vous* (henceforth T/V) use.

As a second level of analysis, I focused on the five students (Jenny, Karen, Nathan, Brenda, and Heather) who received explicit assistance from the Francophone students in order to illustrate the way ESL students scaffolded their Anglophone counterparts in the development of the second-person T/V pronoun use in French. For those students, all the e-mails were coded for instances of T/V use and peer assistance in regard to T/V use. For each of these five FSL students and their tandem partners, e-mails were examined so as to more closely investigate the linguistic development with regard to T use over time (i.e., how the students evolved over the course of the e-mail exchange).

Finally, data from the analysis of e-mails were complemented with data obtained from the interviews for selected FSL case study students (Ruth, Heather and Jenny) and with the FSL teacher in order to investigate the reasons for this development (i.e., why students adopted T use). The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.2.2).

### 4.9.1.3. Use of affordances offered by digital technologies

All e-mails were examined for digital features employed by the students. Examples of these features were quoted in order to illustrate the ways in which the use of the affordances offered by digital technologies assisted students in providing scaffolding to their tandem partners. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.2.3).
4.9.2. Research question # 2: What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?

Within Vygotskian theory (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978, 1981, 1986; Wertsch, 1979, 1985, 1994, 1998), it is assumed that goal-oriented human social interaction is semiotically "mediated," that is, aided by psychological tools involving signs and language. Working within a sociocultural framework, this question sought to investigate what resources (e.g., dictionaries, translators on the Internet, tandem partner's emails and corrections, teacher, classmates) ESL and FSL secondary school students drew on when composing the L2 section of their e-mails. Data for analysis were gathered from the reflection forms completed by the students when writing their e-mails (See Appendix G for the ESL students and H for the FSL students) and from the answers to the first question of the end-of-project questionnaire (See Appendix M for the ESL students and N for the FSL students). Additional qualitative data were obtained from the interviews with six ESL and six FSL students (See Appendix O for the ESL students and P for the FSL students) and with the FSL teacher (See Appendix R) as well as from field notes from my observations in the ESL class.

4.9.2.1. Reflection forms

The total number of days on which e-mails were sent and the total number of reflection forms completed by each student were counted. Following this, the responses (i.e., Yes or No) to each of the seven statements on the reflection forms were quantified. The average percentage of Yes responses for the ESL students and the FSL students for each question of the reflection forms was compared in order to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the two groups. For this purpose, weighted t-tests were performed.

In addition to answering Yes or No to each of the seven statements on the reflection forms, students were asked to note (a) the words and expressions they had looked for in a dictionary, (b) translated using an online translator, (c) asked their
classmates for and (d) asked their teacher for. They were also asked to write (e) the words or expressions they had reused from their partners’ e-mails and (f) the corrections they had used. Finally, they were asked (g) to specify what other help they had received and from whom. The responses provided by the totality of the students were transcribed and categorized for each of the resources used. Examples of responses are provided for the purpose of illustrating the use students made of each of these resources. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.3.1).

4.9.2.2. End-of-project questionnaire

The responses to the first question of this questionnaire, which sought to obtain information on the students’ use of resources when composing their e-mails, were quantified. In order to test whether significant differences existed among the distribution of answers given by the two groups of students, a Fisher’s exact test was performed. Results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.3.2).

4.9.2.3. Interviews

The responses of the ESL and FSL case study students to the open-ended question: “Peux-tu me dire comment tu écrivais tes courriels en anglais?” / “Could you tell me how you wrote your e-mails in French?” were transcribed. Responses were then regrouped under each of the seven types of resources: (1) use of dictionaries, (2) use of an online translator, (3) getting help from their classmates, (4) getting help from their teacher, (5) reusing words/expressions from partners’ e-mails, (6) reusing the corrections provided by their tandem partners, and (7) getting help to write their e-mails in other ways or from somebody else. The students’ responses were presented in a Table. The FSL teacher’s response to the open-ended question “Can you tell me how your students
wrote their e-mails in French?” was transcribed and presented in a Table. Results of these analyses are discussed in Chapter V (section 5.3.3).

4.9.2.4. Observations

Field notes taken during my observations in the ESL classroom were written up as summaries. Instances of use of resources were then coded into qualitative categories: (1) use of dictionaries, (2) use of an online translator, (3) getting help from their classmates, (4) getting help from their teacher, (5) reusing words/expressions from partners’ e-mails, (6) reusing the corrections provided by their tandem partners, and (7) getting help to write their e-mails in other ways or from somebody else. Results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.3.4).

4.9.3. Research question # 3: When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?

The purpose of this question was to investigate the degree to which the secondary school students participating in this study used the feedback provided by their tandem partners. Data for analysis were gathered from a comparison of the first draft pertaining to a report sent by e-mail and the final draft written on the report form, and from answers to the end-of-project questionnaire. Additional qualitative data were obtained from the personal interviews with selected students and from personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher.
4.9.3.1. Reports

As a first level of analysis, the types of revisions made from Draft 1 to draft 2 were identified. This analysis was done as follows:

1) The number of students who had sent each of the three reports to their tandem partners, the number of students who had received feedback on their reports and the number of students who had revised their reports were counted. These findings were presented in a Figure (see section 5.4.1).

2) Since this research question sought to investigate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners to revise their reports, data for analysis were selected if meeting the following requirements: a) Draft 1 of the report had been sent by e-mail to the tandem partner; b) the report had been corrected by the partner; c) Draft 2 had been written on the Report form (in the student’s binder). Fifteen ESL students and 9 FSL students met these requirements.

3) In order to prepare for the data analyses, a Word document file was prepared for each of these 15 ESL students and 9 FSL students. Draft 1 of the reports sent by e-mail and e-mails with feedback on the reports were copy-pasted into the file. Following this, draft 2 of the reports written on the Report forms were transcribed by the researcher and added to the file.

4) The number of words in draft 1 and draft 2 were counted using the “Word count” function offered by Word.

5) Draft 1 of the students’ reports (written directly on the computer and sent by email to their tandem partners) was compared with draft 2 (revised using their tandem partners’ feedback and written on the “Report forms”). Following Mendonça and Johnson (1994), the letters R (revised) and NR (not revised) were placed next to the parts that were modified and the parts that were not modified, respectively.

6) Types of revisions were then coded using a taxonomy adapted from Faigley and Witte’s (1981) taxonomy of revisions. Faigley and Witte’s (1981) taxonomy of revisions was chosen because it provides a sufficiently wide range of types of revisions with a limited number of categories. Their taxonomy, which examined the revisions made by students in their L1, categorizes revisions into two types: surface changes and meaning...
changes. Surface changes made to a text are those that do not bring new or delete old information from the text, but only alter the surface structure. Surface changes are divided into two categories: formal changes, which are copyediting or proofreading changes in areas such as spelling, tense, and punctuation, and meaning-preserving changes, which paraphrase existing concepts in a text but do not alter the essential meaning from one version to the next. Meaning changes are those that affect the information present in the text, by either adding, deleting, or rearranging the ideas. Meaning changes are also divided into two types, both of which affect the text on a global level. Microstructure changes are those that alter the information structure but do not affect the overall gist or direction of the text. Macrostructure changes are major changes that affect the overall meaning. For the present study, Faigley and Witte’s (1981) scheme was adapted as follows:

a) Definitions of categories were adapted to the data of the present study drawing on Connor and Asenavage (1994), Hall (1990), and Paulus’ (1999) taxonomies of revisions.

b) Other sub-categories were added using Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1998) scheme of “descriptors of language aspects” (negation; use of articles; use of prepositions; use of pronouns; number) to better account for the difficulties of second language learners.

c) One category was added for the revisions in French (Gender).

d) One definition was complemented based on my own database (Substitutions – as a meaning-preserving change).

The final taxonomy was derived as a result of a reiterative verification of the coding scheme for my own database. The final taxonomy with definitions of types of revisions and examples taken from my database are shown in Table VI. Changes are indicated in bold to facilitate reading. The original definitions by Connor and Asenavage (1994), Faigley and Witte (1981), Hall (1990), and Paulus’ (1999) taxonomies are included as a reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Definitions (In the present study)</th>
<th>Examples (Taken from the database of the present study)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type (Definitions and examples from previously published taxonomies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Surface changes</strong></td>
<td>Changes that do not bring new or delete old information from the text, but only alter the surface structure. Surface changes are divided into two categories: <em>formal changes</em>, and <em>meaning-preserving changes</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faigley and Witte, 1981</strong> (Changes that do not bring new information to a text or remove old information. There are two subcategories: <em>formal changes</em> and <em>Meaning-preserving changes</em>.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paulus, 1999</strong> (Changes that do not bring new or delete old information from the text, but only alter the surface structure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Formal changes</strong></td>
<td>Changes in the following areas: (a) Spelling, capitalization, and punctuation; (b) Abbreviations/contractions; (c) Verb forms (tense, number and modality); (d) Negation; (e) Use of articles; (f) Use of prepositions; (g) Use of pronouns; (h) Number (singular/plural) (i) Gender (feminine/masculine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faigley and Witte, 1981</strong> (Formal changes include most, but not all, conventional copyediting operations. Formal changes are divided into changes in spelling: tense, number, and modality; abbreviations; punctuation; and format.*)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paulus, 1999</strong> (Copyediting or proofreading changes in the following areas: Spelling/capitalization; Tense/number/modality; Abbreviations/contractions; Punctuation; Formatting; Morphological changes.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling/Capitalization/Punctuation</strong></td>
<td>Changes in spelling; capitalization and punctuation.</td>
<td>Draft 1: (...) we don’t understand because we cheat before. So for this reason I change my idea. Draft 2: we don’t understand because we cheat before. So for this reason I change my idea (ESL 1, report #1) Draft 1: Au centre d’importance est l’<em>orgueilleux</em>. Draft 2: Au centre d’importance est l’<em>orgueilleux</em> (FSL 5, report #1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations /Contractions</td>
<td>Changes in abbreviations and contractions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: However I think that cheat bring nothing, because later when you will need in any situations to give your ideas on any subjects, you'll know nothing. <strong>Draft 1</strong>: However, I think that cheating is useless, because later when you need to answer certain questions, you will know nothing on the subject. <em>(ESL 9, report #1)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: Si les scientifiques veulent utiliser un chimpanzé, ils doivent faire naître deux chimpanzés pour remplacer l'un qui ils sont tués par leur recherche. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: Si les scientifiques veulent utiliser un chimpanzé, ils doivent faire naître deux chimpanzés pour remplacer l'un qu'ils sont tués par leur recherche. <em>(FSL 22, report #3)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb forms (Tense; number; modality)</th>
<th>Changes in verb forms (Tense; number; modality).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: because he love his sister and he don't want to lose her. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: because he love his sister and he doesn't want to lose her. <em>(ESL 1, report #2)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: Comme, Kerjean, je crois que les défauts que les humains possède <strong>Draft 2</strong>: Comme, Kerjean, je crois que les défauts que les humains possèdent <em>(FSL 5, report #1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation</th>
<th>Changes in negation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: Cheating is no good. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: Cheating is not good. <em>(ESL 12, report #1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of articles</th>
<th>Changes in use of articles (use or lack of).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: The last article I read is about the racism. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: The last article I read is about racism. <em>(ESL 4, report #3)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: Il dit que si une personne fume, il recevrait beaucoup de maladies, comme cancer. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: Il dit que si une personne fume, il va avoir beaucoup de maladies, comme le cancer. <em>(FSL 1, report #2)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of prepositions</th>
<th>Changes in choice of prepositions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draft 1</strong>: I will write for compare your opinions with me on the cheating. <strong>Draft 2</strong>: I will write to compare your opinions with mine on the issue of cheating. <em>(ESL 5, report #1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pronouns</td>
<td>Changes in choice of pronouns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: My partner and me agree that the racism is very sad.</td>
<td>Draft 2: My partner and I agree that racism is very sad. (ESL 21, report #3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: Alors, ce montre que las tabagisme provoque une dépendance.</td>
<td>Draft 2: Alors, cela montre que le tabagisme provoque une dépendance. (FSL 22, report #2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number (singular/plural)</th>
<th>Changes in number (singular / plural).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: I don't have high hope.</td>
<td>Draft 2: I don't have high hopes. (ESL 20, report #2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: Jean-Martin a dit aussi que les personnes paresseuses sont tous des personnes vraiment lâches.</td>
<td>Draft 2: Jean-Martin a dit aussi que les personnes paresseuses sont tous des personnes vraiment lâches. (FSL 8, report #1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender - feminine/masculine- (in French)</th>
<th>Changes in gender:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft 1: Il n'a pas rencontré toutes les types dans son emploi.</td>
<td>Draft 2: Il n'a pas rencontré tous les types dans son emploi. (FSL 8, report #1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Meaning-preserving changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include changes that &quot;paraphrase&quot; the concepts in the text but do not alter them. These changes include additions, deletions, substitutions, permutations, distributions, and consolidations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faigley and Witte, 1981 (Include changes that “paraphrase” the concepts in the text, but do not alter them.)

Paulus, 1999 (Meaning-preserving changes paraphrase the original concepts in the text by making them implicit or explicit, without altering the meaning. No new information is brought to the text. Primarily syntactical or lexical changes. All information is recoverable by inferencing.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Additions add a word or a phrase without changing the overall meaning of the sentence.</th>
<th>Deletions</th>
<th>Deletions omit a word or a phrase but do not change the meaning of a sentence.</th>
<th>Substitutions</th>
<th>Substitutions trade words or longer units that represent the same concept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981</td>
<td>(Additions raise to the surface what can be inferred, for example “You pay two dollars” =&gt; “You pay a two-dollar entrance fee.”)</td>
<td>Paulus, 1999</td>
<td>(Information was previously inferred but is now explicit)</td>
<td>Hall, 1990</td>
<td>(“Her honest and unique stories are provocative.” =&gt; “Her honest and unique stories are often provocative”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor and Asenavage, 1994</td>
<td>(Additions add a word or a phrase without changing the overall meaning of the sentence)</td>
<td>Paulus, 1999</td>
<td>(Information was previously inferred but now must be inferred)</td>
<td>Hall, 1990</td>
<td>(“Yes, I have met some clever Americans that know more about Aristotle than I do. =&gt; Yes, I have met some Americans that know more about Aristotle than I do.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981</td>
<td>(Substitutions trade words or longer units that represent the same concept, for example “out-of-the-way spots” =&gt; “out”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permutations</td>
<td>Distributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981</td>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Permutations involve rearrangements or rearrangements with substitutions: “Springtime means to most people” $\Rightarrow$ “springtime, to most people, means”)</td>
<td>(Distributions occur when material in one text segment is passed into more than one segment. A change where a writer revises what has been compressed into a single unit so that it falls into more than one unit is a distributional change: “I figured after walking so far the least it could do would be to provide a relaxing dinner since I was hungry” $\Rightarrow$ “I figured the least it owed me was a good meal. All that walking made me hungry.”)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Paulus, 1999 (Elements are rearranged) | Paulus, 1999 (A single unit becomes more than one unit) |

| Draft 1: I agree with you when you say that laugh is the best medicine. Draft 2: I agree with you when you say that laughter is the best medicine. (ESL 28, report #3) | Draft 1: Firstly, I found have very similar opinions about people who cheat are not good! Draft 2: Firstly, I found that we have very similar opinions about people who cheat, that they are not good! (ESL 5, report #1) |

| Connor and Asenavage, 1994 (Substitutions exchange words with a synonym: “A big house” $\Rightarrow$ A large house”) | Connor and Asenavage, 1994 (Permutations are rearrangements of words or phrases: “With the exception of bananas, he likes most fruit” $\Rightarrow$ “He likes most fruit, with the exception of bananas.”) |

| Substituting incorrect choice of words or longer units for correct choices. | Distributions are revisions in which a segment is divided into more than one. |

| Hall, 1990 (“One can know for sure if he is doing the work right” $\Rightarrow$ One can’t know absolutely if he’s doing the work right.”) | |

| Draft 1: Me and you have very fun to talk about that! Draft 2: You and I have a fun time talking about the issue! (ESL 5, report #2) | |

| Draft 1: Les humains ont découvert beaucoup de choses environ se passé quand ils ont les étudié. Draft 2: Les humains ont découvert beaucoup de choses quand ils les ont étudié. (FSL 1, report 3) | |

| Permutations are rearrangements of words or phrases. | |

| Draft 1: Firstly, I found have very similar opinions about people who cheat are not good! Draft 2: Firstly, I found that we have very similar opinions about people who cheat, that they are not good! (ESL 5, report #1) | |

<p>| Draft 1: I agree with you when you say that laugh is the best medicine. Draft 2: I agree with you when you say that laughter is the best medicine. (ESL 28, report #3) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connor and Asenavage, 1994 (Distributions are revisions in which one segment is divided into more than one: &quot;I thought that since I had studied so hard, I should have at least passed the test!&quot; =&gt; &quot;I should have at least passed the test. I studied hard enough.&quot;)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Meaning changes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Meaning or global changes</strong> are those that do affect the information present in the text, by either adding, deleting, or rearranging the ideas. They are divided into two types (microstructure and macrostructure changes), both of which affect the text on a global level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981 (Involve the adding of new content or the deletion of existing content. Many meaning changes turn out to be of small consequence for the overall text. A phrase is substituted, an example is added, or a sentence is reworked. Other changes have more impact, at times even giving the entire essay a new direction.)</td>
<td>Changes that alter the information structure but do not affect the overall gist (essence) or direction of the text. These are minor changes that elaborate the existing ideas or give additional supporting information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus, 1999 [Meaning (or global) changes are those that do affect the information present in the text, by either adding, deleting, or rearranging the ideas. They are divided into two types (microstructure and macrostructure changes), both of which affect the text on a global level.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor and Asenavage, 1994 (Text-based changes affect a groups of sentences, paragraphs, or the entire text.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Microstructure changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faigley and Witte, 1981 (A microstructure change is a meaning change that would not affect a summary of a text.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulus, 1999 (Changes that do alter the information structure but do not affect the overall gist (essence) or direction of the text. These are minor changes that elaborate the existing ideas or give additional supporting information.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Additions

Faigley and Witte, 1981

("Barton Springs does not fit an outsider’s image of Texas. It is an eighth-mile long unchlorinated pool in a natural limestone creekbed

=> Barton Springs does not fit an outsider’s image of Texas. It is an eighth-mile long, unchlorinated pool in a natural limestone creekbed, fed by 27 million gallons of 68-degree water form the Edwards’ Aquifer each day.")

A word or a phrase is added, altering the information structure but without affecting the overall gist or direction of the text.

**Draft 1:** I agree with you when you say that we can learn a lot from different backgrounds if we take time to listen to them.

**Draft 2:** I agree with you when you say that we can learn a lot from different **ethnic backgrounds** if we take time to listen to them. (ESL 17, report #3)

### Deletions

A word or a phrase is deleted, altering the information structure but without affecting the overall gist or direction of the text.

**Draft 1:** For resume our opinions, the person racism are very stupid and the colour of the skin is not very important.

**Draft 2:** For resume our opinions, the people who are racist are very stupid. (ESL 7, article #3)

### Substitutions

Elements (a word or a phrase) are traded, altering the information structure but without affecting the overall gist or direction of the text.

**Draft 1:** We also have similar opinion about the almond.

**Draft 2:** We also have similar opinions about the **infringements**. (ESL 28, report #2)

### B. Macrostructure changes

Faigley and Witte, 1981 (A macrostructure is a summary of a text. A plot outline is one familiar example of a macrostructure. A macrostructure change is a major revision change. They would alter the summary of a text.)

Paulus, 1999 (Major changes that affect the overall meaning of the text to the extent that they would affect the way one could summarize the given information. Entire new paragraphs or sections may be added. Paragraphs may also be deleted, rearranged, or combined. Finally, one idea—originally presented as a paragraph—may be distributed over several paragraphs.)

Major changes that affect the overall meaning of the text to the extent that they would affect the way one could summarize the given information. Entire new paragraphs or sections may be added. Paragraphs may also be deleted, rearranged, or combined. Finally, one idea—originally presented as a paragraph—may be distributed over several paragraphs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connor and Asenavage, 1994 (Macro-text-based)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>changes change the overall summary of the text, changing the direction or the gist of the idea presented. Entire new paragraphs or sections may be added. Paragraphs may also be deleted, rearranged, or combined. Finally, one idea - originally presented as a paragraph- may be distributed over several paragraphs.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additions | New paragraphs or sections are added. | Draft 1: I think the same think of you but we need to have an other law who are more strict. I don’t have a car but I hope to had one in a few years. I like driving in my video game. Draft 2: This subject was very interesting because to affect a lot of population of this world. In this the old persons who can’t see pretty good have to do not drive because they not have all of their perception on the road. My partner think the same. He say: "we don’t have to drive before we drank or talk to cell phone." And I approve. I think the same think as you but we need to have more strict laws. I don’t have a car but I hope to have one in a few years. I like driving in my video game. (ESL 4, report 2) |

| Deletions | Paragraphs or sections are deleted. | Draft 1: Now that I’ve read your opinion on racism, I’ll compare our opinions on this subject. I understand what you said. Our society is full of different people and we should accept who they are and the opinion they have. Like you said we should treat them like human beings with the same rights as us. I agree with you when you say that we can learn a lot from different backgrounds if we take time to listen to them. And it can be really interesting! I think that we only have to be open minded to be able to accept them. Not to be completely not racist but only to be able to accept who they are! |
In Québec, the only place where we see many people with different ethnic backgrounds is Montreal. Of course there are other backgrounds in the other cities but Montreal there are many ethnic backgrounds.

Humour takes a big place in Québec. So of course there are many jokes about racism that are said. As long as we don't hurt them it's okay. For example there is a black humourist that says joke about us and we laugh so there's as many jokes about us or about other backgrounds that are said. But it's not the subject we laugh about the most because it would be exaggerated... it would become a racist show and not an humour show. So i think that when there's a racism joke, they know when we can tell it or when we cannot tell it.

Draft 2: Now that i've read your opinion on racism, i'll compare our opinions on this subject. I understand what you said. Our society is full of different people and we should accept who they are and the opinion they have. Like you said we should treat them like human beings with the same rights as us. I agree with you when you say that we can learn a lot from different ethnic backgrounds if we take time to listen to them. And it can be really interesting! I think that we only have to be open minded to be able to accept them. (ESL 17, report #3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitutions</th>
<th>Paragraphs or sections are substituted for other ones.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Draft 1: I found we have very similar opinions about the cheaters. You said: "cheating utilize another person against their will", I think that it's very true. If you go to school, it's for learn somethings and evaluate your skill. I agree whit you to 100%!

Draft 2: We were agree on certain topics. You go to school to learn and exercise your mind. We think that if you cheat, you don't learn anything and you utilizes another person against their will. (ESL 23, report #1)
In order to determine reliability, after having coded all the revisions myself using the adapted taxonomy, I asked two raters (a native English speaker for the reports in English and a native French speaker for the reports in French) to code 80% of the revisions independently; the remaining 20% of the items had been used for a training session with the researcher. The raters selected both taught second languages and were involved in graduate studies in applied linguistics. Results of the analysis revealed a 92% rate of agreement for the revisions coded in the ESL students’ reports and a 89% rate of agreement for the revisions coded in the FSL students’ reports. With both raters, discrepancies were resolved by mutual consent after discussion. Following this, the revisions in each category were counted.

As a second level of analysis, after having categorized the types of revisions, the impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students’ revisions was measured by comparing the first drafts of the reports, the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and the revised drafts of their reports so as to identify the source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions).

As a third level of analysis, in order to evaluate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners, the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated were identified by comparing the feedback section in the e-mails and Draft 2.

Finally, instances of “faulty corrections” (Rothschild & Kingenberg, 1990) also termed “false repairs” (Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998), “inaccurate corrections” (Little et al., 1999) or “incorrect solutions” (Swain & Lapkin, 1995) were also detected. In the present study, by “faulty corrections” I mean tandem partners providing incorrect feedback. An example of a faulty correction made by an Anglophone student is provided in Figure 5. The points where errors were made in draft 1 by the ESL student (ESL #5) and the resultant corrections provided by his Anglophone partner (FSL #5) are indicated in bold to facilitate reading. Faulty corrections are underlined. Results of the analyses are discussed in Chapter V (section 5.4.1.)
4.9.3.2. End-of-project questionnaire

Questions 6, 7, and 9 in the end-of-project questionnaire aimed to investigate the students’ reflections regarding the type of feedback received and the use they made of it. A Fisher’s exact test was performed on Likert scale ratings (Yes / No / I can’t say) in order to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the responses given by the two groups. The findings are reported in Chapter V (section 5.4.2).

4.9.3.3. Interviews

The responses of the ESL and FSL case study students to the open-ended question: “As-tu utilisé les rétroactions de ton partenaire pour réviser tes rapports?”/“Did you use your partner’s feedback to revise your reports?” were transcribed. The students’ responses were presented in a Table. The findings are presented in Chapter V (section 5.4.3).
4.9.3.4. **Personal communication by e-mail with FSL teacher**

Personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher was analyzed for the purpose of investigating why some students did not revise their reports. The findings are presented in Chapter V (section 5.4.4).

4.9.4. **Research question # 4:** *To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchanges)?*

Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, this research question sought to investigate if the students' motives (i.e., the students' underlying purpose for engaging in the activity) could explain the differences in the way students oriented to the exchanges (i.e., the specific actions taken to carry out tasks and the resultant outcomes). To this end, I focused on eight partnerships (Édouard and Diane; Lucie and Mary; Pierre and Alice; Sophie and Eric; Mathieu and Jenny; Laure and John; Mylène and Shawn; Audrey and Marc) who showed different degrees of investment in the e-mail tandem project. As explained in section 4.7.4., the selection of case study students was based on the teachers' and my observations of students as well as on information gleaned from e-mail messages and other documents. These partnerships included all the case study students (12) who were interviewed as well as, in certain instances, their partners who were not interviewed.

For each of the partnerships analyzed, various data sources were examined in order to investigate the way the students' motives (i.e., the underlying purposes for engaging in the e-mail project) were related to the carrying out of the task (in reference to the choice of tools/resources) and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced). Results of the analyses are discussed in Chapter V (section 5.5).
4.9.5. Research question # 5: How do the secondary ESL and FSL teachers in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?

This question sought to investigate the three participating teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool. Data for analysis were gathered from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview and from the e-mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher. The interview transcripts and e-mails were coded for themes relevant to the research question. The results of these analyses are presented in Chapter V (section 5.6).

4.10. Reliability and validity of this study

In order to ensure reliability and validity, the present study used the following strategies:

1) Triangulation. As explained in section 4.7, data were collected from written documents, observations, questionnaires, and interviews. The multiple sources of data collection methods facilitated the triangulation to confirm emerging findings (Merriam, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994). For example, in regard to question #4, interview data was checked against data gathered from written documents such as e-mails and questionnaires.

2) Permanent sources of data. Data from written documents, observations, questionnaires, and interviews were kept in a permanent form. All the e-mails were saved on a memory stick as well as printed and kept in a binder with dividers for each of the partnerships. The students’ binders containing the task sheets involved in the project (e.g., reflection forms, opinion pieces, report forms) were collected. Teacher and student interviews were recorded and transcribed. The background and end-of-project questionnaires were kept in binders. Field notes from observations were summarized and saved in an electronic document, printed and kept in a binder.
3) **Member checking.** Member checks were conducted with the ESL and FSL teachers to “increase dependability of findings” (Tisdell, 2002, p. 70). Sections of this thesis containing quotes from the teacher interviews were sent to the ESL and FSL teachers for their feedback. This was particularly important for the purpose of checking if I had correctly interpreted what they had shared during the interview (Merriam, 2002; Tisdell, 2002).

4) **Audit trail.** As suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1981), I described in detail how the study was conducted, how the data were collected and analyzed, and how taxonomies were derived. To this end, I kept a research journal throughout the conduct of this study. Instruments of data collection were included as Appendices. Samples taken from the database were provided.

5) **Raters.** As explained in sections 4.9.1.1 and 4.9.3.1, in order to determine reliability of the scaffolding strategies and the types of revisions as analyzed by the researcher, two raters (a native English speaker for the English data and a native French speaker for the French data) independently coded 70% of the data, in the case of the scaffolding strategies, and 80% of the data, in the case of the types of revisions.

6) **Length of time of data collection phase.** As explained by Merriam (2002), it is recommended that the researcher be submerged or engaged in the data collection phase over a long period to ensure an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. Data for the present study was collected over a 18-week period during the 2004-2005 academic year.

### 4.11. Ethical considerations

This study was submitted to the University Ethics Committee and approved. Prior to the beginning of the study, all students (see Appendices V for the ESL students and W for the FSL students), the students’ parents (see Appendices X for the ESL students’ parents and Y for the FSL students’ parents) and the ESL and FSL teachers (see Appendices Z for the ESL teachers and AA for the FSL teacher) signed a participation consent form. In analyzing the data, except for the three participating teachers who wished to be identified, pseudonyms were used to protect participants’ identities.
As previously mentioned, the e-mail project was conducted using WebCT technology. Each student received an access code and a password to log into WebCT. Each pair of students (one ESL and one FSL student) was assigned a team number in the “discussion forum”. From a researcher’s perspective, one advantage of using WebCT was that access to each team’s site was restricted to each pair of students, the involved teachers, and the researcher, thus protecting the privacy of the students from external parties. The students and teachers’ access codes and passwords were made inactive at the end of the project. The WebCT site used in this project was destroyed after data were analyzed by the researcher.

**Summary**

This section has presented the research methods that were used in this study. First, the overall research design was presented, followed by the description of the participants, the institutional contexts and the e-mail tandem design. Following this, in separate sections, each of the types of data and data collection procedures were described. Finally, the research questions and procedures for data analysis were described. Table VII presents a summary of the five research questions, the instruments of data collection, and data analysis procedures. The following chapter reports on the results related to each of the five research questions.
Table VII
Overview of research questions, instruments of data collection and data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Instruments of data collection</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?</td>
<td>• E-mails.</td>
<td>• E-mails were coded for scaffolding strategies using a modified taxonomy based on Villamil and Guerrero (1996), Mendonça and Johnson (1994), Morris (2005), Sotillo (2000), Stanley (1992), and Zhu's (2001) taxonomies. • E-mails were analyzed for instances of direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (tu/vous). • E-mails were analyzed for digital features employed by the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?</td>
<td>• Reflection forms.</td>
<td>• Data from reflection forms were quantified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• End-of-study questionnaire.</td>
<td>• Data from questionnaires were quantified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews (with case study students and with L2 teachers).</td>
<td>• Interviews were transcribed. The interview transcripts were coded for instances of use of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Observations.</td>
<td>• Data from field notes were coded for instances of use of resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?</td>
<td>• Reports.</td>
<td>• Draft 1 and the revised report (draft 2) were compared to identify revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• End-of-project questionnaire.</td>
<td>• Types of revisions were coded using a modified taxonomy based on Faigley and Witte (1981), Connor and Asenavage (1994), Hall, 1990, and Paulas' (1999) taxonomies of revisions. • Source of revisions (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions) was identified by comparing the draft 1 of reports, feedback provided by tandem partner and revised report (draft 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Data from questionnaire were quantified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchange)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (with case study students).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication by e-mail with FSL teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails (case study students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-study questionnaire (case study students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews (with case study students and with L2 teachers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triangulation of data: Various data sources were examined in order to investigate the way the students’ motives (i.e., the underlying purposes for engaging in the e-mail project) was related to the carrying out of the task (in reference to the choice of tools/resources) and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. How do the secondary ESL and FSL teachers in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End-of-study interview with the teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal communication by e-mail with FSL teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews were transcribed. The interview transcripts were coded for themes relevant to the research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mails were coded for themes relevant to the research question.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

RESULTS

5.0. Introduction

The previous chapter documented the research methods that were used in this study. This chapter reports on the results. First, in order to give a general overview of how the e-mail tandem exchange unfolded, findings from quantitative analyses of the frequency, number and length of the e-mails will be reported on. Then, I report on the results related to each of the research questions, i.e., the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners (Question 1- Section 5.2), the resources used by students when composing their e-mails (Question 2- Section 5.3), the use of the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners when revising their reports (Question 3- Section 5.4), the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (Question 4- Section 5.5), and the teachers' perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool (Question 5- Section 5.6).

5.1. Overview of the e-mail tandem exchange: Data base

As explained in chapter 4, this study examined project-based, e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. In this section, I provide a general overview of how the e-mail tandem exchange unfolded. This analysis is divided into two sections. In section 5.1.1, I report on the findings from quantitative analyses of the frequency and number of e-mails. Then in section 5.1.2, these findings are complemented with the analysis of the quantity of writing as measured by the total number of words and the average number of words by e-mail.
5.1.1. Analysis of e-mail frequency and number

The e-mail tandem project on which the present study was based took place over a period of 18 weeks from November 4, 2004 to April 12, 2005. In this study, a group of 30 secondary 4 ESL students in Quebec communicated by e-mail with two groups of grade 11 FSL students (total 30) in Ontario. Both groups had class two days per week for 75 minutes each day. In both classes, the e-mail tandem project was done once per week and students were required to send a minimum of 10 e-mails. The quantitative assessment of the frequency in terms of the number of days on which e-mails were sent and the total number of e-mails sent by both groups during the project (as more than one e-mail may have been sent on the same day) showed that the majority of the students participating in this project had minimally completed the basic course requirements (see Table VIII). As shown in Table VIII, as a group, the ESL students sent a total of 295 e-mails, with an average of 9.8 e-mails per person. Their FSL counterparts sent a total of 287 e-mails, with an average of 9.6 e-mails per student. It should be noted that some students from both groups sent more than one e-mail per day. The data in this Table indicate that as a group, the ESL students sent slightly more e-mails than the FSL students. This analysis was complemented with an examination of the quantity of writing as measured by the total number of words as a second indicator of student participation.
Table VIII
Total number of days on which e-mails were sent and total number of e-mails sent during project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandem partners</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of days on which e-mails were sent</td>
<td>Total number of e-mails sent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>9.8 e-mails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.2. Analysis of quantity of writing

During the course of the project, students were asked to read three articles taken from newspapers or magazines in the language under study. Topics raised in the articles formed the basis of the e-mail exchanges. Students in both classes were instructed to write about the text they had read, to give their opinion and ask for their partners' opinions about the article's topic in their L2, and to respond to their tandem partners' questions in their L1. Although a minimum number of words was not imposed, a minimum number of lines for different parts of the task was recommended. In particular, for each of the three articles, students were required to complete a reader response form in which they were supposed to identify several points they had found of interest in the article they read (5 lines), give their opinion about it (18 lines), and write down several questions (at least 5) they would ask their partners in order to find out their opinion about the topic they had read about. In addition, after the discussion of each topic, students were asked to write a report (a minimum of half a page) in which they compared and contrasted their opinions with those of their tandem partner regarding the topic they had read about. This report was to be sent by e-mail to their partners to be corrected. In Table IX, the number and length of e-mails sent by the group of ESL and FSL students are compared.
Table IX
Total number of e-mails and words:
Comparison between ESL and FSL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandem partners</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of e-mails</td>
<td>Total number of words</td>
<td>Average number of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>119.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>101.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>255.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>397.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>148.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>142.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>228.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>189.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>148.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>207.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>139.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>129.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>197.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>232.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>104.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>233.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>119.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>159.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>159.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>209.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>156.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>46431</td>
<td>4905.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>1547.7</td>
<td>163.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T-tests were performed on the means and standard deviations of paired samples in order to determine whether or not there were significant differences in terms of the number of e-mails sent by the two groups. As shown in Table X, there was no significant difference between the number of e-mails sent by the ESL and the FSL students ($p>0.0001$). However, when comparing the total number of words written by each of the students in a tandem, significant differences were found ($p<0.0001$). Since the means of the difference between the number of words written by an ESL student and his/her tandem partner is negative, it can be concluded that on average, the FSL students wrote more words than their ESL partners. The same was concluded when comparing the average number of words per e-mail.

**Table X**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of emails ESL-FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.723</td>
<td>0.2667</td>
<td>1.2567</td>
<td>2.1116</td>
<td>2.6514</td>
<td>3.5643</td>
<td>0.4841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of words ESL-FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1030</td>
<td>-741.7</td>
<td>-453.2</td>
<td>615.23</td>
<td>712.51</td>
<td>1038.5</td>
<td>141.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ESL-FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-103.9</td>
<td>-75.02</td>
<td>-46.18</td>
<td>61.519</td>
<td>77.245</td>
<td>103.84</td>
<td>14.103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| T-Tests | DF | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|---------|----|---------|------|
| Number of emails ESL-FSL | 29 | 0.55 | 0.5859 |
| Number of words ESL-FSL | 29 | -5.26 | <.0001* |
| Mean ESL-FSL | 29 | -5.32 | <.0001* |

*p<0.0001

The findings reported here give a general picture of the degree of participation of the ESL and the FSL students as a group. However, a within-group comparison revealed
differences in the way individual students invested in the e-mail exchanges. The total number and length of e-mails written by each ESL student are presented in Table XI. As shown in this table, 11 out of the 30 ESL students (37%) sent more e-mails than required by the course. Six students (20%) sent exactly 10 e-mails and 13 (43%) performed below the project requirements. The within-group analysis also showed that some students were much more prolific than others. Sixteen students (53%) wrote more words compared to the group average while 14 (47%) wrote less. For the majority of the students, when writing a total number of words above the group average, they were also writing, on average, longer messages. However, seven students showed discrepancies. For example, although ESL student #1 wrote a total of 714.3 words more than the group average, her e-mails were, on average, 44.4 words shorter than the group norm. This can be explained by the larger number of e-mails (n=19) sent by this student. A close examination of the e-mails written by this student showed that some messages were just a couple of lines long, while others were a half-page long or even longer.

Some students also showed discrepancies when comparing the number of e-mails with the total number of words. For example, although ESL student #5 wrote fewer e-mails (n=8) than required, her messages were the longest in her group. Compared to the group average, this student wrote 1632.3 words more and her messages were, on average, 234 words longer. In contrast, ESL student #4, who sent the exact number of required messages, wrote a total of 656.7 words less than the group’s average, and his e-mails were, on average, 74.4 words shorter.

The results for the FSL students are presented in Table XII. As shown in the Table, 11 out of the 30 FSL students (37%) sent more e-mails than required by the course. Five students (17%) sent exactly 10 e-mails and 14 (47%) performed below the project requirements. The findings revealed that some students were much more prolific than others: fourteen students (47%) wrote more words compared to the group average while 16 (53%) wrote less. However, discrepancies were also found in five students when comparing the total number of e-mails written with the average number of words per e-mail. For example, FSL student #11 wrote a total of 468.4 words less than the group norm. However, on average, each of the 7 e-mails he sent were 21.6 words longer.
Table XI
Total number of e-mails sent by individuals compared to minimum number required and total number of words by individuals compared to group average: ESL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>Total number of e-mails</th>
<th>+/- number of e-mails compared to required number (n=10)</th>
<th>Total number of words</th>
<th>Total number of words compared to group average</th>
<th>Average number of words (per e-mail)</th>
<th>Average number of words compared to group average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>+ 714.3</td>
<td>119.1</td>
<td>- 44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>- 534.7</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>- 62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>+ 495.3</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>+ 91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>- 656.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>- 74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>+ 1632.3</td>
<td>397.5</td>
<td>+ 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>- 314.7</td>
<td>112.1</td>
<td>- 51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>- 214.7</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>- 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>- 82.3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>- 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>- 263.7</td>
<td>142.7</td>
<td>- 20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>+ 279.3</td>
<td>228.4</td>
<td>+ 64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>- 29.7</td>
<td>189.8</td>
<td>+ 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>- 356.7</td>
<td>148.9</td>
<td>- 14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>+ 91.3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>- 14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>- 539.7</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>- 71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>+ 47.3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>- 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>- 131.7</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>- 45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td>+ 946.3</td>
<td>207.8</td>
<td>+ 44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>- 149.7</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>- 23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>- 770.7</td>
<td>129.5</td>
<td>- 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>+ 33.3</td>
<td>197.6</td>
<td>+ 34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>+ 272.3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>- 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>+ 773.3</td>
<td>232.1</td>
<td>+ 68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>- 398.7</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>- 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>+ 323.3</td>
<td>233.8</td>
<td>+ 70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>1431</td>
<td>- 116.7</td>
<td>119.3</td>
<td>- 44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>- 34.7</td>
<td>116.4</td>
<td>- 47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>- 595.7</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>- 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>+ 50.3</td>
<td>159.8</td>
<td>- 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>+ 128.3</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>+ 46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>- 763.7</td>
<td>156.8</td>
<td>- 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td>46 431</td>
<td>4 905.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 547.7</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XII
Total number of e-mails sent by individuals compared to minimum number required and total number of words by individuals compared to group average: FSL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>Total number of e-mails</th>
<th>+/- number of e-mails compared to required number (n=10)</th>
<th>Total number of words</th>
<th>Total number of words compared to group average</th>
<th>Average number of words</th>
<th>Average words compared to group average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>+ 114.6</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>- 66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>- 960.4</td>
<td>166.1</td>
<td>- 72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ 4</td>
<td>3623</td>
<td>+ 1333.6</td>
<td>258.8</td>
<td>+ 20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>- 441.4</td>
<td>184.8</td>
<td>- 53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>5122</td>
<td>+ 2832.6</td>
<td>426.8</td>
<td>+ 188.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>2244</td>
<td>- 45.4</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>- 34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>- 1437.4</td>
<td>106.5</td>
<td>- 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>- 53.6</td>
<td>292.8</td>
<td>+ 54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>- 400.4</td>
<td>236.1</td>
<td>- 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>- 772.4</td>
<td>151.7</td>
<td>- 86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>- 468.4</td>
<td>260.1</td>
<td>+ 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>- 910.4</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>- 100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>3094</td>
<td>+ 804.6</td>
<td>281.3</td>
<td>+ 42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>- 1292.4</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>- 113.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>2873</td>
<td>+ 583.6</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>- 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>2047</td>
<td>- 242.4</td>
<td>227.4</td>
<td>- 28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>2962</td>
<td>+ 672.6</td>
<td>269.3</td>
<td>+ 30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>- 254.4</td>
<td>169.6</td>
<td>- 68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>3508</td>
<td>+ 1218.6</td>
<td>438.5</td>
<td>+ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>2696</td>
<td>+ 406.6</td>
<td>299.6</td>
<td>+ 61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>4029</td>
<td>+ 1739.6</td>
<td>335.7</td>
<td>+ 97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>3037</td>
<td>+ 747.6</td>
<td>337.4</td>
<td>+ 98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>1631</td>
<td>- 658.4</td>
<td>203.8</td>
<td>- 34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2331</td>
<td>+ 41.6</td>
<td>233.1</td>
<td>- 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>- 1565.4</td>
<td>144.8</td>
<td>- 93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>+ 103.6</td>
<td>217.5</td>
<td>- 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- 6</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>- 1441.4</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>- 26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>2487</td>
<td>+ 197.6</td>
<td>226.1</td>
<td>- 12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2287</td>
<td>- 2.4</td>
<td>228.7</td>
<td>- 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>2331</td>
<td>+ 41.6</td>
<td>388.5</td>
<td>+ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td>68 681</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 156.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 289.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>238.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of these quantitative assessments seem to indicate that the investment of each individual student in the project can not be solely evaluated by measuring the frequency, number and length of the e-mails sent by each student. Individual differences in the way tandem partners engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges will be further analyzed in section 5.5.

The following sections report the findings related to each of the research questions that motivated the present study.

5.2. Research question #1: What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?

As explained in the previous chapter, this question sought to investigate which strategies ESL and FSL secondary school students employed in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners. For this question, there were three levels of analysis: (1) scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students; (2) direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (T/V); (3) use of affordances offered by digital technologies.

5.2.1. Scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students

To answer this question, e-mails were coded by the researcher using a taxonomy adapted from Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of substrategies for providing scaffolding (See Table V, Chapter IV). A total of 294 instances of scaffolding strategies were identified in the e-mails sent by the ESL students and a total of 365 instances in the e-mails sent by the FSL students. Following this, scaffolding strategies were further sorted in function of the students’ tandem role: NS tutor, NNS learner, or e-mail partner. Since in this project students made use of both the L1 and L2, items coded for each of the three tandem roles could be in either the L1 or L2. The type and number of strategies...
employed by the ESL and the FSL students to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners, according to the tandem role adopted, are presented in Table XIII.

Table XIII
Type and total number of strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of strategy</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS TUTOR ROLE</td>
<td>FSL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>4 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
<td>16 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td>11 (3.7%)</td>
<td>19 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting clarification</td>
<td>12 (4.1%)</td>
<td>18 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restating</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>3 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking comprehension</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering help with L2 writing</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>11 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving explicit feedback</td>
<td>94 (31.9%)</td>
<td>86 (23.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td>18 (6.1%)</td>
<td>34 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving implicit feedback</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-giving strategies</td>
<td>43 (14.6%)</td>
<td>50 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>196 (66.7%)</td>
<td>251 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NNS LEARNER ROLE</td>
<td>FSL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting advice</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to advice</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to elicitation</td>
<td>10 (3.4%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>6 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for feedback</td>
<td>16 (5.4%)</td>
<td>23 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-saving strategies</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
<td>17 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking</td>
<td>13 (4.4%)</td>
<td>21 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>14 (4.8%)</td>
<td>9 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>4 (1.4%)</td>
<td>4 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>71 (24.1%)</td>
<td>88 (24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-MAIL PARTNER ROLE</td>
<td>FSL students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>11 (3.7%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>14 (4.8%)</td>
<td>21 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27 (9.2%)</td>
<td>26 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of strategies employed</td>
<td>294 (100%)</td>
<td>365 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is worth noting that no students in any of the two groups performed all types of strategies (See Appendix S for number and type of scaffolding strategies provided by individual students). Consequently, with the exception of two strategies (giving explicit feedback and face-giving strategies), no statistical analyses were performed to determine if there were significant differences between the two groups with respect to the total number of scaffolding strategies provided by each of the two groups. As can be seen in Appendix S, the majority of the students provided explicit feedback and resorted to face-giving strategies when correcting their partners’ e-mails. T-tests were thus performed on the average number of instances of explicit feedback and face-giving strategies provided by each of the two groups. As shown in Tables XIV and XV, no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups. These findings suggest that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the use of these scaffolding strategies.

Table XIV
Paired t-test: Comparison of the average number of instances of explicit feedback provided by ESL and FSL partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Cl</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.3505</td>
<td>3.133</td>
<td>3.9162</td>
<td>1.6697</td>
<td>2.0965</td>
<td>2.8184</td>
<td>0.3828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.2256</td>
<td>2.8667</td>
<td>3.5077</td>
<td>1.3672</td>
<td>1.7167</td>
<td>2.3078</td>
<td>0.3134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (ESL-FSL)</td>
<td>-0.724</td>
<td>0.2667</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>1.9161</td>
<td>2.3413</td>
<td>0.4947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean_Giving explicit feedback_ESL – Mean_Giving explicit feedback_FSL</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.5919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table XV
Paired t-test: Comparison of the average number of instances of face-giving strategies provided by
ESL and FSL partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.9663</td>
<td>1.4333</td>
<td>1.9004</td>
<td>0.9961</td>
<td>1.2507</td>
<td>1.6814</td>
<td>0.2284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.2355</td>
<td>1.6667</td>
<td>2.0978</td>
<td>0.9196</td>
<td>1.1547</td>
<td>1.5523</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference (ESL-FSL)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-0.855</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>0.3888</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.2037</td>
<td>1.4708</td>
<td>0.3108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| T-Tests            | DF | t Value | Pr>|t| |
|--------------------|----|---------|-------|
| Mean_Face giving_ESL – Mean_Face giving_FSL | 58 | -0.75 | 0.4558 |

Figure 6 shows the total number of instances of scaffolding strategies provided by both
groups when adopting the role of the NS tutor, the NNS learner and e-mail partner. As
shown in this Figure, as a group, both ESL and FSL students employed more scaffolding
strategies when functioning as the NS tutor than when adopting the role of the NNS
learner. Two hundred and fifty-one out of the 365 instances (68.8%) identified for the
FSL students, and 196 out of 294 (66.7%) for the ESL students fell under the category NS
tutor role.
Figure 6
Total number of instances of scaffolding strategies provided by ESL and FSL students when adopting the role of the NS tutor, the NNS learner and e-mail partner

T-tests were performed on the means and standard deviations of paired samples in order to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the two groups in terms of the scaffolding strategies provided when functioning as the NS tutor and the NNS learner. As shown in Table XVI, with respect to scaffolding strategies used by students when acting as the NNS learner, there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups ($p>0.05$). There was, however, a significant difference ($p<0.05$) between the two groups with respect to the scaffolding strategies provided when functioning as the NS tutor, thus indicating that the FSL students provided significantly more scaffolding strategies than the ESL students when acting as the NS tutor (Table XVII).
Table XVI
Paired t-test: Comparison of the total number of scaffolding strategies provided by ESL and FSL partners when adopting the role of the NNS learner

<p>| Statistics |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS_total_ESL - NNS_total_FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-1.464</td>
<td>-0.567</td>
<td>0.3304</td>
<td>1.9132</td>
<td>2.4023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XVII
Paired t-test: Comparison of the total number of scaffolding strategies provided by ESL and FSL partners when adopting the role of the NS tutor

<p>| Statistics |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS_total_ESL - NS_total_FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-3.477</td>
<td>-1.833</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>3.5065</td>
<td>4.4028</td>
<td>5.9188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS_total_ESL - NNS_total_FSL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NS_total_ESL - NS_total_FSL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>0.0301*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

Additional t-tests were performed on the means of the number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by both groups when adopting the role of the NNS learner (Table XVIII) and of the NS tutor (Table XIX). When comparing the number of
scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail when adopting the role of the NNS learner (Table XVIII), no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups ($p>0.05$). This conclusion corroborates the results of the t-test that compared the total number of scaffolding strategies rather than the means of strategies per e-mail.

**Table XVIII**

**Paired t-test: Comparison of the average number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by ESL and FSL partners when adopting the role of the NNS learner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Lower CL</th>
<th>Mean Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean_NNS_ESL - mean_NNS_FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.2189</td>
<td>0.2749</td>
<td>0.3695</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean_NNS_ESL - mean_NNS_FSL</td>
<td>-0.833</td>
<td>0.4821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**T-Tests**

| Difference                | DF | t Value | Pr > |t|
|---------------------------|----|---------|------|
| mean_NNS_ESL - mean_NNS_FSL | 29 | -1.17   | 0.2522 |

As shown in Table XIX, statistically significant differences at the level of $p<0.05$ were found when comparing the average number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by both partners when adopting the role of the NS tutor ($p=0.0270$). Since the mean is negative, it can be concluded that the ESL students provided fewer scaffolding strategies per e-mail when adopting the role of the NS tutor than did the FSL students. However, when analyzed at the level of $p<0.001$, to be protected from errors caused by the large number of tests, it can rather be concluded that when taking the role of the NS
tutor, the ESL students *had a tendency* to provide fewer scaffolding strategies per e-mail than their FSL partners.

**Table XIX**

Paired t-test: Comparison of the average number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by ESL and FSL partners when adopting the role of the NS tutor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Lower CL Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Upper CL Mean</th>
<th>Lower CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Upper CL Std Dev</th>
<th>Std Err</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean_NS_ESL - mean_NS_FSL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.4316</td>
<td>0.5419</td>
<td>0.7285</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean_NS_ESL - mean_NS_FSL</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| T-Tests | DF | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|---------|----|---------|------|---|
| mean_NS_ESL - mean_NS_FSL | 29 | -2.33 | 0.0270* |

* p< 0.05

In order to test whether significant differences existed among the proportion of ESL and FSL students that employed a given strategy at least once, a Fisher’s exact test was performed. Fisher’s exact test is a statistical significance test used in the analysis of categorical data where samples are small. This test is used to examine the significance of the association between two variables in a 2 x 2 contingency table. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups of learners (see Table XX). This finding suggests that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the strategies they used to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners. The type and number of scaffolding strategies employed by the students, according to the tandem role adopted, are further analyzed in sections 5.2.1 (Native speaker tutor role), 5.2.2 (Non-native speaker learner role), and 5.2.3 (E-mail tandem role).
**Table XX**
Comparison of the proportion of ESL and FSL students that employed a given strategy at least once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of scaffolding strategy</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NS TUTOR ROLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0.6707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
<td>9 (30%)</td>
<td>0.3604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>0.2668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting clarification</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>14 (46.7%)</td>
<td>0.1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restating</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>0.6120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking comprehension</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering help with L2 writing</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>0.1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving explicit feedback</td>
<td>28 (93.3%)</td>
<td>29 (96.7%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>0.1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving implicit feedback</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-giving strategies</td>
<td>21 (70%)</td>
<td>27 (90%)</td>
<td>0.1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>0.1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NNS LEARNER ROLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting advice</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to advice</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0.4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to elicitation</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0.7480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>0.1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for feedback</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>17 (56.7%)</td>
<td>0.3015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-saving strategies</td>
<td>5 (16.67%)</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>0.0840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking</td>
<td>12 (40%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>0.6042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>0.3985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0.4915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-MAIL PARTNER ROLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0.2326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>13 (43.3%)</td>
<td>0.5959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0.4915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146
5.2.1.1. Native speaker tutor role

The proportion of ESL and FSL students that provided a given scaffolding strategy at least once when adopting the role of the NS tutor is presented in Figure 7. As shown in this Figure, when in the role of the NS tutor, the ESL students provided the full range of strategies, while the FSL students provided all the types of scaffolding strategies except for checking comprehension and giving implicit feedback. In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as NS tutor. With the exception of two ESL students and one FSL student, all the students participating in this study provided explicit feedback to their tandem partners at least once. In general, these findings suggest that students respected the central pedagogical element of a tandem partnership: correcting their partners' errors. Indeed, at the start of the project, it had been pointed out to all learners from both groups that mutual error correction played an important role in e-mail tandem exchanges. On several occasions over the course of the project, teachers reminded them of this fact. Following the suggestion given by DiGiovanni and Nagaswami (2001), after students corrected their partners' first e-mail, the L2 teachers used printouts of selected students' e-mails as a training tool to sensitize students to effective ways to give feedback.
A closer examination of the e-mails revealed that students used a number of different ways to give explicit feedback. Many instances were found where the students rewrote whole e-mails and others where students chose to correct specific paragraphs or sentences. In terms of typographical highlighting, since WebCT can show threaded messages, the majority of students used the “reply” function and very few chose the “quote” function to automatically highlight the original message with arrows (>). Various typographical features were also used as a means of providing explicit feedback. Some students used parentheses, quotation marks, or bold letters to highlight the correction. Others used a dash, asterisks, dots or numbers to enumerate their corrections. To distinguish between the original and the corrected part of the text, some students used

---

3 Note that quantification of ways to give explicit feedback was beyond the scope of the present study.
words or phrases such as You said...., You should say....; Le message original, Le message corrigé; Quand tu dis....; Tu dois dire....; On dit.... au lieu de ....; On ne dit pas....mais...., etc. Finally, some students separated the original word or sentence from the correction using an arrow (=>) or an equals sign (=). It is worth noting that only a few students made use of digital affordances such as the use of underlining, italics and fonts of different colors to highlight their corrections. Examples of the way such features were actualized in the students’ e-mails are provided in Figure 8.

Figure 8. Examples of typographical features used as a means of providing explicit feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parentheses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russell (agrees) with my idea. He think the (people) who cheat are bad and he has reason to think that. (FSL 1, message #1337)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bold capitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My opinion about racism is IT'S bad. Yeah, I hate racism. Racism is, for me, the real destruction of the person. Of course, IT'S great to create a site that helpS! Some people BREAK down all kind of stereotypes. IT'S not mature to LAUGH AT people who have ARE OF other ethnic BACKGROUND. (FSL 3, message #1308)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &quot;Aussi, tu introduis une bonne pointe...&quot; Aussi, tu introduis un bon point...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. &quot;C'est vraiment différent pour chaque individuel...&quot; C'est vraiment différent pour chaque individu... (ESL 15, message #968)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. one mather - spelling error mather should be mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. i draw the animal - should be: I draw animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. i listen the music - should be: I listen to music. (FSL 6, message #672)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words or phrases to distinguish between original and correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quand tu as dit « j'ai 17 ans et j'étude à Turner Fenton », tu dois dire « j'ai 17 ans et j'étudie à Turner Fenton ». On ne dit pas « un frère cadette », mais « j'ai un frère cadet. » (ESL 7, message #701)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have 17 years old =&gt; I am 17 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a girlfriend and 1 year and a half =&gt; I have had a girlfriend for a year and a half. (FSL 9, message #651)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second most salient scaffolding strategy resorted to in the tutor role involved face-giving. Twenty-seven (90%) FSL students and 21 (70%) ESL students softened the tone of their corrections by using phases such as *There are minor mistakes*, *Il y a quelques erreurs dans ton français*. In general, students downscaled the word “mistakes” with adjectives such as *minor, few, little, some, peu, pas d’importantes, pas beaucoup, quelques*.

In general, students of both groups first gave a positive comment about their partners’ command of their L2, even in the case of numerous mistakes, then provided corrective feedback in the form of explicit feedback or instructing [e.g., "*Je tiens à te dire que tu te débrouilles pas mal en français*". (ESL 7, message #706)]. However, several instances of face-giving strategies were also found after the corrections [e.g., “But, it's very good French !!” (ESL 10, message #1400)], and even others before and after the corrections [e.g., before: “First I just want to tell you some little mistakes that you did last e-mail”; after: “Except this, it is perfect” (ESL 9, message #856)].

A pattern used by some students involved a positive appreciation of their partners’ L2 skills followed by a negative judgement of their own abilities in their L2 [e.g., “I think your english is pretty good, at least it’s better than my french” (FSL 16, message #673); “You are very good in french but me in english I don’t have a lot of vocabulary” (ESL 13, message #726)]. When positively appreciating their partners’ command of their L2, students used adjectives such as *good, excellent, great, impressed, correct, bon, bien, pas mal, parfaite*. Some of these adjectives were frequently upscaled by adverbs such as *very, really, très and vraiment*.

In other instances, students justified the fact of providing corrective feedback by reminding their partners that it was a required task [e.g., “Apparently we have to correct any errors that we find in each other’s email. You just have little minor ones like: ” (FSL 23, message #813); “*Je dois te corriger alors c'est ce que je vais faire d'accord !??* (ESL 10, message #1207); “I'm going to correct your mistakes first since that's what we are supposed to do” (FSL 29, message #693)], or that they were responding to their partners’ requests for feedback (e.g., “*Comme tu me l'as demandé, je vais corriger tes erreurs*” (ESL 17, message #737). Some students made humorous comments [e.g., “And now what you waiting for THE CORRECTION TIME! I hope you enjoy this moment” (ESL
12, message #1092)], whereas others used phrases such as “Bravo!!!” (ESL 22, message #14141); “Félicitations mon ami!!” (FSL 20, message #1440); “Keep up the good work!!” (FSL 16, message #1109).

These findings seem to indicate that, even if students were providing corrective feedback in response to the project requirements, the majority of them made use of face-giving strategies to counteract the potential face damage of the face threatening act of correcting other’s mistakes (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

The third most salient strategy provided by both groups, which clearly shows the degree to which secondary students were capable of adopting the role of tutor, was instructing. Although more Anglophone students (60% or 18/30) resorted to this strategy than their Francophone counterparts (40% or 12/30), this difference was not found to be statistically significant. Various ways were resorted to by students to actualize this strategy. In some instances, students gave “mini” lessons on grammar, vocabulary, stylistic conventions, or other aspects of writing [e.g., “On ne dit pas ‘mon sœur’ mais on doit dire ‘ma sœur’ puisque c’est féminin” (ESL 27, message #728)]. In other instances, students provided a synonym, an explanation or a translation of a supposedly difficult word or expression [e.g., “Mon défaut principal c’est que je suis rancunier. Ça veut dire que s’il se passe quelque chose avec quelqu’un et qu’on se parle plus bien ce n’est pas moi qui vais aller lui parler” (ESL 15, message #881)]. There were also instances where the student resorted to English-French comparisons to explain the rule [e.g., “Je pense qu’en français, on dit ‘répondre à’, mais en anglais, on dit just ‘answer’, pas ‘answer to’. Donc, quand vous écrivez ‘To answer to your first question’, on aurait écrit ‘To answer your first question’.” (FSL 9, message #911)].

Findings also revealed that 12 FSL students (40%) and 7 ESL students (23.3%) provided scaffolding to their partners in the form of evaluative comments that were not followed by corrective feedback. By resorting to the reacting strategy, students provided general evaluative remarks in regard to their partners’ L2 [e.g., “Tu es très bon en français!!” (ESL 8, message #771)] or to the content of the e-mail [e.g., “I read your response to the racism article and I really liked your point of view.” (FSL 11, message #1314)]. Some instances were found in the students’ first reply [e.g., “Tout d’abord, j’aimerais te féliciter– tu parles bien l’anglais!” (FSL 26, message #659, First reply)],
while others were found in their “good-bye e-mails” [e.g., “Je pense que ton anglais a amélioré” (FSL 4, message #1610, Good-bye e-mail)]. Finally, some students repeatedly gave positive comments about their partners’ linguistic skills during the course of the e-mail tandem exchange [e.g., “Pour terminer je trouve que tu es vraiment bon en français” (ESL 11, message #704); “Sérieusement, tu es vraiment très bon en français, je te félicite!” (ESL 11, message #851)].

Data also showed that 14 FSL students (46.7%) and 7 ESL students (23.3%) requested clarification of intended meaning when their partners were writing in their L2. These requests were often preceded by phrases such as: “I don’t understand this sentence”; What did you mean that...?”. It is interesting to note that these phrases were sometimes followed by one or several question marks [e.g., “The person back (?)” (FSL 8, message #1311); “sont plus affective ~ ?????” (ESL 18, message #1432)]. It is worth noting that these requests for clarification did not often result in a response on the part of the NNSs. Indeed, the ESL students only responded to 6 out of the 18 requests for clarification on the part of their Anglophone partners and the FSL students responded to only one of the 12 requests for clarification by their Francophone counterparts.

An interesting scaffolding strategy that was used by 9 FSL students (30%) and 5 ESL students (16.7%) was eliciting. This strategy enabled students to elicit opinion or reaction [e.g., “Tu es d’accord avec ton article?” (FSL 3, message #1141)], additional information or content [e.g., “Tu ne parles pas au sujet du boire. Drinking and driving is another major cause of accidents. What do you think about drinking and driving?” (FSL 29, message #1142)], or background knowledge or understanding of text [e.g., “You have said accurately that we agree about cheating, but don’t you want to explain it more?” (FSL 8, message #955)] from their tandem partners in order to encourage their participation. Very interestingly, the data revealed that FSL students (as NNSs) responded to all (n=5) the eliciting attempts from their partners, whereas the ESL students responded to 10 out of 16. Some examples of eliciting and responding to eliciting are shown in Figure 9. As shown in these examples, by providing this scaffolding strategy the NSs pushed the NNSs to articulate their thoughts and to clarify their points of view by offering additional information.
Figure 9. Examples of eliciting and responding to eliciting

**NS’s elicitation:** So what efforts do you make to preserve the heritage of different cultures? Have you ever defended a non-white person from racial comments or hate-crimes? (FSL 20, message #1341)

**NNS’s response to elicitation:** I have already defend my friend from racist action. But this is happened there are 7-8 years, when I was to the primary school. Sometimes the childrens dont know what is the consequence of their racial comments. (ESL 20, Re: message #1341)

**NS’s elicitation :** Je ne suis pas d'accord avec ton opinion que nous ressemblons à des chimpanzés... (ESL 6, message #1397)

**NNS’s response to elicitation :** Je pense que tu ne me comprendes pas quand je disais que nous ressemblons les chimpanzés. j'ai signifié que en genetique, nous ressemblons les chimpanzés 98.4%. (FSL 6, message #1449)

5.2.1.2. Non-native speaker learner role

The proportion of ESL and FSL students that provided a given scaffolding strategy at least once when adopting the role of the NNS learner is presented in Figure 10. As shown in this Figure, when in the role of the NNS, the FSL students performed the full range of strategies, while ESL students resorted to all strategies except two: responding to advice and responding to apologies.
As shown in Figure 10, 17 FSL students (56.7%) and 12 ESL students (40%) asked their partners for feedback at least once. In addition, half of the FSL students (15/30) and 12 ESL students (40%) thanked their partners for their feedback. Very interestingly, it was found that 5 out of the 18 ESL students and 5 out of the 13 FSL students who did not ask for feedback tried to maintain a positive face vis-à-vis their partners by resorting to face-saving strategies. The data showed that, in their desire to be appreciated, respected, and liked by their tandem partners, some students “alerted” their partners to the fact that they might be making mistakes because they were not good in their target languages [e.g., “Je n’est pas bon en français, mais c’est ma dernier année donc je suis content” (FSL 27, message #640); “Moi je suis en secondaire 5e je finis donc cette année. Je ne suis pas vraiment bonne en anglais, je suis donc en anglais de 4e secondaire” (ESL 27, message #621)].
Several instances were also found where the students’ negative self-appraisals of their own abilities in their L2 appeared to function to increase their own positive face [e.g., “Je suis sur qu'il y a beaucoup de problème en grammaire. Ne ris pas...” (FSL 3, message #553); “I'm sorry. I don't speak English very well” (ESL 10, 598); “J'ai probablement tant de fautes” (FSL 20, message #1440)]. By contrast, other instances were found where students justified their errors as being “slips” [e.g., “Hopefully my French makes sense and there isn't some weird meaning that I accidentally wrote that is the new joke in your class” (FSL 18, message #688); “I can't believe I typed Je suis instead of J'ai”. (FSL 3, message #656)]. Yet, in other instances, students resorted to the fact that both of them were L2 learners and might consequently make mistakes [e.g., “I know that im not great at french, and I do not mind how your english is. Have fun with my french” (FSL 27, message #542); “Pense-tu les courriels des notre classe est drôle? Nous nous amusons avec les petits differences en les deux langues, français et anglais” (FSL 21, message #666)]. In addition, 7 out of 17 FSL students who did ask for feedback justified any eventual spelling and grammar mistakes by the fact that they were writing directly on the computer and were thus unable to check for mistakes. Such a face-saving strategy is illustrated in the following e-mail by an FSL student:

Maintenant je suis supposé de ‘Demandez de l'aide pour corriger vos erreurs’. Je n'est pas lu qu'est-ce que j'ai écri alors il y a probablement beaucoup de fautes de grammaire ou orthographe. (FSL 3, message #924)

Eleven ESL students (36.7%) and 7 FSL students (23.3%) also asked their tandem partners “to take action” (i.e., giving directives). It is worth mentioning that some students showed their engagement with the tasks involved in this project, namely mutually helping each other in improving their L2, by specifying the tasks their partners had not fulfilled, as exemplified in the following e-mail:
Objet : tu ne me réponds pas!!!!!!!!!!

Why did you no write a new e-mail..... I have more question about my text and you have questions about your text. I need to compare your opinion whit my opinion for my english class........It's very important for write a report on the article one. Take a few minutes please for write a message......  (ESL 7, Message # 848)

5.2.1.3. E-mail partner role

The proportion of ESL and FSL students that provided a given scaffolding strategy at least once when adopting the e-mail partner role is presented in Figure 11. As can be seen in this Figure, 10 ESL students (33.3%) and 5 FSL students (16.7%) asked their tandem partner to take action with the purpose of keeping the e-mail communication going. The same number of ESL students (10/30 or 33.3%) and 13 FSL students (43.3%) either responded to these directives or apologized for having interrupted the communication. In some cases, students apologized for having written either a long or a short e-mail.
The analysis of e-mails also revealed that in addition to providing the scaffolding strategies described up to this point, Francophone students also assisted their FSL partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (*tu/vous*). As this strategy is solely related to the French language, it was not included in the taxonomy presented in Table V (see Chapter IV) and is described in a separate section (5.2.2.). In addition, a number of typographical features were also used to support or clarify the illocutionary force of students’ scaffolding strategies. The use of these features will be further discussed in section 5.2.3.
5.2.2. Direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (*tu/vous*)

In this section, I describe a scaffolding strategy employed by some Francophone students, namely direct peer assistance in the use of address forms in French. The analysis presented here is limited in scope. My intention is to illustrate the way French-speaking partners scaffolded their Anglophone counterparts in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (*tu/vous*). Analysis of e-mail data pertaining to *tu/vous* (*T/V*) indicated that for a number of students their use of these address forms evolved over the 18-week period of the e-mail exchange. As shown in Figure 12, 25 out of 30 FSL students opened their e-mail exchanges with their Francophone partners by using *vous*. Although all their French-speaking partners addressed them with *T* in their first responses, 18 FSL students continued using *V* exclusively or a mixture of *T* and *V* in e-mail 2. Only 4 of the 25 FSL students who inappropriately used *V* in their first e-mails received direct (explicit) assistance in regard to this point from their Francophone partners in the second or third e-mail. In one of these cases, it was the FSL student herself (Heather/FSL 26) who asked her partner if he did not mind if she used *T* in her e-mails. In their final e-mails, 5 FSL students still addressed their partners with *V*, and 3 still mixed both *T* and *V*. 


In order to illustrate the way French-speaking partners scaffolded their Anglophone counterparts in the development of the second-person T/V pronoun use in French, I focus on the four students (Karen, Nathan, Brenda, and Heather) who received explicit assistance from their tandem partners and on the one student who received indirect peer assistance (Jenny). In Table XXI, T and V uses for each of these students are presented separately for each e-mail sent. Explicit peer assistance by the Francophone partners with respect to the pronoun of address is indicated by "PA". In the case of Heather (FSL 26), peer assistance was preceded by her request for assistance, indicated by "RA". In this way, data in the Table indicate whether the choice of the T form occurred directly following the instance of peer assistance or whether the V form persisted beyond this point in the exchange. The Table also shows that in some e-mails, no instances of either T or V were used by a particular student (e.g., Karen/FSL 17, e-mail #7). This situation arose when students wrote their entire e-mail in English or when they only wrote their opinion pieces.
In the remainder of this section, Francophone students’ assistance with regard to T/V use is further examined in two phases: (a) the linguistic development with regard to T use (i.e., how the students evolved over the course of the e-mail exchange), and (b) the reasons for this development (i.e., why students adopted T use).

5.2.2.1. Linguistic development of T use

Representative examples of the way French-speaking partners scaffolded their Anglophone counterparts in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (tu/vous) are presented in this section. In the examples provided, T/V forms and tandem partner assistance have been highlighted to facilitate reading. Paragraphs that were omitted are indicated as an ellipsis (…).
In her first e-mail, Jenny used 5 V forms and 0 T forms:

**Message numéro 533**
Envoyé par Jenny le Jeudi, Novembre 11, 2004 10:45
Objet : Salut!

Salut Mathieu,

Comment allez-vous? Je m'appelle Jenny. J'ai dix-sept ans. Je fais partie dans une programme nommé IB ou BI en français, que veut dire Baccalauréat Internationale; peut-être vous avez entendu à propos de cet programme, si non il est un programme pour les étudiants qui veulent être plus préparés pour l'université. J'étais dans un programme d'immersion français avant que j'ai commencé BI.

Les intructions dit que je dois vous parler à propos de ma famille. Donc, j'ai un frère qui a quinze ans, et j'habite avec mes parents. Je suis une personne avec beaucoup de passe temps; Je joue en deux bands, un de jazz et un de musique classique. Dans l'été je joue du soccer et tennis en équipe. Je suis le chef de quelques clubs d'école, étudiants pour étudiants qui est un club qui organise les events pour l'école, et le club de politiques. Je me suis très intéressée en les politiques du monde et je fais partie d'un party politique.

Mes amis sont principauxment dans le programme de BI aussi, mais j'ai des amis dehors d'école. Je vais écrire en Anglais maintenant, et je vais vous demander quelques questions, pour voir si vous comprenez mon anglais.

(...)

Jenny’s Francophone partner addressed her with tu in his first response but did not explicitly intervene to correct Jenny’s use of V. Jenny switched to T in e-mail #2 (example below) and maintained her use of it for the duration of the e-mail exchange:

**Message numéro 636**[Branche du numéro 602]
Envoyé par Jenny le Jeudi, Novembre 18, 2004 10:52
Objet : Re: Hello

Bonjour Mathieu,

Je suis désolé aussi que tu ne puisses pas écrire plus, mais pas de problème. Tu n'as pas répondu avec ton âge et à propos de ta famille; je voudrais d'entendre à propos d'eux. Tu es un homme de la forêt hien? Ça c'est bien. J'aime les sports aussi, mais maintenant je n'ai pas du temps pour les faire au cause de l'école. Tu veut enrôler
dans les forces canadiennes? Tu as de la courage vraiment, je ne pourrais pas le faire si j'ai essayé. Mais, je pense que les sports que tu fais va t'aider. Je suis d'accord avec tu, j'aime l'école secondaire plus que l'école primaire.

Je vais écrire quelques indices pour tu pour quand tu écris en anglais. Quand tu veut dire vivre en anglais, tu dis, live, pas leave. Pour example: I live in Charlesbourg in Québec. C'est normale, cet erreur, je pense que c'est au cause de ton accent français.

Quand tu as dit; "I am a real little forest man", il y a un phrase en anglais pour dire ceci. C'est "I am a real outdoors-man." Ce sont tous les petits erreurs que je peux voir maintenant, et ils sont vraiment petits. Je vais écrire en anglais maintenant.

(...)

Karen (FSL 17)

In her first e-mail, Karen used V to address her partner:

**Message numéro 555**  
Envoyé par Karen le Jeudi, Novembre 11, 2004 14:39  
**Objet : Bonjour!**

Bonjour Sylvie,

Je m'appelle Karen. J'aime le français, mais il n'y a pas beaucoup d'opportunités pour le pratiquer à l'Ontario.


J'aime voyager. J'ai vu beaucoup de paysages très différentes et très belles. Je suis allés en Europe quelques années passés. Plus souvent, nous faisons du camping en été. (...) Est-ce que vous avez voyager quelque place?

beaucoup. Je suis une instructeur de la natation, c'est mon travail. Aussi, je fait beaucoup à l'école. Je fais de la photographie, et je participe à une club humanitaire. Je suis très occupées. Est-ce que vous faites beaucoup à l'école?

Quand j'ai le temps, j'aime lire, nager, et rencontrer avec mes amies. Les choses très normales. Alors, qu'est-ce que vous aimer faire? Mon rêve est de retourner à l'Europe. Je veux voyager la monde. Quels sont vos rêves?

A la prochaine fois!
Karen

Although Sylvie, Karen’s Francophone partner, addressed her with T in her first response, Karen still used 2 V forms and 0 T forms in her second e-mail. In Karen’s third e-mail, Sylvie explicitly intervened to correct Karen’s use of V:

Message numéro 737[Branche du numéro 658]
Envoyé par Sylvie le Jeudi, Novembre 25, 2004 16:21
Objet : article 1

Bonjour Karen,
J'espère un jour visiter l'Europe moi aussi, si je voyage. Alors je te souhaite d'habiter là-bas un jour!
Si tu le veux tu peux me tutoyer (dire tu au lieu de vous).
Comme tu me l'as demandé, je vais corriger tes erreurs. Si j'en ai, tu peux me les corriger aussi.
(...)

Following Sylvie’s direct assistance, Karen adopted T use and maintained it throughout the e-mail exchange.

Nathan (FSL 22)

In his first e-mail, Nathan used four V forms and one T form for the possessive adjective (i.e., ta):
Chère Anne,

Je m'appelle Nathan et je suis seize ans. J'habite à Mississauga en Ontario. Je suis dans la onzième année. Mon père s'appelle Frank, ma mère s'appelle Ariza, et mon frère s'appelle Ian. Mon frère va à l'Université de Waterloo, et il est dans sa troisième année d'université. Quel âge avez-vous? Quelle école allez-vous? Combien de personnes est-ce qu'il y a dans ta famille?


(...)

Like all Francophone partners, Anne addressed Nathan with tu in her first response. However, Nathan still mixed both T and V in his second e-mail, even within the same clause:

Salut Anne,

Comment ça va? Je suis très content que vous m'ayez répondu. Ton anglais n'est pas très mal, et je l'ai compromis avec seulement un peu de difficulté. Pour votre bénéfice, j'inclue ton message antérieur et je l'ai corrigé en bas.

(...)

Qu'est-ce que vous voulez faire pour le travail? Je veux devenir un ingénieur parce que j'aime créant les choses, pensant de quelles choses je veux créer, et aussi, je suis très bon à la mathématique. Qu'est-ce que c'est votre sujet favorite à l'école. Est-ce que vous aimez les science ou le littérature?

Si vous vous rappelez, je dis la dernière fois que je vous écris une expression d'argot chaque fois. Alors, la locution de cette lettre est « Whassup! ». Cette expression
veut dire « How is your life? » et en français, ce veut dire « Comment ça va? ». La prochaine fois vous m'écrivez, est-ce que vous me donnez une expression d'argot aussi. I hope to hear from you soon.

In her next e-mail, Anne corrected Nathan’s e-mail in French by providing, among other corrections, the correct T form. She also provided explicit instructions in the appropriate T versus V use:

Message numéro 742[Branche du numéro 687]
Envoyé par Anne le Jeudi, Novembre 25, 2004 16:25
Objet : Bonjour Nathan

Salut Nathan!
Comment vas-tu? Ton français est très bon mais il y a quelques petites fautes. Voici les corrections.

Alors, j’aime regarder le hockey à la télé aussi, mais seulement pendant les séries. Je suis un grand fanatique de l’équipe « Toronto Maple Leafs ». Quelle est ton équipe favorite? Est-ce que tu regardes l’hockey tout le temps ou seulement pendant les séries?

Qu’est-ce que tu veux faire comme métier? Je veux devenir un ingénieur parce que j'aime créer les choses, (pensant de quelles choses je veux créer)?? (je ne comprend pas ce que tu veux dire), et aussi, je suis très bon en mathématique. Qu’est-ce que c’est ton sujet favorite a l’école. Est-ce que tu aimes les sciences ou le littérature?

(...). Je voudrais te dire que l’on utilise vous pour les gens que nous ne connaissons pas et pour les personnes âgées, alors quand tu m’écris, tu peux me dire tu!!

Despite Ann’s explicit assistance, Nathan continued using the V form in his third e-mail:

Message numéro 833[Branche du numéro 742]
Envoyé par Nathan le Jeudi, Décembre 2, 2004 16:32
Objet : Salut

Anne,

(...)
1. Est-ce que vous pensez que les personnes aient classées en cinq grandes familles comme Odile Kerjean dit?
2. Est-ce que vous pensez que Odile ait oublié une famille quand il a classe les personnes en cinq catégories? Et pourquoi?
3. Quel est votre meilleur défaut? Et pourquoi?
4. Quel type de personnes pensez-vous est le plus important?
5. Est-ce que vous pensez que une personne égoïste seulement veuille les choses pour eux-mêmes ?
6. Odile dit « Les paresseux trouvent parfois des raccourcis afin d'accomplir plus facilement leur travail », Est-ce que vous pensez que les paresseuses vraiment bénéficient une compagnie ?

In her next e-mail, Anne responds to Nathan’s questions without providing any corrections regarding his incorrect use of V. Then, in his fourth e-mail, Nathan switched to T use exclusively and continued using it appropriately in his subsequent e-mails.

**Brenda (FSL 24)**

In her first e-mail to her tandem partner, Brenda used V throughout, but closed it with a T form for the possessive adjective:

**Message numéro 535**

Envoyé par Brenda le Jeudi, Novembre 11, 2004 10:45
Objet : Q

Salut Marianne,

Comment allez-vous? Je m'appelle Brenda, je serai votre partenaire. J'ai 16 ans mais dans la mois je serais 17 ans. Quel age avez-vous? Dans ma famille, j'ai un petit frère qui est très ennuyant. Je habite à Brampton, qui est un petit ville. Aussi, je habite avec mon jolie parents. Ma famille n'est pas très grand, mais très traditionnelle.


Until the next time,

*ton* amie,

Brenda
In her second e-mail, Brenda mixed T and V. Of particular interest in this example is Brenda’s switching to a T form for the personal pronoun (“forme tonique”) and the possessive adjective although incorrectly using the masculine ton instead of the feminine ta:

**Message numéro 652** [Branche du numéro 622]
Envoyé par **Brenda** le Jeudi, Novembre 18, 2004 10:58
**Objet : Re: Hello**

Sault Marianne!

Ainsi, comment allez-vous? (...)
Je ne peux pas attendre ton response. À bientot.

In her third e-mail, Brenda opened it with V, then switched to T and used it throughout:

**Message numéro 818** [Branche du numéro 731]
Envoyé par **Brenda** le Jeudi, Décembre 2, 2004 10:54
**Objet : Re: hello**

Salut, Marianne Tremblay!!!
Comment allez-vous? Je suis comme-ce comme-ça. (...)
Maintenant, je serai des discus l’article que j’ai lu en classe. L'article explique des cinq défauts capitaux dans le monde de travail. Les cinq défauts capitaux dans le monde de travail étaient les orgueilleux, les égoïstes, les agressifs, les paresseux, et les complexes. Pour commencer, j'ai été intéressé par son idée disant de l'égoïsme se rapporte au narcissisme (l'amour que l'on se porte); l'orgueil est lié à l'idéal du moi (l'estime que l'on a pour soi); l'agressivité et la paresse sont des dispositions pulsionnelles pour agir et les complexes sont des inhibition qui entrent le fonctionnement des autres composantes de la personnalité. Qu'est-ce que tu penses au
suject du point d'auteur? Es-tu d'accord avec les points soulevés dans cet article? Qu'est-ce que tu penses sont les cinq défauts capitaux dans le monde de travail?

Je ne peux pas attendre ton response. À bientot.

Brenda’s variable use of T and V prompted the following instruction from her Francophone partner:

Message numéro 884 [Branche du numéro 818]
Envoyé par Marianne le Lundi, Décembre 6, 2004 14:26
Objet : salut

salut, comment ça va ? moi ça va super bien surtout que c'est bientôt notre fête !!! ;)

(...) maintenant je vais faire la correction de tes fautes, ahhh aussi t'es pas obligée de me vouvoyer(me dire vous )

(...) In her subsequent response (e-mail #4), Brenda changed her more formal opening “Comment allez-vous” to the more informal “Comment ça va”?, probably following Marianne’s model, but then addressed her partner with V:

Message numéro 916 [Branche du numéro 884]
Envoyé par Brenda le Jeudi, Décembre 9, 2004 10:55
Objet : Re: salut

Salut Marianne...

Bon fête!!! Comment ça va? Moi... je suis bien... très bien!!! Cependant, je ne me sens pas différent. Bien, nous sommes d'accord avec les points soulevés dans cet article. Nous convenons et nous pensons qu'ils sont plus des cinq défauts capitaux parce nous pensons et nous croyons que le monde ne devrait pas être divisé en cinq grandes families: les orgueilleux, les agressifs, les paresseux et les complexes. De plus, je suis d'accord avec votre avis que la paresse est le derriere des cinq défauts capitaux. Aussi, je agree avec votre avis que il est difficile de penser à des autres défauts capitaux, parce que nous sommes besion éprouvons la réalité. (...|
Very surprisingly, in her next six e-mails, Brenda went back to opening her e-mail with a V form ("Comment allez-vous?") and freely mixed T and V. Particularly striking in the following example (E-mail #5) is the juxtaposition of V and T in contiguous sentences:

**Message numéro 998 [Branche du numéro 975]**
Envoyé par Brenda le Jeudi, Décembre 16, 2004 10:54  
**Objet : Re: salut**

Salut Marianne...

Comment allez-vous? Merci beaucoup pour ton corrections.
Que feras-tu pendant Noël? Quel sorte de nourriture vous aimez pendant Noël? La nourriture j'aime manger pour Noël est Eggnog. Cependant, nous ne célébrons Noël, parce je ne c'est pas Christian. Mais, nous achétons cadeaus. (...)

**Heather (FSL 26)**

Like most FSL students, Heather opened her e-mail exchange with her Francophone partner by using vous. She thus used 11 V forms and 0 T forms in her first e-mail. However, in contrast to the rest of her classmates, Heather opened her second e-mail by asking her partner if she could address him with tu and immediately switched to tu:

**Message numéro 659 [Branche du numéro 619]**
Envoyé par Heather le Jeudi, Novembre 18, 2004 14:45  
**Objet : Re: bonjour**

Salut Alexandre
Je peux te tu toyer? Tout d’abord, j’aimerais te feliciter-tu parles bien l’anglais! La ville de Quebec est de plus ou moins bilingue, n’est-ce pas? Y-a-t’il une diversité de cultures, ethinicites, etc? Ici, il y a beaucoup de diverses cultures. (...)

Heather’s request prompted the following response from her Francophone partner Alexandre:
A summary of the instances of explicit assistance in the use of T and V by the Francophone students in these partnerships are presented in Figure 13.

**Figure 13. Direct assistance in the use of T and V**

- Si tu le veux tu peux me tutoyer (dire tu au lieu de vous). (Sylvie/ESL 17, message # 737, second e-mail).

- Je voudrais te dire que l'on utilise vous pour les gens que nous ne connaissions pas et pour les personnes âgées, alors quand tu m'écris, tu peux me dire tu!! (Anne/ESL 22, message #742, second e-mail).

- ahhh aussi t'es pas obligée de me vouvoyer(me dire vous). (Marianne/ESL 24, message #884, third e-mail)

- Je peux te tu toyer? (Heather/FSL 26, message #659, second e-mail)

Re: non, je n'ai aucun problème que tu me tutoies... (Alexandre/ESL 26, message #724, Re : message 659, second e-mail)

**5.2.2.2. Reasons for the students’ linguistic development of T use**

Data from the analysis of e-mails were complemented with data obtained from the interviews with selected FSL case study students (Ruth, Jenny, and Heather) and with the FSL teacher. The interview data was of particular use in understanding the reasons why most FSL students had opened their e-mail exchanges with their tandem partners by using V and why some of them may have made the transition to T in their subsequent e-
mails despite not having received any explicit assistance from their Francophone partners.

In the interview with Callie, the FSL teacher, she explained that in the exam students write at the end of the year, there is a section on register. Consequently, she had instructed her students to take advantage of this e-mail exchange with native French speakers to practice the T/V use. In this regard, one student (Ruth) reported having been instructed to use *vous* when speaking with people whom they did not know well: “I think we were told to use *vous* the first time just because it’s someone you don’t know, and then once you got more familiar to each other you can use *tu*” (Ruth/FSL29, Interview; April 7, 2005). Consistent with her teacher’s instruction, in her first e-mail, Ruth used only V forms but, without receiving any explicit assistance from her tandem partner, switched to *tu* in her subsequent e-mails. Like Ruth, another student Jenny, also started out using V in her first e-mail but then switched to T without receiving any direct feedback from her tandem partner. In the interview with Jenny, she confirmed that her initial use of V was in response to her teacher’s instructions. However, she very interestingly pointed out that her switch to T emerged as a result of an exchange with a classmate who advised using T following advice received from a tandem partner in this regard:

Somebody else in their partners’ e-mails said: ‘you know, you don’t need to use *vous*, you can be a little informal, because we are your age, they’re around your age, you don’t really need to do that with people you own age’ so I made the transition. I knew that at first, if you do not know the person you use *vous*, so I had to use *vous* at the beginning, but then made the transition to *vous*.

(Jenny/FSL 13, April 7, 2005)

As previously mentioned, the only instance of a FSL student requesting assistance in regard to the use of T/V was found in the e-mails written by Heather (FSL 26). In the interview with this student, she explained that she had studied French in an immersion program since kindergarden. In addition, she had participated in a French exchange trip
in Quebec for six weeks during the summer. She had stayed with a family in Trois-Rivières with whom, at the time of the interview, she was still communicating by phone and by e-mail. It may be thus concluded that unlike other students in the course, for whom this e-mail exchange represented the first prolonged contact with an adolescent of about their same age from another province or country, this student had experienced social interaction with other native French speakers in Quebec. In essence, her previous interaction in French with native speakers appeared to have sensitized her to the uses of T/V forms.

To sum up, in this section, I have shown that analyses of e-mails pertaining to T/V use indicated that for a number of FSL students their use of these address forms evolved over the course of the e-mail tandem exchange. Data showed that most FSL students had opened their e-mail exchanges with their Francophone partners by using *vous* and that even though only four of them had received explicit assistance with regard to T/V use from their Francophone partners, only 8 were still addressing their partners with V or a mixture of T and V in their final e-mails. Close analysis of the e-mail data of the four students who received explicit peer assistance (Karen, Nathan, Brenda, and Heather) revealed that one of them (Brenda) still mixed both T and V in her final e-mail despite her tandem partner’s explicit feedback. As well, data from the interviews, which were conducted with three students that had not received explicit feedback from their tandem partners (Ruth, Jenny, and Heather), revealed that change to T use was also due to other contextual factors. In one instance, a student (Ruth) used only V forms in her first e-mail and then switched to T in her subsequent e-mails in response to her teacher’s instruction [i.e., “we were told to use *vous* the first time just because it’s someone you don’t know, and then once you got more familiar to each other you can use *tu*” (Ruth, interview)]. In another instance, although Jenny’s initial use of V also responded to her teacher’s instructions, her switch to T emerged as a result of her interaction with a student in her class who had herself received explicit assistance from her tandem partner. In the third instance, Heather used V in her first e-mail and then in her second e-mail took the initiative to ask her partner if she could address him with *tu*, as a result of her previous interaction with other native French speakers in Quebec. This observation brings to light
the importance of interviewing learners in order to have a better understanding of how contextual and personal factors mediate students’ linguistic development of L2 address forms.

5.2.3. Use of affordances offered by digital technologies

In the following sections, I exemplify the ways in which the use of digital features assisted the participants in this study in providing scaffolding to their tandem partners. Shading has been added to identify the features referred to.

5.2.3.1. Eliciting

Many instances were found where the students used three periods in the middle of two sentences or a reduplication of exclamation marks as a means of inviting their partners to comment on their ideas. To question the logic of an argument, students used icons such as \( \text{Q} \) to imitate a wink, and to express irony. Highlighting words by enclosing them in asterisks and by using block capitals were also used with the intention of eliciting. By highlighting the pronoun “you”, students meant to encourage their partners to give their opinion, reaction or additional information. Figure 14 lists some examples of these features.

Figure 14. Examples of features used for eliciting

| Firstly, I think that you’re not just five category for all people...It’s ridiculous. You cannot put people in a special category...Each people have not the same personality. So I don’t think that you have to class people in one category. (ESL 5, message #857) | So tell me more about “la tourtière”\[ I’m interested in how it tastes\]\[ FSL 20, message #905\) |
Another plus for drunks, is that they help consume, the abundance of OH (hydroxide) ions on this planet. Without drunks, we would have too many OH ions. \[ [\] (FSL 3, message #1141)

So what efforts do you make to preserve the heritage of different cultures? (FSL 20, message #1341)

And no, I don't write answers on my thighs. Do you? (FSL 28, message #812)

5.2.3.2. Reacting

Students upscaled their positive appreciation regarding their partners' abilities in their L2 with the use of two or more exclamation marks. This digital feature is normally interpreted as expressing surprise and as a means to highlight important information. Other graphical equivalents of facial expressions to imitate a smile or a laugh allowed students to indicate satisfaction (see Figure 15).

Figure 15. Examples of features used for reacting

Tu es très bon en français!!! (ESL 8, message #771)
p.s. My friend Nat thinks you have really good English 😊 (FSL 22, message #833)
You have not correction 😐 (ESL 24, message #1424)

5.2.3.3. Requesting clarification

As shown in Figure 16, it was found that students used one or multiple question marks to signal uncertainty and to seek clarification of intended meaning.
5.2.3.4. Face-giving strategies

It was found that to soften the tone of their corrections, students resorted to various features: icons, reduplication of punctuation marks, block capitals, and multiple periods. The use of graphical equivalents of facial expressions to imitate a smile, a laugh or a grin added a touch of humour and thus counteracted the potential face damage of the act of correcting their partners' mistakes. It is interesting to note that, when used as softeners, the use of three periods allowed students to express hesitation and that the use of block capitals were used to recreate a sense of pitch. The following are examples of these strategies.
5.2.3.5. Giving directives

When giving directives, either adopting the role of the NS, the NNS, or e-mail partner, students employed a variety of features. Multiple punctuation marks were used to add emphasis to their requests and to imitate pitch. Strings of periods at the end of a sentence were used to invite partners to take action, that is, to respond to their e-mails. The happy face :) was sometimes used to take the sting out of the order and the icon ^-^ could be interpreted as the graphical equivalent of “I’m getting asleep because of the long wait”.

Figure 18. Examples of features used for giving directives

Can you read your third article and send me your opinion about it please ............ (ESL 1, message #1463)

PS Pourquoi tu ne me réponds pas ?????????? As- tu déménager?, est- ce que c'est à cause d'un problème de santé?????????? En tout cas svp réponds moi, car j'ai vraiment besoin que tu me répondes pour finir mon travail. (ESL 7, message #1224)

Salut... ça va?????????? Alors, tu n'es pas repondu à moi. Mais, c'est d'accord. Je m'amuserai. (FSL 10, message #999)

can you respond at my question please........!!!(ESL 1, message #1204)

so so so ................... I would like that we respond at your text so Byebye (ESL 1, message #1269)

J'aimerais savoir ton opinion la dessus parce que j'en ai pas eu alors .. J'attends de tes nouvelles :2) (ESL 10, message #1270)
5.2.3.6. Asking for feedback

Many instances were found where students accompanied their requests for feedback with multiple question marks to recreate the sense of pitch or to show the importance of their request. Graphical equivalents of facial expressions may be interpreted as a discourse marker of agreement.

Figure 19. Examples of features used for asking for feedback

Can you correct my mistake please???? (ESL 7, message #1342)

So do you would correct my little text?? (ESL 26, message #1294)

P.S. J'aimerais bien que tu corrige mes fautes s'il te plait :) (ESL 20, message #1413)

Let me know if I am making mistakes:-(:) (FSL 20, message #637)

5.2.3.7. Face-saving strategies

As can be seen in the examples provided in Figure 20, the combined tally of their overt negative judgements of their own abilities in their target languages plus the use of emotes or a string of periods allowed students to mitigate the face-threatening act of making mistakes.
Figure 20. Examples of features used as face-saving strategies

Je suis sur qu'il y a beaucoup de problème en grammaire. Ne ris pas. (FSL 3, message #553)

I'm sorry. I don't speak English very well. 😞 (ESL 10, message #598)

I know that im not great at french, and I do not mind how your english is. Have fun with my french 😎. (FSL 27, message #542)

5.2.4. Summary of findings for question #1: What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?

Analysis of e-mails showed that both ESL and FSL students provided scaffolding to one another by resorting to various strategies. Findings showed that as a group, both ESL and FSL students employed significantly more scaffolding strategies when functioning as the NS tutor than when adopting the role of the NNS learner. The results of paired t-tests at the level of $p<0.05$ did not show significant differences between the two groups with respect to scaffolding strategies used by students when acting as the NNS learner. There was, however, a significant difference between the two groups with respect to the scaffolding strategies provided when functioning as the NS tutor. However, additional t-tests at the level of $p<0.001$ showed that when taking the role of the NS tutor, the ESL students had a tendency to provide fewer scaffolding strategies per e-mail than their FSL partners.

The results also showed that when in the role of the NS tutor, the ESL students provided the full range of strategies, while the FSL students provided all the types of scaffolding strategies except for checking comprehension and giving implicit feedback. When in the role of the NNS learner, the FSL students performed the full range of strategies, while the ESL students resorted to all strategies except two: responding to advice and responding to apologies.
In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as the NS tutor. With the exception of two ESL students and one FSL student, all the students participating in this study provided explicit feedback to their tandem partners at least once. The second most salient scaffolding strategy resorted to in the tutor role involved face-giving. Twenty-seven (90%) FSL students and 21 (70%) ESL students softened the tone of their corrections by using phrases such as *There are minor mistakes, Il y a quelques erreurs dans ton français.* The third most salient strategy provided by both groups was instructing. Although more Anglophone students (60% or 18/30) resorted to this strategy than their Francophone counterparts (40% or 12/30), this difference was not found to be statistically significant. In general, these findings demonstrate the capacity of secondary students to adopt the role of tutor and thus provide extensive feedback to their tandem partners.

The analysis of e-mails also revealed that Francophone students assisted their FSL partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (*tu/vous*). In addition, findings showed that students from both groups used digital affordances such as block capitals, reduplication of letters or punctuation marks, and combinations of punctuation marks (i.e., icons) to support or clarify the illocutionary force of their scaffolding strategies.
5.3. Research question # 2: What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?

My second research question sought to investigate the resources used by students when composing their e-mails in their respective target language. Data for analysis were gathered from the reflection forms completed by the students when writing their e-mails, and from the answers to questions 1 and 7 of the end-of-project questionnaire. Additional qualitative data were obtained from the interviews with six ESL and six FSL students, with the FSL teacher as well as from field notes during my observations in the ESL class. In the following sections, the results from each of these instruments of data collection will be reported.

5.3.1. Reflection forms

Students were asked to use a reflection form (See Appendix G for the ESL students and H for the FSL students) to reflect on strategies and processes used in composing their e-mails in their L2. In particular, students were to indicate whether or not they had looked for words in the dictionary, used an online translator, asked their classmates or their teacher how they could say something in the target language, used words or expressions their partners had used in their previous e-mails, looked at the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails, or got help to write their e-mails in other ways or from somebody else. Students were advised to complete the reflection form while composing their e-mails and not to wait until they had finished writing them.

Since at both sites the computer lab had been reserved for 12 weeks during which students were required to send a minimum of 10 e-mails, 12 copies of the reflection form were included in the students’ binders. Table XXII shows the individual frequency of e-mail communications and the number of reflection forms each student completed.
**Table XXII**

Total number of days on which e-mails were sent and total number of reflection forms completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandem partners</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of days on which e-mails were sent</td>
<td>Number of reflection forms completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>270</strong></td>
<td><strong>155</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 9 days 5.2 reflection forms 8.5 days 7.2 reflection forms
As shown in this Table, as a group, the FSL students completed more reflection forms (n=217) than the ESL students (n=155). In the ESL group, only two students (ESL #20 and #22) completed a reflection form on each of the days on which e-mails were sent while half of the FSL group (n=15) followed this instruction. On average, each FSL student completed 7 reflection forms while each ESL student completed 5. The responses to each of the reflection forms were quantified and are presented in Table XXIII. Analysis of the reflection form data indicated that during the composing of their e-mails both groups resorted to a variety of resources. The resource the ESL group drew on the most when composing their e-mails in English was the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails. According to their responses, ESL students looked at their partners’ corrections 41.9% (65/155) of the time. The second most salient resources resorted to by the ESL students were the dictionary and the English teacher. Analysis of their responses revealed that they looked for words in the dictionary in the same proportion as they called on their teacher for help (21.9% or 34/155). The analysis also indicated that calling on their classmates was the third most frequently used resource (18.6% or 29/155). Very surprisingly, the resource they used the least frequently (6.5% or 10/155) was using words or expressions their tandem partners had used in their e-mails.

As for the FSL class, the dictionary was the most frequently used resource when writing their e-mails in French. As indicated in their answers, they looked for words in the dictionary 35.9% (78/217) of the time. Looking at their partners’ corrections was the second most salient resource (22.1% or 48/217). Very interestingly, they asked their classmates for help more often than their French teacher (21.7% versus 9.2% respectively).
Table XXIII
Reflection forms: Resources L2 students draw on when composing their e-mails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements in the Reflection forms</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>FSL students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When I wrote my e-mail in English / French today,</td>
<td>N= 155 Reflection forms</td>
<td>N= 217 Reflection forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) I looked for words in the dictionary.</td>
<td>NO 121 (78.1%)</td>
<td>NO 139 (64.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 34 (21.9%)</td>
<td>YES 78 (35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I used an online translator.</td>
<td>NO 144 (92.9%)</td>
<td>NO 189 (87.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 11 (7.1%)</td>
<td>YES 28 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I asked my classmates how I could say something in English / French.</td>
<td>NO 126 (81.3%)</td>
<td>NO 170 (78.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 29 (18.7%)</td>
<td>YES 47 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I asked my English / French teacher how I could say something in English / French.</td>
<td>NO 121 (78.1%)</td>
<td>NO 197 (90.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 34 (21.9%)</td>
<td>YES 20 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I used words/expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail.</td>
<td>NO 145 (93.5%)</td>
<td>NO 197 (90.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 10 (6.5%)</td>
<td>YES 20 (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails.</td>
<td>NO 90 (58.1%)</td>
<td>NO 169 (77.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 65 (41.9%)</td>
<td>YES 48 (22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I got help to write my e-mail in other ways or from somebody else.</td>
<td>NO 135 (87.1%)</td>
<td>NO 201 (92.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES 20 (12.9%)</td>
<td>YES 16 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average percentage of Yes answers of the ESL students and the FSL students for each question of the reflection forms was compared in order to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the two groups. For this purpose, weighted *t*-tests were performed. This statistical test is accomplished through a weighted average in which the bigger sample’s variance weighs heavier. Thus, the students who had filled out more reflection forms had more weight in the analyses than those who had filled out fewer (See Appendix T for responses to the reflection forms by individual students). The results of the statistical analyses are presented in Table XXIV.

As shown in this Table, a significant difference (*p*<0.001) was found for question “f” (*I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mail*). It can thus be concluded that the two groups, on average, answered Yes in a different proportion. More precisely, the statistical analysis indicated that the ESL students looked
at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails more often than the FSL students. As well, a statistically significant difference at the level of $p<0.05$ was found for question “d” (*I asked my English / French teacher how I could say something in English/French*), that indicates that more ESL students asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 than their Anglophone counterparts.

Finally, no significant differences between the two groups were found for questions “a” (*I looked for words in the dictionary*), “b” (*I used an online translator*), “c” (*I asked my classmates how I could say something in English / French*), “e” (*I used words/ expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail*), and “g” (*I got help to write my e-mail in any other way or from somebody else*). However, since the $p$-value for question “a” is not very far from being significant ($p=0.0607$), it can be concluded that for this question there is a certain trend. In other words, it seems that the FSL students had a tendency to resort to the dictionary more often than the ESL students, but the difference between the two groups is not large enough to conclude that it is significant. Except for the three items previously alluded to (i.e., use of dictionaries, getting help from their teacher and reusing the corrections provided by their tandem partners), these findings suggest that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the way they used resources while composing their e-mails in their respective L2.
### Table XXIV
Reflection forms: Weighted t-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements in the Reflection forms</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When I wrote my e-mail in English / French today,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) I looked for words in the dictionary.</td>
<td>ESL 0.2194, FSL 0.3594</td>
<td>t = -1.91, p = 0.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I used an online translator.</td>
<td>ESL 0.071, FSL 0.129</td>
<td>t = -1.24, p = 0.2192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I asked my classmates how I could say something in English / French</td>
<td>ESL 0.1871, FSL 0.2166</td>
<td>t = -0.50, p = 0.6215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I asked my English / French teacher how I could say something in English / French.</td>
<td>ESL 0.2194, FSL 0.0922</td>
<td>t = 2.52, p = 0.0147*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I used words/expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail.</td>
<td>ESL 0.0645, FSL 0.0922</td>
<td>t = -0.96, p = 0.3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails.</td>
<td>ESL 0.4194, FSL 0.2212</td>
<td>t = 3.71, p = 0.0005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I got help to write my e-mail in any other way or from somebody else.</td>
<td>ESL 0.129, FSL 0.0737</td>
<td>t = 1.11, p = 0.2722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.001

In addition to answering Yes or No to each of the seven statements in the reflection forms, students were asked to note (a) the words and expressions they had looked for in a dictionary, (b) translated using an online translator, (c) asked their classmates for and (d) asked their teacher for. They were also asked to write (e) the words or expressions they had reused from their partners’ e-mails and (f) the corrections they had used. Finally, they were asked (g) to specify what other help they had received and from whom. In the following sections, I present some examples of responses taken from the reflection forms with the purpose of illustrating the use students made of each of these resources. In the Figures, responses provided by a given student on the same reflection sheet are separated with a comma whereas those provided on different reflection sheets are separated by a semi-colon.
5.3.1.1. Use of dictionaries

As shown in Figure 21, some students only took note of the original words either in their L1 or their L2 while others wrote the original word as well as the translation found in the dictionary. However, two ESL students limited themselves to saying “plusieurs” (ESL 10) and “J'ai utilisé un dictionnaire pour trois mots” (ESL 11). No ESL students indicated parts of speech. However, one student in the FSL class (ESL 21) took note not only of the original words and their translations, but also of their grammatical function (i.e., noun, verb, etc.).

Figure 21. Examples of responses to “I looked for words in the dictionary. If yes, which ones?”

**ESL students:**
- Raciste; Maintenant, tombé, pont; Cancer, fêter; providing; Constater (to see, to note) (ESL 1)
- Plusieurs (ESL 10)
- J'ai utilisé un dictionnaire pour trois mots (ESL 11)
- Fautes = mistakes (ESL 13)
- Toutes sortes (all sorts), durant (during); Tricher (cheat), everybody (tout le monde), disagree (pas d'accord); Understand (comprendre), similaire (pareille) (ESL 16)
- Symptôme, conseil (advice); against, to learn; Féminin, masculin; Often (ESL 21)

**FSL students:**
- Échange, déçu; les mandats, compagnie, coeur, établir, réduite, paraîtront, collègues, nuisible, raccourcis; unlimited, classify, range, imply, company; Semestre; monter, légalise, distribution, prohibition, ventes, pharmaceutique, thérapeutiques, nausée, vomissant, migraine, la dépression, saisie, douleur chronique, soulagement; privilège, tuer; Peau, immoral, offensant; décennies, sauvages, honnêtement, siècle; Rappeler (FSL 5)
- Décorations, club, German; To drive, compulsory; v. To relate (établir), v. To describe (décrire), v. To dedicate (dédier), n. hinderance (obstacle); Regarding (qui concerne); in addition (de surcroît), although (bien que); surcroît (FSL 21)
5.3.1.2. Use of an online translator

The examples presented in Figure 22 show that not only did students use an online translator to write their e-mails in their L2, but also to translate into their L1 words or sentences their partners had used in their e-mails.

**Figure 22. Examples of responses to “I used an online translator. If yes, what word(s) / sentence(s) did you translate?”**

**ESL students:**
- Quelques phrases (ESL 10)
- Pour une partie du texte qu’elle m’avait écrit (ESL 13)
- Les vœux du temps des fêtes (ESL 13)
- Race, Une phrase (ESL 15)
- J’ai utilisé www.altavista.com (ESL 24)

**FSL students:**
- “Addictive”, “owners” ; “Bring”; intoxiqué, dégoût, eux-mêmes ; conduire, à la course (FSL 4)
- À mon avis (FSL 5)
- To get accents (FSL 6)
- Corrupt ; Second hand smoke (FSL 13)

5.3.1.3. Getting help from their classmates

As shown in Figure 23, students from both groups turned to their classmates to ask for specific words or expressions in their L2, to check the spelling and meaning of some words, and to understand the task of the day.

**Figure 23. Examples of responses to “I asked my classmates how I could say something in French. If yes, what did you ask?”**

**ESL students:**
- Le mot « moyen » (ESL 7)
- Des phrases que je n’étais pas capable d’écrire; quelques phrases; quelques mots mais il ne savait pas (ESL 10)
- Plusieurs mots ; Le mot « erreurs » en anglais; de m’expliquer certains mots sur la feuille du travail à faire (ESL 11)
- M’assurer que “tante” c’était bien “aunt” (ESL 17)
- De m’aider; Est-ce que, concentrer; de me corriger (ESL 22)
FSL students:

- Verb translations (FSL 2)
- Some spellings (FSL 6)
- How to say “watching”, how to write about the musical instrument I play; how to say “to avoid errors in English”; How to say “the workforce” and how to say “what do you think is your dominant characteristic of the five?”; How to say “You should prepare for the exam”; resemble, declined; amélioré (to improve) (FSL 9)
- Asked about accents on specific words, general edit of my essay; Menthe (mint); fissure (crack) (FSL 11)

5.3.1.4. Getting help from their teacher

Students asked their teacher for help both to ask him/her for specific words or expressions they did not know in their L2 and for words they did not understand in their partners’ e-mails.

Figure 24. Examples of responses to “I asked my French teacher how I could say something in French. If yes, what did you ask him/her?”

ESL students:

- Comment écrire « J’ai lu un texte qui parlait de... », « Les moyens pour vaincre le stress »; « en dehors de l’école »; un trait de personnalité, À Québec quand on triche, on est aussi expulsé; Notre (our); « Nous sommes d’accord sur tous les points », « Est-ce que j’ai bien compris ton opinion? » (ESL 7)
- Comment dire que je vais bientôt avoir dix-huit ans; Moi aussi; « Race » si c’est ça en anglais; (ESL 15)
- J’ai perdu mon e-mail; une personne soûle (ESL 18)
- Sibling (ESL 29)

FSL students:

- What age are they?; from a country (FSL 2)
- Nerd (FSL 3)
- I asked what “les mèches” meant (FSL 10)
- “In light of”; “Je peux te tutoyer?”; “on s’est appris de l’un/ l’autre (we learnt from one another) (FSL 26)
- Field hockey (FSL 29)
5.3.1.5. Reusing words/expressions from partners’ e-mails

The examples in Figure 25 show that both groups of students reused words and expressions their tandem partners had used in their previous e-mails. Interestingly, in the majority of the cases, these were words and expressions their partners had used to open or close their messages.

Figure 25. Examples of responses to “I used words/expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail. If yes, which words/expressions did you use?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Your new friend (ESL 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• You cheat on yourself (ESL 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Later (Salut); Later (ESL 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hope to hear from you (ESL 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnic backgrounds (ESL 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Voulais dire (FSL 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I recopied questions and answered them (FSL 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “J’espère que vous allez bien” (FSL 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General introduction material ; Ça va? ; Je quitte (FSL 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comment ça va? (FSL 12);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• J’ai bien hâte de mieux se connaître (FSL 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Courriel (email) (FSL 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• La même couleur (FSL 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Je suis content de correspondre avec toi (FSL 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.6. Reusing the corrections provided by their tandem partners

As shown in Figure 26, some students took note of the corrections they had received in previous e-mails and which they had reused in the present e-mail. Some others explained that they had not reused the corrections either because they could not apply them in the context of the present e-mail or simply because their partners had not provided any.
Figure 26. Examples of responses to “I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails. If yes, which correction(s) did you use?”

**ESL students:**
- Tink (think), whit (with) (ESL 2)
- I weigh (I weight), I must at class (I must go to class) (ESL 3)
- Aucune; aucune; aucune (ESL 5)
- Aucune, car c’était pour dire d’où je viens et ma date de fête; Il ne m’a pas répondu; Car il ne répond pas; Aucune, car on donne chacun notre opinion (ESL 7)
- Aucune, j’ai juste appris (ESL 9)
- Aucune, j’ai regardé mes erreurs, c’est tout; J’ai lu les corrections qu’il m’a apportées; J’ai lu tout simplement ses corrections; Les corrections qu’on devait faire (ESL 10)
- Today I have read an article= Today, I read an article (ESL 11)
- Il n’y en avait pas. C’était le premier email (ESL 18)
- It’s my first email; Elle ne m’a pas écrit; Je n’ai pas eu de réponse; Je n’ai pas eu de message (ESL 21)

**FSL students:**
- « Je vais bien » instead of « Je suis bien » ; « Tricherie c’est mauvais peu importe si l’examen est d’une petite ou d’une grande importance » instead of « Tricherie est mauvaise n’importe si l’examen est petite ou grande »; le tabagisme et les cigarettes sont mauvais (FSL 9)
- (We are not making corrections yet. We are still in the introduction process); Grammar structure, slight spelling mistakes ; Spelling, grammar, phrasing; “ont un desavantage” should be “on tun désavantage”, “avec la technologie aujourd’hui” should be “avec la technologie d’aujourd’hui” (FSL 11)
- (Il n’y a pas de lien dans ceci) ; …ne sont pas des cobayes (FSL 16)
- None, I just read her response and noted my mistakes (FSL 17)
- (Not yet); (Didn’t make any); (I looked at them) (FSL 20)

5.3.1.7. Getting help to write their e-mails in other ways or from somebody else

In this section of the reflection form, students were asked to report if they had got help in other ways (i.e., a resource other than the ones mentioned in the previous six sections) or from somebody else (i.e., a person other than their classmates or their teacher). As shown in Figure 27, several ESL students asked me how they could say some words and sentences in English. Some others, as in the case of student 10, asked me to explain the task of the day. As for the FSL students, some reported turning to their teacher to find out how to write French accents when using an English keyboard and to
understand what their partners meant to say in their L2 (even though this comment could have been signalled in “Getting help from the teacher”). Very interestingly, one FSL student (FSL 26) used outside e-mail correspondence with old friends in Quebec and the *Okapi* magazine as resources to write her e-mails in French to her tandem partner.

**Figure 27. Examples of responses to “I got help to write my e-mail in other ways or from somebody else. If yes, explain what”**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Je ne comprenais pas ce qu’il voulait dire donc la personne m’a aidé à traduire (ESL 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comment écrire le texte et avec quel renseignement (ESL 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professeur Sabrina, Comparé = compared (ESL 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sabrina, je lui ai demandé ce que voulait dire « siblings » (ESL 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sabrina, « à peu près » (ESL 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The codes for the letters with symbols (FSL 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mme Mady had helped me with some accents; Mme Mady assisted me when trying to figure out some of Claudia’s English, ex. “anonymity”; (FSL 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I asked my teacher what my partner wrote in english, since it was hard to understand (FSL 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extracurricular contact with Quebec friends; I used a phrase from an Okapi magazine (“Koi de 9”); Outside email correspondence with friends in Quebec; Extracurricular email correspondence with friends from Quebec (FSL 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A closer analysis of the responses revealed differences in the way the students from both groups oriented to the use of the reflection forms. Some students, for example, took note of each of the words they had looked for in the dictionary [e.g., “Raciste; maintenant, tombé, pont; cancer, fêter; providing; constater” (ESL 1)], whereas some others limited themselves to saying “plusieurs” (ESL 10) or “J’ai utilisé un dictionnaire pour trois mots” (ESL 11). In the case of the online translator, some students specified each of the words they had translated [e.g., “addictive, owners, bring; intoxiqué, dégoût, eux-mêmes; conduire, à la course” (FSL 4)] whereas others only mentioned that they had translated “a section” of their partner’s e-mail [e.g., “Pour une partie du texte qu’elle m’avait écrit” (ESL 13)] or even indicated which online translator that they had used [e.g., “J’ai utilisé www.altavista.com” (ESL 24)]. These differing responses were impossible to quantify in terms of the use students made of each of these resources to
write their e-mails. Consequently, no attempt was made to quantify the number of responses per student nor to compare if there were statistically significant differences between the two groups.

5.3.2. End-of-project questionnaire

As explained in chapter 4, the end-of-project questionnaire (See Appendix M for the ESL students and N for the FSL students) was administered during the last week of the project. The first question in this questionnaire sought to obtain information on the students' use of resources when composing their e-mails. This question included Likert-type items, each phrased in the form of a statement. For each item, five options were given, ranging from “Never” to “Always”. In order to test whether significant differences existed among the distribution of answers given by the two groups of students, a Fisher's exact test was performed. The results of the data analysis presented in Table XXV show that the only resource that students from both groups reported to have always used was the corrections provided by their tandem partners. Indeed, the majority of the ESL students (76.7% or 23/30) and more than half of the FSL students (55.2% or 16/30) reported having always looked at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails. This difference was not found to be statistically significant ($p>0.05$), thus indicating that according to the student responses, both groups made extensive use of the corrections provided by their tandem partners.

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data showed, however, that there were significant differences at the level of $p<0.05$ in the distribution of the student answers to question “a” (I looked for words in the dictionary), question “c” (I asked my classmates how I could say something in English/French), and “g” (I got help to write my e-mails in any other way or from somebody else). Examination of the responses revealed that the FSL students reported having looked for words in the dictionary and having asked their classmates how they could say something in their L2 more frequently than the ESL students. As for the ESL students, they reported having got help to write their e-mails in
other ways or from somebody else more frequently than their FSL counterparts, who reported that they had almost never or never got this kind of help.

As well, the statistical analysis indicated a significant difference at the level of $p<0.01$ in the distribution of the student answers to question “b” (I used an online translator), and “d” (I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French). Analysis of the responses indicated that all the FSL students except 8 (26.7%) had resorted to an online translator whereas the majority of the ESL students (73.3% or 22/30) had never done so. By contrast, almost half of the ESL students (46.7%) said they had asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 (i.e., English) whereas such was the case for only 5 FSL students (16.7%).
Table XXV
End-of-project questionnaire: Resources L2 students drew on when composing their e-mails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. When I wrote my e-mails in English / French</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I looked for words in the dictionary.</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.7%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I used an online translator.</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(73.3%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I asked my classmates how I could say</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something in English/French.</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I asked my English/French teacher how</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could say something in English/French.</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(26.7%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I used words/expressions my tandem</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner had used in his/her e-mail.</td>
<td>(13.3%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(30%)</td>
<td>(53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I looked at the corrections my tandem</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner had made to my previous e-mails.</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(10.3%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I got help to write my e-mails in any</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>FSL</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other way or from somebody else.</td>
<td>(66.7%)</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(40%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05,  **p<0.01
In contrast to the students’ responses to question 1 of the questionnaire, the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data for question 7 showed a statistically significant difference ($p<0.005$) between the two groups of students. As shown in Table XXVI, significantly more ESL students than FSL students (96.7% versus 41.4% respectively) reported having used the feedback provided by their tandem partners in their other e-mails.

Table XXVI

End-of-project questionnaire: Use of the feedback provided by tandem partners in their subsequent e-mails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. When my partner gave me feedback,</th>
<th>ESL students (n=30)</th>
<th>FSL students (n=29)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I can’t remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I used it in my other e-mails.</td>
<td>1 (3.3%)</td>
<td>29 (96.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<0.005$

5.3.3. Interviews

As explained in chapter 4, I conducted one semi-structured, open-ended interview with a limited number of selected ESL and FSL students at the end of the project. One of the purposes of the interviews was to obtain more information regarding the use of resources when composing their e-mails in their target languages. Students’ responses to the interview confirmed that to cope with the task, they used such aids as dictionaries and online translators. They also turned to the teacher, the researcher or neighboring students for help, in so much as these were readily available “human dictionaries”.

In addition, the findings from the interviews revealed that some students had resorted to strategies such as paraphrasing (e.g., “[...] If I didn’t know how to say something in French I would try to say it differently [...]” [FSL 1/Eric]; “Si je ne savais pas un mot en particulier, je le disais en d’autres mots.” [ESL 29/Samuel]) or attempted to get the message across as best as they could (e.g., “[...] other times I just wrote what I thought.” [FSL 7/Anthony]; “[...] but most of it was at my finger tips” [FSL 13/
Jennifer]. Figure 28 presents the verbatim ESL and FSL students’ responses to the following open-ended question: “Peux-tu me dire comment tu écrivais tes courriels en anglais?” / “Could you tell me how you wrote your e-mails in French?”.

**Figure 28. ESL and FSL students’ responses to the interview: Use of resources**

**ESL students:**

- “Il s’est arrivé quelques fois que j’ai cherché des mots dans le dictionnaire.” (ESL 1/ Sophie, Interview)
- “Quand je ne savais pas un mot, je demandais à quelqu’un, parce que c’est plus vite.” (ESL 2 /Mélissa, Interview)
- “J’utilisais le dictionnaire de temps en temps sauf que j’ai pas vraiment eu besoin d’avoir recours au dictionnaire parce que déjà j’essayais de me faire des phrases assez faciles, donc je comprenais ce que je faisais, là. De temps en temps, oui, mais pas régulièrement.” (ESL 5 / Laure, Interview)
- “Quand il me corrigeait, je faisais attention justement à ce que j’écrivais après. Je cherchais des mots aussi dans le dictionnaire, sur un traducteur aussi sur Internet. Ça arrivait des fois aussi de demander à quelqu’un : ‘X, je ne sais pas comment dire ça !’ ” (ESL 10 /Audrey, Interview)
- “Je demandais surtout à vous, mais des fois je demandais à Kevin, mais c’était plus quand je n’étais pas sûr.” (ESL 14 /Charles, Interview)
- “Quand je ne savais pas un mot, je prenais mon dictionnaire, mais s’il y avait quelqu’un à côté je lui demandais.” (ESL 16 /Marie-Ève, Interview)
- “Des fois je cherchais des mots dans le dictionnaire ou sur un traducteur sur Internet ou je demandais à quelqu’un.” (ESL 20 / Édouard, Interview)
- “Si j’avais un dictionnaire, je cherchais dans le dictionnaire sinon, je vous demandais. Je cherchais plus dans le dictionnaire et je demandais à vous.” (ESL 25 /Lucie, Interview)
- “Si je ne savais pas un mot en particulier, je le disais en d’autres mots.” (ESL 29 / Samuel, Interview)

**FSL students:**

- “I used one translator but not very often. Online. I didn’t use it all the time, like if I didn’t know how to say something in French I would try to say differently it and then I would use it. Just one word, not the whole sentence. I have a couple of friends who are very good in French so I asked them too”. (FSL 1 /Eric, Interview)
- “Sometimes I used a dictionary or asked a friend, just a few words if I had no idea of how to say, but other times I just wrote what I thought.” (FSL 7 / Anthony, Interview)
• "I used the dictionary for some random words, you know, sometimes things don’t come to you or I’d ask one of my classmates or Mme. Mady like for the ‘fumé indirecte or secondaire’ yeah, occasionally, but most of it was at my finger tips.” (FSL 13 / Jennifer)

• "I used the dictionary, actually I have one of those electronic dictionaries, actually because I have to try to learn faster because this is my first year so I used it many times. I always have it with me”. (FSL 14 / Margaret, Interview)

• "Usually when we were at the computer lab there were not many dictionaries around so unless you have one with you, I mean, I never had a dictionary with me. So I sat with one of my friends, Michelle, and her mother is from Quebec so she speaks French very well and he helped each other back and forth, how do you say this, this is my sentence, I need a word for this. We would help each other, or sometimes I asked the teacher, like, I want to say this, I want to use this expression, how do I say it in French, but other than that, I didn’t use a translator or a dictionary”. (FSL 20 / Diane, Interview)

• "Some of the words I didn’t know I looked them up in the dictionary. I also got words from her emails, she would say ‘J’ai hâte de recevoir ton prochain message’, that one I used a lot over again after she used it once. In other words I learned from her emails, just like the slang that we use everyday. Because when we speak and write emails in French here is sort of proper language, you know. I remember for example this expression ‘I’m waiting for your next email’, that I didn’t know, there were a couple of those, like ‘hi, how are you?’, that they use in Quebec. I didn’t use the translator online because sometimes it doesn’t make sense, right?” (FSL 25 /Mary, Interview)

• “For most of the words I didn’t know I just asked my teacher or someone beside me if I just spun a blank but I didn’t use the dictionary much.” (FSL 26 /Heather, Interview)

• “Sometimes I just asked a friend who was next to me about a word or a conjugation, otherwise, not really.” (FSL 27 / Shawn, Interview)

• “I looked for words in the dictionary sometimes, if I had a dictionary around or if my friends had one, but first I asked my friends and if they didn’t know it I would use the dictionary and sometimes I used a translator just because it was on line, just to translate specific words.” (FSL 29 /Ruth, Interview)

• “I basically just used the dictionary to find out some words that I needed to use and that couldn’t get around them. Asking, I would just ask my friends, sometimes you forget some sentence structures or how to conjugate a verb that is what I would ask but it wasn’t very big, just small things that just slipped from my mind.” (FSL 30 /Alice, Interview)

Findings from the interview with the FSL teacher also confirmed that students in her class had resorted to a variety of resources. In particular, she reported that students had sometimes asked her for help and other times had asked their classmates or used an online translator. As well, she reported that no dictionaries were available at the lab and that only a few students had their own dictionaries when writing their e-mails. It is
important to recall that 21 out of the 30 (70%) FSL students reported in their reflection forms that they had used a dictionary. This observation seems to indicate that some may have borrowed their classmates’ dictionaries, as explained by one of the students I interviewed: “I looked for words in the dictionary sometimes, if I had a dictionary around or if my friends had one” (FSL 29/ Ruth). The verbatim transcript of the FSL teacher’s response to my open-ended question “Can you tell me how your students wrote their e-mails in French?” is presented in Figure 29.

Figure 29. FSL teacher’s responses to the interview: Use of resources

“Some of them had physical dictionaries. I didn’t bring dictionaries to the lab. So some of them would have their own dictionaries, that would be a minority of students. Some of them would scream at me, and asked me for a word. Others would ask their friend: how do you say...whatever, and some of them would go online and use an online dictionary.” (FSL teacher, Interview; April 7, 2005)

As well, findings from the interview with the FSL teacher revealed that students not only asked for their classmates’ and her help to write their e-mails in French, but also called on them to clarify what their partners were trying to say in English, as the following extract illustrates:

Researcher: Did they ever ask you how to correct their partners’ e-mails?
FSL teacher: Very rarely. Maybe twice during the whole project.
Researcher: And did they ask their classmates?
FSL teacher: No, a more common question would be: ‘what is this person trying to say?’. ‘Read this, can you tell me what it means?’
Researcher: Did they also ask you this?
FSL teacher: Yes, or the person beside them.
5.3.4. Observations

As explained in chapter 4, observations were only done in the ESL classroom since I was located in Quebec City. I thus attended classes on days when the project was being done. When observing in the classroom, my main objective was to take notes on how the project was carried out by the teacher. However, due to the school constraints with respect to the number of computers available in each computer lab, on the days students wrote their e-mails, the ESL teacher divided the class in half, allowing one group to work in the lab with me for the first “shift” while the other group worked in the classroom with the teacher. Although I positioned myself mainly as a participant observer while in the lab, I also responded to students’ questions regarding the tasks or the language. It is interesting to note that students not only asked for my help in English, but also called on me to check their French for spelling and grammar (e.g., tense and noun agreement). As well, I helped students to deal with technical problems with WebCT and to show them how to make use of the digital resources offered by this platform such as the HTML editor to modify the size and color of letters.

In general, data from my observations confirmed what students reported in their reflection forms and end-of-project questionnaire with respect to the use they made of available resources. In addition, an interesting finding during my observations was to realize that although several students took their dictionaries with them to the lab, not all the students used them. Instead, they asked me or neighboring peers because “it was faster”, as expressed by one of the students I interviewed: “Quand je ne savais pas un mot, je demandais à quelqu’un, parce que c’est plus vite.” (ESL 2 /Mélissa, Interview; April 12, 2005).

Still more interesting was the fact of observing the degree to which students made use of affordances offered by digital technologies, on the one hand, and of paper, on the other. In particular, I observed that to prepare their final oral presentations, one student (ESL 8) highlighted her partner’s opinions with the mouse to facilitate her taking notes on the “Oral presentation - Notetaking form”. She then made use of the “copy-paste” tool to get an online translation when her partner had given her opinions in French. In another instance, a student printed out her partner’s e-mails and highlighted his opinions on the
printout. In addition, this student highlighted words she did not understand, looked for the meanings in the dictionary, and wrote them on the same printout.

5.3.5. **Summary of findings for research question #2: What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?**

Analysis of the reflection form data indicated that during the composing of their e-mails both groups resorted to a variety of resources. The most frequently used resource by the ESL group was the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails. According to their responses, ESL students looked at their partners’ corrections 41.9% (65/155) of the time. The second most salient resources resorted to by the ESL students were the dictionary and their English teacher. Analysis of their responses revealed that they looked for words in the dictionary in the same proportion as they called on their teacher for help (21.9% or 34/155). The analysis also indicated that calling on their classmates was the third most frequently used resource. Very surprisingly, the resource they used the least frequently (6.5% or 10/155) was using words or expressions their tandem partners had used in their e-mails.

As for the FSL class, the dictionary was the most frequently used resource when writing their e-mails in French. As indicated in their responses, they looked for words in the dictionary 35.9% (78/217) of the time. Looking at their partners’ corrections was the second most salient resource (22.1% or 48/217). Very interestingly, they asked their peers for help more often than their French teacher (21.7% versus 9.2% respectively).

The statistical analysis showed a significant difference ($p<0.001$) between the two groups in the distribution of the students’ responses to the statement “I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails”, thus indicating that the ESL students resorted to the corrections their partners had made to their e-mails more often than the FSL students. As well, a significant difference ($p<0.05$) was found with respect to the students’ responses to the statement “I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French”. More precisely, the statistical analysis indicated that more ESL students asked their teacher how they could say something in
their L2 than their Anglophone counterparts. However, no significant differences were found for the students' responses to the other statements, thus indicating that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the way they resorted to dictionaries, online translators, their classmates and their partners' e-mails to write their e-mails in their L2.

Findings from the end-of-project questionnaire showed that the only resource that students from both groups reported to have always used was the corrections provided by their tandem partners. Indeed, the majority of the ESL students (76.7% or 23/30) and more than half of the FSL students (55.2% or 16/30) reported having always looked at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails. This difference was not found to be statistically significant ($p>0.05$), thus indicating that both groups made extensive use of the corrections provided by their tandem partners.

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data showed, however, that there were significant differences at the level of $p<0.05$ in the distribution of the students' answers to question “a” (I looked for words in the dictionary), question “c” (I asked my classmates how I could say something in English/French), and “g” (I got help to write my e-mails in any other way or from somebody else). These findings revealed that the FSL students reported having looked for words in the dictionary and asked their classmates how they could say something in their L2 more frequently than the ESL students. By contrast, the ESL students, who almost never or never resorted to this latter strategy, reported getting help to write their e-mails from somebody else or in other ways more frequently than their FSL counterparts.

As well, the statistical analysis indicated a significant difference at the level of $p<0.01$ in the distribution of the students' answers to question “b” (I used an online translator), and “d” (I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French). In these instances, analysis of the responses indicated that all the FSL students except 8 (26.7%) had resorted to an online translator whereas the majority of the ESL students (22/30 or 73.3%) had never done so. By contrast, almost half of the ESL students (46.7%) said they had asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 (i.e., English) whereas such was the case for only 5 FSL students (16.7%).
Finally, in contrast to the students' responses to question 1 of the questionnaire, the statistical analysis of the questionnaire data for question 7 showed a statistically significant difference ($p<0.005$) between the two groups of students with respect to the use they made of the corrections received in their subsequent e-mails. According to their answers, more ESL students than FSL students (96.7% versus 41.4%) reported having used the feedback provided by their tandem partners in their other e-mails.
5.4. Research question # 3: When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?

The purpose of this question was to investigate the degree to which the L2 secondary school students participating in this study used the feedback provided by their tandem partners. Data for analysis were gathered from a comparison of the first draft pertaining to a report sent by e-mail and the final draft written on the report form, and from answers to the end-of-project questionnaire. Additional qualitative data were obtained from the personal interviews with selected students and from personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher. In the following sections, I will report on the findings from each of these instruments of data collection.

5.4.1. Reports

As explained in chapter 4, the joint reading of three articles taken from newspapers and magazines of interest to teenagers formed the basis for the e-mail discussions. For each of these three articles, students were required to complete a reader response form. Students then sent their opinion pieces to their e-mail tandem partners. After the discussion of each of the three topics, students were to write a report (Draft 1) in which they compared and contrasted their opinions with those of their tandem partners regarding the topic they had read about. They were instructed to send this report to their tandem partners and ask them to correct it. Then, they were to revise their reports (Draft 2) using the feedback provided by their tandem partners and making any other changes they deemed appropriate. This final draft was to be written on the Report form in the students’ binders. An example of an opinion piece, a report (Draft 1) and a revised report (Draft 2) are presented in Figures 30, 31 and 32, respectively. All the pieces were written by one of the FSL students, Line. The points where changes were made in draft 1 and the resultant changes in draft 2 are indicated in bold to facilitate reading.
Objet : Salut Nicolas

Numéro du message 1030

Auteur : Line

Date : Jeudi, 13 Janvier, 2005 10:28

Nous avons lu un article à propos du tabagisme chez les jeunes qui était très intéressante parce que c’est un problème qu’on voit tout le temps. Chaque jour, je vois des jeunes qui fument à l’école ou à l’arrêt d’autobus. Parfois, il y a des gens qui me demandent une cigarette mais je n’en ai pas. Je pense que l’article avait raison quand il a dit que les amis et les parents sont les influences principales sur les jeunes qui décident de fumer.

Si non, comment est-ce que les jeunes qui n’ont pas 19 ans obtenir des cigarettes? C’est souvent les amis qui enseignent à un individu comment fument et où obtenir des cigarettes.

Moi-même, je ne comprends pas pourquoi les jeunes fument en savant que c’est dangereux. En fait, il y a des mises en garde imprimées sur les paquets! C’est comme les fumeurs veulent mourir, et ça c’est un problème entièrement différent. De plus, les cigarettes sont chères, alors mon amie qui fume n’a jamais d’argent. L’année dernière, j’ai essayé de fumer avec cette amie qui fume régulièrement, mais il n’a fait rien pour moi. Il était difficile! Aussi, je crois, comme l’article a dit, que si on fume, on essayera probablement les autres drogues et boira l’alcool. C’est juste quelque chose que j’ai noté parmi les jeunes que je connais.

Cependant, l’article a donné l’impression que le problème est seulement au Québec. Même si le Québec affiche le taux le plus élevé au Canada, nous ne devons pas ignorer le problème dans les autres provinces. En outre, c’est probablement parce que le Québec a une population très grande. Néanmoins, le tabagisme est un problème qui ne peut pas être limité à seulement une province.

I hope that I will receive something from you next week.

Line

Répondre Citer Récupérer Fermer
Objet : Salut

Numéro du message 1525

Auteur : Line

Date : Jeudi, 24 Mars, 2005 10:29

Salut Nicolas,

Je dois faire un report à propos de nos opinions sur la deuxième article. Je crois que nous avons eu les mêmes opinions au sujet du tabagisme. Nous ne comprenons pas pourquoi les jeunes fument en **savant** que les cigarettes peuvent les tuer. Aussi, **il faut que les parents ne fument pas** devant leurs enfants parce que **les enfants** veulent faire **ce que leur parent font**. Aussi, les amis ne doivent pas influencer des autres personnes à fumer car c’est dangereux pour toute la monde, pas seulement pour la personne qui fume.

J’attends vos corrections!

Line

---

With respect to the ESL students, 25 out of 30 (83.3 %) sent at least one of the three reports (i.e., *Draft 1*) to their partners, 5 (16.7%) did not send any, and 9 (30%) sent the three reports. As for the FSL students, only 14 out of 30 (46.7%) students sent at least one report, 16 (53.3%) did not send any, and only one (3.3%) student sent the three
reports. As shown in Figure 33, the ESL students sent more reports to their partners than the FSL students. The ESL students sent a total of 52 reports (Draft 1) and they received feedback on 31 of them. Twenty-four of those 31 reports were revised (Draft 2) by 15 students. The FSL group sent 18 reports (Draft 1) and they received feedback on 13. Eleven of those 13 reports were revised (Draft 2) by 9 students.

**Figure 33**

*Number of reports sent by e-mail and revised using feedback from tandem partner*

Since this research question sought to investigate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners to revise their reports, data for analysis were selected if meeting the following requirements: a) Draft 1 of the report had been sent by e-mail to the tandem partner; 2) the report had been corrected by the partner; 3) Draft 2 had been written on the Report form (in the student’s binder). Fifteen ESL students and 9 FSL students met these requirements.
In addition, it was found that 5 of the 16 FSL students who had not sent any of the three reports had used the Report forms in their binders to revise their opinion pieces on the topics they had read about. I decided to include these data in my analyses for two reasons. First of all, I considered them as valuable information in terms of the degree to which these students tried to use the corrections made by their partners to improve their opinion pieces. Second, these opinion pieces met the requirements of having been sent by e-mail, of having been corrected by their partners, and of having been revised on the report forms using the feedback provided. It is important to mention that, as explained in section 5.1.2, students were expected to write reports of a minimum of half a page. E-mails containing their opinion pieces were expected to be longer. Note also that not all the students included in the analyses revised the same number of reports. Consequently, for the analysis of reports, no statistical analyses were performed to determine if there were significant differences between the two groups.

As a first step, the number of words in draft 1 and draft 2 were counted. As can be seen in Tables XXVII and XXVIII in the process of incorporating their partners’ feedback and rewriting final drafts, most students from both groups modified the number of words. A comparison of length between draft 1 and draft 2 showed that, whereas some final versions decreased in number of words and others increased, some remained invariable. It is important to note, however, that the lack of a change in the word count does not mean that no corrections took place. In general, the analysis of the changes showed that the first drafts were primarily revised by deleting, adding or substituting incorrect choices of words or longer units. For purposes of illustration, a sample of a report that was revised without modifying the total number of words is presented in Figure 34. The points where changes were made in draft 1 and the resultant changes in draft 2 are indicated in bold to facilitate reading.
Table XXVII
Number of words in draft 1 and draft 2: ESL students

|                | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  | 21  | 22  | 23  | 24  | 25  | 26  | 27  | 28  | T    | m    |
|----------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| **ESL students** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **REPORT #1**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 88  | 91  | 31  | 45  | 50  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 506  | 56.2 |
| Draft 2         | 87  | 84  | 81  | 44  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 50  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 50  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 531  | 59   |
| Change          | -1  | -7  | +50 | -1  | -3  | +1  | 0   | -5  | -9  | +25 | +2.8| -1  | -7  | -1  | -3  | +1  | 0   | -5  | -9  | +25 | +2.8| +25  | +2.8 |
| **REPORT #2**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 99  | 41  | 84  | 31  | 45  | 50  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 50  | 59  | 59  | 39  | 44  | 130  | 46.9 |
| Draft 2         | 98  | 101 | 72  | 44  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 50  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 50  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 47  | 60  | 59  | 34  | 35  | 130  | 56.8 |
| Change          | -1  | +60 | -12 | -2  | -6  | +25 | 0   | +39 | +6.5| -1  | -7  | -1  | -3  | +1  | 0   | -6  | +25 | 0   | +39 | +6.5| -1  | -7  | -1  | -3  | +1  | 0   | -6  | +25 | 0   | +39  | +6.5 |
| **REPORT #3**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 60  | 80  | 88  | 89  | 255 | 74  | 42  | 91  | 93  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 872 | 87  | 124.9 | 78.2 |
| Draft 2         | 61  | 169 | 92  | 79  | 102 | 11  | 12  | 92  | 93  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 799 | 84  | 124.8 | 84.7 |
| Change          | +1  | +89 | +4  | -10 | -153| -1  | -4  | +1  | 0   | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | -73 | -8  | 0    | +39  | +6.5 |

T= Total number of words
m= average number of words

Table XXVIII
Number of words in draft 1 and draft 2: FSL students

|                | 1*  | 2  | 3* | 4  | 5* | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 28 | T    | m    |
|----------------|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| **FSL students** |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| **REPORT #1**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 203 | 75 | 171| 28 | 71 | 138| 335| 68 | 105| 85 | 95 | 1374| 124.9|
| Draft 2         | 201 | 75 | 171| 29 | 71 | 138| 336| 68 | 105| 85 | 94 | 1373| 124.8|
| Change          | -2  | 0  | +1 | 0  | +1 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | -1 | -1  | -0.1|
| **REPORT #2**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 225 | 398| 84 | 78 | 333| 414| 1532| 255.3|
| Draft 2         | 227 | 399| 83 | 74 | 334| 406| 1523| 253.8|
| Change          | +2  | 1  | -1 | -4 | +1 | -8 | -9  | -1.5|
| **REPORT #3**   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Draft 1         | 260 | 191| 75 | 182| 242| 950| 190|
| Draft 2         | 236 | 193| 75 | 185| 237| 926| 185.2|
| Change          | -24 | 2  | 0  | +3 | 0  | 24 | -4  | -4.8|

* Students who revised their opinion pieces are identified by an asterisk.

T= Total number of words
m= average number of words

---

208
Figure 34
Analysis of revisions:
Example where the number of words for draft 1 and 2 remained unchanged

Report - Draft 1

Message numéro 955 [Branche du numéro 952]
Envoyé par Donald le Dimanche, Décembre 12, 2004 22:28
Objet : rapport

Nous avons les deux quelques différences entre nous dans les opinions des défauts. Il n'a pas rencontré toutes les types dans son emploi. Moi, j'ai rencontré toutes les types et je crois que chaque personne a les éléments de chacun dans leur personnalité, avec un ou deux qui sont dominants. Jean-Michel crois que les gars sont surtout les orgueilleux et les filles sont surtout les complexés. Je pense que c'est vrai pour la plupart des peuples, mais je pense que c'est un peu trop généralisé. Dans un endroit de travail, je pense que les agissements sont très différents que dans la vie quotidienne. Les filles peuvent être aussi orgueilleux que les hommes si elles veulent améliorer leur niveau. J'ai rencontré quelques filles comme ça. Jean-Michel a dit aussi que les personnes paresseuses sont tous des personnes vraiment lâche. Je pense que nous partageons la même type d'opinion de ça. Il n'a pas mentionné son opinion des égoïstes ou des agressifs, alors je ne suis pas sûr si nous sommes d'accord. (170 words)
Nous avons les deux quelques différences entre nous dans les opinions des défauts. Il n'a pas rencontré toutes les types dans son emploi. Moi, j'ai rencontré toutes les types et je crois que chaque personne a les éléments de chacun dans leur personnalité, avec un ou deux qui sont dominants. Jean-Michel croit que les gars sont surtout les orgueilleux et les filles sont surtout les complexés. Je pense que c'est vrai pour la plupart des personnes, mais je pense que c'est un peu trop généralisé. Dans un endroit de travail, je pense que les agissements sont très différents que dans la vie quotidienne. Les filles peuvent être aussi orgueilleuses que les hommes si elles veulent améliorer leur niveau. J'ai rencontré quelques filles comme ça. Jean-Michel a dit aussi que les personnes paresseuses sont tous des personnes vraiment lâches. Je pense que nous partageons le même type d'opinion de ça. Il n'a pas mentionné son opinion des égoïstes ou des agressifs, alors je ne suis pas sûr si nous sommes d'accord. (170 words)
As a next step, the first drafts of the students’ reports (written directly on the computer and sent by email to their tandem partners) were compared with the final drafts (revised using their tandem partners’ feedback and written on the "Report forms"). Following Mendonça and Johnson (1994), the letters R (revised) and NR (not revised) were placed next to the parts that were modified and the parts that were not modified, respectively.

As explained in Chapter 4, types of revisions were coded using a taxonomy adapted from Faigley and Witte’s (1981) taxonomy of revisions (See Table VI, Chapter IV). It is important to mention that for the purpose of the analyses that follow, the length of the drafts was not taken into account. The frequency and percentage of types of revisions made by both groups of students are presented in Table XXIX (See Appendix U for the number and type of revisions made by individual students).

As shown in this Table, the 15 ESL students included in this analysis made a total of 129 revisions to their reports, the majority of which were surface revisions (91.5% or 118/129). Of these latter, 47.3% (61/129) were formal changes and 44.2% (57/129) were meaning-preserving. Approximately 14% of the formal changes involved spelling, capitalization and punctuation (13.9% or 18/129), 10.1% verb forms (13/129) and 7.8% number (10/129). Almost 30% of the meaning-preserving changes were substitutions (29.5% or 38/129) and 7.8% were deletions (10/129). Only 8.5% (11/129) of the changes were meaning changes, categorized as either microstructure revisions, which accounted for 3.8% (5/129), or macrostructure revisions, which accounted for 4.7% (6/129).

The 14 FSL students made a total of 135 revisions to their reports. Of these revisions, all but one (99.3% or 134/135) were considered surface revisions. Of these, 73.3% (99/135) were formal changes and 26% (35/135) were meaning-preserving changes. Twenty percent of the formal changes made by the FSL students involved spelling, capitalization and punctuation (27/135), 12.6% prepositions (17/135), 11.9% verb forms (16/135), 10.4% gender (14/135) and 9.6% articles (13/135). Almost 18% of the meaning-preserving changes were in the area of substitutions (17.8% or 24/135). Only 1 (0.7%) change was a meaning revision at the microstructure level.
Table XXIX
Analysis of reports: Types of revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of revisions</th>
<th>ESL students (N=15)</th>
<th>FSL students (N=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Surface revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Formal</td>
<td>61 (47.3%)</td>
<td>99 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling; capitalization; punctuation</td>
<td>18 (13.9%)</td>
<td>27 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations; contractions</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb forms</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
<td>16 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of articles</td>
<td>7 (5.4%)</td>
<td>13 (9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepositions</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>17 (12.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pronouns</td>
<td>6 (4.7%)</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10 (7.8%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Meaning-preserving</td>
<td>57 (44.2%)</td>
<td>35 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>10 (7.8%)</td>
<td>2 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>38 (29.5%)</td>
<td>24 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permutations</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Meaning revisions</td>
<td>11 (8.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Microstructure</td>
<td>5 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Macrostructure</td>
<td>6 (4.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revisions</td>
<td>129 (100%)</td>
<td>135 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After having categorized the types of revisions, the impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students’ revisions was measured by comparing the first drafts of the reports, the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and the revised drafts of their reports to identify the source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions). The results of this analysis are presented in Table XXX. Findings showed that the majority of the revisions made by both groups of students resulted from tandem partner feedback. Tandem partner feedback influenced 76% of the total number of revisions (98/129) made by the ESL students and 81.5% (110/135) made by the FSL students. The analysis also revealed that 72.9% (94/118) of the surface
revisions made by the ESL students and 80.7% (109/134) of those by the FSL students were in response to the feedback received from their tandem partners. It was also found that 24% of the revisions (31/129) made by the ESL students, and 18.5% of the revisions (25/135) made by the FSL students were self-revisions. The majority of these self-revisions (24/31) in the case of the ESL students and the totality (25/25) in the case of the FSL students were at the surface level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of revision</th>
<th>Types of revisions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surface changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESL students</td>
<td>FSL students</td>
<td>ESL students</td>
<td>FSL students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tandem partner’s feedback</td>
<td>94 (72.9%)</td>
<td>109 (80.7%)</td>
<td>4 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>98 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
<td>(5.4%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118 (91.5%)</td>
<td>134 (99.3%)</td>
<td>11 (8.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.7%)</td>
<td>129 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a second analysis, in order to evaluate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners, the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated were identified by comparing the feedback section in the e-mails and Draft 2. As shown in Table XXXI, a total of 108 feedback points were provided by the Anglophone students. Of the 108 feedback points, ESL students incorporated most of them (90.7% or 98/108). The majority of these corrections (95.4% or 103/108) were identified as surface corrections. Of the 103 surface corrections, ESL students incorporated 94 (87%). The ESL students only received 5 (4.6%) corrections at the meaning level, of which they successfully incorporated 4 (80%). Only 8 corrections (7.4%) were not incorporated in their revised drafts and two (1.9%) were unsuccessfully incorporated.

As for the Francophone students, they provided a total of 148 feedback points to their FSL partners who incorporated 74.3% (110/148). All but one (99.3%) of these 148
feedback points were coded as surface changes. Of the 147 surface corrections received, FSL students incorporated 109 (74.1%). The one meaning change received was also incorporated. It is interesting to note that contrary to the ESL group, who incorporated most of the feedback received (90.7%), the FSL students did not incorporate 25% (37/148) of the corrections provided by their Francophone partners.

Finally, although most corrections were found to be accurate, a few faulty corrections were also detected in the feedback given by both groups on their partners’ reports. ESL students provided a total of 8 faulty corrections to their tandem partners. The same number of faulty corrections was also detected in the feedback provided by the FSL students. In both cases, all but one were in the area of formal changes.

To sum up, the data submitted to analysis revealed that ESL students incorporated 90.7% of the corrections provided by their tandem partners, while the FSL students incorporated 74.3%. The analysis also revealed that most of the revisions made by both groups of students were surface changes.
Table XXXI
Analysis of reports: Use of feedback provided by tandem partners to revise their reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of revision</th>
<th>ESL students ($n=15$)</th>
<th></th>
<th>FSL students ($n=14$)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total feedback points</td>
<td>Incorporated</td>
<td>Unsuccessful attempts to incorporate</td>
<td>Not revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface changes</td>
<td>103 (95.4%)</td>
<td>94 (87%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>8 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning changes</td>
<td>5 (4.6%)</td>
<td>4 (80%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>0 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108 (100%)</td>
<td>98 (90.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
<td>8 (7.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.2. End-of-project questionnaire

Some of the questions included in the end-of-project questionnaire aimed to investigate the students' reflections regarding the type of feedback received and the use they made of it. Table XXXII presents the findings related to the type of feedback (grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation, word order, other points) provided by the tandem partners. As can be seen in this Table, students from both groups gave feedback to their partners at different levels. Analysis of the responses revealed that 22 ESL students (73.3%) reported having received feedback on grammar and vocabulary, 20 students (66.6%) on spelling and 16 (53.3%) on word order. Only three students (10%) reported having received feedback on punctuation and 4 (13.3%) said they received feedback on other points (i.e., idiomatic expressions). As for the FSL students, the majority reported having received feedback on grammar (26/30 or 86.7%) and more than half (17/30 or 56.7%) said they received feedback on vocabulary. Fourteen students reported having received feedback on word order (46.7%) and 10 on spelling (33.3%). Only six students (20%) said they received feedback on punctuation and three (10%) on other points (i.e., idiomatic expressions and typing errors).

A Fisher's exact test was performed on Likert scale ratings (Yes / No / I can't say) in order to determine whether there were statistically significant differences between the responses given by the two groups. The statistical analysis showed a significant difference \( p<0.005 \) between the two groups in the area of spelling, thus indicating that more ESL students reported having received feedback at this level. However, no significant differences were found in the students' responses related to the other types of corrective feedback provided by their partners. These findings seem to indicate that both groups were similarly involved in giving feedback at the levels of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, word order, and other points.
Table XXXII

End-of-project questionnaire: Types of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. When my partner gave me feedback, he/she gave me feedback on</th>
<th>ESL students (n=30)</th>
<th>FSL students (n=30)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>22 (73.3%)</td>
<td>5 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>22 (73.3%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>20 (66.6%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 (66.3%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>16 (53.3%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 (86.7%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p< 0.005

The analysis of the questionnaires also revealed a significant difference (p<0.005) in the degree to which both groups reported having used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports (Table XXXIII). Twenty (66.6%) ESL students reported having used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports, while only 7 (23.3%) FSL students reported having done so.

Table XXXIII

End-of-project questionnaire: Use of feedback provided to revise their reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. When my partner gave me feedback,</th>
<th>ESL students (n=30)</th>
<th>FSL students (n=29)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I can’t remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I used it to revise my reports (Draft 2.)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.005
Table XXXIV presents the findings related to the students’ perceptions pertaining to the areas of improvement due to the feedback received from their tandem partners. The results of the data analysis showed that the areas perceived by the majority of ESL students (66.6%) as having improved the most were grammar, vocabulary and spelling. As well, half of the group (15/30) reported an improvement in their word order. Only 5 (20%) considered to have improved their punctuation. As for the FSL group, 16 students (55.2%) considered to have improved their French grammar and 15 (51.7%) reported an improvement in the area of vocabulary. Eight students (26.7%) said they their word order had improved, 5 (16.7%) mentioned spelling and 3 (10%) punctuation as areas of improvement. One student did not respond to this question.

The statistical analysis showed a significant difference ($p<0.005$) in the responses given by both groups with respect to the usefulness of the feedback received to improve their spelling, thus indicating that more ESL students considered to have improved in this area. However, no significant differences ($p>0.005$) were found in the students’ responses related to the other areas. These findings seem to indicate that both groups responded similarly in terms of the perceived usefulness of the feedback provided by their partners to improve their English/French in the areas of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and word order.

Table XXXIV

End-of-project questionnaire: Areas of improvement due to feedback received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. The feedback helped me improve my English / French in these areas:</th>
<th>ESL students (n=30)</th>
<th>FSL students (n=29)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I can’t say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>20 (66.6%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>20 (66.6%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>20 (66.6%)</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>18 (60%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word order</td>
<td>11 (36.7%)</td>
<td>15 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.005
5.4.3. Interviews

The information gained from the interviews provided some information as to the reasons why some students did not revise their reports. As shown in Figure 35, three FSL students did not consider it necessary to rewrite their reports because their partners had merely limited their corrections to spelling or typing errors. In certain instances, the errors were perceived as performance errors.

**Figure 35**

**Interviews with FSL students: Use of feedback to revise reports**

"No, because he did correct me but it was like, it was typos or it was things I already knew, like I made a random error, so there wasn’t too much that was really complex.” (FSL 13, interview)

"No, because many of the corrections were spelling errors.” (FSL 14, interview)

“Well most of what I did is because of being lazy, like on that computer specially when I type emails to my friends in French, and I don’t use the accents, and I explained that to him: I’m sorry, the computer is not writing any accents right now or I’m just too lazy to go look at the codes, and that in the computer, but he always told me: ‘watch out for your accents’...and he wrote over my whole email adding all the accents and I went: ‘but I know, but I’m not writing any accents!!’ (FSL 26, interview)

5.4.4. Personal communication by e-mail with FSL teacher

Data from personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher not only corroborated that one of the reasons for students not having written or revised their reports was due to their tandem partners’ lack of responses but also that some of them had lost interest in the tasks related to the project due to their partners’ lack of investment:
Mes étudiants trouvent qu’ils font plus d’effort que leurs partenaires. Par exemple, ils trouvent difficile à comparer des opinions si leurs partenaires n’ont pas répondu à leurs questions, etc. Ils sont découragés quand ils font des corrections mais ils n’en reçoivent pas. (FSL teacher, personal communication by e-mail, December 14, 2004)

In other words, the relative lack of revising activity on the part of the FSL students was due less to their unwillingness to participate but to difficulties pertaining to productive exchanges with their tandem partners.

5.4.5 Summary of findings for research question # 3: When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?

As a first step, types of revisions were coded using a taxonomy adapted from Faigley and Witte’s (1981) taxonomy of revisions. Results from the analysis of the first and revised reports showed that the 15 ESL students included in the analysis made a total of 129 revisions to their reports, the majority of which were surface revisions (91.5% or 118/129 of total revisions). Of these latter, 47.3% (61/129) were formal changes and 44.2% (57/129) were meaning-preserving. Almost fourteen percent of the formal changes were in the area of spelling, capitalization and punctuation (13.9% or 18/129), 10.1% in the area of verb forms (13/129), and 7.8% in the area of number (10/129). Almost 30% of the meaning-preserving changes were substitutions (29.5% or 38/129) and 7.8% were deletions (10/129). Only 8.5% (11/129) of the changes were meaning changes, categorized as either microstructure revisions, which accounted for 3.8% (5/129), or macrostructure revisions, which accounted for 4.7% (6/129).

The 14 FSL students made a total of 135 revisions to their reports. Of these revisions, all but one (99.3% or 134/135 of total revisions) were considered surface
revisions. Of these, 73.3% (99/135) were formal changes and 26% (35/135) were meaning-preserving changes. Twenty percent of the formal changes made by the FSL students were in the area of spelling, capitalization and punctuation (27/135), 12.6% in the use of prepositions (17/135), 11.9% were changes in verb forms (16/135), 10.4% in gender (14/135) and 9.6% in use of articles (13/135). Almost eighteen percent of the meaning-preserving changes were in the area of substitutions (17.8% or 24/135). Only 1 (0.7%) change was a meaning revision at the microstructure level.

The impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students’ revisions was measured by comparing the first drafts of the reports, the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and the revised drafts of their reports to identify the source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions). The findings showed that the majority of the revisions made by both groups of students resulted from tandem partner feedback. Tandem partner feedback influenced 76% of the total number of revisions (98/129) made by the ESL students and 81.5% of the revisions made by the FSL students (110/135). The analysis also revealed that 72.9% of the surface revisions (94/118) made by the ESL students and 80.7% of those by the FSL students (109/134) were in response to the feedback received from their tandem partners. It was also found that 24% of the revisions (31/129) made by the ESL students, and 18.5% of the revisions (25/135) made by the FSL students were self-revisions. The majority of these self-revisions (77.4% or 24/31) in the case of the ESL students and the totality (25/25) in the case of the FSL students were at the surface level.

As a second analysis the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated were identified by comparing the feedback section in the e-mails and Draft 2. A total of 108 feedback points were provided by the Anglophone students. Of the 108 feedback points, ESL students incorporated most of them (90.7% or 98/108). The majority of these corrections (95.4% or 103/108 of the total number of feedback points) were identified as surface corrections. Of the 103 surface corrections, ESL students incorporated 94 (87%). The ESL students only received 5 (4.6%) corrections at the level of meaning, of which they successfully incorporated 4 (80%). Only 8 corrections (7.4%) were not incorporated in their revised drafts and two (1.9%) were unsuccessfully incorporated.
As for the Francophone students, they provided a total of 148 feedback points to their FSL partners who incorporated 74.3% (110/148) of them. All but one (99.3%) of these 148 feedback points were coded as surface changes. Of the 147 surface corrections received, FSL students incorporated 109 (74.1%). The one meaning change received was also incorporated. It is interesting to note that contrary to the ESL group, who incorporated most of the feedback received (90.7%), the FSL students did not incorporate 25% of the corrections (37/148) provided by their Francophone partners.

Quantitative data from the end-of-project questionnaire showed a significant difference ($p<0.005$) in the degree to which both groups used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports. Twenty (66.6%) ESL students reported having used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports, while only 7 (23.3%) FSL students reported having done so.

The information gained from the interviews with selected FSL students provided some information as to the reasons why some students did not revise their reports. As reported by three of the FSL students I interviewed, they did not consider it necessary to rewrite their reports because their partners had merely limited their corrections to spelling or typing errors. In certain instances, the errors were perceived as performance errors. As well, data from personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher not only corroborated that one of the reasons for students not having written or revised their reports was due to their tandem partners' lack of responses but also that some of them had lost interest in the tasks related to the project due to their partners' lack of investment. These findings are particularly significant for better understanding why fewer FSL students used the feedback provided by their tandem partners to revise their reports. In other words, the relative lack of revising activity on the part of the FSL students was due less to their unwillingness to participate but to difficulties pertaining to productive exchange with their tandem partners.
5.5. Research question # 4: To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchanges)?

As explained in section 5.1.2., the analyses of the amount of writing showed that the majority of the students participating in the e-mail tandem project had minimally completed the basic course requirements. However, the analyses further suggested that differences in the written products and the degree to which all parts of the tasks were completed varied. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, this research question sought to investigate if the students' motives (i.e., the students' underlying purpose for engaging in the activity) could explain the differences in the way students oriented to the exchanges. To this end, in each of the two sites, interviews were conducted with three students who were very interested in the e-mail tandem project and three who were not very interested. It is important to reiterate that this selection was based on the teachers' and my own observations of students as well as on information gleaned from e-mail messages and other documents. For the purpose of these analyses, data from each of the selected partnerships\(^5\) will be presented in separate sections.

5.5.1. Partnership 20 – Édouard* (ESL) and Diane* (FSL): Differences in personal importance attributed to the studying of a second language

Analyses of the data of the partnership formed by Édouard and Diane revealed differences in the importance each of them attributed to the studying of a second language. Analyses of Édouard's responses to the background and the end-of-project questionnaires as well as to the personal interview revealed that he had an ambivalent orientation to learning English. In the background questionnaire, administered at the beginning of the project, Édouard said that for him, learning English was important ("Pour moi, apprendre l'anglais est important"). However, in the end-of-project

\(^5\) Students who were interviewed within a partnership are identified by an asterisk (*). Names of students are pseudonyms.
questionnaire, he reported not being sure whether he liked learning English or not. To the statement "En général, j'aime apprendre l'anglais", Édouard answered "Je ne sais pas". In the interview, he further added that he wished French would be spoken everywhere in Canada, and not English. When asked if he liked learning English, he replied "Ben, non, là. J'aimerais que ce soit le français partout".

By contrast, his Anglophone partner Diane saw French as part of her education. Not only did she answer "Very important" to the statement "For me, learning French is important" and "I strongly agree" to the statement "In general, I like learning French", but she also presented herself as being a Francophile, as evidenced in her first e-mail:

Diane, Extract message # 541; November 11, 2004 (First e-mail)

I also can't wait to go to Montreal for New Years! I love shopping and clubbing, and I'd love to get a taste of Francophone gastronomy. :) My favorite is french onion soup!! ...is that too stereotypical? I also love french fries, french lace, and french cheese!

The different orientations to learning English or French, as expressed by Diane and Edward, may also be due to the different opportunities they have had to learn and practice their L2. Diane started her French education in kindergarten. She was in French immersion until Grade 8, and after that she continued in the extended French programme. She and her family travelled to Quebec and to France where they stayed for a period of a month. By contrast, Édouard had never been in an English immersion program, had never travelled to an English-speaking city and his parents did not speak any English.

Data from the personal interviews with the ESL and the FSL teachers revealed that both Édouard and Diane had a positive orientation to schooling. Indeed, they were defined by their respective teachers as excellent students:

Édouard est ce genre de gars qui remet ses travaux toujours impeccables, toujours soignés. Il est en haut de la moyenne. C'est un gars qui travaille super bien. On peut compter sur lui pour être chef d'une équipe quand ils sont à
travailler à 4 ou 5. Il peut voir à ce que le travail soit remis proprement,
clairement et bien fait. (ESL teacher/Catherine, interview; April 1, 2005)

Diane is a multi-talented girl. She’s multi-talented, linguistically. She’s just as
strong in languages as she is in science. She is not stronger in science than in
maths. As well, she is a very talented dancer, and she plays the piano. She’s an
extremely busy girl. And an extremely talented girl, and very motivated. Her
French is good. (FSL teacher, interview; April 7, 2005)

This positive orientation to schooling was also evident in their respective introductory e-
mails. Diane told her partner that despite being a very demanding program, she “loved”
studying in the International Programme. She also presented herself as being not only
good in sports and arts but also academically-oriented and desiring to become a doctor:

Diane, Extract message # 541; November 11, 2004 (First e-mail)

Je suis en deuxième année et je participe au programme de
Baccalaureate Internationale. Il y en a tant de devoirs, mais je
l'adore.
Pendant mon temps libre, je suis sur l'équipe de la lutte, et
l'athlétisme. Hors de l'école, je suis danseuse et pianiste. J'ai
gagner beaucoup de compétitions autour du monde dont j'ai dansé et
joué, mais ce n'est pas mon future. Je préfère les mathématiques
et les sciences, et je rêve d'être docteur.

As for Édouard, he told Diane that although he was still uncertain about his choice of
profession, he would also like to become a doctor:

Édouard, Extract message # 609; November 16, 2004 (First e-mail)

Je ne sais pas encore dans quel métier je veux aller mais j'ai
encore du temps devant moi pour y penser. J'aimerais bien être
Médecin moi aussi!
In this respect, when Diane asked him whether he was planning on going to McGill ["Are you planning on going to McGill? I hear it's a prestigious university”(Diane, message #637)], Édouard replied negatively as it was an Anglophone university [“Je ne pense pas aller à McGill parce que c'est une université anglaise.”(Édouard, message #741)]. This comment suggests that Édouard did not consider learning English important for his future profession.

Despite Édouard’s rather ambivalent orientation to learning English, as revealed by analysis of various documents, both Édouard and Diane seemed to have had a positive orientation to the e-mail tandem project. Although they sent fewer e-mails than the minimum requested (8 and 9 e-mails, respectively), they compensated for it by writing lengthy messages (1581 and 2696 words, respectively). Even if Édouard wrote shorter e-mails than his partner, his e-mails fell above the ESL group’s average (33.3 words more). In addition, they both completed a reflection form for each of their e-mails.

Their positive orientation to this project was also evident in their good-bye e-mails where both Édouard and Diane evaluated the project as having been beneficial for their respective second languages. Furthermore, as evidenced in Diane’s e-mail, she considered this project had contributed to develop her “éducation francophone”. Finally, she expressed her desire to continue communicating with Édouard:

Édouard, Extract message # 1580, March 30, 2005 (Good-bye e-mail)

I am so sick when i think this is my last message i will send to you. But this experience with you was realy fun and i had learn a lot of thing about you and improve my grammar too. I think you are a fabulous person and i wish you to take fun and be happy for the rest of your life.

Good bye my friend ;(

-Ed-
Diane, Extract message # 1607, March 31, 2005 (Good-bye e-mail)
Ca me fait mal au coeur de te dire aurevoir. Merci beaucoup pour m'avoir écrit toutes ces messages pendant les semaines, j'ai beaucoup appris de ton personnalite, ta langage, et ta culture. J'ai bien aime nos discussions controversials, et baverder avec toi au sujet de nos vies differentes. Tu as beaucoup desenvoloe mon education Francophone! C'était un projet superb.

I do hope that we may continue communicating with each other, via MSN or e-mail. I truly have enjoyed this expérience with you, I hope we both make the best of what we have learned from each other. I wish you happiness and success in your life.

Pour cette occasion incroyable, je te remercie
Ton Amie Anglophone,
Diane* ;)

Diane’s positive evaluation of the project was not limited to her final e-mail, but was also evident over the duration of the e-mail exchange. As shown in the following e-mails, on repeated occasions, Diane told her partner how excited she was to participate in this e-mail exchange:

Diane, Extract message # 541; November 11, 2004 (First e-mail)
I hope you're as thrilled about this assignment as I am; I'm looking forward to hearing all about you! Write back soon! ;)

Diane, Extract message # 637; November 18, 2004 (Second e-mail)
I am really enjoying this activity, I can't wait to hear back from you!

Diane, Extract message # 811; December, 2004 (Third e-mail)
I'm loving this tandem communication assignment; I find myself excited every week to go to the labo and receive a message from you!
In the interview, Diane further explained that she had perceived this project as an opportunity to interact with a native French speaker and to receive feedback from him:

I really enjoy speaking French a lot, but to be able to see someone who already knows how to do it, and then just comes natural to them, you learn a lot. Because you can study and read as many books as you want but it is not until you actually see someone who knows, who was brought up with that language that you actually learn how the language is used. Like certain expressions and certain words that mean just a little bit different and you would not know they're used in the same situations. It's not until you see someone who knows what they are talking about that you learn a lot more. (...) I liked correcting each other, I think more than the articles. It was neat to hear his opinion on what he thought about the articles but when he started giving me feedback on what I was saying, it was really good to hear that I was doing some things right and that there were things I could work on. But I liked correcting him because I could help him and I could see that in his next email he would fix some of those mistakes. There were always new ones and I always made new mistakes, but it was neat because we were learning from each other. (Diane, interview; April 7, 2005)

As for Édouard, despite his positive attitude to the task at hand, as manifested in his e-mail communication with Diane, his responses to the end-of-project questionnaire gave a strikingly different picture of his investment in the project. When asked to evaluate the project (i.e., I liked this project), Diane answered “I strongly agree”. Very surprisingly, Édouard reported not being sure whether he had liked the project or not (i.e., Je ne sais pas). The way both partners evaluated the tasks involved in the project greatly differed as well. While Diane evaluated them as “interesting” or “very interesting”, for Édouard all the tasks were “plus au moins intéressante” or “pas du tout intéressante”. Finally, when asked to give their opinion about the task of correcting their partners, Diane evaluated it as “sometimes difficult, sometimes easy” and “always interesting”. In contrast, Édouard evaluated it as “souvent facile” and “souvent ennuyant”.
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In the interview, Édouard justified his responses to the questionnaire by explaining that he had found the repetition of tasks demotivating: “J'ai aimé ça, sauf que des fois c'était trop répétitif, ça me tannait un peu. Mais c'était le fun de partager mes affaires avec elle” (Édouard, interview; April 12, 2005). While Édouard’s observation may be accurate in explaining his opinion of the project, it does not convey an accurate depiction of the way Diane perceived him as orienting to the e-mail exchanges. As expressed by Diane, he was perceived as an “engaged” tandem partner:

His e-mails were sometimes short, sometimes they were long. I was sick for a week so I missed a week and his e-mails were about the same as mine, interesting and usually long. Over Christmas break, I think, I forgot my password to the Website so he told me ‘e-mail me and tell me how things are going’, so it was fun. It was not just a school assignment, we actually became friends and we learned a lot about each other and about different cultures so it was cool. (Diane, interview; April 7, 2005)

However, close examination of the written products (i.e., e-mails, reflections forms and reports) revealed that despite his apparent positive orientation to the e-mail project, Édouard had not invested in the tasks involved in it such as to optimize his opportunities for language learning. Analysis of e-mails showed that he provided 6 instances of scaffolding strategies to Diane, 2 of which in the role of the NS and 4 in the role of the NNS. By contrast, a total of 24 instances of scaffolding strategies were coded in Diane’s e-mails, with 13 being in the role of the NS, 8 as the NNS and 3 as e-mail partner. As a way to scaffold her partner, Diane resorted to English and French comparisons when giving feedback to Édouard [e.g., Oh, by the way, about what you were saying about cheating...I know in French, it’s “Le Trichage”, but in English, you don’t say “the cheating”, it’s just “cheating”. So you would say “What do you think about cheating” (Diane, message #811)]. When asked why she had resorted to this scaffolding strategy, she replied that she considered it a way to become aware of the difference and thus to understand it better:
There are different expressions in English that do not always translate exactly to French, and vice versa, there are some French expressions that do not always make sense in English. So if someone sees something constructed in a certain way and then completely different in English, it is easier for them to see the difference and understand it better, I think. (Diane, interview; April 7, 2005)

Another interesting scaffolding strategy used by Diane when in the rôle of the NS was asking Edouard for additional information on cultural issues raised in their e-mail communication. In one of his e-mails, Edouard told Diane that for Christmas, he and his family ate a meat called “tourtière”: “I dont have a lot of tradition for Christmas but i eat at each year a meat named ‘tourtière’ its really, really good” (Edouard, message #886). In her following e-mail, Diane asked Edouard to further explain what “la tourtière” was like: “So tell me more about ‘la tourtière’!! I’m interested in how it tastes!!” (Diane, message #905). However, Edouard did not respond to Diane’s elicitation.

Differences in investment also emerged in regard to the way they completed the reflection forms. Indeed, a close examination of the reflection forms revealed that although both Diane and Edouard had completed one form per e-mail, the way they had oriented to the completion of the reflection forms had differed. Edouard limited himself to saying Yes or No, whereas Diane took specific note of the way she had used various resources to write her e-mails (in the form of 15 responses).

Finally, in their end-of-project questionnaires, Edouard reported having worked about the same he usually did for an English assignment while Diane wrote “not necessarily harder, but more enthusiastically”, next to the option “I worked harder than I usually do for a French assignment”.

Taken together, the findings suggest that even if both tandem partners had similarly completed the tasks as required by the project, they had different motives in doing so. Although both partners were excellent students, the difference in importance they each gave to learning a second language made them view the project differently. While Edouard viewed this e-mail tandem project as another classroom task, Diane saw it as a unique opportunity to develop her “éducation francophone” (Diane, message #
1607; March 31, 2005). The discussion above seems to indicate that Édouard engaged in the e-mail project more at the level of task compliance, while Diane was found to be more fully engaged.

5.5.2. Partnership 5 – Laure* (ESL) and John (FSL): Differences in personal importance attributed to the studying of a second language

As in the case of the partnership described in the previous section (Édouard and Diane), analyses of the questionnaire data of Laure and John revealed differences in the importance each of them attributed to the studying of a second language. In the background questionnaire, John said that for him, learning French was “more or less important”. Similarly, in the end-of-project questionnaire, he replied “I can’t say”, to the statement “In general, I like learning French”. By contrast, Laure’s responses to the questionnaire revealed that she had a positive orientation to learning English. In the background questionnaire, she reported that for her, learning English was “Très important”. Similarly, in the end-of-project questionnaire, she replied “D’accord” to the statement “En général, j’aime apprendre l’anglais”. Laure’s responses to the interview further revealed that she was sensitive to the use value of learning English. When asked if for her learning English was important, she replied: “Oui, je me suis beaucoup dit que c’est la deuxième langue important pour notre futur. Je trouve que c’est vraiment important puis je pense que c’est vraiment la langue qu’il faut apprendre pour avancer, dans le fond” (Laure, interview, April 12, 2005).

Analyses of the end-of-project questionnaire also revealed that Laure and John had evaluated the e-mail tandem project differently. To the statement “I liked this project”, Laure replied “D’accord”, whereas John replied “I can’t say”. However, despite John’s rather ambivalent evaluation of the project, from the product point of view, John displayed a completely different picture of his investment in the project. Indeed, analyses of data pertaining to e-mail frequency, number of e-mails sent, and quantity of writing revealed that Laure and John were the most prolific writers in their respective groups (3180 and 5122 words, respectively). John also sent more e-mails than the minimum
required (n=12), and his e-mails fell above his group’s average (183.3 more words per e-mail). As for Laure, although she sent fewer e-mails than her partner because she was absent from some classes (8 e-mails compared to her partner’s 12), she meticulously completed the tasks related to the project and her e-mails where always very substantive.

Their positive orientation to the e-mail exchange was also evident in their good-bye e-mails where both Laure and John evaluated the project as having been “fun” and where they praised each other for their engagement in it:

Laure, message # 1252, March 30, 2005 (Good-bye e-mail)
Hi John today is my last e-mail that I write. It's so bad :( okay okay okay :P First I have to correct your last e-mail:
(...)
For finish I would like to say that you're a very good person and the project that we did was very fun. I'm very happy to do this project with you and I think that we had fun to talk about the subjects. So, have a nice day and see you later :) >>>(sur MSN ou dans un E-MAIL)<<<
XOoxOxoxOx
tAkE cArE MiStEr Jooooohhhhhhhhhhhnnnnn

John, message # 1630, Re: 1252, March 31, 2005 (Good-bye e-mail)
Laure,
J’espère que vous allez bien? Je vais bien!
Ceci est la dernière fois que je vous écrirai. J’ai voulu dire à vous que c’était très amusante pour parler avec vous. Vous êtes une personne gentille qui est facile pour parler. Je suis content que vous entendre l’a apprécié m’aime. Ceci est une expérience que je rappellerai et merci que vous faire il bon. Bien, je dois aller maintenant mais j’espère que je parlerai avec vous encore, peut-être sur MSN.
Pour la dernière fois :
Votre Copain Jooooohhhhhhhnnnnn

John’s investment in the project also emerged in regard to the way he completed the reflection forms. Not only did he complete one form per e-mail (with the exception of
But he also took specific note of the way he had used various resources to write his e-mails (in the form of 49 responses). As for Laure, her positive orientation to the project was evident in the fact that she was one of the two ESL students to have sent the three reports. Although John did not send any of the three reports, he revised his three opinion pieces using Laure’s feedback, and rewrote them on the “Report forms – Draft 2”. With respect to the feedback received, their mutual engagement in the project was also evident in the use they made of it to revise their compositions. Analyses of the first and revised drafts revealed that Laure made a total of 32 surface changes to her three reports, being the student who had made the most extensive revisions in her class. As for John, he made a total of 18 surface changes to his three opinion pieces.

However, analysis of e-mail data pertaining to *tu/vous* use revealed that John was one of the 5 FSL students who still addressed their partners with *V* in their final e-mails. When asked if the fact that he had always used *vous* in his e-mails had annoyed her in any way, Laure replied that she had felt it as a desire on his part to be polite, and thus she had never taken the time to ask him to address her with *tu* instead:

Researcher: *Ton partenaire t’a toujours vouvoyé, est-ce que ça te dérangeait?*

Laure: *Non, je me sentais un peu plus...pas vieille, mais plus de politesse entre les deux personnes sauf que je trouvais ça bien comme ça puis...*

Researcher: *Est-ce que tu lui as demandé de te tutoyer?*

Laure: *Non, je ne sais pas pourquoi, j’ai fait comme bof, ok. Ça me dérangeait pas, là. Je trouvais ça normal. Peut être que c’était parce qu’il est loin et je le connais pas. S’il m’aurait tutoyé, ça m’aurait pas dérangé non plus. Je sais pas, je me suis pas attardé à ça.*

As John was not interviewed, the reasons as to why John never adopted *T* use in his e-mail communication with Laure remain unknown. In addition, although questionnaire data revealed that John’s rather ambivalent orientation to learning French may explain his rather ambivalent evaluation of the e-mail exchange, as reported in the end-of-project
questionnaire, these conclusions remain inconclusive. These findings underscore the importance of complementing analyses of products with teacher and student interviews in order to more fully understand why students invest or fail to invest in a given task.

5.5.3. Partnership 25 – Lucie* (ESL) and Mary* (FSL): Differences in attitudes toward grades

Analysis of the data revealed that individual differences in attitudes toward grades could have played a strong role in the limited amount of interaction that took place between Lucie and Mary. Analyses of the responses to the background and end-of-project questionnaires revealed that both partners had a positive orientation to learning English and French, respectively. In the background questionnaire, both Lucie and Mary said that learning English/French was “very important”. In addition, in the end-of-project questionnaire, they both replied “I strongly agree” to the statement “In general, I like learning English/French”. In reflecting on Mary’s orientation to classroom language learning, it is also important to note that her teacher perceived her as a hard-working motivated student: “Her French is great. She works hard, she is motivated, wonderful” (FSL teacher, interview; April 7, 2005). As for Lucie, her teacher perceived her as having some learning difficulties but trying hard to perform: “Lucie, c'est une élève quasi-ment modèle par son comportement mais avec des difficultés d'apprentissage, ben, pas de difficultés d'apprentissage mais elle performe pas aussi bien qu'elle le voudrait. Elle travaille fort, pourtant” (ESL teacher/Catherine, Interview; April 1, 2005).

However, despite this positive orientation to language learning, differences emerged in the way both students oriented to the e-mail tandem project. Specifically, Lucie had a positive attitude to the e-mail exchange, whereas Mary showed a negative orientation to it, which was further reflected in how she went about doing the tasks. To the statement “I liked this project”, in the end-of-project questionnaire, Lucie replied “Tout à fait d'accord”, whereas Mary replied “I strongly disagree”. This different orientation to the e-mail exchange was also evident in the analyses of the written documents. Analysis of data pertaining to e-mail frequency, number of e-mails sent, and
quantity of writing revealed that while Lucie wrote more e-mails (n=12) than the minimum required (i.e., 10), her Anglophone partner, wrote only five. Differences in investment also emerged in regard to the number of reflection forms completed. While Lucie completed 8 reflection forms, Mary completed only one. The lack of sustained e-mail communication on Mary’s part, as well as the scarcity of the input provided, limited Lucie’s ability to write two of the three reports as well as revise the only report she had been able to write.

In the end-of-project questionnaire, Mary acknowledged that she had not invested in this project as she could have: “I worked less than I usually do for a French assignment”. During the interview, Mary justified her lack of investment by the fact that the project did not count for the final mark: “It didn’t really count for marks, right?, because we have the exam and it counts for everything. So I wasn’t really motivated” (Mary, interview; April 7, 2005). These findings suggest that the importance of grades for this student weighed in as a strong factor in influencing how she valued the time spent writing to her tandem partner. Very surprisingly, despite the lack of responses from her partner, Lucie continued sending e-mails. In the end-of-project questionnaire, she reported to have liked the project and to have worked about the same as she usually did for an English assignment. In her interview, she further explained that she had never stopped the communication, “parce qu’il fallait que je le fasse et j’aimais ça, faire mes choses. Puis, c’était son problème si elle ne me répondait pas. Il fallait que je fasse mon travail, donc je l’ai fait” (Lucie, interview; April 12, 2005). In contrast to Mary, Lucie very much liked the e-mail project and considered it a good way to learn English. As she further explained, she viewed this e-mail tandem exchange as an opportunity to receive feedback from a native speaker of her own age:

*Ses corrections m’ont aidées parce que j’ai compris des erreurs que je ne comprenais pas. Elle m’expliquait dans le fond mes erreurs, pourquoi je faisais cette erreur-là. C’était comme une amie qui me corrigeait mais dans le fond ça aurait été la même chose si ça aurait été un prof. Sauf qu’elle me le disait d’une différente façon.* (Lucie, interview; April 12, 2005)
These findings suggest that these two divergent attitudes to the e-mail tandem project were played out in the way both students invested in the project. While Lucie viewed this project as an opportunity to improve her English, Mary did not value the time spent writing to her tandem partner as the project did not count for the final mark. These different motives in regard to participation in the e-mail project seem to explain why Mary displayed a minimum investment in it while Lucie was found to be more fully engaged.

5.5.4. Partnership 30 – Pierre* (ESL) and Alice* (FSL): Differences in view of classroom language learning

Analysis of the data of Pierre and Alice’s partnership revealed that differences in the way they viewed classroom language learning may have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail tandem project. Analyses of the responses to the background and end-of-project questionnaires revealed that both partners had a positive orientation to learning English and French, respectively. In the background questionnaire, both Pierre and Alice said that learning English/French was “very important”. In addition, in the end-of-project questionnaire, they both replied “I agree” to the statement “In general, I like learning English/French”. Despite Pierre’s positive orientation to learning English, what further emerged in his interview was a negative orientation to classroom language learning. He felt that the classroom was not the ideal place to become proficient in a second language. He reported having learned English by watching TV, listening to songs, and communicating with friends in English, whereas classroom language learning had been limited to learning verbs and some grammatical structures:

He also expressed his preference for doing oral activities in the English class and his
dislike for activities that imply working alone, such as reading and writing:

*Qu’est-ce que j’aime pas faire, les compréhensions écrites, là. Ça, j’aime pas ça. Tout ce qui est faire un texte, un oral, ça, c’est le fun. J’aime plus travailler en équipes parce que je parle avec le monde. La ambiance est fun, c’est plus amusant. Quand tu es tout seul, tu es dans ton cahier, t’as pas le goût de travailler, ça avance pas.* (Pierre, interview; April 12, 2005)

By contrast, Alice appreciated learning French in school and reported liking all types of
activities, especially reading and writing:

> We do oral, reading and writing. For oral we do spontaneous group presentations
or some kind of sketch. For reading we do like reading an article and answer some
questions. The IB exam is like that as well so...and then we also practice writing,
too. We write compositions, we write a journal entry. I like reading articles and
writing something like my opinion or something like writing a newspaper article
about the article I just read, something like that. (Alice, interview; April 7, 2005)

Pierre’s negative orientation to classroom language learning and in particular to
activities implying reading and writing, may have influenced his perception of the e-mail
tandem project as not being of any value in terms of helping him learn English. This
negative orientation to the e-mail exchange was further reflected in how he went about
doing the tasks involved in the project. During the course of the project, Pierre only
attended 4 classes and sent 5 e-mails. His e-mails were short and they were mainly to
apologize for not having written or for sending short e-mails. The lack of sustained e-mail
communication on Pierre’s part limited Alice’s ability to write the required number of e-
mails. However, even if she only wrote 6 e-mails, she was above her group’s average in
terms of the total number of words written and the average number of words per e-mail.
Difference in investment also emerged in regard to the number of reflection forms they
completed. While Alice completed 4 reflection forms and took note of 17 responses,
Pierre did not complete any. The scarcity of the input provided by Pierre also hindered Alice from writing the three reports. On each of the three report forms, Alice wrote “Not possible because partner didn’t give his opinion on article”.

Pierre’s negative orientation to the e-mail tandem project was further confirmed in the end-of-project questionnaire where to the statement “J'ai aimé ce project”, he replied “Pas d'accord”. In his interview, Pierre justified his lack of investment in the project by explaining that he would have liked to communicate with her without having to discuss the articles they had read about:

J’aurais plus aimé que ce soit conversation avec elle, mettons, on s’écrivait des messages mais c’est pour savoir ce qu’on fait dans la vie, si on travaille...que dire ton opinion sur un article. C’est sûr qu’il y a ceux qui aiment ça, parler des articles puis tout. Mais je suis pas ce type de personne... (Pierre, interview; April 12, 2005)

When asked whether the feedback provided by his partner had helped him in any way, he replied that he never took the time to take note of the corrections:

Je lisais le courriel et ça me paraissait quand même bon. C’est sûr, il y avait des erreurs, mais, des fois je disais, comme elle me disait, « ton anglais est correct », c’est sûr qu’il y avait des erreurs mais je prenais jamais le temps de vraiment prendre un mot, le marquer en bas, le réécrire. Je sais pas... Moi, je prenais pas le temps. Elle peut-être, elle prenait ça à cœur, elle voulait vraiment apprendre son français correctement. (Pierre, interview; April 12, 2005)

Alice’s disappointment with Pierre’s lack of investment and non-commitment to the project was captured in her interview:

First, I was really motivated. I really liked this project. I was happy to write so I wrote about the articles and I responded, corrected his English, and then for a long
time, he didn't respond, and that got me less motivated because it was like a one-sided thing and I wasn't getting anything back so during the end, the last article, I wrote my opinion, but I didn't necessarily send it to him because I knew that he wouldn't be replying so I think that was what got me less motivated but I continued to write, just in case, because he said something like he missed classes, and that's not his fault if he is sick, but I just think that he should've taken a little bit of responsibility and could've sent it from home or something like that and that could've made it a little better for me. (Alice, interview; April 7, 2005)

Taken together, the findings suggest that these two divergent attitudes in regard to classroom language learning were played out in the way both students engaged in the project and in the way they oriented to the exchanges. Alice was positively oriented to learning French in the classroom and thus viewed this project as an opportunity to improve her French. By contrast, Pierre believed that in the classroom little could be achieved and thus did not perceive this e-mail tandem project to be of any value in terms of helping him learn English.

5.5.5. Partnership 13 – Mathieu (ESL) and Jenny* (FSL): Differences in investment in school

Analysis of the data of Mathieu and Jenny's partnership revealed that personal differences in investment in school may have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail tandem project. Analyses of the responses to the background and end-of-project questionnaires revealed that although both partners had a positive orientation to learning English and French, respectively, their responses also evidenced certain nuances. In the background questionnaire, Mathieu said that learning English was "important", whereas Jenny replied that for her, learning French was "very important". In addition, in the end-of-project questionnaire, to the statement "In general, I like learning English/French", Mathieu replied "D'accord", whereas Jenny responded "I strongly agree". Similarly, to the statement "I liked this project", in the end-of-project questionnaire, Mathieu
responded “D’accord”, whereas Jenny replied “I strongly agree”. It is important to mention that Jenny added “the idea”, next to this option. This comment, as was further confirmed during her interview, attests to a positive orientation to the project but also to her desire to have received more from her partner:

I enjoyed it. I just wished I could’ve had more on the other side, but I think it could work really well if we get more on the other side because I really think is a very good experience. (Jenny, interview; April 7, 2005)

When asked which task(s) she had enjoyed the most, Jenny replied that she had enjoyed reading the articles a lot:

I really liked the articles. I learned so much, specially the one on smoking. I had no idea that Quebec had such a high rate of smokers. I didn’t expect Ontario to be so low! I had no idea. You get this opinion about Ontario that everything is so fast-paced and not as morally-centered as some of the other provinces so I was shocked to find out that Ontario was one of the lowest. The articles were very interesting, I really liked them. Like I said, I’m very politically and socially-minded, so I like to read these things. I think it’s excellent. You get students involved because I know a lot of my classmates aren’t very politically-minded or socially-minded. (Jenny, interview; April 7, 2005)

As evidenced in the above comments, Jenny was genuinely interested in the topics discussed in the readings and saw this task as an opportunity to compare facts and realities of her L1 and L2 cultures. By contrast, as evidenced in Mathieu’s responses to the end-of-project questionnaire, the reading of the articles was not of interest to him. Indeed, when asked to reflect on each of the tasks involved in the project, Mathieu said that reading the articles was “Pas très intéressante”.

These different orientations to the project were further reflected in how they went about doing the tasks involved in it. Although the analysis of e-mail frequency and
number revealed that both partners sent the same number of e-mails (n=11) in the same number of days (n=11), the analysis of quantity of writing revealed that Jenny was much more prolific. She wrote a total of 3094 words with an average of 281.3 words per e-mail while her partner wrote a total of 1639 words with an average of 149 words per e-mail. The different ways these two partners invested in the project were also evident in the number of reflection forms they completed. In contrast to Jenny, who completed one reflection form for each e-mail she wrote, Mathieu completed only 3. The analysis of the e-mails also revealed that although Jenny had provided a lot of input on the topics the ESL students had read about, Mathieu did not use it to write his reports. In terms of language learning, these findings seem to suggest that Mathieu’s lack of engagement in the exchange hindered him from using the linguistic affordances (van Lier, 2000) offered by his tandem partner to write his e-mails and reports. By contrast, Jenny’s engagement in the project and her active investment in her French class appeared to mediate her appropriate use of the *tu* of solidarity, as explained in section 5.2.3. Finally, Mathieu did not respond to two of her three opinion pieces which subsequently limited her ability to write these reports. Jenny, however, used Mathieu’s feedback to revise the only report she had been able to write.

Very interestingly, in the end-of-project questionnaire, both partners reported having worked about the same they usually did for an English/French assignment. Jenny, however, added "my effort is always high", next to this option. During the personal interview with Jenny, she explained that her motivation in the exchange had diminished because despite her efforts to elicit her partner’s opinion, she had not got much back from him in return:

My partner, I think he was a little...I don’t know if he was unmotivated or the time was just too short for him to write a lot because I like to write a lot. I put a lot of effort in whatever I do. I tried to get my opinion and tried to evoke something but I don’t know if he was just short of time or what but I didn’t get much back on the other side. (Jenny, interview; April 7, 2005)
Comments such as “I put a lot of effort in whatever I do” (Jenny, interview) show Jenny’s investment not just in this project in particular but also in school. The different ways these two partners invested in school were also evident in their e-mails. In her second e-mail, Jenny let her partner know how important it was for her to succeed in school:

Life in Brampton is pretty boring, at least for me as I’ve got to concentrate on my studies in order to me being accepted into a university. Weekends for me are primarily for catching up on homework and not having fun like every other teenager in the world. (Jenny, Message # 636; November 18, 2004)

Jenny’s investment in her French class as well as her desire to succeed in school was corroborated by the FSL teacher: “Jenny has to work harder than some of her friends. She’s a smart girl but it does take work. It doesn’t come naturally, and she does very well. Her French is also very good” (FSL teacher, interview; April 7, 2005). By contrast, Mathieu replied that for him, school was not very important:

Me I don’t give a lot of time at my studies. I'm more of the time in the forest or in body-shop. (Mathieu, Message # 726, Nov. 25, 2004, Re: 636)

Comments such as “I don’t give a lot of time at (sic) my studies” seem to suggest that for Mathieu, “having worked about the same he usually did for an English assignment” meant having done the minimum required assignments, without putting too much time or effort in it. Taken together, the findings suggest that Mathieu and Jenny’s different investment in school determined the degree to which they engaged in the project. While Mathieu displayed a minimal investment in the e-mail tandem project, Jenny was found to be more fully engaged.
5.5.6. Partnership 1 – Sophie* (ESL) and Eric* (FSL): Differences in investment in school

Analyses of the data of the partnership formed by Sophie and Eric revealed that differences in genuine interest in school may have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail tandem project. Analyses of Eric’s responses to the background and the end-of-project questionnaires as well as to the personal interview revealed that he had an ambivalent orientation to learning French. In the end-of-project questionnaire, Eric replied “I agree” to the statement “In general, I like learning French”. However, in the background questionnaire, he had reported that for him learning French was “more or less important”. This ambivalent orientation to learning French was also evident in his interview. When asked if learning French was important for him, he further explained that although he thought speaking French could be a useful tool in his future career as a doctor, he did not see any further role for it in his everyday future life:

Well, yes. In the future, I’m pretty sure...since I want to be a doctor. So I’m sure when someone comes and can’t speak English, just French, I already have a background, and it is pretty good. But on a daily basis, I don’t know... (Eric, interview; April 7, 2005)

By contrast, his Francophone partner Sophie was sensitive to the use value of learning English: “L’anglais, c’est une langue internationale. On en a besoin pour tout” (Sophie, interview, April 12, 2005). This positive orientation to learning English was consistent with her responses to the questionnaires. In the background questionnaire, Sophie reported that for her learning English was “Très important”. Similarly, in the end-of-project questionnaire, she replied “Tout à fait d’accord” to the statement “En général, j’aime apprendre l’anglais”.

Differences also emerged in the way both partners oriented to the e-mail tandem exchanges. Specifically, Sophie had a positive attitude to the e-mail exchange, whereas Eric showed an ambivalent orientation to it. To the statement, “I liked this project”, in the end-of-project questionnaire, Sophie replied “Tout à fait d’accord”, whereas Eric replied
“I can’t say”. However, during the interview, when asked if he had liked the project, Eric replied that he had enjoyed it. In particular, he pointed out that he had appreciated the fact of being corrected by a Francophone of his same age rather than by a teacher:

Yes, it was fun. It was kind of interesting that I wrote my thing and she corrected it for me, and writing my opinion, it was like kind of...it made me realize when I was making mistakes. It’s not like my teacher, that corrects everything. She was my age so she showed me this and sometimes she used different ways to say things, as well. For example, I used “utiliser” that I think it works, but she corrected me for “employer”. (Eric, interview; April 7, 2005)

Despite Eric’s ambivalent evaluation of the e-mail project, from the product point of view, both Sophie and Eric seemed to have had a positive orientation to it. Analysis of the data pertaining to e-mail frequency, number of e-mails sent, and quantity of writing revealed that both Sophie and Eric were prolific writers. They both sent more e-mails than the minimum required (19 and 14 e-mails, respectively) and their e-mails were lengthy (2262 and 2404 words, respectively). However, close examination of their e-mails showed a different degree of engagement in the exchange. Indeed, on several occasions, Sophie had to ask him to “take action” (e.g., read, write, ask, comment, continue with the task, etc.). As evidenced in the following two threaded messages, although Eric replied to her questions in response to her directives, he did not do it because of a real engagement in the task:

Sophie, Message # 843; December 6, 2004
Hi, mmm please can you respond at my question please and can you write me a message on your subject because I can't work if you didn't this.
thank you
Sophie -xxx-
Premièrement, je m'excuse. Je n'étais pas ici pour deux semaine parce que j'ai eu un tournoi du lutte. Je ne peux pas faire beaucoup de devoirs, et maintenant, je suis très fatigué. Cependant, je vais faire ça ainsi tu peux faire ton devoirs.

Later during the course of the exchange, Sophie had to urge him again to read his third text and send her his opinion piece:

Sophie, Extract message # 1463; March 15, 2005
Can you read your third article and send me your opinion about it please !!!!!!!!

One week later, Eric responded to Sophie’s directives by sending her his opinion piece, but this time, however, he did not apologize or justify his delay in any way:

Message numéro 1517
Envoyé par Eric le Lundi, Mars 21, 2005 22:37
Objet : La vie après les LABO

Les chimpanzés sont les animaux les plus intéressant dans le monde. C'est parce qu'ils ont, probablement, la réponse à notre passé. Les humains ont découvert beaucoup de choses environ se passé quand ils ont les étudié.

Les chimpanzés ressemblent les humains beaucoup. Il avait rapporté que les chimpanzés possèdent un patromoine génétique à 98,4% semblable à celui des humains. Aussi, ils peuvent vivre jusqu'à 50 ans. Les émotions similaires aux nôtre, et c'est le même pour les comportement. Quand ils sont un enfant en bas âge, ses mères les nourrirais jusqu'à ce qu'ils ont quatre à cinq ans, et les enfant vivraient aves les parents pour la dix premières années de sa vie. Ceux sont d’excellentes et salutaires découvertes.

Quoique la recherche ait été salutaire à notre société, la façon don’t l’information a été recueillie était erronée. Les chimpanzés des forêts se sont volé et ses mettent dans un lab. Le population des chimpanzés avait decline parce que de plus en plus chimpanzés sont enlevés. C'est parce qu’ils sont employés pour des experiments scientifiques. Les scientifiques les utilisent pour le recherché sur la traitement du VIH et
de l'hépatite C. Ce n'est pas bien. Il est comme une personne emploie un
humain pour cet recherché (comme j'ai dit plus tôt, les chimpanzés sont
comme les humains).

Si une personne recherchera, il ne doit pas employer les chimpanzés.
Cependant, il peut utiliser un autre façon à obtenir les information dont
il a besoin. Les chimpanzés sont similaire à les humains, et je pense que
nous doivions les traiter comme des humains.

During the interview, when asked which tasks he had liked the least, he replied he had
not liked writing about the articles and that he would have liked to chat with her instead:

I really didn’t like writing about the articles. I prefer to chat, like in a chat room,
like in the MSN or something, because it is like in a dialogue, they can correct
you right away without having to talk about the articles. (Eric, interview; April 7,
2005)

However, it is important to note that when Sophie tried to provide him with this
opportunity, he failed to take her up on it:

Sophie, Extract message # 574; November 15, 2004
J'aimerais que tu me parles de toi un peu plus. Est-ce que tu as
Msn messemger? Moi, oui. Je vais te donner mon adresse:
XXXXXXXXXXX@hotmail.com

Eric, Extract message # 660; Re : #576; November 18, 2004
Je ne pense pas que je peux parler à toi en MSN, parce que ma
prof a dit ça, mais si nous tombons dans amour, je vais mettre
dans mon liste (lol).
Despite Eric’s refusal to her invitation to communicate by chat, Sophie insisted once again during the course of the project and in her good-bye e-mail:

Sophie, Extract message # 1061; January 19, 2005
En je vais te donner encore une fois mon adresse msn ok : XXXXXX@hotmail.com
J’aimerais que tu me rajoutes à ta liste parce que nous allons pouvoir garder contact et nous pourrions pratiquer notre anglais.

Sophie, Extract message # 1544 (Good-bye e-mail); March 30, 2005
On peut continuer à se parler sur msn. Ça sera très intéressant et je serais très contente de garder le contact avec toi !!! :)

The discussion above seems to indicate that Eric was not enthusiastic about learning French, whatever the medium proposed. By contrast, Sophie’s engagement in this project was a reflection of her general investment in her ESL class, as confirmed by the ESL teacher:

Sophie est discrète, travaillante, pointilleuse. Je dirais même perfectionniste. Son travail est toujours bien fait. Si elle a terminé avant les autres, elle va prendre le temps de ré viser au lieu de s’occuper à d’autres choses. C’était le modèle finalement. (ESL teacher/Catherine, interview; April 1, 2005)

By contrast, during the interview, Eric acknowledged not liking school very much:

Researcher: What made you decide to register in the IB programme?
Eric: Well, it was my parents...
Researchers: But did you like the idea?
Eric: Well, at first I said ugh!
Researcher: And now?
Eric: I don’t like it...
Researcher: Why?

Eric: It's so much work...

Researcher: Do you think it is going to help you?

Eric: I guess in the long run, it will.

Comments such as “Well, it was my parents”, “Well, at first I said ugh!”, and “I don’t like it [because] it’s so much work” seem to indicate that Eric was not genuinely interested in schooling. As the FSL teacher explained, “many of our students [in the IB program] want to become doctors, in part due to family pressure” (FSL teacher, interview, April 7, 2005). In other words, Eric was caught between the need to do required school assignments in order to get good marks and be accepted into a university, and his genuine interest in schooling. This ambivalent orientation to schooling may have played a role in the way he oriented to the e-mail tandem project. While Eric engaged more at the level of task compliance, Sophie was found to be more fully engaged.

5.5.7. Partnership 27 – Mylène (ESL) and Shawn* (FSL): Differences in satisfaction about personal level of English/French

Analyses of the data revealed that individual differences in satisfaction about their personal level of English/French could have played a strong role in the limited amount of interaction that took place between Mylène and Shawn. Analyses of the responses to the background questionnaire revealed that both Mylène and Shawn reported having a “Fair” level of written and oral English or French, respectively. Close analysis of their e-mails also showed that Mylène and Shawn were more limited than some of their classmates in their abilities to express themselves in their respective second languages. However, they responded to this situation in different ways. In his first e-mail, Shawn let Mylène know that his French was not good and he added “and I don’t mind how your English is”. These comments can be interpreted as a strategy to save his own face, on the one hand, but also of his relative lack of interest in improving his level of French, on the other:
Shawn, Extract message # 542, November 11, 2004 (First e-mail)

I know that im not great at french, and I do not mind how your english is. (...)Don't make the 'français' too hard!! lol

In her introductory e-mail, Mylène also included a negative judgement of her own abilities in English and explained to her partner that although she was a secondary 5 student, she was taking secondary 4 English:

Mylène, Extract message # 621, November 16, 2004 (First e-mail)

Moi je suis en secondaire 5e je finis donc cette année. Plus tard je veux devenir intervenante en délinquance. C'est donc 3 années de cégep. Je ne suis pas vraiment bonne en anglais, je suis donc en anglais de 4e secondaire.

Analyses of their responses also showed a different orientation to learning a second language. In the background questionnaire, Mylène reported that for her, learning English was “important”, whereas her Anglophone partner Shawn replied that for him, learning French was “more or less important”. Similarly, to the statement “In general, I like learning English/French” in the end-of-project questionnaire, Mylène replied “D'accord”, whereas Shawn replied “I can’t say”. Despite these different orientations to the learning of English/French, their responses to the questionnaire also revealed that both Mylène and Shawn had a negative orientation to the e-mail project. Indeed, both of them replied “I strongly disagree” to the statement “I liked this project”. In addition, they both reported having worked less than they usually did for an English/French assignment. However, beside this option, Mylène added that her negative evaluation of the project was due to the scarcity of e-mails on the part of her partner: “Je suis désolée si mes commentaires peuvent être négatifs. C'est juste que comme mon correspondant ne m'a presque jamais écrit, je n'ai pas pu faire tout le travail comme il faut”.

Indeed, Shawn’s negative orientation to the e-mail project was further reflected in the way he went about doing the tasks involved in the project. After his introductory e-
mail, Shawn sent only three other e-mails to his partner. On three occasions during the course of the project, Mylène tried to encourage his participation:

Mylène, message # 875; December 6, 2004
Je t'écris ce message pour te demander si tu pouvais me répondre parce que j'ai besoin de ton opinion sur mon texte pour un autre travail.

Mylène, message # 1252; February 21, 2005
p.s. Tu pouvais me répondre svp

Mylène, message # 1506; March 17, 2005
salut toi! j'espère que ça va toujours bien.
Je t'écris pour te demander si tu pouvais m'écrire et répondre à mes questions svp

Despite Mylène's efforts to urge him to "take action", not only did Shawn fail to respond to her directives but never apologized or explained why he had interrupted the communication. His non-commitment to the partnership was also reflected in his "good bye" e-mail, which he sent one week after the project was over:

Shawn, message # 1653; April 5, 2005
ahh, I sent you messages from home but it seems that you did not get them. Well this is over, i'm sorry about the responses or lack there of. My msn is XXXXXX@hotmail.com if you still want to talk.

In the interview, when asked to reflect on his limited participation in the e-mail project, he further explained that he had often been absent from his French class: "Because I was often absent. I think I sent two of the three articles we had to do. I did one here and one at home". He also justified the fact of not having written any reports due to lack of time: "Lack of time, something just got in the way and then just dragged on." Besides this negative orientation to the e-mail project, what further emerged in his
responses to the interview, was the fact that he was not overly concerned by his then current level of French:

Well, being in Canada, I guess it is important to know French, but I think that after high school I’ll be at a point to be able to understand French, but I won’t be able to read or speak fast. (Shawn, interview, April 7, 2005)

Commenting on his engagement in the French class in general and in the e-mail project in particular, the FSL teacher explained that “Shawn is satisfied with his level of French. He doesn’t think he would use it any more, and so doesn’t put a lot of effort.” Taken together, these findings seem to indicate that Shawn’s lack of investment in the e-mail project could be explained by the fact that for him, learning French had a rather little use value. Consequently, being in his last year of high school and basically satisfied with his level of French, he did not give too much importance to the French class.

5.5.8. Partnership 10 – Audrey* (ESL) and Marc (FSL): Supportive scaffolding and perception of self as a language learner

Analysis of the data of these two partners revealed that differences in perception of self as language learners may have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail project. Analyses of the responses to the background questionnaire revealed that Marc considered that his oral and written French were “Good”, whereas Audrey thought her oral and written English were “Poor”. Audrey was described by her ESL teacher as a hard working but struggling and rather unmotivated student:

 Audrey a beaucoup de difficulté. Elle travaille très bien. Elle est souvent absente, par contre. Ça l'aide pas. Je pense que ça joue beaucoup sur les résultats de ses travaux. Si elle est pas là quand on voit une certaine partie de la matière, c'est normal qu'elle soit perdue après. Même chose dans le projet, si elle prend du retard dans ses emails, c'est sûr et certain qu'elle va avoir la double charge de
travail et probablement ça va le faire baisser les bras. (ESL teacher, interview; April 1, 2005)

Nevertheless, the description by her teacher was at odds with an image of Audrey that emerged from an analysis of the data obtained from the e-mails, the end-of-project questionnaire, the interview and my in-class observations. Although she missed some classes and sent fewer e-mails than required (2 e-mails less), her e-mails were longer than her group’s average (279.3 words more). Contrary to her teacher’s predictions, she remained motivated and never gave up. In addition, her attitude in the computer lab showed her enthusiasm and engagement in the project. Her constant enthusiasm during the project was evident in her e-mails:

Audrey, Extract message # 598, November 15, 2004 (First e-mail)
I'm happy for meet with you in correspondance. :-)
My name is Audrey. I'm 15 years old coming soon 16! My date is March 19. :-) I have 1 brother. Your name is Francis. He have 18 years old. :-) I'm sorry. I don't speak English very well. :-s
I have two cats. :-) There name is Timine and Toutite. :-) They are very cute. :-) Comme tu as bien vu j'ai un peu de difficulté et j'espère que je vais mieux écrire ou parler Anglais après cela.

Audrey, Extract message # 847; December 6, 2004
Thanks you for my English !! ;-) I'm so happy to be a correspondance :-P !!! You are boys very gentle !! ;-)
Audrey, Extract message 1546, March 30, 2005 (Good-bye e-mail)

Hello Marc!

How are you today? I'm fine!!! Today it's last message!! :-(
I love my experience with you! It's very funny! You are a boys very smart and funny. I hope one day can be to speak again you!
You take care of you okay?! And I hope that I have to help you in your French ;-) !!! I love to discuss with you during an end.
Then.... take care and give again to me your news...
Je te laisse mon adresse hotmail (si tu as cela) et au pire on s'écrira ... XXXXXXX@hotmail.com !!!!
Good bye Marc ! You are a super boy ! ;-
Audrey avec affection ! xxxxxxxxxxx

Like Audrey, her Anglophone partner Marc, showed a positive orientation to the e-mail project. He sent 10 e-mails, completed 9 reflection forms, sent his partner the first report, and gave her feedback on her e-mails and reports. When giving her feedback, he used face-giving strategies, as in the following two instances:

Marc, message # 657, November 18, 2004

En totale, ton anglais était bien, mais il y a quatre erreurs.
Tu m'appelles Francis, ça c'est drôle. Je fais les erreurs aussi! :)

Marc, message # 831; December 2, 2004

Tres. Bien.

Although he, too, presented himself as having a weak level of French, he also stressed that he tried hard to improve it:
Bonsoir,


His positive orientation to the project was also evident in his good-bye e-mail (March 31, 2005):

Marc, Extract message # 1622, March 31, 2005 (Good bye e-mail)

Objet : Le dernier message

Hello Audrey! Bonne fete a toi, bonne fete a toi, bonne fete, bonne fete, bonne fete a toi!
Okay... have a good life.
Talk to you later, Marc

In her interview, Audrey explained that she struggled in her English class because she had started high school with a poor level of English. She also reported that she preferred reading and writing activities because she found them easier than speaking in English:

J'ai de la misère, parce que moi, au primaire, j'étais deux années à avoir de la difficulté, parce que nos professeurs ben, les élèves, il y avait des gars qui faisaient chier les professeurs, si j'emploie la bonne expression. Ben, j'ai pas appris l'anglais pendant deux années. Ça m'a pas mal retardé. Puis, j'arrive ici puis il faut qu'on parle en anglais puis tout, ça m'aide parce que le prof parle tout le temps en anglais donc ça m'aide, mais, à part ça, les structures des phrases, des fois je ne les ai pas tout le temps dans ma tête. J'ai vraiment de la
misère avec ça, là. Donc, parler, j'aime moins, mais écrire puis comprendre je suis capable, puis j'aime ça, là. Faire des textes, les petites réponses ça nous aide, là. (Audrey, interview; April 12, 2005)

In the responses to the end-of-project questionnaire, she expressed that she had been surprised to find out how easy it was for her to learn English when someone besides the teacher gave her feedback: “Dans ce projet, j'étais surprise d'apprendre que j'avais aussi de facilité à apprendre l'anglais lorsque c'était une autre personne qu'un professeur qui me l'expliquait”. This sentiment was also evident in her comments in the interview:

Quand il me corrigeait, j'essayais de faire attention justement à ce que j'écrivais après. À un moment donné j'avais marqué, je parlais de mon frère....il m'a dit que j'avais marqué « Your name is Francis », en tout cas, je lui avais dit que c'était lui mon frère...j'ai trouvé ça super drôle, c'était pas ça ce que je voulais dire. Il m'a corrigé et puis j'ai compris mon erreur. J'ai trouvé ça le fun que quelqu'un d'autre que le professeur nous corrige, c'est comme des jeunes, donc on se comprend, on fait pareil, et j'ai trouvé ça super le fun. J'aimerais ça continuer...! (Audrey, interview; April 12, 2005)

These findings seem to suggest that Marc’s positive orientation to the e-mail exchange and the scaffolding he provided her played a strong role in the way Audrey viewed herself as a language learner. It could be thus concluded that this e-mail project enhanced Audrey’s self-image as a successful language learner and this contributed to her becoming more fully invested in the project.
5.5.9. **Summary of findings for research question # 4:** *To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchanges)?*

The analyses of the amount of writing showed that the majority of the students participating in the e-mail tandem project had minimally completed the basic course requirements. However, analyses of data of eight partnerships [Édouard (ESL) and Diane (FSL); Laure (ESL) and John (FSL); Lucie (ESL) and Mary (FSL); Pierre (ESL) and Alice (FSL); Mathieu (ESL) and Jenny (FSL); Sophie (ESL) and Eric (FSL); Mylène (ESL) and Shawn (FSL); Audrey (ESL) and Marc (FSL)] revealed differences in how students accomplished the tasks involved in the project. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, in particular on the interpretative framework of activity theory, this question sought to investigate if the students’ motives could explain these differential degrees of investment in the project.

For each of the partnerships analyzed, various data sources were examined to investigate the way the students’ motives (i.e., the underlying purpose each of them ascribed to the e-mail exchange) were related to the carrying out of the task (in reference to the choice of tools/resources) and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced). Taken together, these analyses revealed that Diane, Laure, Lucie, Alice, Jenny, Sophie, Audrey and Marc were fully engaged in the e-mail tandem project, Édouard, John, Eric and Mylène engaged more at the level of task compliance, while Mary, Pierre, Mathieu and Shawn displayed a minimal engagement. Table XXXV summarizes the differences in how the case study students (i.e., students who were interviewed within a partnership and for whom the data is more complete) accomplished the tasks involved in the project with respect to motive and the implementation of actions.
Table XXXV

Comparison of how case study students engaged in the e-mail tandem project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students / Level of engagement</th>
<th>Motive (Underlying purpose)</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diane (FSL 20)                | • Motive: opportunity to develop her ‘éducation francophone’.
• Orientation to e-mail project: positive.
• Personal characteristics: positive orientation to FSL learning and culture. | • sent 9 e-mails (1 e-mail less than required), but wrote 2696 words (406.6 words more than group’s average).
• wrote 299.6 words per e-mail (61.1 words more than group’s average).
• completed a reflection form for each of e-mails she sent, and wrote fifteen responses.
• provided a total of 24 instances of scaffolding strategies (the highest in FSL group) to tandem partner, of which 13 in the role of the NS, 8 as the NNS, and 3 as e-mail partner.
• elicited cultural information from tandem partner.
• Resorted to English-French comparisons when giving feedback to partner.
• considered she worked not necessarily harder but more enthusiastically on this project than she usually did for a French assignment. |
| Laure (ESL 5)                 | • Motive: opportunity to practice her English.
• Orientation to e-mail project: positive.
• Personal characteristics: positive orientation to ESL learning. | • sent 8 e-mails (2 e-mails less than required), but wrote 3180 words (1632.3 more words than group’s average).
• wrote 397.5 words per e-mail (234 more words than group’s average).
• sent the three reports (Draft 1) to partner.
• revised the three reports (Draft 2) using partner’s feedback.
• considered she worked about the same on this project as she usually did for an English assignment. |
| Lucie (ESL 25)                | • Motive: Opportunity to learn English and get native speaker contact and feedback.
• Orientation to e-mail project: positive.
• Personal characteristics: positive orientation to ESL learning. | • sent 12 e-mails (2 e-mails more than required).
• completed 8 reflection forms (2 less than required).
• sent one report (Draft 1) to tandem partner.
• considered she worked about the same on this project as she usually did for an English assignment. |
Alice (FSL 30)  
- Motive : opportunity to learn French and receive feedback from native speaker.  
- Orientation to e-mail project: positive.  
- Personal characteristics: positive orientation to FSL learning; positive orientation to classroom language learning.

Jenny (FSL 13)  
- Motive : opportunity to learn French and to compare facts and realities of L1 and L2 cultures.  
- Orientation to e-mail project: positive.  
- Personal characteristics: positive orientation to FSL learning.

Sophie (ESL 1)  
- Motive : opportunity to learn English and to communicate with a native English speaker.  
- Orientation to e-mail project: positive.  
- Personal characteristics: positive orientation to ESL learning.

Audrey (ESL 10)  
- Motive : opportunity to learn English and receive feedback from native speaker.  
- Orientation to e-mail project: positive.  
- Personal characteristics: positive orientation to ESL learning; before the e-mail project: considered herself a weak ESL student.; during and at the end of e-mail project: acknowledged how easy it was for her to learn English when tandem partner gave her feedback.

- sent 6 e-mails (4 e-mails less than required), but wrote a total of 2331 words (41.6 words more than group’s average).  
- wrote 388.5 words per e-mail (150 words more than group’s average).  
- completed 4 reflection forms and wrote 17 responses.  
- provided 13 instances of scaffolding strategies of which 7 as the NS, 5 as the NNS, and 3 as e-mail partner.

- sent 11 e-mails (1 e-mail more than required).  
- wrote 3094 words ( 804.6 words more than group’s average).  
- wrote 281.3 words per e-mail (42.8 words more than group’s average).  
- completed a reflection form for each e-mail she sent.  
- provided a lot of input on topics the ESL students had read about.  
- made transition to tu in second e-mail and maintained her use of it for the duration of the e-mail exchange.  
- considered she worked about the same on this project as she usually did for a French assignment.

- sent 19 e-mails (9 e-mails more than required).  
- wrote 2262 words (714.3 words more than group’s average).  
- completed 5 reflection forms.  
- sent the 3 reports (Draft 1) to partner.  
- revised the 3 reports (Drafts 2) using partner’s feedback.  
- on several occasions, asked partner to “take action”.  
- invited partner to communicate by MSN.

- sent 8 e-mails (2 e-mails less than required), but wrote 1827 words (279.3 words more than group’s average).  
- completed 7 reflection forms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Édouard and Eric: Task compliance</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Édouard (ESL 20)</td>
<td>Eric (FSL 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motive:</strong> do well in English class.</td>
<td><strong>Motive:</strong> grades – Do well in French class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to e-mail project:</td>
<td>Orientation to e-mail project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambivalent.</td>
<td>ambivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics:</td>
<td>Personal characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambivalent orientation to ESL</td>
<td>ambivalent orientation to FSL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning.</td>
<td>learning; ambivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation to ESL learning.</td>
<td>orientation to schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sent 8 e-mails (2 e-mails less than required) but wrote 1581 words (33.3 words more than group’s average).</strong></td>
<td><strong>sent 14 e-mails (4 e-mails more than required).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wrote 197.6 words per e-mail (34.1 words more than group’s average).</strong></td>
<td><strong>wrote 2404 words (114.6 words more than group’s average).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>completed a reflection form for each e-mail he sent, but only wrote two responses.</strong></td>
<td><strong>completed only 2 reflection forms.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sent one report (Draft 1) to partner.</strong></td>
<td><strong>revised two of the three opinion pieces in the Report forms (Draft 2).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>considered he worked about the same on this project as he usually did for an English assignment.</strong></td>
<td><strong>declined partner’s invitation to communicate by MSN.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mary, Pierre and Shawn: Minimally engaged</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary (FSL 25)</td>
<td>Pierre (ESL 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motive:</strong> e-mail project perceived as having no value as not counting for final mark.</td>
<td><strong>Motive:</strong> e-mail project perceived as not being of any value in learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to e-mail project:</td>
<td>Orientation to e-mail project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative.</td>
<td>negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics:</td>
<td>Personal characteristics:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive orientation to FSL learning.</td>
<td>positive orientation to ESL learning; negative orientation to classroom language learning (perceived as not being the ideal place to become fluent in English).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sent 5 e-mails (5 e-mails less than required).</strong></td>
<td><strong>sent 5 e-mails (5 e-mails less than required).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>completed only 1 reflection form.</strong></td>
<td><strong>wrote a total of 784 words (763.7 words less than group’s average).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>did not write any of the three reports (even though required).</strong></td>
<td><strong>did not complete any reflection form (even though required).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>did not correct partner’s report (even though required).</strong></td>
<td><strong>did not write any of the three reports (even though required).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>acknowledged she worked less on this project than she usually did for a French assignment.</strong></td>
<td><strong>provided only three instances of scaffolding strategies, all of them being “responding to directives”.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>did not correct partner’s e-mails</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in this Table, all the participants were positively oriented toward the learning of a second language, except Édouard and John who showed an ambivalent orientation to English and French, respectively. Although on the one hand Édouard considered the learning of English important, he also expressed his uncertainty as to whether he liked learning English or not, and his desire that French would be spoken everywhere in Canada, and not English. His ambivalent orientation to English detracted from his ability to take the maximum advantage of the resources afforded him by the exchange with his tandem partner. In contrast to Édouard, who viewed this e-mail tandem project as another classroom task, his FSL partner Diane saw it as a unique opportunity to develop her “éducation francophone”. Similarly to Édouard, John had an ambivalent orientation to the learning of French. From the product point of view, John seemed to have been fully invested in the project. However, his evaluation of the project, as reflected in his responses to the end-of-project questionnaire, revealed that he had a rather ambivalent orientation to it. Analyses of e-mail data pertaining to *tu/vous* use revealed that John never adopted *tu* use in his communication with his Francophone partner Laure. As John was not interviewed, the reasons as to why he maintained the use of *vous* for the duration of the e-mail exchange remain unknown. These findings underscore the importance of complementing analyses of products with interviews in order to more fully understand why students invest in or fail to invest in a given task.

Another factor which influenced how students oriented to the e-mail tandem exchange was the importance attributed to grades. Specifically, although Mary had a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shawn (FSL 27)</th>
<th>Motive: e-mail project perceived as having no value (as he thought he would not use French any more)</th>
<th>sent 4 e-mails (6 e-mails less than required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation to e-mail project: negative.</td>
<td>wrote 848 words (1441.4 words less than group’s average).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal characteristics: ambivalent orientation to FSL learning; not overly concerned with his level of French.</td>
<td>completed 3 reflection forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>did not write any of the three reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
positive orientation to the learning of French, she did not value the time spent writing to her tandem partner as the project did not count for the final mark. In contrast to Mary, who displayed a minimal investment in the project, her Francophone partner Lucie was found to be more fully engaged as she viewed this project as an opportunity to improve her English.

Differences also emerged concerning the students’ orientation to classroom language learning. In particular, Pierre’s discussion on how he invested in the e-mail tandem project revealed that although he considered learning English very important, he did not consider the classroom to be the ideal place to become fluent in English. In his words, what had helped him learn English was outside class activities such as watching TV, listening to songs, and communicating with friends in English. Pierre believed that in the classroom little could be achieved and thus did not perceive this e-mail tandem project to be of any value in terms of helping him learn English. In contrast to Pierre, his Anglophone partner Alice both valued learning French and considered the e-mail tandem project to be useful to this end.

As for Mathieu and Jenny, personal differences in investment in school seemed to have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail project. While Jenny concentrated on her studies in order to be accepted into a university, Mathieu did not give a lot of time to his studies. Although both of them were positively oriented to second language learning, their underlying purpose for engaging in the e-mail project was different. As Jenny was fully invested in school, she viewed the e-mail exchange as an opportunity to learn French and to compare facts and realities of their L1 and L2 cultures. By contrast, Mathieu saw it as another classroom task and thus displayed a minimal investment in it.

Lacking a genuine interest in schooling also seemed to have determined the way Eric oriented to the e-mail project. Although analysis of the data pertaining to the e-mail frequency, number of e-mails sent, and quantity of writing revealed that he had been a prolific writer, close examination of the e-mail exchange with his Francophone partner Sophie showed a different degree of engagement in the exchange. During the course of the project, Sophie repeatedly had to urge him to “take action”. As well, he declined Sophie’s invitation to communicate by chat outside of class hours. Besides his somewhat
ambivalent orientation to learning French, what emerged during the interview, was that Eric had registered in the IB program due to family pressure. These findings seem to indicate that the underlying purpose Eric ascribed to the e-mail project (i.e., do well in his French class in order to get good grades and be admitted in a university) had a bearing on how well and to what degree he did the tasks involved in the project.

Differences in satisfaction with their personal level of English/French could have played a strong role in the limited amount of interaction that took place between Mylène and Shawn. Both Mylène and Shawn acknowledged having a fair level of English/French, respectively. However, in contrast to Mylène, Shawn was not overly concerned by his then current level of French because he did not consider he would need it after finishing high school. Shawn’s lack of interest in improving his level of French seems to have determined the way he oriented to the French class in general and the e-mail project in particular. This, in turn, affected the quality of the final product (e.g., the number and length of e-mails) and the quality of learning (e.g., appropriating language from readings and e-mail exchanges, using his partner’s feedback).

Finally, analyses of the partnership formed by Audrey and Marc showed how the e-mail communication with a native speaker of about the same age can mediate a student’s perception of self as a language learner. Reflecting on her current level of English, Audrey explained that she struggled in her English class because she had started high school with a poor level of English. In reflecting on Audrey’s orientation to language learning, it is also instructive to note that the ESL teacher perceived her as a hard working but struggling and rather unmotivated student. Nevertheless, the description by her teacher was at odds with an image of Audrey that emerged from an analysis of the data obtained from the e-mails, the end-of-project questionnaire, the interview and my in-class observations. In her responses to the questionnaire and the interview, she expressed that she had been surprised to find out how easy it was for her to learn English when someone besides the teacher gave her feedback. These findings seem to suggest that Marc’s positive orientation to the e-mail exchange and the scaffolding he provided her enhanced Audrey’s self-image as a successful language learner and thus mediated the way she invested in the project.
5.6. **Research question # 5:** How do the secondary ESL and FSL teachers in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?

This question sought to investigate the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool. Data for analysis were gathered from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview and from the e-mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher. In this chapter, findings as to each of the teachers’ views on the usefulness of this e-mail tandem project as a language learning tool are presented in the first three sections. In the final section, I explore the challenges which teachers were confronted with in their attempts to carry out the tandem project.

5.6.1. Teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool

As explained in chapter 4, the design of the present project benefited from a previous collaboration with the ESL teacher, Catherine Dubé, and the FSL teacher, Callie Mady. For personal reasons, after the Christmas vacation Catherine had to take a leave of absence from her classes. For this reason, David Connolly substituted for Catherine and collaborated in the project from January 12 to April 5, the last day of the project. Notwithstanding, Catherine kept contact with me and the students during the whole course of the project. She often went to school on the days the project was done at the computer lab and she logged onto WebCT on a regular basis to keep track of the e-mail exchanges.

During the individual interviews\(^6\), Catherine, David, and Callie discussed their perceptions of the usefulness of this e-mail tandem project as a language learning tool.

---

\(^6\) I conducted the interviews with the ESL teachers on April 1, and with the FSL teacher on April 7, 2005.
5.6.1.1. Catherine

At the time of this study, Catherine had recently graduated from a BA in TESL program and had been teaching ESL for only two years. For Catherine, what was particularly appealing about ESL teaching was the myriad of possible activities that a teacher could include in her classes, as illustrated in the following excerpt:

Je trouve qu’il y a plein de choses à faire quand on enseigne une langue. Il y a plusieurs manières de l’enseigner, il y a plusieurs manières d’apprendre à la connaître. L’ouverture aussi des possibilités. Je peux leur faire lire des romans, la lisie est longue des activités de tout ce qu’on peut faire. C’est pas aussi dirigé qu’en mathématiques, où ils doivent absolument apprendre les soustractions. C’est tellement saturé comme domaine, les mathématiques, ou les sciences. Il y a tellement de matière à voir en si peu de temps, que j’aime moins travailler sous pression. Tandis qu’en anglais, on a plusieurs choses à voir mais il y a tellement de façons, tellement de possibilités que...c’est cette ouverture là que j’aime.

In her teaching, Catherine often incorporated team work and promoted the understanding and reinvestment of written texts. Thus, she commented:

Ils travaillent souvent en équipes. Ils sont bien habitués à faire ça. Ils doivent aussi lire des textes, les analyser et répondre à des questions de compréhension, de questions de...pour résumer des textes. Donner les informations les plus importantes, résumer le texte, donner l’idée principale, c’est quoi les idées secondaires qui en ressortent.

By contrast, she rarely incorporated teacher and peer feedback, and multiple drafts as part of the writing process. As she further explained, this was not only due to time constraints but also because she was sensitive to the fact that students’ privacy could be disrupted if asked to read and comment on their classmates’ writing:
Souvent ce qui arrive, c’est qui est malheureux, on n’a pas assez de temps pour faire ça. Donner une rétroaction, demander à ce qu’ils réécrivent leur texte. C’est sûr et certain que dans un enseignement idéal, il faudrait qu’on réussisse à le faire avec chacun des textes qu’ils ont écrits, mais c’est pas toujours évident. De l’autre côté, c’est souvent des sujets personnels que je leur demande d’écrire. À ce moment là, c’est pas évident d’aller soumettre une copie à quelqu’un. On imagine un élève qui a beaucoup d’amis dans sa classe, puis il arrive pour aller soumettre une copie à un autre élève quand c’est quelque chose de personnel qui est écrit dedans. C’est imposé. Ils pourraient me dire, oh, tu ne nous respectes pas. Je trouve ça compliqué. Mais oui, il faudrait que je le fasse. Je pense qu’il faudrait que je trouve effectivement un moyen de le faire.

What emerged as important in Catherine’s reflection about her own teaching was her belief that although adopting a process approach to teaching writing was not always easy, it was indeed pedagogically useful. Comments such as “Il faudrait qu’on réussisse à le faire avec chacun des textes qu’ils ont écrits” and “Je pense qu’il faudrait que je trouve effectivement un moyen de le faire” seem to suggest that for her, it remained an important goal for the ESL program.

As the following excerpt illustrates, Catherine viewed this project not only as an opportunity to provide her students with authentic communication with native English speakers, but also to incorporate peer feedback as part of the writing process:

J’étais intéressée à participer à cet échange parce que j’ai trouvé que c’était une belle façon d’apprendre, que c’était une belle façon d’embarquer dans un projet par Internet avec des locuteurs natifs de l’anglais et d’incorporer de rétroaction par les pairs.
However, in discussing how students viewed this project, Catherine reported that although her students had felt privileged to have taken part in it, they had not viewed it as an integral part of their regular ESL class activities, but rather as an independent project:

Je pense qu’ils l’ont vu comme un projet indépendant. C’est sûr et certain qu’il y avait du travail à faire en classe que c’était inclus aux leçons et tout ça, mais je pense qu’ils voyaient ça comme une gâterie que je leur faisais, d’avoir la chance de participer avec des gens de l’extérieur. Ils voyaient ça comme un co-projet à part et qu’ils étaient les seuls à pouvoir le faire dans l’école. Ils se croyaient choyés.

Regarding the pedagogical benefits of this project, Catherine reported that besides having gained a greater awareness of particular aspects of English Canadian culture, her students had also benefited from their tandem partners’ input and feedback:

Ils ont appris beaucoup sur le volet culturel. Quelqu’un m’a dit « ah, je savais pas qu’à Toronto il y avait autant d’immigrants! ». Il y en a aussi qui ont appris des expressions : ‘C’est drôle ah, j’ai appris plein d’expressions, je les utilise dans mes mails. C’est bien drôle’. Il y en a d’autres qui ont appris : ‘Ah, c’est vrai, je fais des fautes! Je pensais pas que je faisais autant, Je me trouvais bonne. J’ai du travail à faire quand-même’. Il y en a qui ont réalisé qu’ils apprenaient plein d’affaires.

Finally, when asked if she would incorporate a project like this one with other groups again, Catherine not only manifested her enthusiasm, but also her willingness to make pedagogical arrangements in order to overcome the constraints caused by the limited number of computers in her school:

Oui, définitivement. Je crois que je m’arrangerais pour avoir le labo à tous les cours que je donne, puis je donnerais des cours à des petits groupes, puis je donnerais un cours mettons..on voit les élèves 4 fois dans un cycle, un cours je verrais la matière avec les élèves, avec une première moitié d’élèves pendant que
As this excerpt illustrates, for Catherine, these pedagogical changes could include incorporating lab time into all her classes, adapting the course work and very importantly, delegating the responsibility for their own learning to the students.

### 5.6.1.2. David

David held a degree in TESL and at the time of this study, he had been teaching ESL in secondary school for five years, after several years of teaching ESL to adults. He grew up in Ottawa with a Francophone mother and an Anglophone father. Although he was fully bilingual, he considered himself “a little bit more Francophone” because he did all his studies in French. In class, David presented himself as having no merit to being bilingual because he “did not have to work at it”:

Even if you’re Francophone in Ottawa you learn French there. But I had it in my family, so I learned them both at the same time. I consider myself lucky. I tell the kids, I’m bilingual but I have no merit because I didn’t have to work at it.

In his teaching, David sometimes incorporated team work and projects. However, for him teaching grammar was of utmost importance for them to be well understood:
In English, team work is very useful, specially when you want them to talk. Some teachers work only with projects but not me, I’m not used to that, but I always do a few projects here and there. However, I put a lot of emphasis on the structure, you know, grammar structure, either if they are talking or writing. I try to teach them mostly verb tenses, at least. I know they can’t have everything perfect in the structure but verb tenses I try to put emphasis on that. That they know the difference if they’re talking in the past or correct form of the verb in general. I taught a lot adults conversation English, and I found that it’s the verb tenses that are the most important to be well understood. And I know I can put emphasis on everything so I try to emphasize more the verb tenses. That’s my style.

With respect to corrective feedback, he promoted peer feedback when students worked in teams. However, he corrected the students’ writing himself:

When we do oral production, they speak in groups and I say ‘if one person, you know, wasn’t correct, you correct them’. A little bit like that. I don’t know if they do it all that well. Normally, what I try to do in different groups when they write, they give me their things and I correct them.

Prior to becoming involved in this e-mail tandem project, David had never organized an e-mail project in his classes before. The fact that this type of project was a novelty for him and that Catherine had showed her enthusiasm for it, made him initially view it as a good opportunity to get ideas for future exchanges:

I took Catherine’s place so she told me about the project. She seemed very happy about that, so I said I definitely have no objection to continue the project, so it seemed like an interesting project and so it’s maybe something that I could use some other time, too. I’d never done that before. That’s why I was in a way interested too. I said, oh, I can get a few ideas.
Like Catherine, David valued this project for the authentic contact with native English speakers: “I think that to have students corresponding or communicating with real Anglophones is a good idea.” As well, David had also found that the students had viewed the e-mail project as a separate project and not as an integral part of their regular ESL class. For him, this was due to the change of teachers during the project. As the following excerpt illustrates, although he was aware that the project was planned to count for a percentage of the final mark, he had not yet attributed any mark to the tasks involved in it. As he explained, he was not sure if the students were aware of “what counts and not”, on the one hand, or if the degree of engagement in the project had been affected by his lack of feedback, on the other:

I think they saw this as a separate project. I think it is because we switched over. I think Catherine was supposed to mark them...If I had to do it again, I’d make sure that I would mark them on their written production and things like that, and try to link it more with what we’re doing in class. But I found it hard to do that because it sort of landed on my desk. I know Catherine was going to mark them, though. It was because of the change over, because normally, the end of December or something, I would’ve marked them on something and they would’ve received feedback on that, so they say, oh, this is serious, so I’d better get my act together, and I’m sure that would’ve helped you more, too. It’s too bad, you switched teachers during the project. But on the other hand, they are not very sure of what counts and not. I think they did it as seriously as they would have anyway. Because sometimes, you know, we do this and you are going to be marked on that and some, they hand in something that is not very good. So I think they put the same seriousness into it anyway. So that was good.

However, in contrast to Catherine, although David acknowledged the benefits of online exchanges, he manifested his concern about the amount of work and organization a teacher needs to put into them:
I realize it's very complicated. I could never do that with more...I couldn't do both, it's too much work what you put into it. To get another school, all this follow up. I could do something like that if I had...for me it's just my workload, which is a bit crazy, that's what I mean. But after a few years that I had only secondary fours, I could do step by step. Because I know other teachers who have done things like that, different types of exchanges, which is always good. I could probably do something like that, eventually, but I have to really think about it, because it's not something that...there's a lot of work involved.

5.6.1.3. Callie

At the time of this study, Callie had been teaching FSL for 17 years, of which two in the IB programme. Living in southern Ontario, Callie started studying French in grade 7. As the following excerpt illustrates, Callie was concerned about the little interest that many of their students have in learning French. As she explained, this challenge motivated her to find ways to make the studying of FSL relevant to her students:

The reality is that a lot of our students hate learning French, and I like the challenge of having to change their mind..... Because they do not understand why it might be useful for their life. And I think as an English speaker in particular, they don't see a need. And some of them have a hard time. So I really think that we have to work hard on making it relevant.

As she reported, she got interested in this e-mail tandem project because it represented an opportunity for her students to communicate with native French speakers. As well, being herself a PhD student, Callie knew the importance for researchers of finding collaborating teachers. Thus, when asked why she got interested in participating in this project, Callie commented:
First of all, because I think it would be interesting for my students. Because in Southern Ontario, we don’t have lots of opportunities to communicate with Francophones, so it allows the students to connect French with their lives, and connect French with real people. Because I’m also doing research I know that you need to get people to do it and so I understood that part too.

In contrast to David and Catherine, Callie had organized several e-mail exchanges in other classes before participating in this project. As she explained, these projects had not been very successful due to the limited access to computers in the contact schools:

I had organized other projects but not very successfully though. I’d done it once with Africa which is very difficult because of their limited access to computers so it wasn’t very successful. Once, with a place in Chicoutimi, same problem: they didn’t have a lot of access to computers so we were only successful maybe once in the semester. I think that’s it. Besides, when e-mail first began, we did it between schools in the board, but not Francophones. They wrote each other in French but they were both Anglophones.

Like Catherine and David, in her teaching Callie incorporated team work and promoted mutual scaffolding:

At the beginning we had them do that in groups, so they can take a look at something that is good, understand why it’s good, how they can improve a piece of writing. So they might do that in groups, so they can get the benefit of other people. After that, when they understand what the criteria are, then they do it individually, and they usually do it in class, so we know it’s their writing, and not from help of the Internet.

This comment shows that Callie viewed team work as a way to help students move from a state of being object-regulated (“At the beginning we had them do that in groups, so they can take a look at something that is good”) or other-regulated (“So they might do
that in groups, so they can get the benefit of other people”) to eventually becoming self-regulated (“After that, when they understand what the criteria are, then they do it individually”). In the e-mail tandem project, this process was also facilitated by the way Callie structured the tasks related to it. As she further explained, she “made questions based on the readings and had the students work with some of the vocabulary” (Callie, interview). As required in the IB program, in her classes Callie used authentic readings and sensitized her students to the different written genres in French:

In this class in particular, I have to stress oral, reading and writing, and last emphasis on listening. At present, they’ve done their oral exam. So now preparations for the exam is just reading and writing. They have to do a more authentic French reading. So not things that are written for FSL students. So, newspapers, magazines, books, and unlike other classes we have to teach them specific varieties of writing. Whereas in other French classes, they may not do that. So specifically, they have to learn how to write a journal, a newspaper article, a critique, an opinion piece.

In this sense, Callie could easily incorporate this project into the regular course work. However, due to the evaluation system in the IB programme, the e-mail tandem project did not count for any percentage of the final mark:

I tried to make it part of the class. So for example, when they write their exam, there’s the possibility of six categories of writing: one of which is an opinion piece. So I used this project to teach them how to write an opinion piece. So it wasn’t separate from what we were doing. And the authentic reading, too. They need to do authentic readings so the articles were perfect. However, the IB exam counts for 60% of the final mark. This project does not have any percentage of the final mark.

With respect to the pedagogical value of the e-mail tandem project, Callie found that communicating in tandem had allowed her students to increase their level of motivation:
I think that at the level of motivation, I think it’s good, because students feel responsible to help somebody else and then that person will do it for them. So I think they feel some responsibility, and I think they feel confident that they are able to help somebody do something.

For Callie, due to the nature of tandem exchanges, students felt responsible not only for their own learning but also for their partner’s learning, thus their motivation increased. Regarding the cultural aspect of the exchange, it is important to reiterate that one of the main objectives of communicating with tandem partners was for the students to find out if their counterparts had the same opinions about the discussed topics. As the following excerpt shows, Callie reported that her students were surprised by the similarities between the Ontario students and the Quebec students:

When we did our oral presentations, I think maybe, partly influenced by me, we thought that there might be distinct differences between an Ontario community and a Quebec community, but they didn’t find that. They found it was individual opinions. For example that adolescents in general don’t smoke as much as people did in the past. So they didn’t find a lot of differences between Ontario and Quebec. Most of them were non-smoking. Whereas, if you asked them before, they might’ve thought that, based on the article, more of their partners would smoke. It was rather adolescent opinions rather than Ontario.

Like Catherine, Callie also manifested her willingness to continue incorporating projects like this one in her classes. For Callie, the project gave her students motivation to study French, and a real context to use it. What emerged as important in Callie’s reflection on the usefulness of this type of online exchange, was the impact of the different degrees of access to computers of the schools involved. As the following excerpt shows, for Callie, in order to take full advantage of it, her students would need to be paired up with a group that has the time or resources to commit to the project at the same level:
I think this project was good and has potential to be great. I think it gave my students motivation. I also think it gave them a real context to use their French. It gave them the opportunity to also learn some slang (not rude or swear words, but colloquial language) that I don’t know. In this program the students need to know how to write in formal and informal ways so this forum allows them to make the transfer from formal to informal. In future exchanges, I would like to be partnered with a group that has the time or resources to commit to the project to the same level—so my students receive the same amount of corrections as they offer for example.

5.6.1.4. Summary

Data from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview, and from the e-mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher revealed that the L2 teachers who participated in this study perceived the use of tandem e-mail as a valuable language learning tool. Generally, the teachers found that their students benefited from their online exchanges with their tandem partners. In particular, Catherine reported that besides having gained a greater awareness of particular aspects of English Canadian culture, her students had also benefited from their tandem partners’ input and feedback. Like Catherine, David valued this project for the authentic contact with native English speakers. As for Callie, she found that communicating in tandem had allowed her students to increase their level of motivation. For her, it was the nature of tandem exchanges that made her students feel responsible not only for their own learning but also for their partner’s learning. She thus found that the e-mail tandem project gave her students motivation to study French, and a real context in which to use it. In reference to the intercultural aspect of the exchange, Callie reported that her students were surprised by the similarities between the Ontario and the Quebec students.
5.6.2. Challenges for teachers participating in the e-mail tandem project

In addition to the positive results of the e-mail tandem exchange, findings also revealed that the teachers had been confronted with a number of challenges. Some of them addressed institutional factors, such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. Others were related to the design of the tasks involved in the project. Each of these will now be looked at in the following sections.

5.6.2.1. Access to computers

As mentioned elsewhere, all students in Ontario had access to a computer for the whole period whereas the students in Quebec had only half of the period to write their e-mails due to the number of computers available. As evidenced by the teachers, these institutional affordances and constraints with respect to access to computers had an impact not only on the overall interaction between the two groups of students, but also on the students’ motivation in the project:

I don’t know if I’m right but I assume that having to split the group in two sections to go to the lab limited the québécois students’ time. So our students had more time, which means if they used it appropriately, they could write more, and therefore, they expected the same in return. And that they were disappointed when they didn’t get it. Even when I explained, ‘you know they don’t have as much time as we do’, they were disappointed. (Callie, interview)

Ce qu’ils ont le plus aimé c’est la période de laboratoire où ils sont allés au laboratoire pour taper leurs mails. Mais c’était cette partie là qui a crée la plupart des frustrations : « Oh, on n’a pas eu assez de temps. Oh, je n’ai pas eu le temps de finir mon mail. » Je pense que ça, autant que c’était un des plus beaux côtés qu’autant il y a eu de frustrations par rapport à ça. C’est malheureux qu’on
n'ait pas assez de postes dans le laboratoire pour chaque personne. (Catherine, interview)

5.6.2.2. The misalignment of academic calendars

The differences between the two schools' academic calendars badly disrupted the rhythm of the e-mail correspondence between partners. Christmas holidays in Ontario were from December 20 to January 3 while in Quebec students came back to class a week later, that is on January 10. March Break ("Semaine de relâche") for the ESL students was from February 28 to March 4 whereas in Ontario it was from March 14 to March 21. ESL students' midterm exams were from January 24 to 26 while exams in Ontario extended over three weeks: January 27, February 3 and 17. Although a careful planning was devoted to the organization of the project, the discrepancies between the schools' calendars inevitably created peaks and valleys in the frequency of the students' communication, as the following e-mails illustrate:

Date : 7 Feb 2005
De : Callie J. Mady
Mes étudiants vont aller au labo ce jeudi mais nous ne pouvons pas y aller le 17 parce que je fais mes examens oraux avec eux et un autre professeur fera ma classe. Est-ce que vous pouvez prévenir l'autre prof? merci,
Callie
Date : 2 Jan 2005  
De : Callie J. Mady
Si nous allons au labo le 6 janvier et le 13, c'est possible que mes étudiants n'auront pas de réponse à leur message du 6 janvier quand ils iront le 13. Qu'est-ce que vous suggérez? Nous avons des examens la semaine de 24 janvier donc nous n'enverrons pas de message cette semaine. Nous revenons la première semaine de février.

Callie

As reflected in the above e-mails, the differences in academic calendars resulted in students failing to meet deadlines on several of the tasks. It is important to mention that teachers from both groups were aware of the differences in calendars since the beginning of the project, and that there was a constant communication between the teachers and the researcher throughout the course of the project. Despite this fact, lack of e-mails was perceived by the FSL students as a lack of engagement on the part of their partners and thus negatively impacted their interest in the project. In this regard, Callie commented:

At the beginning, they were very excited. Diane, for example, would tell me that she was very excited and I think she still remains excited. In three other projects she indicated that she was happy and she would read the email and guess what it said to them. Look at this and she was excited. Nat and other students were excited, and planned that maybe he could teach his partner funny expressions and that he would learn some funny expressions. So I think they were very excited. After, they would complain, or they would be disappointed when they didn’t have any email, or it was difficult to complete the tasks. Sometimes they couldn’t complete the task, they couldn’t compare their opinions to their tandems. So, they would get frustrated because I kept asking them to do something they couldn’t do. (Callie, interview)
As for the ESL students, David mentioned that some students said they had lost interest in the project because of its length: “Some found it too long from November to April. Some sort of lost the rhythm for different reasons: their partner didn’t answer, things like that. So some after a while sort of lost interest because of that I guess” (David, interview). These findings seem to suggest that the differences in school calendars not only affected the frequency of communication between partners and limited the collaborative work they could accomplish, but also had an impact on the degree to which students sustained their engagement in the e-mail exchange across the duration of the project.

5.6.2.3. Task design

Regarding the content and timing of the tasks involved in the project, Callie found that the project involved a lot of work and that it was sometimes difficult to accomplish all the required tasks in one period:

Date: 14 Dec 2005
De: Callie J. Mady
Bonjour Sabrina,
A vrai dire je trouve cette année beaucoup plus compliquée et beaucoup plus de travail que l'année passée. C'est difficile à lire, écrire et envoyer un message et remplir la page jaune dans une période. Ça prend aussi une autre période pour préparer à faire le travail.

In her interview, she further reported that the most popular texts had been the last two (“Le tabagisme chez les jeunes” and “Chimpanzés: La vie après le labo”), and that the task students had liked the least was the final oral presentation in teams. As the following
extract shows, she found this was due in part to the limited input her students had received from their partners, and to the fact that they had not been able to find many differences in opinions between themselves as a group and their partners:

I think they liked the first article the least. And I think they liked the last two articles. So based on subject area, the last two articles were better than the first. I don’t think they enjoyed the oral presentations. And I don’t think so, because they couldn’t give a lot. If they didn’t receive a lot, they couldn’t give a lot. So in terms of being able to compare, which was part of the presentation, a lot of them weren’t able to share the opinions of their partners. I think when they began, they thought there was a reason to share the information in teams and we were expecting that by doing this final task, looking at the overview of what had happened, that they would be able to see some commonalities between themselves as a group which they didn’t find. (Callie, interview)

As for Catherine, she reported that although her students were initially disappointed about having to base their e-mail exchanges on the topics they had read about instead of establishing only personal communication, they ended up liking it:

Avant que le projet commence il y en a plusieurs qui étaient très très enthousiastes. Ils avaient vraiment très hâte qu’on commence : ‘Quand est-ce qu’on va commencer? J’ai hâte de savoir ce quoi que j’ai, si c’est un gars, si c’est une fille, comment il s’appelle’. Ils étaient très enthousiastes par le projet. Quand ça a commencé il y en a qui m’ont fait des commentaires sur ‘Oh ben là, on a des textes à lire, on peut pas dire ce qu’on veut, c’est plate, pourquoi est-ce qu’on peut pas dire ce qu’on veut ‘. Je leur ai expliqué qu’il y en aurait beaucoup qui sauraient pas de quoi parler. Quand on fait face à un étranger souvent ça prend un sujet de base pour pouvoir communiquer. Que c’est pour ça qu’on imposait des lectures puis ils ont trouvé que c’était correct, que c’était une bonne idée, que c’était nécessaire de le faire. (Catherine, interview)
However, in this respect David reported that “I think most of them probably would’ve preferred talking about anything they want, all the time” (David, interview).

5.6.2.4. Other constraints

Catherine reported that in addition to time constraints, some of her students may have found it difficult to write long e-mails because of their weak levels of English. The limited computer skills on the part of some students may also have resulted in limited interaction with their partners:

*Pourquoi est-ce que leurs courriels n’étaient pas longs. J’ai plusieurs idées sur ce sujet là. Premièrement, le fait qu’ils n’avaient pas beaucoup de temps, pour revenir à ce qu’on disait. Puis, il y en aussi qui n’étaient pas capables de préparer leurs textes. Il y en a aussi qui n’étaient pas vite sur l’ordinateur, sur le clavier, ils ne sont pas à l’aise sur un clavier. Quand on tape à la doigt, ça va pas super vite, probablement.* (Catherine, interview)

As well, the teachers were confronted with other problems that were beyond their control: student absences on “snow” days, teacher illness and absences, failure of the WebCT platform, and students involuntarily deleting their e-mails, among others. These problems resulted in students failing to meet deadlines on several of the tasks and thus negatively impacted the students’ interest in the project, as the following e-mails illustrate:

*Date : 14 Dec 2005*
*De : Caille J. Mady*

Nous avons eu des problèmes avec mon absence, un jour avec les ordinateurs et beaucoup de fois les étudiants perdent ce qu’ils écrivent quand ils mettent des accents. Je ne suis pas là cette semaine puisque j’écris mes examens compréhensifs pour l’université! Mais les étudiants y iront
sans moi parce que cette fois j'ai obtenu la permission du directeur! Mes étudiants ont beaucoup d'absences avec ce programme mais j'espère qu'ils écriront un message demain. Mes étudiants trouvent qu'ils font plus d'effort que leurs partenaires. Par exemple ils trouvaient difficile à comparer des opinions si leurs partenaires n'ont pas répondu à leurs questions etc.
Ils sont découragés quand ils font des corrections mais ils n'en reçoivent pas. De toute façon, ils sont enthousiastes.

Date : 6 Jan 2005
De : Callie J. Mady
Salut,
Nous sommes maintenant au labo, mais nous avons des problèmes. 1- il y a une tempête de neige donc trois personnes sont absentes. 2-la majorité de mes étudiants ne sont pas capables de bien refaire leurs rapports précisément:
- Alice n'a jamais reçu de corrections ni un message au sujet de l'article en anglais;
- Jenny a reçu une ou deux corrections et une courte réponse comme- "je suis d'accord avec toi" pas vraiment un échange d'opinion;
- Nadia n'a pas reçu de réponse à ses questions;
- William - son partenaire n'a pas parlé de son article
Donc, les étudiants qui sont capables vont écrire leur rapport sur la page verte sinon ils ne peuvent pas. Je suggère que nous continuons avec le deuxième à ce point.
Finally, as reported by the teachers, integrating CMC in their classes also confronted them with the challenge of keeping students on task when at the computer lab. As the followings excerpts illustrate, the students often went “off-task” due to the affordances offered by ICTs, such as the possibility to be listening to music, chatting or shopping online while writing their e-mails. Thus Callie commented, “They can’t get on a chat on our computers, but they would be shopping or listening to music, absolutely.” In this regard, Catherine underscored the importance to have stricter rules and to closely monitor students when working at the lab: “Les règles seraient probablement beaucoup plus strictes. Ça les empêcherait d’aller faire du chatte.”

5.6.2.5. Summary

Findings revealed that the teachers were confronted with a number of challenges. Some of them addressed institutional factors, such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. As well, the teachers were confronted with other problems that were beyond their control, such as student absences on “snow” days, teacher illness and absences, failure of the WebCT platform, and students involuntarily erasing their e-mails, among others. In particular, it was found that these factors not only affected the frequency of communication between partners and limited the collaborative work they could accomplish, but also had an impact on the degree to which students sustained their engagement in the e-mail exchange across the duration of the project.

It was also found that time constraints due to the limited number of computers in the secondary school in Quebec as well as weak levels of English or limited computer skills could have hindered some ESL students from writing longer e-mails. It is important to note, however, that although teachers from both groups were aware of the differences in access to computers and calendars since the beginning of the project, and that there was extensive contact between the teachers and the researcher before and during the course of the project, lack of e-mails was perceived by the FSL teacher and her students as a lack of engagement on the part of the ESL students and thus negatively impacting on the latter’s interest in the project. In this respect, Callie reported at the end of the project,
that in order to take full advantage of it, her students would need to be paired up with a
group that has the time or resources to commit to the project at the same level.

As well, findings showed that some other constraints were related to the design of
the tasks involved in the project. In particular, data from the interview with Catherine
revealed that although her students were initially disappointed about having to base their
e-mails exchanges on the topics they had read about, instead of establishing only personal
communication, they ended up liking it. However, David reported that some students
would have preferred to talk about anything they wanted, all the time. Data from the
interview with the Callie revealed that her students had liked some of the readings more
than others, and that they had found it difficult to accomplish all the required tasks as
they had originally been planned.

Taken together, these findings showed that although the e-mail tandem project
was integrated into the students' regular class activities on both ends, factors such as
different levels of access to computers, curriculum requirements, and local group
dynamics determined the degree to which it was actually integrated into the second
language classroom.

5.6.3. Summary of findings for research question #5: How do the ESL and FSL
teachers in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?

Data from the teachers' responses to the end-of-study interview, and from e-mail
exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher revealed that the L2 teachers
involved in this study perceived the use of tandem e-mail as a valuable language learning
tool. Generally, the teachers found their students benefited from their online exchanges
with their tandem partners. In particular, the teachers reported that their students had
benefited from the authentic communication with native speakers and from the feedback
they received from them. However, data also revealed that the teachers had been
confronted with a number of challenges. Some of them pertained to institutional factors,
such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. Some others
were related to the design of the tasks involved in the project.
5.7. Summary of overall findings

Analysis of e-mails showed that both ESL and FSL students provided scaffolding to one another by resorting to various strategies. In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as NS tutor. With the exception of two ESL students and one FSL student, all the students participating in this study provided explicit feedback to their tandem partners at least once. The second most salient scaffolding strategy resorted to in the tutor role involved face-giving. Twenty-seven (90%) FSL students and 21 (70%) ESL students softened the tone of their corrections by using phases such as "There are minor mistakes, Il y a quelques erreurs dans ton français". The third most salient strategy provided by both groups was instructing. Although more Anglophone students (60% or 18/30) resorted to this strategy than their Francophone counterparts (40% or 12/30), this difference was not found to be statistically significant. In general, these findings demonstrate the capacity of secondary school students to adopt the role of tutor and thus provide extensive feedback to their tandem partners.

Results from the analysis of reflection forms and from the responses to the end-of-project questionnaire revealed that to write their e-mails in their L2, students drew on a variety of resources. The statistical analysis of the reflection form data showed a significant difference (p<0.001) between the two groups in the distribution of the students’ responses to the statement “I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails”, thus indicating that the ESL students resorted to the corrections their partners had made to their e-mails more often than the FSL students. As well, a significant difference (p<0.05) was found with respect to the students’ responses to the statement “I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French”. More precisely, the statistical analysis indicated that more ESL students asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 than their Anglophone counterparts. However, no significant differences were found for the students’ responses to the other statements, thus indicating that students from both groups performed
similarly in terms of the way they resorted to dictionaries, online translators, their classmates and their partners’ e-mails to write their e-mails in their L2.

Findings from the end-of-project questionnaire showed that the only resource that students from both groups reported to have *always* used was the corrections provided by their tandem partners. Indeed, the majority of the ESL students (76.7% or 23/30) and more than half of the FSL students (55.2% or 16/30) reported to have always looked at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails. This difference was not found to be statistically significant (*p* > 0.05), thus indicating that both groups made extensive use of the corrections provided by their tandem partners.

The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data showed, however, that there were significant differences at the level of *p* < 0.05 in the distribution of the student responses to the statements “I looked for words in the dictionary”, “I asked my classmates how I could say something in English/French”, and “I got help to write my e-mails in other ways or from somebody else”. These findings revealed that the FSL students reported having looked for words in the dictionary and asked their classmates how they could say something in their L2 more frequently than the ESL students. By contrast, the ESL students, who almost never or never resorted to this latter strategy, reported getting help to write their e-mails from somebody else or in other ways more frequently than their FSL counterparts.

As well, the statistical analysis indicated a significant difference at the level of *p* < 0.01 in the distribution of the student answers to the statements “I used an online translator” and “I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French”. In these instances, analysis of the responses indicated that all the FSL students except 8 (26.7%) had resorted to an online translator whereas the majority of the ESL students (22/30 or 73.3%) had never done so. By contrast, almost half of the ESL students (46.7%) said they had asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 (i.e., English) whereas such was the case for only 5 FSL students (16.7%).

Results from a comparison of the first draft sent by e-mail and the final draft written on the report form showed that the majority of the *revisions* made by both groups of students resulted from tandem partner feedback. Tandem partner feedback influenced 76% of the total number of revisions (98/129) made by the ESL students and 81.5% of
the revisions made by the FSL students (110/135). The analysis also revealed that 72.9% of the surface revisions (94/118) made by the ESL students and 80.7% of those by the FSL students (109/134) were in response to the feedback received from their tandem partners. It was also found that 24% of the revisions (31/129) made by the ESL students, and 18.5% of the revisions (25/135) made by the FSL students were self-revisions. The majority of these self-revisions (24/31) in the case of the ESL students and the totality (25/25) in the case of the FSL students were at the surface level.

The findings from a comparison of the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated showed that ESL students incorporated most of the corrections made by their partners (90.7% or 98/108). The majority of these corrections (95.4% or 103/108) were identified as surface corrections. Of the 103 surface corrections, ESL students incorporated 94 (87%). The ESL students only received 5 (4.6%) corrections at the level of meaning, of which they successfully incorporated 4 (80%). Only 8 corrections (7.4%) were not incorporated in their revised drafts and two (1.9%) were unsuccessfully incorporated.

As for the FSL students, they incorporated 74.3% (110/148) of the corrections provided by their Francophone partners. All but one (99.3%) of these corrections were coded as surface changes. Of these, FSL students incorporated 109 (74.1%). The one meaning change received was also incorporated. It is interesting to note that contrary to the ESL group, who incorporated most of the feedback received (90.7%), the FSL students did not incorporate 25% of the corrections (37/148) provided by their Francophone partners.

Quantitative data from the end-of-project questionnaire showed a significant difference ($p<0.005$) in the degree to which both groups used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports. Twenty (66.6%) ESL students reported having used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports, while only 7 (23.3%) FSL students reported having done so.

The analyses of the amount of writing showed that the majority of the students participating in the e-mail tandem project had minimally completed the basic course requirements. However, analyses of data of eight partnerships [Édouard (ESL) and Diane (FSL); Laure (ESL) and John (FSL); Lucie (ESL) and Mary (FSL); Pierre (ESL) and
Alice (FSL); Mathieu (ESL) and Jenny (FSL); Sophie (ESL) and Eric (FSL); Mylène (ESL) and Shawn (FSL); Audrey (ESL) and Marc (FSL)] revealed differences in how students accomplished the tasks involved in the project. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, in particular on the interpretative framework of activity theory, this question sought to investigate if the students’ motives could explain these differential degrees of investment in the project.

For each of the partnerships analyzed, various data sources were examined to investigate the way the students’ motives (i.e., the underlying purpose each of them ascribed to the e-mail exchange) were related to the carrying out of the task (in reference to the choice of tools/resources) and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced). All the participants were positively oriented toward the learning of a second language, except Édouard and John who showed an ambivalent orientation to English and French, respectively. Although on the one hand Édouard considered the learning of English important, he also expressed his uncertainty as to whether he liked learning English or not, and his desire that French would be spoken everywhere in Canada, and not English. His ambivalent orientation to English detracted from his ability to take the maximum advantage of the resources afforded him by the exchange with his tandem partner. In contrast to Édouard, who viewed this e-mail tandem project as another classroom task, his FSL partner Diane saw it as a unique opportunity to develop her “éducation francophone”. Similarly to Édouard, John had an ambivalent orientation to the learning of French. From the product point of view, John seemed to have been fully invested in the project. However, his evaluation of the project, as reflected in his responses to the end-of-project questionnaire, revealed that he had a rather ambivalent orientation to it. Analyses of e-mail data pertaining to *tu/vous* use revealed that John never adopted *tu* use in his communication with his Francophone partner Laure. As John was not interviewed, the reasons as to why he maintained the use of *vous* for the duration of the e-mail exchange remain unknown. These findings underscore the importance of complementing analyses of products with interviews in order to more fully understand why students invest or fail to invest in a given task.

Another factor which influenced how students oriented to the e-mail tandem exchange was the importance attributed to grades. Specifically, although Mary had a
positive orientation to the learning of French, she did not value the time spent writing to her tandem partner as the project did not count for the final mark. In contrast to Mary, who displayed a minimal investment in the project, her Francophone partner Lucie was found to be more fully engaged as she viewed this project as an opportunity to improve her English.

Differences also emerged concerning the students’ orientation to classroom language learning. In particular, Pierre’s discussion on how he invested in the e-mail tandem project revealed that although he considered learning English very important, he did not consider the classroom to be the ideal place to become fluent in English. In his words, what had helped him learn English was outside class activities such as watching TV, listening to songs, and communicating with friends in English. Pierre believed that in the classroom little could be achieved and thus did not perceive this e-mail tandem project to be of any value in terms of helping him learn English. In contrast to Pierre, his Anglophone partner Alice both valued learning French and considered the e-mail tandem project to be useful to this end.

As for Mathieu and Jenny, personal differences in investment in school seemed to have played a role in the way they oriented to the e-mail project. While Jenny concentrated on her studies in order to be accepted into a university, Mathieu did not give a lot of time to his studies. Although both of them were positively oriented to second language learning, their underlying purpose for engaging in the e-mail project was different. As Jenny was fully invested in school, she viewed the e-mail exchange as an opportunity to learn French and to compare facts and realities of their L1 and L2 cultures. By contrast, Mathieu saw it as another classroom task and thus displayed a minimal investment in it.

Lacking a genuine interest in schooling also seemed to have determined the way Eric oriented to the e-mail project. Although analysis of the data pertaining to the e-mail frequency, number of e-mails sent, and quantity of writing revealed that he had been a prolific writer, close examination of the e-mail exchange with his Francophone partner Sophie showed a different degree of engagement in the exchange. During the course of the project, Sophie repeatedly had to urge him to “take action”. As well, he declined Sophie’s invitation to communicate by chat outside of class hours. Besides his somewhat
ambivalent orientation to learning French, what emerged during the interview, was that Eric had registered in the IB program due to family pressure. These findings seem to indicate that the underlying purpose Eric ascribed to the e-mail project (i.e., do well in his French class in order to get good grades and be admitted in a university) had a bearing on how well and to what degree he did the tasks involved in the project.

Differences in satisfaction with their personal level of English/French could have played a strong role in the limited amount of interaction that took place between Mylène and Shawn. Both Mylène and Shawn acknowledged having a fair level of English/French, respectively. However, in contrast to Mylène, Shawn was not overly concerned by his then current level of French because he did not consider he would need it after finishing high school. Shawn’s lack of interest in improving his level of French seems to have determined the way he oriented to the French class in general and the e-mail project in particular. This, in turn, affected the quality of the final product (e.g., the number and length of e-mails) and the quality of learning (e.g., appropriating language from readings and e-mail exchanges, using his partner’s feedback).

Finally, analyses of the partnership formed by Audrey and Marc showed how the e-mail communication with a native speaker of about the same age can mediate a student’s perception of self as a language learner. Reflecting on her current level of English, Audrey explained that she struggled in her English class because she had started high school with a poor level of English. In reflecting on Audrey’s orientation to language learning, it is also instructive to note that the ESL teacher perceived her as a hard working but struggling and rather unmotivated student. Nevertheless, the description by her teacher was at odds with an image of Audrey that emerged from an analysis of the data obtained from the e-mails, the end-of-project questionnaire, the interview and my in-class observations. In her responses to the questionnaire and the interview, she expressed that she had been surprised to find out how easy it was for her to learn English when someone besides the teacher gave her feedback. These findings seem to suggest that Marc’s positive orientation to the e-mail exchange and the scaffolding he provided her enhanced Audrey’s self-image as a successful language learner and thus mediated the way she invested in the project.
Taken together, these analyses revealed that Diane, Laure, Lucie, Alice, Jenny, Sophie, Audrey and Marc were fully engaged in the e-mail tandem project, Édouard, John, Eric and Mylène engaged more at the level of task compliance, while Mary, Pierre, Mathieu and Shawn displayed a minimal engagement. These findings suggest that activity theory provides a way to discuss individual differences in relation to the tools used to carry out a task and the ultimate outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced). As demonstrated in this study, students’ personal histories variously mediated the way they engaged in the tandem project, an engagement which was further evidenced in the nature of their written products.

Data from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview, and from the e-mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher revealed that the L2 teachers who participated in this study perceived the use of tandem e-mail as a valuable language learning tool. Generally, the teachers found that their students benefited from their online exchanges with their tandem partners. In particular, Catherine reported that besides having gained a greater awareness of particular aspects of English Canadian culture, her students had also benefited from their tandem partners’ input and feedback. Like Catherine, David valued this project for the authentic contact with native English speakers. As for Callie, she found that communicating in tandem had allowed her students to increase their level of motivation. For her, it was the nature of tandem exchanges that made her students feel responsible not only for their own learning but also for their partner’s learning. She thus found that the e-mail tandem project gave her students motivation to study French, and a real context in which to use it. In reference to the intercultural aspect of the exchange, Callie reported that her students were surprised by the similarities between the Ontario and the Quebec students.

Findings also revealed, however, that the teachers were confronted with a number of challenges. Some of them addressed institutional factors, such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. As well, the teachers were confronted with other problems that were beyond their control, such as student absences on “snow” days, teacher illness and absences, failure of the WebCT platform, and students involuntarily erasing their e-mails, among others. In particular, it was found that these factors not only affected the frequency of communication between partners and limited the collaborative
work they could accomplish, but also had an impact on the degree to which students sustained their engagement in the e-mail exchange across the duration of the project.

It was also found that time constraints due to the limited number of computers in the secondary school in Quebec as well as weak levels of English or limited computer skills could have hindered some ESL students from writing longer e-mails. It is important to note, however, that although teachers from both groups were aware of the differences in access to computers and calendars since the beginning of the project, and that there was extensive contact between the teachers and the researcher before and during the course of the project, lack of e-mails was perceived by the FSL teacher and her students as a lack of engagement on the part of the ESL students and thus negatively impacting the latter's interest in the project. In this respect, Callie reported at the end of the project, that in order to take full advantage of it, her students would need to be paired up with a group that has the time or resources to commit to the project at the same level.

As well, findings showed that some other constraints were related to the design of the tasks involved in the project. In particular, data from the interview with Catherine revealed that although her students were initially disappointed about having to base their e-mails exchanges on the topics they had read about, instead of establishing only personal communication, they ended up liking it. However, David reported that some students would have preferred to talk about anything they wanted, all the time. Data from the interview with the Callie revealed that her students had liked some of the readings more than others, and that they had found it difficult to accomplish all the required tasks as they had originally been planned.

Taken together, these findings showed that although the e-mail tandem project was integrated into the students' regular class activities on both ends, factors such as different levels of access to computers, curriculum requirements, and local group dynamics determined the degree to which it was actually integrated into the second language classroom.
Summary

This chapter reported on the results. First, in order to give a general overview of how the e-mail tandem exchange unfolded, findings from quantitative analyses of the frequency, number and length of the e-mails were reported on. Then, I reported on the results related to each of the research questions. In the following chapter, findings related to each of the five research questions are discussed in relation to previous studies on second language writing and on the application of digital technologies to second language learning.
6.0. Introduction

As explained in chapter 1, this study examined project-based e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, it sought to investigate (a) the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners, (b) the resources used by students when composing their e-mails, (c) the use of feedback provided by the tandem partners when revising their reports, (d) the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges), and (e) the teachers' perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool.

Based on the results of analyses presented in the previous chapter, this chapter discusses the findings related to each of the five research questions with reference to previous studies on second language writing and on the application of digital technologies to second language learning.

6.1. Discussion of results for research question #1: What strategies do ESL and FSL secondary school students employ in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners?

As explained in the previous chapters, this question sought to investigate which strategies ESL and FSL secondary school students employed in order to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners. Data to answer this question were gathered
through the analysis of the e-mails sent by the ESL and the FSL students. For this question, there were three levels of analysis: (1) scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students; (2) direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (T/V); (3) use of affordances offered by digital technologies.

6.1.1. Scaffolding strategies employed by the ESL and FSL students

To answer this question, e-mails were coded using a taxonomy adapted from Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of substrategies for providing scaffolding. It is important to recall that Villamil and De Guerrero’s study examined the strategies employed by EFL adult students to facilitate the face-to-face peer revision process. Consequently, definitions of some categories were adapted to better fit the data of the present study. Some categories were also added drawing on taxonomies and definitions from Mendonça and Johnson (1994), Morris (2005), Sotillo (2000), Stanley (1992), and Zhu (2001). Other categories were also added based on my own data base. Finally, as in this e-mail tandem project, writing in both languages gave students an opportunity to present themselves both as language learners (non-native speaker role) as well as language tutors (native-speaker role), strategies were coded separately for the two roles: the non-native speaker (NNS) learner role and the native-speaker (NS) tutor role in order to better understand this reciprocal relationship. As no previous research has quantitatively investigated, to my knowledge, the strategies employed by students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, the adapted taxonomy used in this study can be a starting point of analysis for further research.

Having analyzed the use of these strategies from a qualitative point of view, Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) suggested that further research should quantitatively investigate the use and frequency of scaffolding strategies among the students. In the present study, occurrences of each type of strategy were tallied according to the tandem role adopted. In addition, t-tests were performed on the means and standard deviations of paired samples in order to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the two groups in terms of the total number of scaffolding strategies provided.
when functioning as the NS tutor and the NNS learner. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups \( (p>0.05) \) with respect to the scaffolding strategies used by the students when acting as the NNS learner. There was, however, a significant difference \( (p<0.05) \) between the two groups with respect to the scaffolding strategies provided when functioning as the NS tutor, thus indicating that when taking the role of the NS tutor, ESL students provided fewer scaffolding strategies than the FSL students. Additional t-tests at the level of \( p<0.001 \) were performed on the means of the number of scaffolding strategies provided per e-mail by both groups when adopting the role of the NNS learner and of the NS tutor. Results of these analyses revealed that when taking the role of the NS tutor, the ESL students had a tendency to provide fewer scaffolding strategies per e-mail than their FSL partners.

Finally, in order to test whether significant differences existed among the proportion of ESL and FSL students that employed a given strategy at least once, a Fisher's exact test was performed. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups of learners. This finding suggests that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the strategies they used to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners. The results also showed that when in the role of the NS tutor, the ESL students provided the full range of strategies, while the FSL students provided all the types of scaffolding strategies except for checking comprehension and giving implicit feedback. When in the role of the NNS, the FSL students performed the full range of strategies, while the ESL students resorted to all strategies except two: responding to advice and responding to apologies.

In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as the NS tutor. With the exception of two ESL students and one FSL student, all the students participating in this study provided explicit feedback to their tandem partners at least once. Similar results were obtained by Villamil and De Guerrero (1996), who found that 38 out of the 40 dyads (95%) had engaged in this activity. However, these results contrast with those by Mendonça and Johnson (1994) who found that grammar corrections rarely occurred in the peer reviews in which advanced ESL learners participated.
Data from the present study also showed that 18 FSL students (60%) and 12 ESL students (40%) gave “mini” lessons on grammar, vocabulary, stylistic conventions, or other aspects of writing (i.e., the *instructing* strategy). The use of these scaffolding strategies clearly demonstrated the capacity of L2 secondary school students to assume the role of “tutor” as has been observed in previous studies on online tandem learning (Appel, 1997; Kötter, 2002; Little et al., 1999; O’Rourke, 2005; Priego, 2002) and telecollaborative projects (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003) involving adult learners.

However, this observation differs from the results obtained by Sotillo (2000) in a study that examined corrective feedback in NS-NNS and NNS-NNS dyads while participants were engaged in communicative and problem-solving activities via Instant Messenger. She found that direct corrective feedback such as signaling out the incorrect form or providing metalinguistic explication only accounted for 11% of all error corrections made by the NSs. These results seem to suggest that in contrast to the students in Sotillo’s study, in the present study, students’ awareness of the learning purpose of the exchange and their shared status as NNS learners and NS tutors led them to use direct failure signals in the form of *explicit feedback* and *instructing* that were in other contexts (e.g., Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Sotillo, 2000, 2005) avoided by the NS interlocutors. This observation is supported by previous research in the area of online tandem learning (Appel, 1997; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Kötter, 2002; Little et al., 1999; O’Rourke, 2005; Priego, 2002) that have shown that due to the nature of tandem exchanges, adult tandem partners provide each other extensive explicit feedback.

Very interestingly, data from the present study also revealed that the second most salient scaffolding strategy resorted to in the tutor role involved *face-giving*. Twenty-seven (90%) FSL students and 21 (70%) ESL students softened the tone of their corrections by using phrases such as “There are minor mistakes”. This finding is consistent with previous studies (Belz, 2001, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002; Priego 2002) which found that even if students were providing corrective feedback in response to the project requirements, students made use of face-giving strategies to counteract the potential face damage of the face threatening act of correcting other’s mistakes (Brown & Levinson, 1987).
The discussion above clearly shows the capacity of ESL and FSL secondary school students to mutually provide scaffolding. Albeit in a different sense, because Villamil and De Guerrero's (1996) data stem from oral interactions between adult learners with shared native and target languages, the findings of the present study appear to substantiate their claim that providing scaffolding was a general strategy whose main function was for the members of the dyad to assist each other in achieving task goals. In their study, Villamil and De Guerrero found that although pairs had been formed with the intention that the reader would assist the writer in improving his/her composition, their data indicated that both students provided "mutual scaffolding" (Donato, 1994), in which assistance moved to and from readers and writers. Similarly, the findings from the present study showed that students in an e-mail tandem partnership mutually assisted each other in achieving task goals and in improving their respective second languages.

6.1.2. Direct peer assistance in the use of French address forms (tu/vous)

The analysis of e-mails also revealed that besides providing the scaffolding strategies described in the previous section, Francophone students also assisted their FSL partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (tu/vous). Analyses of e-mails pertaining to T/V use indicated that for a number of FSL students their use of these address forms evolved over the course of the e-mail tandem exchange. Data showed that most FSL students had opened their e-mail exchanges with their Francophone partners by using vous and that even though only four of them had received explicit assistance with regard to T/V use from their Francophone partners, 8 were still addressing their partners with V or a mixture of T and V in their final e-mails. This observation supports previous studies (Belz, 2002; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003; Belz & Vyatkina, 2005) which have found that for most learners, the participation in online exchanges with L2 expert speakers led to an increase in appropriate pronoun use over time. However, these studies have focused on the development of T/V use in French (Belz & Kinginger, 2002) and in German (Belz, 2002; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003;
Belz & Vyatkina, 2005) in telecollaborative partnerships at the university level. By contrast, the present study is the first one, to my knowledge, to have analyzed how Francophone secondary school students assisted their Anglophone partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French.

In the present study, close analysis of the e-mail data of the four students who received explicit peer assistance (Karen, Nathan, Brenda, and Heather) revealed that one of them (Brenda) still mixed both T and V in her final e-mail despite her tandem partner’s explicit feedback. As well, in contrast to previous research which has examined the development of French T use from the exclusive analysis of products (e.g., Belz & Kinginger, 2002), in the present study, data from the interviews, which were conducted with three students that had not received explicit feedback from their tandem partners (Ruth, Jenny, and Heather), revealed that change to T use was also due to other contextual factors. In one instance, a student (Ruth) used only V forms in her first e-mail and then switched to T in her subsequent e-mails in response to her teacher’s instruction [i.e., “we were told to use vous the first time just because it’s someone you don’t know, and then once you got more familiar to each other you can use tu” (Ruth, interview)]. In another instance, although Jenny’s initial use of V also responded to her teacher’s instructions, her switch to T emerged as a result of her interaction with a student in her class who had herself received explicit assistance from her tandem partner. In the third instance, Heather used V in her first e-mail and then in her second e-mail took the initiative to ask her partner if she could address him with tu, as a result of her previous interaction with other native French speakers in Quebec. This observation brings to light the importance of interviewing learners in order to have a better understanding of how contextual and personal factors mediate students’ linguistic development of L2 address forms.

6.1.3. Use of affordances offered by digital technologies

As in previous studies dealing with adults (e.g., Kötter, 2002, 2003; Little et al. 1999), secondary school students in this study also made use of the affordances offered
by computer technology to compensate for the absence of visual, oral and aural cues in their online exchanges. In particular, the findings of this study revealed that students from both groups used digital affordances such as block capitals, reduplication of letters or punctuation marks, and combinations of punctuation marks (i.e., icons) to support or clarify the illocutionary force of their scaffolding strategies. For example, students used three periods in the middle of two sentences or a reduplication of exclamation marks as a means to invite their partners to comment on their ideas (i.e., eliciting). To question the logic of an argument, students used icons such as ; ) to imitate a wink, and to express irony. Highlighting words by enclosing them in asterisks and by using block capitals were also used with the intention of eliciting. By highlighting the pronoun “you”, students meant to encourage their partners to give their opinion, reaction or additional information. Students indicated satisfaction regarding their partners' abilities in their L2 (i.e., reacting) with the use of two or more exclamation marks, as well as with other graphical equivalents of facial expressions to imitate a smile or a laugh. It was also found that students used one or multiple question marks to signal uncertainty and to seek clarification of intended meaning (i.e., requesting clarification). To soften the tone of their corrections (i.e., face-giving strategies), students resorted to features such as icons, reduplication of punctuation marks, block capitals, and multiple periods. Finally, data showed that multiple punctuation marks were used to add emphasis to their requests and to imitate pitch (i.e., giving directives).

6.2. Discussion of results for research question #2: What resources do ESL and FSL students draw on when composing their e-mails?

Compared to previous research on CMC where in certain instances the use of resources was banned (e.g., Lee, 2002; Spiliotopoulos, 2002), the present study sought to investigate the resources used by students when composing their e-mails in their respective target language. Data for analysis were gathered from the reflection forms completed by the students when writing their e-mails, and from the answers to questions 1 and 7 of the end-of-project questionnaire. Additional qualitative data were obtained
from the interviews with six ESL and six FSL students, with the FSL teacher as well as from field notes during my observations in the ESL class. In general, findings from these different sources of data collection methods showed that during the composing of their e-mails, both groups drew on a variety of resources. This observation supports those from previous research drawing on a sociocultural perspective that has revealed that the use of external resources helped students to cope with the task at hand (Parks et al., 2005; Roebuck, 2001; Thorne, 2003; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996).

Analysis of the ESL and FSL students’ responses to the reflection forms revealed that looking at the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails was the most frequently used resource by the ESL group and the second most frequently used resource by the FSL students (41.9% versus 22.1% respectively). This difference was found to be statistically significant ($p<0.001$), thus indicating that the ESL students resorted to the corrections their partners had made to their e-mails more often than the FSL students. Similarly, the statistical analysis of the end-of-project questionnaire data for question 7 showed that significantly more ESL students than FSL students ($p<0.005$) reported having used the feedback provided by their tandem partners in their other e-mails (96.7% versus 41.4% respectively). By contrast, the results from the data analysis of question 1 of the questionnaire showed that the only resource that students from both groups reported to have always used was the corrections provided by their tandem partners. Indeed, the majority of the ESL students (76.7%) and more than half of the FSL students (55.2%) reported having always looked at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails. This difference was not found to be statistically significant, thus indicating, in contrast to the findings drawing from the reflection forms and from question 7 of the questionnaire that both groups made similar use of the corrections provided by their tandem partners.

Although these analyses revealed contradictory findings, the fact that more ESL students resorted to the feedback provided by their partners is generally supported by my actual analysis of revisions (Research question #3) that will be dealt with in section 6.3. This observation underscores the importance of using multiple sources of data collection methods as a means of triangulation to confirm emerging findings.
Analysis of data from the *reflection forms* also showed that the *dictionary* was the most frequently used resource by the FSL students when writing their e-mails in French and the second most salient resource resorted to by the ESL students (35.9% versus 21.9% respectively). This difference was not found to be statistically significant, thus indicating that both groups of students resorted to the dictionary when composing their e-mails in their L2. By contrast, the statistical analysis of the *questionnaire data* showed that there was a significant difference ($p<0.05$) in the distribution of the student answers to the question ‘*I looked for words in the dictionary*’, thus revealing that the FSL students reported having looked for words in the dictionary more frequently than the ESL students.

In my *interviews* with six ESL students, all but one told me that they had sometimes used the dictionary. However, during my *observations*, I realized that although several students in the ESL class took their dictionaries with them to the lab, not all the students used them. As for the FSL students, 3 out of 6 told me that they had sometimes looked for words in the dictionary when writing their e-mails in French. During the *interview* with Callie, the FSL teacher, she further explained that a minority of students took their dictionaries to the lab. As these various data sources revealed contradictory findings, whether or not the FSL group resorted to the dictionary more often than the ESL students is not clear. Rather, these findings seem to suggest that the dictionary was indeed one of the resources used by both groups of students to write their e-mails in their L2.

In the case of the ESL group, analysis of the data from the *reflection forms* revealed that they reported having looked for words in the dictionary in the same proportion as they asked their teacher for help. As for the FSL class, they reported having called their French teacher for help in only 9.2% of the cases. This difference was found to be statistically significant ($p<0.001$), thus indicating that more ESL students asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 than their Anglophone counterparts. These results are supported by the statistical analysis of the *end-of-project questionnaire* data that showed a significant difference ($p<0.01$) in the distribution of the student answers to the question ‘*I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French*’. According to their responses, almost half of the ESL
students (46.7%) asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 (i.e., English) whereas such was the case for only 5 FSL students (16.7%).

No significant differences were found for the students’ responses to the other statements (i.e., using an online translator, asking their classmates how they could say something in English/French, and using words/expressions their tandem partners had used in their e-mails to write their e-mails in their L2) thus indicating that students from both groups performed similarly in terms of the way they resorted to these resources.

Taken together, these results support those by Villamil and De Guerrero (1996), in the area of writing, who found that the ESL students in their study made use of resources such as dictionaries, prompt sheets, the teacher, and classmates to cope with task demands. In the area of CMC, Thorne (2003) found that the focal student in his study had used grammar texts and vocabulary lists when communicating by e-mail with her French-speaking partner. However, these studies have dealt with university level students. My contribution has been to design a study that examined, on both sides of the exchange, the resources used by secondary school students when communicating by e-mail with tandem partners.

6.3. Discussion of results for research question #3: When revising their reports, do ESL and FSL students use the feedback provided by their e-mail tandem partners?

The purpose of the third research question was to investigate the degree to which the L2 secondary school students participating in this study used the feedback provided by their tandem partners. Data for analysis were gathered from a comparison of the first draft pertaining to a report sent by e-mail (i.e., draft 1) and the final draft written on the report form (i.e., draft 2), as well as from the answers to the end-of-project questionnaire. Report data for analysis were selected if meeting the following requirements: a) Draft 1 of the report had been sent by e-mail to the tandem partner; 2) the report had been corrected by the partner; 3) Draft 2 had been written on the Report form (in the student’s binder). Fifteen ESL students and 9 FSL students met these requirements. Additional
qualitative data were obtained from the personal interviews with selected students and from personal communication by e-mail with the FSL teacher.

For this question, there were four levels of analysis: types of revisions (6.3.1.), source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner's feedback or self-revisions) (6.3.2), impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students' revisions (6.3.3), and faulty corrections (6.3.4).

6.3.1. Types of revisions

The students' reports were coded using a taxonomy adapted from Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revisions. As explained in Chapter IV, Faigley and Witte's taxonomy, which examined the revisions made by students in their L1, categorizes revisions into two types: surface changes and meaning changes. In the present study, other sub-categories were added using Villamil and De Guerrero's (1998) scheme of "descriptors of language aspects" to better account for the difficulties of second language learners. Definitions of categories were also adapted to the data of the present study using Connor and Asenavage (1994), Hall (1990), and Paulus' (1999) taxonomies of revisions.

Results from the analysis of draft 1 and draft 2 of the reports showed that the majority of the revisions made by both groups of students were surface revisions (91.5% in the case of the ESL students and 99.3% in the case of the FSL students). These findings are consistent with previous research on revision (Paulus, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998) that has concluded that L2 students tend to concentrate more on surface revisions. For example, in a study that investigated the impact of peer revisions on writers' final texts in two rhetorical modes, narration and persuasion, Villamil and De Guerrero (1998) found that a third of the revisions in both modes were grammatical while organization was the least attended to. Similarly, in a study conducted by Paulus (1999) that analyzed the revisions made by university ESL students to their essays using Faigley and Witte's (1981) taxonomy of revisions, the researcher found that 62.5% of the revisions made by the students were surface changes. However, it is important to note that in contrast to the present study, these studies (Paulus, 1999; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1998) focused on the types of revisions made by adult students. Very few studies (e.g.,
Tsui & Ng, 2000) have been conducted on secondary L2 learners who are relatively less mature and less competent L2 writers. In this sense, the present study represents a valuable contribution to research on revision.

6.3.2. Source of revision

In order to identify the source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions), draft 1 of the reports, the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and draft 2 of their reports were compared. The findings showed that the majority of the revisions made by both groups of students resulted from tandem partner feedback. Tandem partner feedback influenced 76% of the total number of revisions made by the ESL students and 81.5% made by the FSL students.

A finding supported by previous studies (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Nelson & Murphy, 1993; Villamil & Guerrero, 1998) is the addition of self-revisions, demonstrating the writer’s authorial control. In the present study, it was found that 24% of the total number of revisions made by the ESL students, and 18.5% made by the FSL students were self-revisions. These findings support those of Villamil & De Guerrero (1998) who found that 39% of the revisions adopted were self-revisions. They concluded that the fact that some in-session revisions were not incorporated and that several self-revisions were added demonstrates that, ultimately, it was the writers’ prerogative to choose from the suggestions and exercise authorial control. Similar results were found by Mendonça and Johnson (1994) and Nelson and Murphy’s (1993) studies which showed that selective decisions about adoption of corrections were finally made by the writers.

6.3.3. Impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students’ revisions

In order to evaluate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners, the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated were identified by comparing the feedback section in the e-mails and draft 2
of the reports. The analyses showed that the ESL students incorporated most of the corrections provided by their Anglophone partners (90.7%). Only 8 corrections (7.4%) were not incorporated in their draft 2 and two (1.9%) were unsuccessfully incorporated. As for the FSL students, they incorporated 74.3% of the corrections provided by their Francophone partners. Twenty-five percent of the corrections received were not incorporated in their draft 2, and only one correction (0.7%) was unsuccessfully incorporated.

The analysis of the end-of-project questionnaire revealed that significantly more ESL students reported having used the feedback received from their partners to revise their reports (20 ESL students versus 7 FSL students). These findings are consistent with the analysis of the report data. With respect to the areas perceived by the students as having improved during the e-mail exchange with their tandem partners, questionnaire data also showed that significantly more ESL students considered to have improved their spelling. However, no significant differences ($p>0.005$) were found in the ESL and FSL students’ responses related to the other areas. These findings seem to indicate that both groups responded similarly in terms of the perceived usefulness of the feedback provided by their partners to improve their English/French in the areas of grammar, vocabulary, punctuation and word order.

Taken together, these findings demonstrate that, similarly to L2 adult students (e.g., Mendonça and Johnson, 1994; Villamil and De Guerrero, 1998), the secondary school students in this study were capable of giving each other feedback, on the one hand, and that they successfully used it to revise their pieces of writing, on the other. As in the present study, Mendonça and Johnson (1994) found that in 53% of the cases, students incorporated their peers’ suggestions, in 10% of the cases they did not incorporate suggested changes, and in 37% of the cases they made changes that were not mentioned by their partners. Another study by Villamil and De Guerrero (1998) found that 74% of the revisions made during peer sessions were incorporated in the final versions, 8% were further revised and 18% were not incorporated.

In the area of asynchronous CMC, no previous study has investigated, to my knowledge, the effectiveness of peer feedback in revision. In their evaluation of e-mail tandem exchanges between Irish and German university students, Little et al. (1999)
investigated if the students had re-used corrected words or phrases in the course of the exchanges. They found that there were very few indications that any of the corrections were picked up or recycled in the subsequent e-mails. The authors concluded that in many cases, the re-use of incorrect forms indicated that there was no conscious effort to use the corrected forms later on. It should be noted, however, that compared to the present study, Little et al.'s study did not include any task in which students were required to revise their drafts using their partners' feedback. It may be concluded that, in contrast to the students in the present study, students participating in Little et al.'s (1999) study may have found fewer opportunities to re-use the corrections provided by their tandem partners. The present study highlights the importance of the design of tasks which require students to reuse the feedback provided.

In contrast to Little et al.'s study, in a study by Greenfield (2003) involving a Form 4 (10th grade) ESL class in Hong Kong and an 11th grade English class in Iowa, students were asked to give reciprocal feedback via e-mail on their partners' essays and to subsequently revise their pieces of writing until a final copy was ready to be published in the jointly-produced anthology. The purpose of Greenfield's (2003) study, however, was limited to examining the students' opinions, attitudes, and perceptions of the e-mail project. No attempt was thus made to investigate the revisions that the ESL students made to their essays using their NS partners.

6.3.4. Faulty corrections

Sections in which students provided feedback to their partners were analyzed for instances of faulty corrections (i.e., incorrect feedback). This analysis revealed that although most corrections were found to be accurate, a few faulty corrections were also detected. ESL students provided a total of 8 faulty corrections to their tandem partners. The same number of faulty corrections was also detected in the feedback provided by the FSL students.

As well, analysis of e-mails revealed that while Anglophone students displayed an excellent command of written language, Francophone students' e-mails often contained
flawed input. In discussing the issue of the quality of French in students with the ESL
teachers, they replied as follows:

I know in general, students have a hard time with their French. Why? It’s a
mystery here in Quebec. Because even the students at university have a hard time
with their French. We realize that they graduate from secondary school and they
still don’t know the French well. So there’s some general problem there.
They have a hard time with the French exam at the university and some fail. It’s a
bit of a mystery here. (David, interview, April 1, 2005)

J’ai des élèves qui sont vraiment pas forts en français, qui écrivent plus au son.
Je pense que la qualité chez les jeunes aujourd’hui c’est une faille de la société
parce que les jeunes ne sont pas capables d’écrire correctement. (Catherine, April
1, 2005)

As evidenced in the excerpts, both David and Catherine suggested that this was not
exclusive of these students in particular, but rather a general problem of Quebec
Francophone students. As for the FSL teacher, she reported that some of these mistakes
were perceived by the more proficient FSL students:

Interviewer: Did your students make any comments about the French of their
partners?
Callie: Yes, sometimes. I think when you’re writing an email, you’re less careful,
or students would email perhaps the way they chat. And that, my students, some
of them, the strongest students would notice that they would write “ça” with
“sa”, or I can’t think of another example. But they noticed. Which was good. It
was funny. (Callie, interview, April 7, 2005)

As reflected in Callie’s answer, she did not see this issue as an obstacle for language
learning in tandem, but rather as an occasion for her students to gain greater language
awareness. Because of the limitations of this research, whether or not the errors made by
the Francophone students when writing in their L1 had an impact on the way FSL students viewed their Francophone partners as “experts of their L1” remains unknown. It seems clear, however, that this is an aspect of online tandem learning that needs to be further explored. Indeed, the expertise of native speakers has not been questioned in previous research on tandem learning involving adults. For instance, although Little et al.’s (1999) data revealed that there were spelling mistakes in the e-mails written by the NSs and that many of the metalinguistic comments they provided were incorrect or at best incomplete, the researchers found that the expertise of the native speakers was at no point doubted by the non-native speakers:

In general, corrections were accurate, but students should be encouraged to use spell checkers, as many mistakes could be avoided that way. The expertise of native speakers was at no point doubted by non-native speakers. (...) Again, we can summarize by saying that while some students were able to give helpful explanations using some form of metalanguage, many metalinguistic comments were incorrect or at best incomplete. (pp. 48-49)

Of the few studies involving young learners, a study by Dodd (2001) involving ESL and FSL students aged 12 and 13 years old, reported that one of the obstacles to effective learning encountered in her project was that Anglophone students made mistakes in their English and that there were mistakes in the French e-mails they received. Although the author’s comment remains anecdotal, her findings also seem to substantiate the need to further investigate this issue in tandem projects involving secondary school students.
6.4. Discussion of results for research question #4: To what extent can the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how the students engaged and invested in the e-mail exchanges)?

While previous research in the area of second language learning (e.g., Donato, 1994; Gillette, 1994; McKay & Wong, 1996; Ohta, 2001; Parks, 2000) have stressed the importance of investigating the way students invest themselves in a given task, in the context of CMC, little research (Ware, 2003, 2005) has investigated how students engage and invest themselves in online exchanges. Drawing on a sociocultural perspective, in particular the interpretative framework of activity theory, the present study sought to investigate if the students’ motives, i.e., the underlying purpose each of them ascribed to the e-mail exchange, could explain the students’ differential degrees of investment in it. In order to investigate the way the students’ motives for engaging in the project was related to the carrying out of the task and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the type of products produced), various data sources were examined.

In light of the descriptive accounts of the case study participants as presented in Chapter V (section 5.5), in this section I will focus on five main issues that were identified as having influenced why these particular students invested in or failed to invest in the e-mail tandem project: use value ascribed to second language learning (6.4.1), orientation to classroom language learning (6.4.2), investment in school (6.4.3), socio-political issues related to identity and resistance (6.4.4), and perception of self as a language learner (6.4.5).

6.4.1. Use value ascribed to second language learning

Previous second language learning research (e.g., Gillette, 1994; Parks, 2000) has pointed out that the way students invest in a language course depends on the ‘use value’ ascribed to second language learning. In her study, Gillette (1994) found that students who viewed language study only as a requirement limited their language learning effort to what they perceived as necessary to pass the course or earn a certain grade. On the
other hand, those students who considered languages as valuable were found to make a far greater effort to acquire the target language. While Gillette focused on adult language learners in a required third-semester French course, the present study focused on ESL and FSL secondary school students whose motives for studying an L2 may differ from those of university learners. Even so, similarly to Gillette's study, analysis of the data of one of the ESL case study students in the present study (Laure) showed that she was sensitive to the use value of learning English ["C'est la deuxième langue importante pour notre future (...) C'est vraiment la langue qu'il faut apprendre pour avancer, dans le fond" (Laure, interview, April 12, 2005)] and thus she viewed the e-mail project as an opportunity to practice her English.

By contrast, data analyses of one of the FSL case study students (Mary) showed that although she had a positive orientation to the learning of French, she did not value the time spent writing to her tandem partner as the project did not count for the final mark. In reflecting on Mary's investment in the FSL class, it is important to note that her teacher perceived her as a hard-working motivated student. However, despite her positive orientation to the learning of French, unlike the participants in Gillette's (1994) study, Mary did not invest in the e-mail project such as to optimize her opportunities for language learning. In this sense, the present study introduces a caveat, namely that a generally positive orientation to L2 learning may not necessarily result in full engagement in specific L2 classroom tasks.

6.4.2. Orientation to classroom language learning

One point that has received little attention in previous research (e.g., Parks, 2000) pertains to how students' orientation to classroom language learning has an influence on how they engage in a given task. In a study that addressed the issue of investment in the context of a task where students engaged in producing videos for an ESP course aimed at CEGEP tourism students, Parks (2000) found that a negative view of the value of classroom learning mediated how one participant invested in the video project. Similar to the participant in Parks's study, in the present study the contrasting examples of two
tandem partners, Pierre and Alice, show how their view of classroom L2 learning mediated how they invested in or failed to invest in the e-mail tandem project. Although both partners had a positive orientation to learning English and French, respectively, what further emerged in the interviews were their different orientations to classroom language learning. While Alice appreciated learning French in school and reported liking all types of activities, Pierre felt that the classroom was not the ideal place to become proficient in a second language. In discussion with Pierre as to how he had learned English, he explained that what had helped him learn English was outside class activities such as watching TV, listening to songs, and communicating with friends in English. Of note in the case of Pierre is that he believed that little could be achieved in the classroom and thus did not perceive this e-mail tandem project to be of any value in terms of helping him learn English. This negative orientation to the e-mail exchange was further reflected in how he went about doing the tasks involved in the project. During the course of the project, Pierre only attended 4 classes and sent 5 e-mails. His e-mails were short and they were mainly to apologize for not having written or for having sent short e-mails.

In contrast to Pierre, Alice’s positive orientation to learning French in the classroom made her view this project as an opportunity to improve her French. Her deep investment in the project was reflected by the fact that although the lack of sustained e-mail communication on Pierre’s part limited her ability to write the required number of e-mails, she was above her group’s average in terms of the total number of words written and the average number of words per e-mail. These findings underscore the importance to further analyze this issue in studies involving adolescent learners who may have more opportunities to learn the second language outside the language classroom (such as watching TV and listening to songs in English) than adult learners who may tend to rely more on formal classroom instruction. Indeed, in the area of CMC no previous study, to my knowledge, has investigated how the students’ different orientations to classroom language learning might mediate the way they invest in L2 tasks.
6.4.3. Investment in school

A point that has not been explored in previous research on CMC, to my knowledge, pertains to how students’ investment in school mediates how they orient to a given task in their L2 classes. Findings from the present study showed that personal differences in investment in school played a role in the way some of the case study students oriented to the e-mail project. Data analyses from the partnership formed by Mathieu and Jenny showed that although both of them considered the learning of a second language as important, their degree of investment in school differed. While Jenny concentrated on her studies in order to be accepted into a university, her Francophone partner Mathieu did not give a lot of time to his studies. Being fully invested in school, Jenny viewed the e-mail exchange as an opportunity to learn French and to compare facts and realities of their L1 and L2 cultures. By contrast, Mathieu saw it as another classroom task and thus displayed a minimal investment in it.

Unlike Mathieu who did not devote a lot of time to his studies and thus did the minimum amount of work required to fulfill the requirements of the project, the data analysis of another FSL student, Eric, revealed that despite his apparent investment in school, he had engaged in the project more at the level of task compliance. Besides his somewhat ambivalent orientation to learning French, what emerged during the interview, was that Eric had registered in the IB program due to family pressure. These findings seem to indicate that the underlying purpose Eric ascribed to the e-mail project (i.e., do well in his French class in order to get good grades and be admitted in a university) had a bearing on how well and to what degree he did the tasks involved in the project.

6.4.4. Socio-political issues related to identity and resistance

Prior research in the area of second language learning has also indicated (e.g., Norton, 1997, 2000; Parks, 2000; Peirce, 1995; Spiliotopoulos & Carey, 2005; Thorn, 2003) that a point that may influence how certain students invest in or fail to invest in L2 classes pertains to socio-political issues related to identity and resistance. In the case of
ESL learning in the Quebec context, Parks (2000) pointed out that this issue may pertain to the broader socio-political discourse that exhorts Francophones to uphold the French language and culture. In the present study, data analyses from the partnership formed by Édouard and Diane showed that although they both had a positive orientation to school and were defined by their respective L2 teachers as excellent students, they had different orientations to second language learning. While Édouard wished French would be spoken everywhere in Canada, and not English, his Anglophone partner Diane presented herself as being a Francophile and saw French as part of her education.

Within studies on identity in L2 learning, gender issues have also gained increasing importance. Kissau (2006), for example, brought the point that it is not only the political context that makes students ‘resist’ learning a second language, but also the issue of gender as it relates to socially accepted masculine roles. In his study conducted among Grade 9 students in southern Ontario, Kissau found that while the female students frequently reported that they were putting a lot of effort into learning French and that they wished to learn the language to get to know French-speaking people, the male students more often responded that they did not pay attention in French class and that they had little interest in French culture. In the present study, the FSL teacher identified this lack of interest in studying French on the part of many Anglophone students: “many FSL students in southern Ontario are not interested in learning French because they do not understand why it might be useful in their life” (Callie, interview; April 7, 2005). In particular, it was found that lack of investment in the e-mail project on the part of one of the focal FSL students (Shawn) was due to the fact that, being in his last year of high school he did not think he would use French anymore. As well, as he reported himself, he was satisfied with his then current level of French and thus he did not give too much importance to the French class.
6.4.5. Perception of self as a language learner

Previous research on CMC has underlined a number of potential benefits of tandem learning partnerships compared with other situations in which learners and native speakers communicate. In particular, it has been claimed that the fact that both partners depend on each other and are on the same level as learners and experts can increase motivation and puts both in a similar position (e.g., Appel, 1999; Brammerts, 1996; Little et al., 1999; O'Rourke, 2002; Schwienhorst, 1997). In the present study, data analysis from one of the ESL case study students (Audrey) showed how the e-mail communication with her Anglophone partner Marc enabled her to enhance her self-image as a successful language learner. During her interview, Audrey explained that she struggled in her English class because she had started high school with a poor level of English. In reflecting on Audrey's orientation to language learning, it is also instructive to note that the ESL teacher perceived her as a hard working but struggling and rather unmotivated as a student. Nevertheless, the description by her teacher was at odds with an image of Audrey that emerged from an analysis of the data obtained from the e-mails, the end-of-project questionnaire, the interview and my in-class observations. In her responses to the questionnaire and the interview, she expressed that she had been surprised to find out how easy it was for her to learn English when someone besides the teacher gave her feedback. These findings seem to suggest that Marc's positive orientation to the e-mail exchange and the scaffolding he provided her played a strong role in the way Audrey viewed herself as a language learner. Specifically, these findings showed that this e-mail project enhanced Audrey's self-image as a successful language learner and this contributed to her becoming more fully invested in the project. This observation provides evidence of ways in which social interaction and scaffolding in successful partnerships can play a critical role in enhancing students' self-image as successful language learners and consequently in motivating them to learn the language.

Taken together, these findings suggest the importance of considering the broader sociocultural milieu with respect to the students' life trajectories and their motives to explain why students invested in or failed to invest in the e-mail tandem project. Indeed,
the triangulation of various data sources for each of the partnerships analyzed allowed me
to investigate the way students’ motives were related to the carrying out of the task (in
reference to the choice of tools/resources) and the resultant outcomes (in terms of the
type of products produced).

6.5. Discussion of results for research question #5: How do the ESL and FSL teachers
in this study perceive the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool?

Data from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview, and from the e-
mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher revealed that the L2 teachers
who participated in this study perceived the use of tandem e-mail as a valuable language
learning tool. Generally, the teachers found that their students benefited from their online
exchanges with their tandem partners. In particular, Catherine reported that besides
having gained a greater awareness of particular aspects of English Canadian culture, her
students had also benefited from their tandem partners’ input and feedback. Like
Catherine, David valued this project for the authentic contact with native English
speakers. As for Callie, she found that communicating in tandem had allowed her
students to increase their level of motivation. For her, it was the nature of tandem
exchanges that made her students feel responsible not only for their own learning but also
for their partner’s learning. She thus found that the e-mail tandem project gave her
students motivation to study French, and a real context in which to use it. In this respect,
these findings support those of previous studies in the area of CMC that have revealed
that the use of online projects to link language learners with NSs results in higher
motivation (Appel & Gilabert, 2002; Dodd, 2001; Greenfield, 2003; Kern, 1995; Ware,
2003; Warschauer, 1996), supports learner autonomy (Müller-Hartmann, 2000;
Schwienhorst, 1998; Ushioda, 2000), and develops learners’ intercultural communicative
competence (Belz, 2003; O’Dowd, 2003). In reference to the intercultural aspect of the
exchange, Callie reported that her students were surprised by the similarities between the
Ontario and the Quebec students. Similar findings were reported by Dodd (2001) in a
study involving ESL and FSL students aged 12 and 13 years old. As in the present study,
Dodd found that “students have expressed surprise that ‘we are nearly all the same’, ‘like and enjoy television’ and ‘they even have programmes like ours’” (p. 170).

Findings also revealed that the teachers were confronted with a number of challenges. Some of these addressed institutional factors, such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. As well, the teachers were confronted with other problems that were beyond their control, such as student absences on “snow” days, teacher illness and absences, failure of the WebCT platform, and students involuntarily erasing their e-mails, among others. In particular, it was found that these factors not only affected the frequency of communication between partners and limited the collaborative work they could accomplish, but also had an impact on the degree to which students sustained their engagement in the e-mail exchange across the duration of the project. As well, findings showed that the institutional affordances and constraints with respect to access to computers and time constraints had an impact not only on the overall interaction between the two groups of students, but also on the students’ motivation in the project. As reported by Callie, students “would complain, or they would be disappointed when they didn’t have any email, or it was difficult to complete the tasks. So, they would get frustrated because I kept asking them to do something they couldn’t do” (Callie, interview). Similar comments were reported by Dodd (2001), as the following quote illustrates: “The students in my class had begun to feel frustrated because I was making them send e-mails although they were not receiving any new messages from France” (p. 171).

It was also found that that in addition to time constraints, weak levels of English or limited computer skills could have hindered some ESL students from writing longer e-mails. However, as mentioned before, lack of or short e-mails were perceived by the FSL students as a lack of engagement by their partners and thus negatively impacted their interest in the project. In her study, Belz (2001) also showed how a lack of proficiency in the foreign language can lead to students writing shorter correspondence than their partners and that this can consequently be interpreted by their partners as a lack of openness and friendliness. These observations support those from recent studies that have shown how social, cultural, and institutional affordances and constraints affected the development of exchanges (Belz, 2001, 2002; Belz & Müller-Hartmann, 2002, 2003;
Dodd, 2001; Greenfield, 2003; O’Dowd, 2005; Ware, 2003). For instance, Belz (2001, 2002) and Belz and Müller-Hartmann (2002, 2003) found that some of the social and institutional factors which had influenced the exchanges included the misalignment of academic calendars, differences in societal norms with respect to technological access, divergent forms of assessment in the respective cultures, and the different structures of the universities. Similarly, O’Dowd (2005) found that factors such as the different levels of access to technology and differences in the evaluation requirements at the two institutions influenced the development of a Spanish-American exchange. In a qualitative analysis of student attitudes, Ware (2003) found that time pressures and institutional constraints negatively influenced students’ communicative choices, leading to what she calls “missed communication” (i.e., moments of miscommunication, disengagement, or missed opportunities for intercultural learning). In another study, O’Dowd and Ritter (2006) concluded that “It is easy to imagine how limited access and hence shorter messages or a longer response time can lead to misunderstandings between differently equipped partners” (p. 633).

As reported by O’Dowd and Ritter (2006), the importance of a good teacher-teacher relationship has repeatedly been recognized in the literature on CMC. For instance, Dodd (2001) concluded that teachers should contact one another on a regular basis to alert each other to such potential impediments as mismatched holiday dates or students’ absences. Similarly, O’Dowd and Eberbach (2004) underscored the need for both teachers to develop a good online working relationship together in order to coordinate and reach agreement on the many aspects of the exchange. It is important to note, however, that although teachers from both groups were aware of the differences in calendars since the beginning of the project, and that there was extensive contact between the teachers and the researcher before and during the course of the project, lack of e-mails was perceived by the FSL teacher and her students as a lack of engagement from the ESL students and thus negatively impacted their interest in the project. In this respect, Callie reported at the end of the project, that in order to take full advantage of it, her students would need to be paired up with a group that has the time or resources to commit to the project at the same level. These findings are consistent with those of Greenfield (2003), who concluded that “project dependability is impossible to ensure when working with a
partner school, even with the best designed project or the most enthusiastic partners” (p. 58).

As well, findings showed that some other constraints were related to the design of the tasks involved in the project. In particular, data from the interview with Catherine revealed that although her students were initially disappointed about having to base their e-mails exchanges on the topics they had read about, instead of establishing only personal communication, they ended up liking it. However, David reported that some students would have preferred to talk about anything they wanted, all the time. Comments such as “Quand ça a commencé il y en a qui m’ont fait des commentaires sur, ‘Oh ben là, on a des textes à lire, on peut pas dire ce qu’on veut, c’est plate, pourquoi est-ce qu’on peut pas dire ce qu’on veut” and “Une élève m’a dit, ‘Je trouve ça niaiseux parler d’un article dans un échange comme ça’ (Catherine, interview) reported by Catherine seem to indicate that for some students, their ability to engage in communication at a deep level of intercultural inquiry may have been impeded by their expectations about e-mail communication that often favors brevity over sustained attention. Similar results were found by Ware (2003) who found that the medium itself may have constrained the interactions to a certain degree. She thus concluded that “it is quite plausible that online context does not provide a safe space for taking a critical, academic tone into what might be viewed by students as a space for interpersonal dialogue” (p. 190).

Data from the interview with the FSL teacher revealed that her students had liked some of the readings more than others, and that they had found it difficult to accomplish all the required tasks as they had originally been planned. These observations are consistent with those of previous research (Müller-Hartmann, 2000; O’Dowd & Ritter, 2006) that have looked at the relationship between failed exchanges and the methodological aspects of the activity. For instance, O’Dowd and Ritter (2006) reported on the results of a German-Spanish exchange in which the clash between student and teacher needs in task design was evident. As explained by the authors, in the end-of-term feedback, all the negative comments made by the Spanish group in reference to the project were in some way related to aspects of task design. For example, one student complained that the topics chosen by the two teachers (based principally on the discussion of newspaper articles and the comparison of student-led surveys) had hindered
the development of the online relationships between the German and the Spanish students. It is important to recall that in the present study, the selection of readings was done with the collaboration of the ESL and FSL teachers. In this respect, O’Dowd and Ritter’s (2006) suggestion is, in my opinion, very valuable: “teachers could distribute preexchange questionnaires to students in all the classes asking them for their opinions on topics that they would like to discuss with their partners” (p. 361).

In the present study, an interesting finding was the fact that integrating CMC in their classes also confronted teachers with the challenge of keeping students on task when at the computer lab. In particular, findings showed that the students often went “off-task” due to the affordances offered by the ICTs, such as listening to music, surfing on the net, chatting or shopping online while writing their e-mails. These observations seem to indicate that the use of online projects such as the one presented here may trigger changes in the teaching and learning activities, and is reciprocally affected by the very changes it causes. It is important to note, however, that although the literature has identified various key tasks (O’Dowd & Eberbach, 2004; Ware & Kramsch, 2005) which confront teachers who wish to exploit the potential of online exchanges, this issue has been unexplored and needs, in my opinion, to receive further attention.

As well, data from this study revealed that while Catherine and Callie expressed their willingness to integrate a similar project in the future in spite of the challenges to be faced, David showed himself more reluctant. In this respect, he reported, “I could probably do something like that, eventually, but I have to really think about it, because it’s not something that...there’s a lot of work involved” (David, interview). Comments such as “I could do something like that if I had...for me it’s just my workload, which is a bit crazy (...)” and “Some teachers work only with projects but not me (...) However, I put a lot of emphasis on the structure, you know, grammar structure, either if they are talking or writing” seem to indicate that for him, integrating projects like the one presented here takes time away from the teaching of grammar, that is, in his opinion, of utmost importance for students to be well understood. These observations seem to indicate, as Ware and Kramsch (2005) concluded, that “computer-mediated communication confronts teachers with the ultimate raison d’être of language teaching” (p. 202).
Finally, findings showed that although the e-mail tandem project was integrated into the students' regular class activities on both ends, factors such as different levels of access to computers, curriculum requirements, and local group dynamics determined the degree to which it was actually integrated into the second language classroom. Drawing on Engeström's (2001) model of two interacting activity systems, as a theoretical framework, this study concludes that the two different activity settings in which each of the two classes were involved had a bearing on how students viewed the e-mail project and on how tasks were ultimately carried out.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I discussed the findings related to each of the five research questions with reference to previous studies on second language writing and on the application of digital technologies to second language learning. In the final chapter, I will present the conclusions of this study.
7.0. Introduction

The previous chapter discussed the findings related to each of the five research questions with reference to previous studies on second language writing and on the application of digital technologies to second language learning. This chapter presents the conclusions of this study. For this, I first summarize the findings for the five research questions. Then, in light of these findings, I review the pedagogical implications for computer-mediated communication and second language learning. Finally, I examine the originality and limitations of this study and provide recommendations for future research.

7.1. Synopsis of the findings

_The first research question_ sought to investigate the strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners. Analysis of e-mails showed that both ESL and FSL students provided scaffolding to one another by resorting to various strategies. The findings revealed that as a group, both ESL and FSL students employed more scaffolding strategies when functioning as the NS tutor than when adopting the role of the NNS learner. The results also showed that when in the _role of the NS tutor_, the ESL students provided the full range of strategies, while the FSL students provided all the types of scaffolding strategies except for checking comprehension and giving implicit feedback. When in the _role of the NNS learner_, the FSL students performed the full range of strategies, while the ESL students resorted to all strategies except two: responding to advice and responding to apologies.
In both groups, giving explicit feedback was the most salient strategy employed by the students when functioning as the NS tutor. With the exception of two ESL students and one FSL student, all the students participating in this study provided explicit feedback to their tandem partners at least once. The second most salient scaffolding strategy resorted to in the tutor role involved face-giving. Twenty-seven (90%) FSL students and 21 (70%) ESL students softened the tone of their corrections by using phases such as “There are minor mistakes”, “Il y a quelques erreurs dans ton français”. The third most salient strategy provided by both groups was instructing. Although more Anglophone students (60% or 18/30) resorted to this strategy than their Francophone counterparts (40% or 12/30), this difference was not found to be statistically significant. In general, these findings demonstrate the capacity of secondary students to adopt the role of tutor and thus provide extensive feedback to their tandem partners.

The analysis of e-mails also revealed that Francophone students assisted their FSL partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French (tu/vous). In addition, findings showed that students from both groups used digital affordances such as block capitals, reduplication of letters or punctuation marks, and combinations of punctuation marks (i.e., icons) to support or clarify the illocutionary force of their scaffolding strategies.

The second research question sought to investigate the resources used by ESL and FSL students when composing their e-mails. Analysis of the reflection form data indicated that the most frequently used resource by the ESL group was the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails. Very surprisingly, the resource they used the least frequently was using words or expressions their partners had used in their e-mails. It was also found that they looked for words in the dictionary in the same proportion as they asked their teacher for help. As for the FSL class, the dictionary was the most frequently used resource when writing their e-mails in French. Very interestingly, they asked their peers for help more often than their French teacher. When comparing both groups, findings showed that the ESL students turned to their teacher for help more often than the FSL students, and that they looked at the corrections their partners had made to their previous e-mails more often than their FSL counterparts.
These differences were found to be statistically significant. Findings from the *end-of-project questionnaire* showed that the only resource that students from both groups reported to have *always* used was the corrections provided by their tandem partners. Indeed, the majority of the ESL students (76.7% or 23/30) and more than half of the FSL students (55.2% or 16/30) reported having always looked at the corrections their tandem partners had made to their previous e-mails. This difference was not found to be statistically significant (*p* > 0.05), thus indicating that both groups made extensive use of the corrections provided by their tandem partners. The statistical analysis of the questionnaire data showed, however, that there were significant differences at the level of *p* < 0.05 in the distribution of the student answers to question “a” (*I looked for words in the dictionary*), question “c” (*I asked my classmates how I could say something in English/French*), and “g” (*I got help to write my e-mails in any other way or from somebody else*). These findings revealed that the FSL students reported having looked for words in the dictionary and asked their classmates how they could say something in their L2 more frequently than the ESL students. By contrast, the ESL students, who almost never or never resorted to this latter strategy, reported getting help to write their e-mails from somebody else or in other ways more frequently than their FSL counterparts. As well, the statistical analysis indicated a significant difference at the level of *p* < 0.01 in the distribution of the student answers to question “b” (*I used an online translator*), and “d” (*I asked my English/French teacher how I could say something in English/French*). In these instances, analysis of the responses indicated that all the FSL students except 8 (26.7%) had resorted to an online translator whereas the majority of the ESL students (22/30 or 73.3%) had never done so. By contrast, almost half of the ESL students (46.7%) said they had asked their teacher how they could say something in their L2 (i.e., English) whereas such was the case for only 5 FSL students (16.7%). Situated in a sociocultural perspective, it was concluded that the employment of resources in the form of the support provided to students (tandem partners, classmates, the language teacher, and the researcher), in conjunction with cultural tools in the form of artifacts (dictionaries, translators in the Internet, their partners’ e-mails, and the corrections provided by their tandem partners) fundamentally shaped the activities in the learning environment, namely the e-mail tandem exchanges.
The third research question aimed to investigate the use of the feedback provided by the tandem partners when revising their reports. Results from the analysis of the first and revised reports showed that the majority of the revisions (91.5%) made by the ESL students and that all but one (99.3%) of the total revisions made by the FSL students were considered surface revisions. The impact of the feedback provided by the tandem partners on the students’ revisions was measured by comparing the first drafts of the reports, the feedback provided by their tandem partners, and the revised drafts of their reports to identify the source of revision (i.e., using tandem partner’s feedback or self-revisions). The findings showed that the majority of the revisions made by both groups of students resulted from tandem partner feedback. More specifically, findings showed that tandem partner feedback influenced 76% of the total number of revisions made by the ESL students and 81.5% made by the FSL students. As well, it was found that 24% of the total number of revisions made by the ESL students, and 18.5% made by the FSL students were self-revisions. The majority of these self-revisions (77.4% or 24/31) in the case of the ESL students and the totality (25/25) in the case of the FSL students were at the surface level.

In order to evaluate if the students had used the feedback provided by their tandem partners, the total number of feedback points received and the total feedback points incorporated were identified by comparing the feedback section in the e-mails and Draft 2. It was found that the ESL students incorporated most of the corrections (90.7%) provided by their tandem partners, while the FSL students incorporated 74.3% of them.

The fourth research question sought to investigate the usefulness of the notion of motive, as defined by sociocultural theory, to explain the differences in the way the tandem partners oriented to the exchanges (i.e., how they engaged and invested themselves in the e-mail exchanges). Close analysis of the data of eight partnerships [Édouard (ESL) and Diane (FSL); Laure (ESL) and John (FSL); Lucie (ESL) and Mary (FSL); Pierre (ESL) and Alice (FSL); Mathieu (ESL) and Jenny (FSL); Sophie (ESL) and Eric (FSL); Mylène (ESL) and Shawn (FSL); Audrey (ESL) and Marc (FSL)] revealed that the students’ motives for participating in the e-mail project (e.g., viewed as an opportunity to learn the target language and to communicate with a native speaker or
viewed as having no value as not counting for final mark) influenced the way students carried out the project in terms of specific actions taken (e.g., providing scaffolding to tandem partner; using the partner’s corrections to revise their reports) or not taken (e.g., not writing any of the three reports) and was reflected in the quality of the outcomes (e.g., writing long e-mails). Taken together, these findings suggest the importance of considering the students’ motives to explain why students invested in or failed to invest in the e-mail tandem project. As illustrated by the description of the eight case study students, how students oriented to the e-mail project based on the underlying purpose each of them ascribed to it resulted in substantially different activities as to actions and outcomes. As well, the present study suggests that Engeström’s (2001) model of two interacting activity systems, may help identify how the two different activity settings in which each of the two classes were involved had a bearing on how students viewed the e-mail project and on how tasks were ultimately carried out.

The fifth research question aimed to evaluate the teachers’ perceptions of the use of tandem e-mail as a language learning tool. Data from the teachers’ responses to the end-of-study interview, and from e-mail exchanges between the researcher and the FSL teacher revealed that the L2 teachers involved in this study perceived the use of tandem e-mail as a valuable language learning tool. Generally, the teachers found their students benefited from their online exchanges with their tandem partners. In particular, the teachers reported that their students had benefited from the authentic communication with native speakers and from the feedback they received from them. However, data also revealed that the teachers had been confronted with a number of challenges. Some of them addressed institutional factors, such as access to computers and the misalignment of academic calendars. Some others were related to the design of the tasks involved in the project.
7.2. Pedagogical implications

This thesis has focused on examining project-based e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. The findings from the present study bear important implications in several aspects for second language writing and for the application of e-mail tandem projects to second language learning.

First, the main pedagogical implications of this study arise from the findings concerning the capacity of secondary school students to provide each other feedback. Interpreted within a sociocultural perspective, these findings emphasize the usefulness of e-mail tandem collaboration between ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide opportunities whereby learners can mutually provide scaffolding and thus assist each other in achieving task goals and in developing their L2 writing skills.

Second, the results of this study underscore the importance of resources in second language writing. In the case of e-mail tandem communication, this may include the support provided by the tandem partners (i.e., their e-mails and the corrections provided), by their classmates and by their respective L2 teachers, as well as by cultural tools in the form of artifacts (e.g., dictionaries and Internet translators). According to sociocultural theory, teaching is the process of helping students to develop mental functions (Gallimore & Tharp, 1990). In this regard, Vygotsky (1978) argued that cognitive development occurs in two stages. A learned function occurs first between two or more people and then within a person. That is, a person is first able to carry out a task with the help of another person or other resources and later learns to carry out the task individually with little or no outside help (Roebuck, 2001).

Third, the results of this study also yield some insights into the impact that tandem partner feedback has on the final draft produced by a student. The findings revealed that students incorporated their partners’ corrections in a high percentage and thus underscore the effectiveness of tandem partner feedback in revision. As well, it was found that the nature of the task (i.e., revising their reports using their tandem partners’ feedback) promoted the incorporation of tandem partner feedback.
Fourth, data from the end-of-project questionnaire and from the interview with the FSL teacher revealed that students liked some of the readings more than others. The selection of the readings was done with the collaboration of the ESL and FSL teachers. Based on these findings, it may be advisable, as suggested by O’Dowd and Ritter (2006), that teachers distribute pre-exchange questionnaires to students in both contact classes asking them for their opinions on topics that they would like to discuss with their partners.

Lastly, this study demonstrates that teachers involved in applying e-mail tandem projects to second language instruction should engage in the different phases of the project from planning, implementation to evaluation. In this respect, it seems appropriate to point out that while the use of tandem e-mail fosters communication with NSs, facilitates intercultural learning, and enhances motivation, it is ultimately a tool in the hands of teachers who must effectively integrate it into their course in order to maximize students’ learning experiences. The findings of this study confirm claims from previous studies (Belz, 2002; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Kern, 2000; Müller-Hartmann, 2000; Ware, 2003) that teacher involvement, far from being peripheral in online learning, has been made more important because teachers must not only have pedagogical and linguistic expertise, but also must be able to help students navigate, negotiate, interpret and express themselves in a foreign language in ways that go beyond a mere exchange of factual information.

7.3. Originality of the study

The present study contributes to research in the following ways:

1. In order to investigate the strategies used by ESL and FSL secondary students to provide scaffolding to their tandem partners, e-mails were coded using a taxonomy adapted from Villamil and De Guerrero’s (1996) taxonomy of *substrategies for providing scaffolding* used to analyze face-to-face peer interactions. As in this e-mail tandem project, writing in both languages gave students an opportunity to present themselves
both as language learners (non-native speaker role) as well as language tutors (native-speaker role), strategies were coded separately for the two roles: the non-native speaker (NNS) learner role and the native-speaker (NS) tutor role in order to better understand this reciprocal relationship. As no previous research has quantitatively investigated, to my knowledge, the strategies employed by students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners, the adapted taxonomy used in this study can be a starting point of analysis for further research.

2. Having analyzed the use of these strategies from a qualitative point of view, Villamil and De Guerrero (1996) suggested that further research should quantitatively investigate the use and frequency of scaffolding strategies among the students. In the present study, occurrences of each type of strategy were tallied according to the tandem role adopted and the results used for statistical analyses to better account for the observed patterns.

3. Findings from this study showed that even though the types of strategies employed by ESL and FSL secondary school students to provide scaffolding to their e-mail tandem partners were similar to the types of negotiations that occur during face-to-face peer review (Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Morris, 2005; Stanley, 1992; Villamil & Guerrero, 1996; Zhu, 2001), tandem partners’ awareness of the learning purpose of the exchange and their shared status as NNS learners and NS tutors led them to use direct failure signals in the form of explicit feedback and instructing that were in other contexts (e.g., Mendonça & Johnson, 1994; Sotillo, 2000, 2005) avoided by the NS interlocutors. As well, the use of these scaffolding strategies clearly demonstrated the capacity of L2 secondary school students to assume the role of “tutor” as has been observed in previous studies on online tandem learning (Appel, 1997; Kötter, 2002; Little et al., 1999; O’Rourke, 2005; Priego, 2002) and telecollaborative projects (Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003) involving adult learners.

4. The present study is the first one, to my knowledge, to have analyzed how Francophone secondary school students assisted their Anglophone partners in the development of the second-person pronoun use in French. It thus contributes to those
studies which have begun to address this issue in adults (Belz, 2002; Belz & Kinginger, 2002, 2003, and Belz & Vyatkina, 2005).

5. Compared to previous research on CMC where in certain instances the use of resources was banned (e.g., Lee, 2002; Spiliotopoulos, 2002), the present study found that during the composing of their e-mails both groups resorted to a variety of resources. These findings support the view that the use of external resources helps students cope with the task at hand (Parks et al., 2005; Roebuck, 2001; Thome, 2003; Villamil & De Guerrero, 1996).

6. The findings revealed that students incorporated their partners’ corrections in a high percentage and thus underscore the effectiveness of tandem partner feedback in revision. As well, it was found that the nature of the task (i.e., revising their reports using their tandem partners’ feedback) promoted the incorporation of tandem partner feedback. It is important to mention that although a number of studies in the area of online tandem learning (Appel, 1997; Donaldson & Kötter, 1999; Kötter, 2002; Little et al., 1999) have evaluated the students’ perceptions regarding the usefulness of the feedback provided by their partners, no previous research, to my knowledge, has investigated the degree to which tandem partner feedback was used to revise their drafts.

7. At a theoretical level, the findings of the present study suggest the importance of considering the students’ motives to explain why students invested in or failed to invest in the e-mail tandem project. It thus contributes to those studies which have explored how motive relates to the selection of resources and outcomes (e.g., Donato, 1994; Gillette, 1994; McKay & Wong, 1996; Ohta, 2001; Parks, 2000). It is important to mention that to date, no research, to my knowledge, has investigated how L2 secondary school students engage and invest in online exchanges.
8. The present study suggests that Engeström’s (2001) model of two interacting activity systems may help identify how the two different activity settings in which each of the two classes were involved had a bearing both on how the students invested in the e-mail project and on the way the teachers oriented to it. It thus contributes to recent studies that have shown how social, cultural, and institutional affordances and constraints affected the development of exchanges (Belz, 2001, 2002, Belz & Müller-Hartmann, 2002, 2003; Dodd, 2001; Greenfield, 2003; O’Dowd, 2005; Ware, 2003).

7.4. Limitations of this study

Some limitations constrain the extent to which the findings of this study can be generalized. First, this study involved 30 intermediate-level English-speaking ESL students in a secondary school in Quebec and 30 intermediate-level FSL students in a secondary school in Ontario so the findings can not be generalized to other L2 learners at other proficiency levels. As well, this study involved two secondary schools with relatively different access to computers so the findings can not be generalized to other school contexts, such as when pairing two groups in schools featuring an environment rich in ICTs.

The results of this study are also limited in certain aspects due to the research design. In this study, it was found that the ESL students incorporated 91% of the corrections provided by their tandem partners, while the FSL students incorporated 74%. Although the findings are meaningful because they demonstrate that tandem partner feedback is provided to and used by secondary students, the study does not address whether the feedback and students’ use of it to revise their drafts led to L2 development. Future studies might also investigate if having students revise their drafts using their tandem partners’ feedback develops their ability to revise their writing without receiving additional input from their classmates or teachers.

In addition, when comparing both groups, the data submitted for analysis revealed that the ESL students incorporated the feedback provided by their tandem partners to a
greater extent than the FSL students. Due to the nature of the present study, the reasons why fewer FSL students did so could not be determined.

Finally, the findings of this study showed that the institutional affordances and constraints with respect to access to computers had an impact not only on the overall interaction between the two groups of students, but also on the students' motivation in the project.

7.5. Recommendations for future research

Given the findings and the limitations of the present study, several recommendations can be made for future research to further investigate the effectiveness of using e-mail tandem exchanges for enhancing second language writing, particularly in the context of secondary school second language learners.

First of all, while the findings of the present study showed that participating students mutually provided scaffolding in various ways, this study does not provide evidence at the level of acquisition. Further research needs to be conducted in order to investigate if social interaction and scaffolding provided by tandem partners lead to language acquisition.

Second, the evaluation of the use of affordances offered by online communication, such as block capitals and icons to support or clarify the illocutionary force of the scaffolding strategies employed by the students was approached from a qualitative point of view. The use of these affordances could be quantitatively investigated in future research.

Third, in this study, the joint reading of articles taken from newspapers and magazines of interest to teenagers formed the basis for the e-mail discussions. Additional studies should examine the role that e-mail discussions play on the development of specific L2 structures.

Fourth, in this study the analysis of e-mails revealed that while Anglophone students displayed an excellent command of written language, Francophone students' e-mails often contained flawed input. Additional studies should examine the impact that the
errors made by the students in their L1 have on the way their tandem partners perceive them as “experts” of their first language and, in particular, address how this affects the incorporation of the feedback received in their revisions.

Fifth, as indicated by the FSL teacher’s comments in the end-of-study interview, many FSL students in southern Ontario are not interested in learning French “because they do not understand why it might be useful in their life” (Callie, interview; April 7, 2005). In particular, it was found that lack of investment in the e-mail project on the part of one of the focal FSL students was due to the fact that, being in his last year of high school and satisfied with his level of French, he did not give too much importance to the French class. This FSL teacher’s concern is voiced by Kissau (2006) in a study that investigated gender differences in motivation to learn French. Thus, he posited, “there is a concern among second language educators in Canada that male students are losing interest in studying French as a second language” (p. 401). Kissau’s study revealed that how French is perceived by society at large not only influences how students perceive French but also influences a number of other classroom-related factors. He concluded that dominant views of masculinity in society are discouraging males from studying French. It would be very interesting to investigate the impact that e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL students have on the Anglophone male students’ perceptions of the French language. In particular, additional studies should examine if inviting tandem partners to discuss topics related to students’ perceptions of the French language (e.g., “I think French is more suitable for girls than boys” or “French is a gentle and pleasant-sounding language”) or incorporating topics geared more toward male interests, such as sports (e.g., hockey) can help Anglophone students to change their perception that French is a feminine subject.

Sixth, the two FSL classes involved in this study consisted of 25 students born in Canada, four in India, and one in Jamaica. For five students, the first language learned at home was not English. Analyses of the e-mails revealed that some FSL students presented themselves as being both Canadians and Asians (e.g., “Je suis un garçon Chinois qui était né en Montréal, alors naturellement, j’adors les Canadiens de

7 These items were designed by Kissau (2006) and were included in his questionnaire to uncover differences between genders in how the French language is perceived.
Montréal” (FSL 3, message # 553); “Je suis un demi chinois (mon père) et un demi blanc” (FSL 8, message # 540); “Juste en cas vous ne saviez pas, je suis une fille, et mon nom est un non coréen. Mes parents sont venus de la Corée mais mes frères et moi sont nés à Toronto” (FSL 15, message 570). In some cases, they brought up and shared with their partners their cultural background as immigrants and as Canadians [e.g., “J’espère que tu célèbres Noël, ou une autre chose comme ça. J’ai un question: tu es religieux ou tu célèbre une religion? Je suis un chrétien. Quand j’habitais en Jamaique, j’allais à une école chrétien, et je portais un uniforme brun. Il était horrible, mais quelquefois j’aimerais y retourner” (FSL 1, message # 1010)]. Because of the limitations of this study, these issues were not further analyzed. Future studies involving Anglophone students in Canada would benefit from an exploration of issues of identity. As noted by Norton (1997), issues of identity have important consequences for positive and productive language learning and teaching. Similarly, from the perspective of activity theory, Lantolf and Pavlenko (1998) stressed the need to construct “whole learners,” which takes into account the situated nature of language learning as well as the individual’s personal history.

Seventh, in the present study, an interesting finding was the fact that integrating CMC into their classes also confronted teachers with the challenge of keeping students on task when at the computer lab. In particular, it was found that some students would be listening to music, surfing on the net, chatting or shopping on line while writing their e-mails. This issue has been unexplored in the literature on CMC and is, in my opinion, an important topic for future investigations.

Finally, it would be of interest to explore tandem exchanges in the context of projects which were carried out under more optimal conditions than was the case of the present study. As noted by Callie, if she continued on with such a project, she would like to have partner classes with comparable resources and time. Such conditions would make it possible to explore the impact of comparable resources and time on the interaction between the two groups of students and on the students’ investment in the project.
7.6. Concluding remarks

This study examined project-based e-mail tandem exchanges between ESL and FSL secondary school students. It involved one group of 30 intermediate-level French-speaking ESL students in a secondary school (secondary 4) in Quebec and two groups of intermediate-level English-speaking FSL students (total 30) in a secondary school (Grade 11) in Ontario. The joint reading of articles taken from newspapers and magazines of interest to teenagers formed the basis for the e-mail discussions. Overall, this study supports the claim that e-mail tandem learning is a valuable tool in L2 instruction. In particular, the data from this study sheds light on the degree to which L2 secondary school students are capable of giving each other feedback. As such, it represents a valuable contribution to research on writing processes involving digital technologies.
References


Appel, M.C. (1997). Tandem language learning by e-mail: Some basic principles and a case study. Dublin: CLCS.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

Background information questionnaire  (ESL students)

Répondez aux questions suivantes :

1. Nom : ___________________________ Prénom : ___________________________

2. Âge: _____

3. Sexe: M____ F _____

4. Lieu de naissance : Ville _______ Province/État _______ Pays _______

5. Première langue apprise à la maison : Français _____ Autre (Spécifiez) _____

- Si langue maternelle autre que le français, depuis combien de temps es-tu scolarisé(e) en français? ________________

6. Langue maternelle de mon père : Français : _______ Autre (Spécifiez) : _______

7. Langue maternelle de ma mère : Français : _______ Autre (Spécifiez) : _______

8. J’ai un ordinateur à la maison:
   Non _____  Oui _____

9. J’ai Internet à la maison:
   Non _____  Oui _____

10. J’ai eu des amis par correspondance (lettres envoyées par la poste)
   Non _____  Oui _____

   Si oui, complétez le tableau :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue de la correspondance</th>
<th>Durée de la correspondance</th>
<th>Comment avez-vous trouvé l’expérience ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Indiquez à quel point vous vous sentez à l’aise avec l’ordinateur en cochant d’une croix les cases correspondantes:

   Expérience avec l’ordinateur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traitement de texte</th>
<th>Pas du tout à l’aise</th>
<th>Assez à l’aise</th>
<th>À l’aise</th>
<th>Très à l’aise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courrier électronique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. J’utilise le courrier électronique (mettez une croix dans la case appropriée):
   Jamais _____ Presque jamais _____ Souvent _____ Très souvent _____ Tous les jours _____

13. J’ai déjà eu des correspondants anglophones par courrier électronique :
   Non _____ Oui _____
   Si oui, complétez le tableau :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Langue de la correspondance</th>
<th>Durée de la correspondance</th>
<th>Comment avez-vous trouvé l'expérience ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Je suis déjà allé(e) dans des camps de vacances en anglais.
   Non _____ Oui _____
   Si oui, où? __________________ Quand? __________________
   Combien de temps tu y es resté(e)? __________________

15. J’ai déjà voyagé dans un pays où l’on parle anglais. Non _____ Oui _____
   • Si oui, Quand? __________________ Où? __________________
   Combien de temps tu y es resté(e)? __________________

   Jamais _____ Presque jamais _____ Souvent _____ Très souvent _____ Tous les jours _____

17. Pour moi, apprendre l’anglais est :
   Pas important _____ Assez important _____ Important _____ Très important _____

18. Je pense que mon niveau d’anglais écrit est
   Pauvre _____ Assez bon _____ Bon _____ Très bon _____ Excellent _____

19. Je pense que mon niveau d’anglais oral est
   Pauvre _____ Assez bon _____ Bon _____ Très bon _____ Excellent _____

20. Je pense que ce projet (échange en tandem par courrier électronique) pourrait m’aider à améliorer mon niveau d’anglais.
   Non _____ Oui _____ Je ne sais pas _____

21. Pour le projet tandem, je préférerais, si possible, correspondre avec
   Un gars _____ Une fille _____ Je n’ai pas de préférence _____

MERCI BEAUCOUP
APPENDIX B

Background information questionnaire (FSL students)

Please answer the following questions:

1. Last name: __________________________ First name(s) : __________________________

2. Age: ________

3. Sex: M____ F_____

4. Place of birth: City ____________ Province/State ____________ Country _______

5. First language I learnt at home: English _____ Other (Specify) ______

- If mother tongue other than English, how long have you studied in an English-speaking school? __________________________

6. My father’s mother tongue: English _____ Other (Specify) ______

7. My mother’s mother tongue: English _____ Other (Specify) ______

8. I have a computer at home:
   No ______ Yes ______

9. I have Internet at home:
   No ______ Yes ______

10. I have had pen-pals (mailed letters)
   No ______ Yes ______

   If yes, complete the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of correspondence</th>
<th>Length of correspondence</th>
<th>How did you find the experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Please indicate how comfortable you are when using:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word processing</th>
<th>Very uncomfortable</th>
<th>More or less comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Very comfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. I use the computer to send e-mails (tick as appropriate):
   Never _____ Almost never _____ Often _____ Very often _____ Every day _____

13. I have corresponded by e-mail with French-speakers:
   No ______ Yes ______
   If yes, complete the table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of correspondence</th>
<th>Length of correspondance</th>
<th>How did you find the experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. I have gone to summer camps in French.
   No _____ Yes ______
   • If yes, where? __________________________ When?
   How long did you stay there? ________________

15. I have traveled to a place where French is spoken. No _____ Yes ______
   • If yes, When? __________________________ Where? __________________________
   How long did you stay there? ________________

16. I speak with French speakers outside of school.
   Never _____ Almost never _____ Often _____ Very often _____ Every day _____

17. For me, learning French is:
   Not important _____ More or less important _____ Important _____ Very important _____

18. I think my written French is
   Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Very good _____ Excellent _____

19. I think my oral French is
   Poor _____ Fair _____ Good _____ Very good _____ Excellent _____

20. I think this project (exchange in tandem by e-mail) could help me improve my French
   No _____ Yes _____ I don’t know _____

21. For this project, I would prefer, if it is possible, to correspond with
   A boy _____ A girl _____ I don’t have any preference _____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
APPENDIX C
Description of the project (ESL students)

E-mail Tandem Project

In this project, you will communicate by e-mail with an Anglophone secondary student who is learning French. Since you are both native speakers of the language the other is learning, you can learn a lot from each other.

Over the course of the project, you will read three articles taken from newspapers or magazines in French and you will give your opinion on the topics raised in the articles. You will then compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Ontario. During the exchange, you will write three reports (one for each topic discussed) and do a final oral presentation in which you will report what you found out to the whole class.

TASKS

A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER

Part I. Getting to know each other

Task 1. Sending the first e-mail to your tandem partner:
Write half of your e-mail in English, so you can practice your English, and half of your e-mail in French, so your partner can follow your e-mail as a model:

a) Introduce yourself: Tell him/her your name and age. Write about your family, your school, your friends, and your hobbies.

b) Ask your partner any question you would like to know about him/her.

c) REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use the reflection form included in your portfolio (yellow sheets). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.
Task 2. Responding to your tandem partner’s first e-mail

Write half of your e-mail in English, so you can practice your English, and half of your e-mail in French, so your partner can follow your e-mail as a model:

a) Answer your partner’s questions.
b) If there is something you did not understand in his/her e-mail, ask him/her to clarify it in his/her following e-mail.
c) Help your tandem partner with his/her French by correcting his/her mistakes. Try to give him/her good feedback. Your partner will help you with your English as well.
d) REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English (use the reflection form). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.

Part II. Preparing the article for homework

Task 1. Read the article.

Task 2. READER RESPONSE FORM. Take your reader response form (blue sheets) and do as follows:

a) Write down the title of the article and source (where it was taken from).
b) Take note of the points you found of interest in the article.
c) Write a paragraph in which you give your opinion about the topic discussed in the article. Do you agree/disagree with the points you read in the article? Why? Give examples based on your personal experience.
d) Ask your partner several questions to find out what he/she thinks about this topic.
e) Keep your reader response form in your portfolio.
Part III. Talking about the article in class

Task 1. Sit with your team.

Task 2. Take turns discussing points you found of interest in the article. Ask your teammates for their opinions. Continue taking turns until all team members’ points have been discussed.

Task 3. Get as many ideas as you can. As you discuss, take notes on the back of your reader response form. This will help you write your e-mail.

Part IV.

a) Getting information from your partner

Task 1. Greet your tandem partner.

Task 2. In English, tell your partner about the article you read. Refer to the reader response form to help you.
   a) Tell him/her what the title and source of the article are.
   b) Tell him/her what the article talks about.
   c) Give him/her your opinion about the topic you read about. Tell him/her why you agree/disagree with the points you read about in the article. Give him/her examples based on your personal experience.
   d) Ask your partner for his/her opinion about the topic. Ask him/her specific questions about the topic. Also, ask him/her to give specific examples based on his/her experience.

Task 3. REFLECTION FORM. Before you continue with the rest of your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English (use the reflection form in your portfolio). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.

b) Responding to your partner’s e-mail.

Task 1. Read your tandem partner’s e-mail. In French, respond to the questions your partner asked you about the topic he/she read about.

Task 2. Correct your partner’s mistakes.
Part V. Getting answers from your partner

Task 1. Read your tandem partner’s e-mail. Focus on his/her opinions about the article you read in English.

Task 2. REPORT-DRAFT 1. Write a report in English (a minimum of half a page) in which you compare and contrast your opinion with your tandem partner’s opinion in regard to the topic you read about.

Task 3. Send your report to your tandem partner.
   a) Ask him/her whether or not his/her opinions are accurately reflected in your report.
   b) Ask him/her to correct your English.

Task 4. REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English (use the reflection form).

Task 5. Keep a print out of your e-mail in your portfolio.

Part VI. Using the feedback from your tandem partner to revise your report

Task 1. REPORT FORM- DRAFT 2. Rewrite your report (for the teacher) using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use the report form (green sheets) included in your portfolio.

Task 2. Keep the report form in your portfolio.

Part VII. Sending an e-mail to your tandem partner to say good bye

Task 1. As needed, ask your partner to answer any questions he/she hadn’t answered from your previous e-mails.

Task 2. Thank him/her for his/her help in correcting your e-mails.

Task 3. REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your e-mail in English (use the reflection form).

Task 4. Keep a print out of your e-mail in your portfolio.

Task 5. Read your tandem partner’s good bye e-mail.
B) PREPARING THE FINAL ORAL PRESENTATION

Part VIII. Sharing information with your teammates at the end of the project

Task 1. Sit with your team.

Task 2. ORAL PRESENTATION. NOTETAKING FORM. Take one oral presentation - Notetaking form (pink sheets) from your portfolio.

Task 3. Choose a secretary. He/she will be responsible for jotting down your ideas.

Task 4. Compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Ontario for each of the three articles you discussed.

Part IX. Reporting on your tandem partners' opinions to the class

Task 1. Get with your team. Use your oral presentation - notetaking form to prepare an oral presentation. In this oral presentation, you will compare and contrast your teammates' opinions with those of your partners in Ontario.

Task 2. Think of an interesting way to present the information to your classmates. For example, use a poster or a transparency.

Task 3. Practice your part of the presentation.

Task 4. Do your oral presentation on the date assigned by your teacher.

C) EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project will consist of:

1) Your portfolio. Your portfolio must contain:

   1) Printouts of all the e-mails you sent to your tandem partner.
   2) Printouts of all the e-mails your partner sent you.
   3) Your reflection forms.
   4) Your reader response forms.
   5) Your report forms - Draft 2.
   6) Oral presentation form.

2) The three reports:

   a. The content (Comparing and contrasting points).
   b. Quality of the language.
3) The oral presentation:
   a. The content (Comparing and contrasting points from the three articles).
   b. Quality of the language.

Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PART I- TASK 1- Send “Hello” e-mail (50% in French, 50% in English). After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PART I- TASK 2- Reply to your tandem partner’s “Hello” e-mail (50% in French, 50% in English. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #1. Use reader response form (blue sheets). PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2. Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French. PART V. TASKS 1 to 5. Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2. In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #1 - Draft 2 (green sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #2. Use reader response form (blue sheets). PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2. Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French. PART V. TASKS 1 to 5. Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2. In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #2 - Draft 2 (green sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2. As homework, read article #3. Use reader response form (blue sheets). PART III. TASKS 1, 2, 3. In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. PART IV-A. TASKS 1, 2, 3. Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in French. <strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in English. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #3 -Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>PART VII. TASKS 1 to 4.</strong> Send « good bye/thank you » e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in English in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in English. Use reflection form (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B) PREPARING THE FINAL ORAL PRESENTATION**

| 13 | **PART VII. TASK 5.** Read your tandem partner’s good bye e-mail. **PART VIII. TASKS 1 to 4.** Take one oral presentation note taking form (pink sheets). Compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Ontario for each of the articles you discussed. |
| 14 | **PART IX. TASKS 1 and 2.** Prepare your oral presentation |
| 15 | **PART IX. TASK 4.** Oral presentation in teams |
APPENDIX D
Description of the project (FSL students)

In this project, you will communicate by e-mail with a French-speaking secondary student who is learning English. Since you are both native speakers of the language the other is learning, you can learn a lot from each other.

Over the course of the project, you will read three articles taken from newspapers or magazines in French and you will give your opinion on the topics raised in the articles. You will then compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Quebec City. During the exchange, you will write three reports (one for each topic discussed) and do a final oral presentation in which you will report what you found out to the whole class.

TASKS

A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER

Part I. Getting to know each other

Task 1. Sending the first e-mail to your tandem partner:
Write half of your e-mail in French, so you can practice your French, and half of your e-mail in English, so your partner can follow your e-mail as a model:

a) Introduce yourself: Tell him/her your name and age. Write about your family, your school, your friends, and your hobbies.

b) Ask your partner any question you would like to know about him/her.

c) REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use the reflection form included in your portfolio (yellow sheets). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.
Task 2. Responding to your tandem partner’s first e-mail

Write half of your e-mail in French, so you can practice your French, and half of your e-mail in English, so your partner can follow your e-mail as a model:

a) Answer your partner’s questions.

b) If there is something you did not understand in his/her e-mail, ask him/her to clarify it in his/her following e-mail.

c) Help your tandem partner with his/her English by correcting his/her mistakes. Try to give him/her good feedback. Your partner will help you with your French as well.

d) REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French (use the reflection form). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.

Part II. Preparing the article for homework

Task 1. Read the article.

Task 2. READER RESPONSE FORM. Take your reader response form (blue sheets) and do as follows:

a) Write down the title of the article and source (where it was taken from).

b) Take note of the points you found of interest in the article.

c) Write a paragraph in which you give your opinion about the topic discussed in the article. Do you agree/disagree with the points you read in the article? Why? Give examples based on your personal experience.

d) Ask your partner several questions to find out what he/she thinks about this topic.

e) Keep your reader response form in your portfolio.
Part III. Talking about the article in class

Task 1. Sit with your team.

Task 2. Take turns discussing points you found of interest in the article. Ask your teammates for their opinions. Continue taking turns until all team members’ points have been discussed.

Task 3. Get as many ideas as you can. As you discuss, take notes on the back of your reader response form. This will help you write your e-mail.

Part IV.

a) Getting information from your partner

Task 1. Greet your tandem partner.

Task 2. In French, tell your partner about the article you read. Refer to the reader response form to help you.

a) Tell him/her what the title and source of the article are.

b) Tell him/her what the article talks about.

c) Give him/her your opinion about the topic you read about. Tell him/her why you agree/disagree with the points you read about in the article. Give him/her examples based on your personal experience.

d) Ask your partner for his/her opinion about the topic. Ask him/her specific questions about the topic. Also, ask him/her to give specific examples based on his/her experience.

Task 3. REFLECTION FORM. Before you continue writing the rest of your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French (use the reflection form in your portfolio). Keep your reflection in your portfolio.
b) Responding to your partner’s e-mail.

**Task 1.** Read your tandem partner’s e-mail. In English, respond to the questions your partner asked you about the topic he/she read about.

**Task 2.** Correct your partner’s mistakes.

**Part V. Getting answers from your partner**

**Task 1.** Read your tandem partner’s e-mail. Focus on his/her opinions about the article you read in French.

**Task 2.** REPORT-DRAFT 1. Write a report in French (a minimum of half a page) in which you compare and contrast your opinion with your tandem partner’s opinion in regard to the topic you read about.

**Task 3.** Send your report to your tandem partner.

a) Ask him/her whether or not his/her opinions are accurately reflected in your report.

b) Ask him/her to correct your French.

**Task 4.** REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in French (use the reflection form).

**Task 5.** Keep a print out of your e-mail in your portfolio.

**Part VI. Using the feedback from your tandem partner to revise your report**

**Task 1.** REPORT FORM- DRAFT 2. Rewrite your report (for the teacher) using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use the report form (green sheets) included in your portfolio.

**Task 2.** Keep the report form in your portfolio.

**Part VII. Sending an e-mail to your tandem partner to say good bye**

**Task 1.** As needed, ask your partner to answer any questions he/she hadn’t answered from your previous e-mails.

**Task 2.** Thank him/her for his/her help in correcting your e-mails.

**Task 3.** REFLECTION FORM. After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your e-mail in French (use the reflection form).
Task 4. Keep a print out of your e-mail in your portfolio
Task 5. Read your tandem partner’s good bye e-mail.

C) PREPARING THE FINAL ORAL PRESENTATION

Part VIII. Sharing information with your teammates at the end of the project

Task 1. Sit with your team.

Task 2. ORAL PRESENTATION. NOTETAKING FORM. Take one oral presentation – Notetaking form (pink sheets) from your portfolio.

Task 3. Choose a secretary. He/she will be responsible for jotting down your ideas.

Task 4. Compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Ontario for each of the three articles you discussed.

Part IX. Reporting on your tandem partners’ opinions to the class

Task 1. Get with your team. Use your oral presentation - notetaking form to prepare an oral presentation. In this oral presentation, you will compare and contrast your teammates’ opinions with those of your partners in Quebec City.

Task 2. Think of an interesting way to present the information to your classmates. For example, use a poster or a transparency.

Task 3. Practice your part of the presentation.

Task 4. Do your oral presentation on the date assigned by your teacher.

C) EVALUATION

The evaluation of the project will consist of:

1) Your portfolio. Your portfolio must contain:
   1) Printouts of all the e-mails you sent to your tandem partner.
   2) Printouts of all the e-mails your partner sent you.
   3) Your reflection forms.
   4) Your reader response forms.
5) Your report forms- Draft 2.
6) Oral presentation form.

2) The three reports:
   a. The content (Comparing and contrasting points).
   b. Quality of the language.

3) The oral presentation:
   a. The content (Comparing and contrasting points from the three articles).
   b. Quality of the language.

Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>TASKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A) CORRESPONDING WITH YOUR TANDEM PARTNER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>PART I - TASK 1</strong> - Send “Hello” e-mail (50% in English/ 50% in French). After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>PART I - TASK 2</strong> - Reply to your tandem partner’s “Hello” e-mail (50% in English/ 50% in French). After sending your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, read <strong>article #1.</strong> Use <strong>reader response form</strong> (blue sheets). <strong>PART III. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. <strong>PART IV-A. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in French in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in English. <strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in French. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in French. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use <strong>report form # 1-Draft 2</strong> (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, read <strong>article #2.</strong> Use <strong>reader response form</strong> (blue sheets). <strong>PART III. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. <strong>PART IV-A. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in French in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use <strong>reflection form</strong> (yellow sheets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table of Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>PART IV-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in English. <strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in French. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your report in French. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #2 -Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>PART II. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> As homework, read article #3. Use reader response form (blue sheets). <strong>PART III. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> In class, sit with your team and talk about the article. <strong>PART IV-A. TASKS 1,2, 3.</strong> Send e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in French in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>PART VI-B. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> Reply to your tandem partner’s questions in English. <strong>PART V. TASKS 1 to 5.</strong> Read your partner’s e-mail. Write a report in French. Send your report to your tandem partner. After writing your report, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>PART VI. TASKS 1 and 2.</strong> In class, rewrite your report using the feedback given by your tandem partner. Use report form #3 -Draft 2 (green sheets).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>PART VII. TASKS 1 to 4.</strong> Send « good bye/thank you » e-mail to your tandem partner. After writing the section in French in your e-mail, reflect on the strategies you used in composing your message in French. Use reflection form (yellow sheets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 12 | **B) PREPARING THE FINAL ORAL PRESENTATION**  
**PART VII. TASK 5.** Read your tandem partner’s good-bye e-mail. **PART VIII. TASKS 1 to 4.** Take one oral presentation- note taking form (pink sheets). Compare and contrast your opinions with those of your partners in Quebec City for each of the three articles you discussed. |
| 13 | **PART IX. TASKS 1 and 2.** Prepare your oral presentation |
| 14 | **PART IX. TASK 4.** Oral presentation in teams |
APPENDIX E
READER RESPONSE FORM - Article #1 (ESL students)

Title: ____________________________
Source: __________________________

Identify several points you found of interest in the article you read:
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Write a paragraph in which you give your opinion about the article you read. Do you agree/disagree with the points raised in the article? Why? Try to illustrate your point of view taking examples from your personal experience.
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Ask your partner several questions to find out what he/she thinks about this topic:
1) ___________________________________________________?
2) ___________________________________________________?
3) ___________________________________________________?
4) ___________________________________________________?
5) ___________________________________________________?

If you need extra space, write on the back of this page.

In class, take turns discussing points you found of interest in the article. Ask your teammates for their opinions. Get as many ideas as you can. As you discuss, take notes on the back of this page. This will help you write your e-mail.
READER RESPONSE FORM - Article #2

Title: ________________________________
Source: ______________________________________

Identify several points you found of interest in the article you read:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Write a paragraph in which you give your opinion about the article you read. Do you agree/disagree with the points raised in the article? Why? Try to illustrate your point of view taking examples from your personal experience.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Ask your partner several questions to find out what he/she thinks about this topic:
1) ___________________________________________?
2) ___________________________________________?
3) ___________________________________________?
4) ___________________________________________?
5) ___________________________________________?

If you need extra space, write on the back of this page.

In class, take turns discussing points you found of interest in the article. Ask your teammates for their opinions. Get as many ideas as you can. As you discuss, take notes on the back of this page. This will help you write your e-mail.
READER RESPONSE FORM - Article #3

Title: ________________________________________________________________

Source: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

Identify several points you found of interest in the article you read:

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Write a paragraph in which you give your opinion about the article you read. Do you agree/disagree with the points raised in the article? Why? Try to illustrate your point of view taking examples from your personal experience.

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

Ask your partner several questions to find out what he/she thinks about this topic:

1) __________________________________________________________? 
2) __________________________________________________________? 
3) __________________________________________________________? 
4) __________________________________________________________? 
5) __________________________________________________________? 

If you need extra space, write on the back of this page.

In class, take turns discussing points you found of interest in the article. Ask your teammates for their opinions. Get as many ideas as you can. As you discuss, take notes on the back of this page. This will help you write your e-mail.
APPENDIX F
READER RESPONSE FORM- Article #1 (FSL students)

Titre : 
Source : 

Identifie plusieurs points que tu as trouvés de ton intérêt dans l'article que tu as lu:

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Écris un paragraphe où tu donnes ton opinion sur l'article que tu as lu. Es-tu d'accord avec les points soulevés dans cet article ? Pourquoi ? Essaie d'illustrer ton point de vue avec des exemples tirés de ton expérience personnelle.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

______________________________________

Demande à ton partenaire en tandem ce qu'il/elle pense de ce sujet:
1) ?
2) ?
3) ?
4) ?
5) ?

Si tu as besoin de plus d'espace, écris au verso.

En classe, prends des tours pour discuter des points que vous avez trouvés d'intérêt dans cet article. Demande à tes co-équipiers ce qu'ils en pensent. Prends note de toutes les idées. Lors de la discussion, prends des notes au verso de cette page. Ceci t'aidera à rédiger ton courriel.
Titre : 

Source : 

Identifie plusieurs points que tu as trouvés de ton intérêt dans l'article que tu as lu:

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Écris un paragraphe où tu donnes ton opinion sur l'article que tu as lu. Es-tu d'accord avec les points soulevés dans cet article ? Pourquoi ? Essaie d'illustrer ton point de vue avec des exemples tirés de ton expérience personnelle.

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Demande à ton partenaire en tandem ce qu'il/elle pense de ce sujet:

1) ?

2) ?

3) ?

4) ?

5) ?

Si tu as besoin de plus d'espace, écris au verso.

En classe, prends des tours pour discuter des points que vous avez trouvés d'intérêt dans cet article. Demande à tes co-équipiers ce qu'ils en pensent. Prends note de toutes les idées. Lors de la discussion, prends des notes au verso de cette page. Ceci t'aidera à rédiger ton courriel.
READER RESPONSE FORM - Article #3

Titre : __________________________________________
Source : _______________________________________

Identifie plusieurs points que tu as trouvés de ton intérêt dans l’article que tu as lu :
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Écris un paragraphe où tu donnes ton opinion sur l’article que tu as lu. Es-tu d’accord avec les points soulevés dans cet article ? Pourquoi ? Essaie d’illustrer ton point de vue avec des exemples tirés de ton expérience personnelle.
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Demande à ton partenaire en tandem ce qu’il/elle pense de ce sujet :
1) ?
2) ?
3) ?
4) ?
5) ?

Si tu as besoin de plus d’espace, écris au verso.

En classe, prends des tours pour discuter des points que vous avez trouvés d’intérêt dans cet article. Demande à tes co-équipiers ce qu’ils en pensent. Prends note de toutes les idées. Lors de la discussion, prends des notes au verso de cette page. Ceci t’aidera à rédiger ton courriel.
**APPENDIX G**  
**REFLECTION FORM** (ESL students)

NAME: ______________________  DATE: ________________

*Remplis ce tableau après avoir écrit ton courriel en anglais*

### Quand j'ai écrit mon courriel en anglais aujourd'hui,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) J'ai cherché des mots dans le dictionnaire.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, lesquels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) J'ai utilisé un traducteur disponible sur Internet.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, quels mots ou phrases as-tu traduits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) J'ai demandé à mes camarades de classe comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, à qui?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) J'ai demandé à mon enseignante comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, qu'est-ce que tu lui as demandé?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e) J'ai utilisé des mots/ des expressions que mon/ma partenaire en tandem avait utilisés dans ses courriels.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, quels mots/expressions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>f) J'ai lu les corrections que mon/ma partenaire m'avait faites dans mes courriels antérieurs.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, quelles corrections as-tu utilisées?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g) J'ai reçu de l'aide d'une autre personne pour rédiger mon courriel.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Oui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, précisez quel type d'aide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX H**

**REFLECTION FORM**  (FSL students)

**NAME:** ______________________________ **DATE:** ______________________________

*PLEASE FILL IN THIS GRID AFTER WRITING YOUR E-MAIL IN FRENCH*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When I wrote my e-mail in French today,</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) I looked for words in the dictionary.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, which ones?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I used a translator in the Internet.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what word(s)/sentence(s) did you translate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I asked my classmates how I could say something in French.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, who?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what did you ask?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I asked my teacher how I could say something in French.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, for what?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I used words/expressions my Tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, which words/expressions did you use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I looked at the corrections my Tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, which correction(s) did you use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) I got help to write my e-mail in any other way or from somebody else.</td>
<td>No _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, explain what / from whom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
REPORT FORM #1  DRAFT 2  (ESL Students)

Task: Comparing and contrasting my opinions with those of my tandem partner.

Article #1- Title: ____________________________________________________________
My name: _________________________________________________________________
My tandem partner’s name: ________________________________________________

If you wish to write more, write on the back.
REPORT FORM #2 - DRAFT 2

Task: Comparing and contrasting my opinions with those of my tandem partner.

Article #2 - Title: ________________________________
My name: ________________________________
My tandem partner's name: ________________________________

If you wish to write more, write on the back.
REPORT FORM #3 - DRAFT 2

Task: Comparing and contrasting my opinions with those of my tandem partner.

Article #3 - Title: ________________________________________________________________
My name: _______________________________________________________________________
My tandem partner’s name: ________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
If you wish to write more, write on the back.
Tâche: Comparer et contraster mes opinions avec celles de mon partenaire en tandem.

Article #1- Titre: ____________________________________________________________

Mon nom: __________________________________________________________________

Nom de mon partenaire en tandem: ____________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Si tu as besoin de plus d’espace, écris au verso.
REPORT FORM #2  DRAFT 2

Tâche: Comparer et contraster mes opinions avec celles de mon partenaire en tandem.

Article #2- Titre: _______________________________________________________

Mon nom: ____________________________________________________________

Nom de mon partenaire en tandem: _______________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Si tu as besoin de plus d’espace, écris au verso.
REPORT FORM #3  DRAFT 2

Tâche: Comparer et contraster mes opinions avec celles de mon partenaire en tandem.

Article #3- Titre: _______________________________

Mon nom: __________________________________

Nom de mon partenaire en tandem: ________________________

Si tu as besoin de plus d’espace, écris au verso.
## APPENDIX K

**ORAL PRESENTATION- NOTETAKING FORM (ESL Students)**
Comparing and contrasting our opinions with those of our partners in Ontario

**Points raised in article #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our team</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our tandem partners</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ORAL PRESENTATION- NOTETAKING FORM

Comparing and contrasting our opinions with those of our partners in Ontario

**Points raised in article #2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our team</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our tandem partners</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ORAL PRESENTATION- NOTETAKING FORM

Comparing and contrasting our opinions with those of our partners in Ontario

**Points raised in article #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our team</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our tandem partners</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
<th>Name :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L
ORAL PRESENTATION – NOTETAKING FORM (FSL Students)

Comparer et contraster nos opinions avec celles de nos partenaires à Québec
Points traités dans l’article #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notre équipe</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos partenaires en tandem</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Comparer et contraster nos opinions avec celles de nos partenaires à Québec
Points traités dans l'article #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notre équipe</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nos partenaires en tandem</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORAL PRESENTATION – NOTETAKING FORM
Comparer et contraster nos opinions avec celles de nos partenaires à Québec
Points traités dans l'article #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notre équipe</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
<th>Nom :</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nos partenaires en tandem</td>
<td>Nom :</td>
<td>Nom :</td>
<td>Nom :</td>
<td>Nom :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX M
End-of-project questionnaire (ESL students)

I. Identification
a. Nom: ____________________________ Prénom: ____________________________
b. Age: __________

II. Projet d'échanges en tandem par courriel

1. Quand j’écrivais mes courriels,

   a) Je cherchais des mots dans le dictionnaire.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   b) J’utilisais un traducteur disponible sur Internet.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   c) Je demandais à mes camarades de classe comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   d) Je demandais à mon enseignant(e) d’anglais comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   e) J’utilisais des mots /des expressions que mon/ma partenaire en tandem avait utilisés dans ses courriels.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   f) Je regardais les corrections que mon/ma partenaire avait faites à mes courriels antérieurs.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

   g) Je recevais de l’aide d’une autre personne pour rédiger mes courriels.
      Jamais ______ Presque jamais ______ Quelques fois ______ Presque toujours ______ Toujours ______

2. Corriger les fautes de mon/ma partenaire était

   a) Toujours difficile ______ Souvent difficile ______
      Quelques fois difficile, quelques fois facile ______
      Souvent facile ______ Toujours facile ______

   b) Toujours ennuyant ______ Souvent ennuyant ______
      Quelques fois ennuyant, quelques fois intéressant ______
      Souvent intéressant ______ Toujours intéressant ______

3. Le fait de corriger les fautes de français de mon/ma partenaire m’a rendu plus conscient(e) des règles de grammaire du français.
   Pas du tout d’accord ______ Pas d’accord ______ Je ne sais pas ______ D’accord ______ Tout à fait d’accord ______
4. Le fait de corriger les fautes de mon/ma partenaire m’a aidé à voir des différences entre le français et l'anglais.

Pas du tout d’accord ____ Pas d’accord ____ Je ne sais pas ____ D’accord ____ Tout à fait d’accord ____

5. Mon/ma partenaire m’a fourni des rétroactions.

Jamais ____ Presque jamais ____ Quelques fois ____ Presque toujours ____ Toujours ____

6. Quand mon/ma partenaire me fournissait une rétroaction, elle portait sur :

- Grammaire Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas ____
- Vocabulaire Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas ____
- Orthographe Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas ____
- Ponctuation Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas ____
- Ordre des mots Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas ____
- Autre. Quoi ? __________

7. Quand mon/ma partenaire me fournissait une rétroaction,

- En général, j’en prenais connaissance. Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas __________
- En général, j’en tenais compte. Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas __________
- En général, j’en tenais compte pour réviser mes rapports (Report – Draft 2). Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne me souviens pas __________

8. La rétroaction fournie par mon/ma partenaire m’a aidé à améliorer mon anglais.

Pas du tout d’accord ____ Pas d’accord ____ Je ne sais pas ____ D’accord ____ Tout à fait d’accord ____

9. La rétroaction m’a aidé à améliorer mon anglais dans les dimensions suivantes :

- Grammaire Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne sais pas ____
- Vocabulaire Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne sais pas ____
- Orthographe Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne sais pas ____
- Ponctuation Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne sais pas ____
- Ordre des mots Non ____ Oui ____ Je ne sais pas ____
- Autre : __________

10. Pendant ce projet (cocher une option) :

- J’ai travaillé moins que je ne le fais d’habitude pour d’autres devoirs d’anglais ______
- J’ai travaillé autant que je le fais d’habitude pour d’autres devoirs d’anglais ______
- J’ai travaillé plus que je ne le fais d’habitude pour d’autres devoirs d’anglais ______

11. En général, j’aime apprendre l’anglais.

Pas du tout d’accord ____ Pas d’accord ____ Je ne sais pas ____ D’accord ____ Tout à fait d’accord ____

12. Je pense que communiquer avec mon/ma partenaire était

Pas du tout intéressant ______ Pas très intéressant ______ Intéressant ______ Très intéressant ______

13. Dans ce projet, j’ai appris des choses sur les anglophones que je ne connaissais pas avant.

Pas du tout d’accord ____ Pas d’accord ____ Je ne sais pas ____ D’accord ____ Tout à fait d’accord ____
• Dans ce projet, j’ai été surpris(e) d’apprendre que


Pas du tout d’accord ___  Pas d’accord ___  Je ne sais pas ___  D’accord ___  Tout à fait d’accord ___

15. Je pense que les tâches étaient :
• Tâche 1. Envoyer le premier courriel à mon/ma partenaire en tandem.
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 2. Comme devoir, lire un article en anglais.
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 3. Parler de l'article en classe.
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 4. Demander à mon/ma partenaire en tandem son opinion sur le sujet sur lequel j'avais lu.
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 5. Répondre aux questions de mon/ma partenaire sur l'article qu'il avait lu en français.
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 6.Comparer et contraster mes opinions avec celles de mon/ma partenaire en tandem concernant le sujet sur lequel j'avais lu (« Report – draft 1 »).
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 7. Utiliser les rétroactions de mon partenaire pour réviser mon rapport (« Report – draft 2 »).
Pas du tout intéressante ___  Pas très intéressante ___  Plus ou moins intéressante ___
Intéressante ___  Très intéressante ___

• Tâche 8. Échanger de l’information avec mes coéquipiers à la fin du projet (pour préparer l’exposé oral).
Pas du tout intéressant ___  Pas très intéressant ___  Plus ou moins intéressant ___
Intéressant ___  Très intéressant ___

• Tâche 9. En équipes, faire part à la classe des opinions de nos partenaires en tandem (Exposé oral).
Pas du tout intéressant ___  Pas très intéressant ___  Plus ou moins intéressant ___
Intéressant ___  Très intéressant ___
• Tâche 10. Envoyer un message d’au revoir par courriel à mon/ma partenaire.
Pas du tout intéressante ____  Pas très intéressant ____  Plus ou moins intéressant ____  
Intéressante ____  Très intéressant ____

16. Je pense que les sujets à discuter étaient :
• Article #1 : « Cheating : The perfect score »
Pas du tout intéressant ____  Pas très intéressant ____  Plus ou moins intéressant ____  
Intéressant ____  Très intéressant ____
• Article #2 : « Dangerous drivers : Are you one? »
Pas du tout intéressant ____  Pas très intéressant ____  Plus ou moins intéressant ____  
Intéressant ____  Très intéressant ____
• Article #3 : « Racism »
Pas du tout intéressant ____  Pas très intéressant ____  Plus ou moins intéressant ____  
Intéressant ____  Très intéressant ____

17. Ce que j'ai aimé le plus de ce projet était

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

18. Ce que je pense qui pourrait être changé/amélioré dans ce projet est

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

19. Pendant ce projet, j'ai aussi communiqué avec mon partenaire en dehors de l'horaire du cours.
   Non ____  Oui ____
• Si oui, par quel moyen?
   Par WebCT ____  Par e-mail ____  Par « chat » (MSN) ____

20. Je pense continuer à correspondre avec mon partenaire en tandem.
   Non ____  Oui ____  Je ne sais pas ____
• Si oui, par quel moyen?
   Par e-mail ____  Par chat ____

21. Je suggère que ce projet fasse partie d'autres cours d'anglais.
   Non ____  Oui ____  Je ne sais pas ____

22. As-tu d'autres commentaires à faire concernant ce projet?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

MERCI BEAUCOUP.
APPENDIX N
End-of-project questionnaire (FSL students)

I. Identification

a. Last name ___________________ First name(s): _______________________

b. Age: _______________

II. E-mail tandem project

1. When I wrote my e-mails,

a) I looked for words in the dictionary.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

b) I used a translator in the Internet.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

c) I asked my classmates how I could say something in French.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

d) I asked my French teacher how I could say something in French.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

e) I used words/expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

f) I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

g) I got help to write my e-mails from somebody else.
   Never _______ Almost never _______ Sometimes _______ Almost always _______ Always _______

2. Correcting my partner's e-mails was

a) Always difficult _______ Usually difficult _______
   Sometimes difficult, sometimes easy _______
   Usually easy _______ Always easy _______

b) Always boring _______ Usually boring _______
   Sometimes boring, sometimes interesting _______
   Usually interesting _______ Always interesting _______

3. The fact of correcting my partner's e-mails in English made me be more aware of the grammar rules in English.
   I strongly disagree _______ I disagree _______ I can't say _______ I agree _______ I strongly agree _______
4. The fact of correcting my partner's English helped me see the differences between English and French.
I strongly disagree    I disagree    I can't say    I agree    I strongly agree    

5. My partner gave me feedback.
Never    Almost never    Sometimes    Almost always    Always    

6. When my partner gave me feedback, he/she gave me feedback on
- Grammar
- Vocabulary
- Spelling
- Punctuation
- Word order
- Other points. What?
I can't remember  

7. When my partner gave me feedback,
- In general, I read it over.
  No    Yes  I can't remember  
- In general, I used it in my other e-mails.
  No    Yes  I can't remember  
- In general, I used it to revise my reports (Draft 2).
  No    Yes  I can't remember  

8. The feedback helped me improve my French.
I strongly disagree    I disagree    I can't say    I agree    I strongly agree    

9. The feedback helped me improve my French in these areas:
- Grammar
- Vocabulary
- Spelling
- Punctuation
- Word order
- Other:  
I can't say  

10. During this project (check one),
- I worked less than I usually do for a French assignment  
- I worked about the same I usually do for a French assignment  
- I worked harder than I usually do for a French assignment  

11. In general, I like learning French.
I strongly disagree    I disagree    I can't say    I agree    I strongly agree    

12. I think that communicating with my partner was
Not at all interesting    Not very interesting    More or less interesting    
Interesting    Very interesting  

13. In this project, I found out things about French speakers that I didn't know before.
I strongly disagree    I disagree    I can't say    I agree    I strongly agree  


In this project, I was surprised to find that

14. I liked this project
I strongly disagree ___ I disagree ___ I can’t say ___ I agree ___ I strongly agree ___

15. I think the tasks were:
   - Task 1. Sending the first e-mail to my tandem partner.
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 2. Reading an article in French for homework.
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 3. Talking about the article in class.
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 4. Asking my partner for his/her opinion about the topic I read about.
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 5. Responding to my partner’s questions about the article he/she read in English.
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 6. Comparing and contrasting my opinion with my tandem partner’s opinion regarding the topic I read about (Report - draft 1).
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 7. Using the feedback from my partner to revise my report (Report - draft 2).
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 8. Sharing information with my teammates at the end of the project (Preparing the final oral presentation).
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
   - Task 9. In teams, reporting on our tandem partners’ opinions to the class (Oral presentation).
     Not at all interesting ___ Not very interesting ___ More or less interesting ___
     Interesting ___ Very interesting ___
• Task 10. **Sending the “good-bye” e-mail to my tandem partner.**
Not at all interesting  Not very interesting  More or less interesting  
Interesting  Very interesting

16. **I think the topics to be discussed were:**
• **Article #1 : « Les défauts utiles au travail : Pardonnez-leur »**
Not at all interesting  Not very interesting  More or less interesting  
Interesting  Very interesting

• **Article #2 : « Plus de la moitié des jeunes fumeurs de 11 à 16 ans vivent au Québec »**
Not at all interesting  Not very interesting  More or less interesting  
Interesting  Very interesting

• **Article #3 : « Chimpanzés : La vie après le labo»**
Not at all interesting  Not very interesting  More or less interesting  
Interesting  Very interesting

17. **What I liked best about the project was**

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

18. **What I think that could be changed / improved in this project is**

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

19. **During this project, I also communicated with my partner outside of class time**
No  Yes

- If yes, by which means?
  By WebCT  By e-mail  By chat (MSN)

20. **I am planning to continue communicating with my tandem partner**
No  Yes  I don’t know

- If yes, by which means?
  By e-mail  By chat

21. **I would recommend this project be included in future classes of French.**
No  Yes  I don’t know

22. **Do you have any other comments regarding this project?**

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH.**
APPENDIX O

End-of-study student interview (ESL students)

I. Renseignements généraux

a) Scolarité
1) Peux-tu me dire où est-ce que tu as fait tes études jusqu’à maintenant?
   - Où est-ce que tu as fait ton primaire?
   - Tu étudies dans cette école depuis le Secondaire 1?

b) Parents
2) Peux-tu me parler un peu de tes parents?
   - Quelle est la langue maternelle de tes parents?
   - Est-ce qu’ils parlent anglais couramment?
   - Quelle est l’occupation de tes parents?

c) Apprentissage des langues
3) Peux-tu me dire où tu as étudié l’anglais jusqu’à maintenant?
   - Pour toi, c’est important d’apprendre l’anglais?
   - Jusqu’à maintenant, comment est-ce que tu as appris l’anglais?
   - As-tu déjà suivi un cours d’immersion en anglais?
   - As-tu voyagé dans un pays où l’on parle anglais?
   - Pratiques-tu l’anglais en dehors de l’école?
   - Parles-tu une autre langue, autre que le français et l’anglais?
   - Comment l’as-tu apprise?

II. Cours d’anglais
4) Peux-tu me parler de ton cours d’anglais?
   - Quelles sont tes activités préférées dans le cours d’anglais?

III. Échanges en tandem par courriel
a) Communication avec le partenaire en tandem
5) As-tu aimé communiquer avec ton partenaire?
6) As-tu appris quelque chose en communiquant avec lui/elle?
7) Dans ce projet, as-tu appris des choses sur les anglophones que tu ne connaissais pas avant?

b) Tâches
8) Dans ce projet, quelles tâches as-tu aimé le plus?
   - Envoyer le premier courriel à ton partenaire?
   - Comme devoir, lire un article en anglais?
   - Parler de l’article en classe?
- Demander à ton/ta partenaire son opinion sur le sujet sur lequel tu avais lu?
- Répondre aux questions de ton partenaire sur l’article qu’il/elle avait lu en français?
- Comparer et contraster tes opinions avec celles de ton/ta partenaire concernant le sujet sur lequel tu avais lu (Report –draft1)?
- Utiliser les rétroactions de ton/ta partenaire pour réviser ton rapport?
- Échanger de l’information avec tes coéquipiers à la fin du projet?
- En équipes, faire part à la classe des opinions de vos partenaires en tandem (Exposé oral)?
- Envoyer un message d’au revoir par courriel à ton/ta partenaire?

9) Lesquelles as-tu aimé le moins?

c) Rétroaction
10) Penses-tu que ton/ta partenaire a fait un bon travail quand il/elle te donnait des rétroactions?
11) As-tu appris quelque chose grâce à tes rétroactions?
12) As-tu utilisé ses rétroactions pour écrire tes courriels?
13) As-tu utilisé ses rétroactions pour réviser tes rapports?
14) C’était facile de donner des rétroactions à ton/la partenaire?

d) Ressources
15) Peux-tu me dire comment tu écrivais tes courriels en anglais?
   - Quand tu ne savais pas un mot en anglais, le cherchais-tu dans le dictionnaire?
   - Utilisais-tu un traducteur disponible sur Internet?
   - Demandais-tu à tes camarades de classe comment tu pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais?
   - Demandais-tu à ton enseignante d’anglais comment tu pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais?
   - Utilisais-tu des mots ou des expressions que ton/ta partenaire avait utilisés dans ses courriels?
   - Regardais-tu les corrections que ton/ta partenaire avait faites à tes courriels antérieurs?
   - Recevais-tu de l’aide d’une autre personne pour rédiger tes courriels?

IV. Questions spécifiques pour ESL 2
- Tes rapports étaient excellents et tu as corrigé les rapports de ton partenaire. Ce qui n’était pas le cas de la plupart de tes camarades de classe. Pourquoi?
- Tu écrivais des longs courriels et tu as donné beaucoup de rétroactions à ton partenaire. Aussi, tu parlais des articles que tu avais lus mais aussi d’autres sujets Ce qui n’était pas le cas de la plupart de tes camarades de classe. Pourquoi?
ESL 5
- Tes rapports étaient excellents et tu as corrigé les rapports de ton partenaire. Ce qui n’était pas le cas de la plupart de tes camarades de classe. Pourquoi?
- Tu écrivais des longs courriels et tu as donné beaucoup de rétroactions à ton partenaire. Ce qui n’était pas le cas de la plupart de tes camarades de classe. Pourquoi?
- Dans le questionnaire, tu as mentionné que tu étais surprise d’apprendre que les élèves à Toronto avaient fait le même projet que vous mais vraiment plus loin. Peux-tu m’expliquer un peu plus?
- Ton partenaire te vouvoyait. Est-ce que ça te dérangeait?

ESL 10
- Dans le questionnaire, tu as dit que tu étais surprise de voir la facilité qu’ils ont pour apprendre le français et que toi, tu as de la difficulté à écrire en anglais. Peux-tu m’expliquer un peu plus?
- Ton message d’au revoir laissait voir combien tu as apprécié communiquer avec ton partenaire. Peux-tu m’expliquer un peu plus?

ESL 20
- Tu as fait un excellent travail dans ce projet. Tu écrivais des longs courriels et tu as donné beaucoup de rétroactions à ton partenaire. Tu parlais des articles que tu avais lus mais aussi d’autres sujets. Cependant, dans le questionnaire, tu as dit que tu ne l’avais pas beaucoup aimé. Pourquoi?

ESL 25
- Ta partenaire ne t’a pas toujours écrit. Cependant, tu lui as toujours envoyé un message, même les jours où elle ne t’avait pas écrit. Pourquoi?

ESL 30
- Dans le questionnaire, tu as dit que le projet était intéressant pour les personnes qui ont pris ça à cœur, mais que pour toi, tu aurais préféré juste discuter avec elle. Peux-tu m’expliquer un peu plus?
APPENDIX P

End-of-study student interview (FSL students)

I. Background

a) Schooling
1) Can you tell me where you went to school in the past?
   - What is your mother tongue?
   - What is your parents’ mother tongue?
   - How old were you when you arrived in Canada?
   - Where did you study before you arrived in Canada?
   - Have you been living in Ontario since you arrived in Canada?
   - Do your parents speak English fluently?
   - Do they speak French?
   - What is your parents’ occupation?
2) Can you tell me about the International Baccalaureat programme?
   - How long have you been registered in the IB program?
   - What made you decide to register in the IB programme?

b) Language learning history
3) Can you tell me where you have studied French?
   - For you, is it important to learn French?
   - Up to this point, how have you learned French?
   - Have you ever been in an immersion program in French?
   - Have you traveled to a place where French is spoken?
   - Do you speak French outside of school?
   - Besides your mother tongue and English, do you speak any other language?
   - How did you learn it?
   - Do you think that the other languages you learned make it easier for you to learn French? Why/why not?

II. French class
4) Can you tell me about your French class?
   - What are your favorite activities in your French class? Why?

III. Tandem Exchange

a) Communication with tandem partner
5) Did you like to communicate with your tandem partner? Why? Why not?
6) Did you learn anything by communicating with your partner?
   - Can you give me some examples?
7) In this project, did you learn anything about French speakers that you didn’t know before?
   - Can you give me some examples?
b) Tasks

8) Of the tasks involved in this project, which one(s) did you like the best? Why?
- Reading an article in French for homework?
- Talking about the text in class?
- Asking your partner for his or her opinion about the topic you read about?
- Responding to your partner’s questions about the article he/she read in English?
- Writing a report to compare and contrast your opinion with your partner’s opinions regarding the topic you read about?
- Using the feedback from your partner to revise your report?
- Sharing information with your teammates at the end of the project?
- The oral presentation?

9) Which one(s) did you like the least? Why?

c) Feedback

10) Do you think your partner did a good job in correcting your French?
11) Do you think you learned anything from your partner’s feedback?
12) Did you use your partner’s feedback in your other emails?
13) Did you use your partner’s feedback to revise your reports?
14) Was it easy to give feedback to your tandem partner?

d) Resources

15) Can you tell me how you wrote your emails in French?
- When you didn’t know how to say something in French, did you look for words in the dictionary?
- Did you use a translator in the Internet?
- Did you ask your classmates how you could say something in French?
- Did you ask your French teacher how you could say something in French?
- Did you use words or expressions your tandem partner had used in his/her emails in French?
- Did you look at the corrections your partner had made to your previous emails?
- Did you get help to write your emails from somebody else?

IV. Specific questions for

FSL 1

- You did an excellent job in this project. Your e-mails were long and you gave a lot of feedback to your partner. Why?

FSL 13

- Your emails were long and you gave a lot of feedback to your partner. Most students didn’t. Why?
You told your partner you loved the tandem communication assignment, and that you found yourself excited every week to go to the computer lab and receive a message from her. What did you like the best about this project?

- You asked your partner to correct your French. Did he correct your e-mails? If so, did you use your partner’s feedback to write your e-mails or to revise your reports?
- Sometimes, you compared English and French when you gave feedback to your partner. Why?

Your emails were short and the last weeks you didn’t send any email. Why?

- In average, your classmates sent 10 emails (you had to send 10 emails). You sent 3. Why?
- You did not write your reports to compare your opinions with your tandem’s opinions about the topics you read about. Why?

In the first e-mail, you and your partner didn’t talk about the topics you had read about. Why?
APPENDIX Q

End-of-study ESL teacher interview

I. E-mail tandem project

a) Context

1) Can you tell me why you were interested in participating in this email project?
   - Why were you interested in having your students participate in this project?
   - Have you organised an email exchange in any of your classes before?

2) Do you think your students saw this project as part of their regular class work or as a separate project?

3) The FSL students had each a computer and they had the whole period to write their emails. Your students only had half of the period due to the constraints of the school. Do you think this posed a problem?
   - Were your students aware of this (i.e., that their partners didn’t have the same amount of time to write their emails)? Do you think this impacted on their perceptions of their partners in any way?

b) Communication with tandem partner

4) Did your students make any comments to you about this e-mail project?
   - If so, what?
   - What do you personally think about this issue?
   - Did they mention they liked to communicate with their tandem partner?
   - What is your opinion about this?
   - Did they mention if they learned anything by communicating with their partner?
   - What is your opinion about this?
   - Did they mention if they learned anything about French speakers they didn’t know before?
   - What do you think about this?

5) Some FSL students used « vous » to address to their partners. Did your students make any comments to you about this?
   - Did they mention if this bothered them in any way?

c) Tasks

6) What task(s) do you think they liked the best?
   - Sending s first e-mail t o their tandem partner?
   - Reading an article in English for homework?
   - Talking about the text in class?
- Asking their partner for his or her opinion about the topic they read about in English?
- Responding to their partner’s questions about the article he/she read in French?
- Comparing and contrasting their opinion with their partner’s opinions regarding the topic they read about (Report – draft 1?)
- Using the feedback from their partner to revise their report?
- Sharing information with their teammates at the end of the project to prepare the oral presentation?
- The oral presentation?
- Sending a “good bye” e-mail?

7) Was there any task they did not like?
   - Do you know why?
   - Did they mention to you why?
   - What do you think about this issue?

8) Do you think some tasks were more useful for helping them learn English? If so, can you explain in what way?

d) Feedback
9) Do you think your students were capable of giving feedback to their partners?
   - If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
10) Did you help or guide them in any way to give feedback to their partners?
    - If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
11) Do you think your students’ tandem partners were capable of giving feedback to your students?
    - If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
12) Do you think your students learned from their partners’ feedback?
    - If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
13) Do you think your students were satisfied with the feedback received from their partners?
    - Did they mention to you if they were satisfied with the feedback received from their partners?
14) Do you know if your students used the feedback they received from their tandem partners to write their emails?
    - If so, give any examples?
15) Do you know if your students used the feedback they received from their tandem partners to revise their reports?
    - If so, can you explain why or give any examples?

e) General perception
16) Would you incorporate a project like this one with other groups again?
    - Is there anything that you would change?

f) Questions about specific students
17) I would like to know how you perceived the participation of certain students in this e-mail exchange. Based on your knowledge of the particular student, I would like you to
tell me if anything surprised you about the way he/she participated. I made also some observations and at certain points I may also bring these up.

NB- Points to be brought up in the case of each individual student are indicated below.

**ESL 2**
- Ses rapports étaient excellents et elle a corrigé les rapports de son partenaire.
- Elle écrivait des longs courriels et elle a donné beaucoup de rétroactions à son partenaire. Aussi, elle parlait des articles qu’elle avait lus mais aussi d’autres sujets.

**ESL 5**
- Ses rapports étaient excellents et elle a corrigé les rapports de son partenaire. Elle écrivait des longs courriels et elle a donné beaucoup de rétroactions à son partenaire.

**ESL 10**
- Dans le questionnaire, elle a dit qu’elle avait de la difficulté à écrire en anglais.
- Son message d’au revoir laissait voir combien elle a apprécié communiquer avec son partenaire.

**ESL 20**
- Il a fait un très bon travail dans ce projet. Ses rapports étaient excellents. Il écrivait des longs courriels et il a donné beaucoup de rétroactions à sa partenaire. Cependant, dans le questionnaire, il a dit qu’il ne l’avait pas beaucoup aimé.

**ESL 25**
- Sa partenaire ne lui a pas toujours écrit. Cependant, elle lui a toujours envoyé un message, même les jours où elle n’avait pas reçu de message.

**ESL 30**
- Dans le questionnaire, il a dit que le projet était intéressant pour les personnes qui ont pris ça à cœur, mais qu’il aurait préféré juste discuter avec sa partenaire. Il a rarement écrit sur les articles qu’ils ont lus.

**II. Approach to teaching English**

18) Can you tell me about your English class?
- What do you emphasize in your teaching?
- Why?
- In your classes, do you speak in English all the time?
- What advantage do you see in having students communicate with a tandem partner by email?
- In your classes—other than those involved in this project—do you ask your students to write several drafts of their written texts?
- Do you use the word “drafts” to refer to the different versions of the same text?
- In your classes, other than those involved in this project—do you have students work in teams?
- What is your opinion of team work? Do you think it works well with secondary students?
- In your classes, do you ask your students to give feedback to their peers?
- In your classes, other than for this project, do you incorporate the computer?

19) I realized that many of your students made a lot of grammar and spelling mistakes in French.
- In your opinion, what may be the cause of this?

III. Background
20) Can you tell me about your teaching experience?
   - How did you get into teaching English?
   - Why?
21) Can you tell me how you learned English?
   - Where did you learn it?
APPENDIX R

End-of-study FSL teacher interview

I. E-mail tandem project

a) Context

1) Can you tell me why you were interested in participating in this email project?
   - Why were you interested in having your students participate in this project?
   - Have you organised an email exchange in any of your classes before?

2) Can you tell about the International Baccalaureat programme?
   - What criteria are used for admission? Are there any specific criteria with respect to English and French?
   - In terms of their prior studies, is there a general profile? Types of schools? Grades?
   - In terms of their families, how would you characterize their backgrounds?
   - In your opinion, are students registered in the International Baccalaureate programme generally more interested in learning French than students registered in the regular program?

3) Can you tell me how you incorporated the email tandem project in your French course?
   - Did you assign the readings as homework or did they read the articles in class?
   - Did they talk about the articles in class?
   - Did they work in teams to help each other understand the text better?
   - Did you ask them to send emails from home if they were absent to class?
   - Did your students see this project as part of their regular class work or as a separate project?
   - You told me each of your students had a computer and they had the whole period to write their emails. The ESL students only had half of the period due to the constraints of the school. Do you think this posed a problem?
   - Were your students aware of this (i.e., that their partners didn’t have the same amount of time to write their emails)? Do you think this impacted on their perceptions of their partners in any way?

b) Communication with tandem partner

4) Did your students make any comments to you about this e-mail project?
   - If so, what?
   - What do you personally think about this issue?
   - Did they mention they liked to communicate with their tandem partner?
- What is your opinion about this?
- Did they mention if they learned anything by communicating with their partner?
- What is your opinion about this?
- Did they mention if they learned anything about French speakers they didn’t know before?
- What do you think about this?

c) Tasks

5) What task(s) do you think they liked the best?
- Reading an article in French for homework?
- Talking about the text in class?
- Asking their partner for his or her opinion about the topic they read about in French?
- Responding to their partner’s questions about the article he/she read in English?
- Writing a report to compare and contrast their opinion with their partner’s opinions regarding the topic they read about?
- Using the feedback from their partner to revise their report?
- Sharing information with their teammates at the end of the project?
- The oral presentation?

6) Was there any task they did not like?
7) Do you think some tasks were more useful for helping them learn French? If so, explain in what way.

d) Feedback

8) Do you think your students were capable of giving feedback to their partners?
- If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
9) Did you help or guide them in any way to give feedback to their partners?
- If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
10) Do you think your students’ tandem partners were capable of giving feedback to your students?
- If so, can you explain why or give any examples?
11) Do you think your students learned from their partners’ feedback?
- If so, can you give me any examples?
12) Were your students satisfied with the feedback received from their partners?
13) Do you know if your students used the feedback they received from their tandem partners to write their emails?
- If so, can you give me any examples?
14) Do you know if your students used the feedback they received from their tandem partners to revise their reports?
- If so, can you give me any examples?

e) Resources

15) Can you tell me how your students wrote their emails in French?
- When they didn’t know how to say something in French, did they look up words in the dictionary?
- Did they ask their classmates?
- Did they ever use an online translator?
- Did you notice if they used any words their tandem partner had used in his/her previous emails in French?
- Did they ask you how to say something in French when they were writing their emails?

f) General perception
16) In one of your emails you told me that your students found that their partners did not invest in the exchange as much as they did. Can you tell about this, please?
   - Would you incorporate a project like this one with other groups again?
   - Is there anything that you would change?

g) Questions about specific students
17) I would like to know how you perceived the participation of certain students in this e-mail exchange. Based on your knowledge of the particular student, I would like you to tell me if anything surprised you about the way he/she participated. I made also some observations and at certain points I may also bring these up.
   NB. Points to be brought up in the case of each individual student are indicated below.

**FSL 1**
- He did an excellent job. His emails were long and he gave a lot of feedback to his partner.

**FSL 13**
- I saw she sent e-mails from her house.
- Her e-mails were long and she gave a lot of feedback to her partner.
- In her first e-mails, she used "vous" to communicate with her partner. In the following e-mails (in January), she used "tu".

**FSL 20**
- She told her partner she was loving the tandem communication assignment, that she found herself excited every week to go to the computer lab and receive a message from her partner.
- She asked her partner to correct her French because she wanted to improve it.
- She gave excellent feedback and sometimes compared English and French to give explanations to her partner.

**FSL 25**
- Her emails were short and she didn’t send any email on the last weeks.
FSL 27
- In average, students sent 10 emails. He sent 3.
- He did not write his reports to compare his opinions with his tandem’s opinions about the topics he read about.

FSL 30
- In the first e-mail, she and her partner didn’t talk about the topics they had read about.

IV. **Approach to teaching French**

18) Can you tell me about your French class?
- What do you emphasize in your teaching?
- Why?
- In your classes, do you speak in French all the time?
- What advantage do you see in having students communicate with a tandem partner by email?
- In your classes –other than those involved in this project- do you ask your students to write several drafts of their written texts?
- Do you use the word “drafts” to refer to the different versions of the same text?
- In your classes, -other than those involved in this project- do you have students work in teams?
- What is your opinion of team work? Do you think it works well with secondary students?
- In your classes, do you ask your students to give feedback to their peers?
- In your classes, other than for this project, do you incorporate the computer?
- How do you teach the *tu/vous* use?
- Do your students use *tu* or *vous* when they talk to their peers in class?
- Do your students use *tu* or *vous* when they talk to you?
- Some of your students used “vous” to communicate with their partner. Do you know why?

V. **Background**

19) Can you tell me about your teaching experience?
- How did you get into teaching French?
- Why?

20) Can you tell me how you learned French?
- Where did you learn it?
### APPENDIX S

Number and type of scaffolding strategies provided by individual students

(ESL students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy for providing scaffolding</th>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>NS ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting clarification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering help with L2 writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving explicit feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving implicit feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-giving strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/ apologizing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9 7 10 4 9 12 6 4 4 7 5 12 8 4 8 2 12 9 0 2 2 10 7 8 8 5 5 11 5 1</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to elicitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-saving strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | T  |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Giving directives | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11 |
| Responding to directives/apologizing | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 |
| Responding to apologies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| TOTAL            | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 27 |

|                  | 16 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 294 |

| Total number of strategies employed | 16 | 11 | 19 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 9 | 12 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 294 |

414
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy for providing scaffolding</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliciting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reacting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting clarification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension check</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering help with L2 writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving explicit feedback</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving implicit feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-giving strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS ROLE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requesting advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to advice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to elicitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking for feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-saving strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving directives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to directives/apologizing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to apologies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E-MAIL PARTNER ROLE | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | TOTAL |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Giving directives | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Responding to directives/apologizing | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| Responding to apologies | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 26 |

| Total number of strategies employed | 11 | 11 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 13 | 9 | 13 | 10 | 17 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 | 24 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 18 | 6 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 365 | 416 |
## APPENDIX T

### Responses to reflection forms by individual students (ESL students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tandem</th>
<th>Number of Reflection forms</th>
<th>a) J'ai cherché des mots dans le dictionnaire</th>
<th>b) J'ai utilisé un traducteur disponible sur Internet</th>
<th>c) J'ai demandé à mes camarades de classe comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais</th>
<th>d) J'ai demandé à mon enseignante d'anglais comment je pouvais dire quelque chose en anglais</th>
<th>e) J'ai utilisé des mots/des expressions que mon/ma partenaire avait faites à mes courriels</th>
<th>f) J'ai lu les corrections que mon/ma partenaire avait faites à mes courriels</th>
<th>g) J'ai reçu de l'aide d'une autre personne pour rédiger mon courriel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESL 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No: 0</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>No: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>No: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 0</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>No: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>No: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 0</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>No: 9</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>No: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 0</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>No: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 0</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>No: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 2</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 2</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 7</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>No: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 10</td>
<td>Yes: 5</td>
<td>Yes: 10</td>
<td>No: 10</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>No: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
<td>Yes: 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>No: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 4</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
<td>Yes: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes: 6</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>No: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
<td>Yes: 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Responses to reflection forms by individual students (FSL students)

| Tandem | Number of Reflection forms | a) I looked for words in the dictionary. | b) I used a translator in the Internet. | c) I asked my classmates how I could say something in French | d) I asked my French teacher how I could say something in French | e) I used words/expressions my tandem partner had used in his/her e-mail. | f) I looked at the corrections my tandem partner had made to my previous e-mails. | g) I got help to write my e-mail in any other way or from somebody else. |
|--------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
|        | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 1  | 2  | 2   | 0  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 2  | 8  | 5   | 3  | 1  | 7  | 1   | 7  | 1   | 7  | 1   | 6  | 2   | 6  | 2   | 6  | 2   | 1  | Yes| 2  | 1   | 2  | 1   |
| FSL 3  | 10 | 10  | 0  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 4  | 7  | 7   | 0  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 5  | 11 | 1   | 10 | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 6  | 3  | 3   | 0  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 7  | 5  | 5   | 0  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 8  | 7  | 5   | 2  | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 9  | 7  | 4   | 3  | 5  | 2   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 10 | 9  | 7   | 2  | 6  | 3   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 11 | 7  | 4   | 3  | 7  | 0   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 12 | 8  | 6   | 2  | 6  | 2   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 13 | 10 | 4   | 6  | 8  | 2   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 14 | 4  | 4   | 0  | 3  | 1   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| FSL 15 | 11 | 7   | 4  | 11 | 0   | Yes| No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

| ESL 26 | 5   | 5   | 0   | 5   | 0   | 4   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 5   | 0   | 4   | 1   | 5   | 0   |
| ESL 27 | 3   | 0   | 3   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 0   |
| ESL 28 | 6   | 5   | 1   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 6   | 0   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0   |
| ESL 29 | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   |
| ESL 30 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |
| N (%)  | 155 | 121 | 34  | 144 | 11  | 126 | 29  | 121 | 34  | 145 | 10  | 90  | 65  | 135 | 20  |

<p>| ESL 26 | 5   | 5   | 0   | 5   | 0   | 4   | 1   | 3   | 2   | 5   | 0   | 4   | 1   | 5   | 0   |
| ESL 27 | 3   | 0   | 3   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 3   | 0   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 0   |
| ESL 28 | 6   | 5   | 1   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 6   | 0   | 3   | 3   | 6   | 0   |
| ESL 29 | 1   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   |
| ESL 30 | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL 16</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FSL 17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSL 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(64.1)</td>
<td>(35.9)</td>
<td>(87.1)</td>
<td>(12.9)</td>
<td>(78.3)</td>
<td>(21.7)</td>
<td>(90.8)</td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>(90.8)</td>
<td>(9.2)</td>
<td>(77.9)</td>
<td>(22.1)</td>
<td>(92.6)</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix U

**Number and type of revisions by individual students**

**ESL students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Surface changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Formal changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling; capitalization; punctuation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18 (13.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations; contractions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb forms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of articles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepositions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pronouns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Meaning-preserving changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permutations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SURFACE CHANGES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>118 (91.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Meaning changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Microstructure changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Macrostructure changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitutions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MEANING CHANGES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total changes 129 (100%)
### FSL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Formal changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling; capitalization; punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations; contractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Surface changes

| **Surface changes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 135 |
| Additions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Deletions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Substitutions | 10 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Permutations | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| TOTAL SURFACE CHANGES | 27 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 2 | 7 | 134 |

### II. Meaning changes

| **Meaning changes** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| A. Microstructure changes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Substitutions | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTAL MEANING CHANGES | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total changes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 135 |

Total changes (100%)
APPENDIX V
Consent form (ESL students)

Québec, Octobre 2004

Bonjour,

Mon nom est Sabrina Priego. Je suis étudiante au doctorat en linguistique à l’Université Laval sous la supervision de Mme Susan Parks. Je poursuis présentement une recherche sur l’apprentissage de l’anglais et du français par courrier électronique (« Apprentissage en tandem ») à l’intérieur d’un projet réalisé dans ton cours d’anglais. Dans ce projet, tu communiqueras par courrier électronique avec un élève anglophone de ton âge, habitant en Ontario, et qui apprend le français.

Pour réaliser le volet recherche du projet (dont les tâches sont présentées en annexe), j’ai besoin de ta collaboration et je te demande par la présente ton autorisation à cet effet. Aux fins de ma recherche, j’aurais besoin d’examiner tes travaux relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courriel, de te demander de remplir deux questionnaires et de participer à une entrevue. Cependant, il va de soi que tu peux refuser de participer à une tâche donnée (par exemple, refuser de remplir un questionnaire), même si tu signes l’autorisation ci-jointe. Tu peux également te retirer du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier ta décision.

Je m’engage à ce que les informations recueillies durant ce projet par l’intermédiaire des communications en tandem par courriel, des questionnaires ou des entrevues soient gardées confidentielles (données identifiées au moyen de pseudonymes, conservées dans des classeurs verrouillés jusqu’à la fin de leur traitement, puis détruites) et utilisées uniquement pour la recherche (rédaction de thèse de doctorat et travaux de publications scientifiques). Enfin, les documents recueillis pour des fins de ma recherche ne seront jamais utilisés à des fins d’évaluation ou de notation des élèves.

Si tu acceptes de participer à cette recherche, il est important que tu signes le formulaire de consentement ci-joint et que tu le remettes à ton enseignante d’anglais avec le formulaire signé par tes parents. Je demeure à ta disposition pour toute précision complémentaire ou, si tu le désires, pour discuter d’un aspect particulier de cette recherche.

Je te remercie à l’avance.

Pavillon Charles-De Koninck (418) 656-3263
Québec (Québec) G1K 7P4
CANADA

422
Toute question concernant mon étude de doctorat pourra être adressée à :

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique,
Université Laval
Tél. 651-9318
Courriel : sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Université Laval
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone : (418)656-2131 poste 6367
Télécopieur : (418)656-2622
Courriel : Susan.Parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Toute plainte ou critique pourra être adressée au Bureau de l'Ombudsman de l'Université Laval :

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
Renseignements-Secrétariat : 656-3081
Télécopieur : 656-3846
Courriel : ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique

Susan Parks, PhD
Professeure agrégée
Formulaire de consentement  
(à l'intention des élèves)

Étude sur l'apprentissage de l'anglais et du français par courrier électronique  
(« Apprentissage en tandem »)

SVP remplis ce formulaire, et remets-le à ton enseignante d’anglais.

☐ J’accepte de participer à la recherche.
☐ Je refuse de participer à la recherche.

Nom de l’élève : ______________________________________________

Signature de l’élève: __________________________________________

Date : ________________________________________________________

Numéro d’approbation du Comité d’éthique de la recherche de l’Université Laval : 2004-217
Description de la recherche

**Objectif général**
Evaluer l'utilité des échanges en tandem par courrier électronique en tant qu'outil d'apprentissage d'une langue seconde.

**Description des responsabilités et des tâches impliquées pour tous les participants**

**Pour les élèves**
- Au début de l'étude, remplir un questionnaire de renseignements généraux (10-20 minutes).
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- À la fin de l'étude, remplir un questionnaire (15-20 minutes) qui visera à obtenir les renseignements suivants : (a) les ressources utilisées par les élèves lors de la rédaction de leurs courriels, (b) les attitudes des élèves quant à la rétroaction qu'ils devaient fournir à leurs partenaires en tandem, (c) la perception des élèves quant à la rétroaction fournie par leurs partenaires en tandem, (e) les raisons des élèves pour apprendre la langue cible, (f) la perception des élèves en ce qui concerne les sujets discutés, les échanges en tandem et le projet en général.
- À la fin de l'étude, participer à une entrevue (15-20 minutes) menée par la chercheure, entrevue permettant de connaître les perceptions des élèves quant à l'utilité du projet en tandem en tant qu'outil d'apprentissage.

**Pour les parents** :
- Permettre la participation de leur enfant aux activités réalisées dans le cadre du projet de recherche.

**Pour l'enseignante d'anglais** :
- Permettre à la chercheure d'observer le déroulement du cours les jours où le projet aura lieu.
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux des élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- Accepter d'être interviewée à la fin de l'étude.

**Pour la direction de l'école** :
- Permettre à la chercheure de travailler en collaboration avec l'enseignante d'anglais.
- Mettre à la disposition de la chercheure un local pour les entrevues.

Les participants seront identifiés par des pseudonymes, de façon à assurer la confidentialité la plus complète.
APPENDIX W
Consent form (FSL students)

Quebec City, October 2004

Dear Student,

My name is Sabrina Priego. I am a PhD student in Linguistics at Université Laval, under the supervision of Dr Susan Parks. I am currently conducting a study involving learning English and French via e-mail exchanges ("Tandem learning") in the context of a project carried out in your French class. In this project, you will communicate by e-mail with a French-speaking Quebec student of your own age, who is studying English.

To carry out the research portion of it (see attached research description), I will need your collaboration and consent. In particular, I would ask you to complete two questionnaires, to agree to give me access to the e-mails and other documents produced during this project, and to participate in an interview. However, even if you sign the attached consent form, it is understood that you may eventually refuse to participate in any of these tasks (e.g., refuse to complete a questionnaire).

I will ensure that all data collected during this project in the form of e-mails, questionnaires or interviews, will be kept confidential (stored in a secured locked filing cabinet and destroyed once analyzed) and used only for research purposes (doctoral thesis and scientific publications). Participation in this research project will have no bearing on grades given by the teacher in the context of this project. Finally, any participant can withdraw from the project at any time without having to justify it or without penalty.

If you agree to participate in this research, it is important that you sign the attached consent form and hand it in to your French teacher along with your parents’ consent form. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me at any time.

Thank you very much,
Any question concerning the research project can be addressed to:

Sabrina Priego  
PhD student in Linguistics,  
Université Laval  
Tel. 651-9318  
E-mail: sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD  
Thesis advisor  
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction  
Université Laval  
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4  
Telephone: (418)656-2131 poste 6367  
Fax: (418)656-2622  
E-mail: Susan.Parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Any complaint or critique may be addressed to:

Bureau de l'Ombudsman de l'Université Laval  
Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Room 3320  
Tel.: 656-3081  
Fax: 656-3846  
E-mail: ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego  
PhD student in Linguistics

Susan Parks, PhD  
Professeure agrégée
Consent form (for the students)

Research project involving learning English and French via e-mail exchanges ("Tandem learning")

Please fill in this questionnaire and hand it in to your French teacher.

☐ I agree to participate in the research project.
☐ I refuse to participate in the research project.

Student’s name: ______________________________________

Student’s signature: _________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________

CERUL approval number: 2004-217
Description of research project

General objective
Explore to what degree e-mail exchanges can be used as a means for second language learning French as a second language.

Task description for all participants
For the students:
- At the beginning of the study, complete a background questionnaire (10-20 minutes).
- Agree to give access to the e-mails and other written documents produced during this project.
- At the end of the study, complete a questionnaire (15-20 minutes) that will focus on (a) the resources students draw on when composing their e-mails, (b) the students' attitudes concerning the feedback given to their partners, (c) the students' opinions concerning the feedback received from their partners, (e) their reasons for learning French, (f) their opinions concerning the topics discussed, the e-mail tandem exchanges and the project in general.
- At the end of the study, participate in an interview (15-20 minutes) with the researcher that will focus on students' opinions concerning the usefulness of the tandem project for learning French.

For the parents:
- Allow their children to participate in the tasks related to the research project.

For the French teacher:
- Allow the researcher to observe the classes involving the e-mail project.
- Agree to give access to the e-mails and other written documents produced during this project.
- Agree to be interviewed at the end of the project.

For the high school principal:
- Allow the researcher to work in collaboration with the French teacher.
- Allow the researcher to use one of the rooms at the school to carry out the interviews at the end of the project.

To ensure confidentiality, participants’ real names will be replaced by pseudonyms.
APPENDIX X
Consent form (ESL students’ parents)

Québec, Octobre 2004

Madame, Monsieur,

Mon nom est Sabrina Priego. Je suis étudiante au doctorat en linguistique à l’Université Laval sous la supervision de Mme Susan Parks. Je poursuis présentement une recherche sur l’apprentissage de l’anglais et du français par courrier électronique (« Apprentissage en tandem ») à l’intérieur d’un projet réalisé dans la classe d’anglais de votre enfant. Dans ce projet, votre enfant communiquera par courrier électronique avec un élève anglophone de son âge, habitant en Ontario, et qui apprend le français.

Pour réaliser le volet recherche du projet (dont les tâches sont présentées en annexe), j’ai besoin de votre collaboration et de celle de votre enfant et je vous demande par la présente votre autorisation à cet effet. Aux fins de ma recherche, j’aurais besoin d’examiner les travaux de votre enfant relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courriel, de lui demander de remplir deux questionnaires et de participer à une entrevue. Cependant, il va de soi que votre enfant peut refuser de participer à une tâche donnée (par exemple, refuser de remplir un questionnaire), même s’il signe l’autorisation ci-jointe. Votre enfant peut également se retirer du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier sa décision.

Je m’engage à ce que les informations recueillies durant ce projet par l’intermédiaire des communications en tandem par courriel, des questionnaires ou des entrevues soient gardées confidentielles (données identifiées au moyen de pseudonymes, conservées dans des classeurs verrouillés jusqu’à la fin de leur traitement, puis détruites) et utilisées uniquement pour la recherche (rédaction de thèse de doctorat et travaux de publications scientifiques). Enfin, les documents recueillis pour des fins de ma recherche ne seront jamais utilisés à des fins d’évaluation ou de notation des élèves.

Si vous acceptez que votre enfant participe à cette recherche, il est important que vous signiez le formulaire de consentement ci-joint et que vous le fassiez parvenir à l’école par l’intermédiaire de votre enfant. Je demeure à votre disposition pour toute précision complémentaire ou, si vous le désirez, pour discuter d’un aspect particulier de cette recherche.
Je vous remercie à l'avance de votre précieuse collaboration et je vous prie d'agréer l'assurance de mes sentiments les meilleurs.

Toute question concernant mon étude de doctorat pourra être adressée à :

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique,
Université Laval
Tél. 651-9318
Courriel : sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Université Laval
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone : (418)656-2131 poste 6367
Télécopieur : (418)656-2622
Courriel : Susan.Parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Toute plainte ou critique pourra être adressée au Bureau de l'Ombudsman de l'Université Laval :

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
Renseignements-Secrétariat : 656-3081
Télécopieur : 656-3846
Courriel : ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique

Susan Parks, PhD
Professeur agrégée
Formulaire de consentement
(à l'intention des parents)

Étude sur l'apprentissage de l'anglais et du français par courrier électronique
(« Apprentissage en tandem »)

Veuillez remplir ce formulaire, et le retourner à l'enseignante d'anglais de votre enfant.

Je, soussigné(e) ____________________________________________
(nom, prénom du titulaire de l’autorité parentale)

□ J’accepte que mon enfant participe à la recherche.

□ Je refuse que mon enfant participe à la recherche.

Nom de l’enfant : ____________________________________________

Signature du titulaire de l’autorité parentale : __________________________

Date : __________________________

Numéro d’approbation du Comité d’éthique de la recherche de l’Université Laval : 2004-217
Description de la recherche

Objectif général
Évaluer l’utilité des échanges en tandem par courrier électronique en tant qu’outil d’apprentissage d’une langue seconde.

Description des responsabilités et des tâches impliquées pour tous les participants

Pour les élèves
- Au début de l’étude, remplir un questionnaire de renseignements généraux (10-20 minutes).
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- À la fin de l’étude, remplir un questionnaire (15-20 minutes) qui visera à obtenir les renseignements suivants : (a) les ressources utilisées par les élèves lors de la rédaction de leurs courriels, (b) les attitudes des élèves quant à la rétroaction qu’ils devaient fournir à leurs partenaires en tandem, (c) la perception des élèves quant à la rétroaction fournie par leurs partenaires en tandem, (e) les raisons des élèves pour apprendre la langue cible, (f) la perception des élèves en ce qui concerne les sujets discutés, les échanges en tandem et le projet en général.
- À la fin de l’étude, participer à une entrevue (15-20 minutes) menée par la chercheure, entrevue permettant de connaître les perceptions des élèves quant à l’utilité du projet en tandem en tant qu’outil d’apprentissage.

Pour les parents :
- Permettre la participation de leur enfant aux activités réalisées dans le cadre du projet de recherche.

Pour l’enseignante d’anglais :
- Permettre à la chercheure d’observer le déroulement du cours les jours où le projet aura lieu.
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux des élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- Accepter d’être interviewée à la fin de l’étude.

Pour la direction de l’école :
- Permettre à la chercheure de travailler en collaboration avec l’enseignante d’anglais.
- Mettre à la disposition de la chercheure un local pour les entrevues.

Les participants seront identifiés par des pseudonymes, de façon à assurer la confidentialité la plus complète.
Dear Parents,

My name is Sabrina Priego. I am a PhD student in Linguistics at Université Laval, under the supervision of Dr Susan Parks. I am currently conducting a research project involving learning English and French via e-mail exchanges ("Tandem learning") in the context of a project carried out in your son/daughter’s French class. In this project, your son/daughter will communicate by e-mail with a French-speaking Québec student of his/her own age, who is studying English.

To carry out the research portion of it (see attached research description), I will need your collaboration and consent. In particular, I would ask him/her to complete two questionnaires, to agree to give me access to the e-mails and other documents produced during this project, and to participate in an interview. However, even if he/she signs the attached consent form, it is understood that he/she may eventually refuse to participate in any of these tasks (e.g., refuse to complete a questionnaire).

I will ensure that all data collected during this project in the form of e-mails, questionnaires or interviews, will be kept confidential (stored in a secured locked filing cabinet and destroyed once analyzed) and used only for research purposes (doctoral thesis and scientific publications). Participation in this research project will have no bearing on grades given by the teacher in the context of this project. Finally, any participant can withdraw from the project at any time without having to justify it or without penalty.

If you agree that your son/daughter participates in this research, it is important that you sign the attached consent form and give it to your son/daughter so he/she can hand it in to his/her French teacher. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me at any time.

Thank you very much,
Any question concerning the research project can be addressed to:

Sabrina Priego  
PhD student in Linguistics  
Université Laval  
Tel. 651-9318  
E-mail: sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD  
Thesis advisor  
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction  
Université Laval  
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4  
Telephone: (418)656-2131 poste 6367  
Fax: (418)656-2622  
E-mail: Susan.Parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Any complaint or critique may be addressed to:

Bureau de l'Ombudsman de l'Université Laval  
Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Room 3320  
Tel.: 656-3081  
Fax: 656-3846  
E-mail: ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego  
PhD student in Linguistics  

Susan Parks, PhD  
Professeure agrégée
Consent form  
(for the parents)

Research project involving learning English and French via e-mail exchanges  
("Tandem learning")

Please fill in this questionnaire and hand it in to your son/daughter’s French teacher.

☐ I agree that my son/daughter may participate in the research project.

☐ I do not wish for my son/daughter to participate in the research project.

Name of parental authority: ____________________________________________

Student’s name: ______________________________________________________

Signature of parental authority: _______________________________________

Date: ____________________________

CERUL approval number: 2004-217
Description of research project

**General objective**
Explore to what degree e-mail exchanges can be used as a means for second language learning French as a second language.

**Task description for all participants**

For the students:
- At the beginning of the study, complete a background questionnaire (10-20 minutes).
- Agree to give access to the e-mails and other written documents produced during this project.
- At the end of the study, complete a questionnaire (15-20 minutes) that will focus on (a) the resources students draw on when composing their e-mails, (b) the students’ attitudes concerning the feedback given to their partners, (c) the students’ opinions concerning the feedback received from their partners, (e) their reasons for learning French, (f) their opinions concerning the topics discussed, the e-mail tandem exchanges and the project in general.
- At the end of the study, participate in an interview (15-20 minutes) with the researcher that will focus on students’ opinions concerning the usefulness of the tandem project for learning French.

For the parents:
- Allow their children to participate in the tasks related to the research project.

For the French teacher:
- Allow the researcher to observe the classes involving the e-mail project.
- Agree to give access to the e-mails and other written documents produced during this project.
- Agree to be interviewed at the end of the project.

For the high school principal:
- Allow the researcher to work in collaboration with the French teacher.
- Allow the researcher to use one of the rooms at the school to carry out the interviews at the end of the project.

To ensure confidentiality, participants’ real names will be replaced by pseudonyms.
Madame,

Mon nom est Sabrina Priego. Je suis étudiante au doctorat en linguistique à l'Université Laval sous la supervision de Mme Susan Parks. Je poursuis présentement une recherche sur l'apprentissage de l'anglais et du français par courrier électronique (« Apprentissage en tandem ») à l'intérieur du projet d'échanges en tandem par courriel que vous allez réaliser dans votre cours d'anglais.

Pour réaliser le volet recherche du projet (dont les tâches sont présentées en annexe), j'ai besoin de votre collaboration et je vous demande par la présente votre autorisation à cet effet. Aux fins de ma recherche, j'aurais besoin que vous acceptiez que j'observe le déroulement du cours les jours où le projet aura lieu. Également, j'aurais besoin que vous acceptiez que j'examine les travaux de vos élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courriel. Finalement, j'aurais besoin que vous acceptiez d'être interviewée à la fin de l'étude.

Je m'engage à ce que les informations recueillies durant ce projet par l'intermédiaire des communications en tandem par courriel, des questionnaires ou des entrevues soient gardées confidentielles (données identifiées au moyen de pseudonymes, conservées dans des classeurs verrouillés jusqu'à la fin de leur traitement, puis détruites) et utilisées pour la recherche (rédaction de thèse de doctorat et travaux de publications scientifiques).

Si vous acceptez de participer à cette recherche, il est important que vous signiez le formulaire de consentement ci-joint et que vous me le fassiez parvenir. Je demeure à votre disposition pour toute précision complémentaire ou, si vous le désirez, pour discuter d'un aspect particulier de cette recherche.

Je vous remercie à l'avance.
Toute question concernant mon étude de doctorat pourra être adressée à :

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique,
Université Laval
Tél. 651-9318
Courriel : sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Université Laval
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone : (418)656-2131 poste 6367
Télécopieur : (418)656-2622
Courriel : Susan.Parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Toute plainte ou critique pourra être adressée au Bureau de l’Ombudsman de l’Université Laval :

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
Renseignements-Secrétariat : 656-3081
Télécopieur : 656-3846
Courriel : ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique

Susan Parks, PhD
Professeure agrégée
Formulaire de consentement
(à l'intention de l'enseignante d'anglais)

Étude sur l'apprentissage de l'anglais et du français par courrier électronique
(« Apprentissage en tandem »)

Veuillez remplir ce formulaire.

Je, soussigné(e) ____________________________________________
(nom, prénom de l'enseignante)

☐ J'accepte de participer à la recherche.

☐ Je refuse de participer à la recherche.

Signature: _________________________________________________

Date: ______________________________________________________

Numéro d'approbation du Comité d'éthique de la recherche de l'Université Laval : 2004-217
Description de la recherche

Objectif général
Évaluer l'utilité des échanges en tandem par courrier électronique en tant qu'outil d'apprentissage d'une langue seconde.

Description des responsabilités et des tâches impliquées pour tous les participants

Pour les élèves
- Au début de l'étude, remplir un questionnaire de renseignements généraux (10-20 minutes).
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- À la fin de l'étude, remplir un questionnaire (15-20 minutes) qui visera à obtenir les renseignements suivants : (a) les ressources utilisées par les élèves lors de la rédaction de leurs courriels, (b) les attitudes des élèves quant à la rétroaction qu'ils devaient fournir à leurs partenaires en tandem, (c) la perception des élèves quant à la rétroaction fournie par leurs partenaires en tandem, (e) les raisons des élèves pour apprendre la langue cible, (f) la perception des élèves en ce qui concerne les sujets discutés, les échanges en tandem et le projet en général.
- À la fin de l'étude, participer à une entrevue (15-20 minutes) menée par la chercheure, entrevue permettant de connaître les perceptions des élèves quant à l'utilité du projet en tandem en tant qu'outil d'apprentissage.

Pour les parents :
- Permettre la participation de leur enfant aux activités réalisées dans le cadre du projet de recherche.

Pour l’enseignante d’anglais :
- Permettre à la chercheure d’observer le déroulement du cours les jours où le projet aura lieu.
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux des élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- Accepter d’être interviewée à la fin de l’étude.

Pour la direction de l’école :
- Permettre à la chercheure de travailler en collaboration avec l’enseignante d’anglais.
- Mettre à la disposition de la chercheure un local pour les entrevues.

Les participants seront identifiés par des pseudonymes, de façon à assurer la confidentialité la plus complète.
APPENDIX AA
Consent form (FSL teacher)

Québec, Octobre 2004

Madame,

Mon nom est Sabrina Priego. Je suis étudiante au doctorat en linguistique à l’Université Laval sous la supervision de Mme Susan Parks. Je poursuis présentement une recherche sur l’apprentissage de l’anglais et du français par courrier électronique (« Apprentissage en tandem ») à l’intérieur du projet d’échanges en tandem par courriel que vous allez réaliser dans votre cours de français.

Pour réaliser le volet recherche du projet (dont les tâches sont présentées en annexe), j’ai besoin de votre collaboration et je vous demande par la présente votre autorisation à cet effet. Aux fins de ma recherche, j’aurais besoin que vous acceptiez que j’examine les travaux de vos élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courriel. Également, j’aurais besoin que vous acceptiez d’être interviewée à la fin de l’étude.

Je m’engage à ce que les informations recueillies durant ce projet par l’intermédiaire des communications en tandem par courriel, des questionnaires ou des entrevues soient gardées confidentielles (données identifiées au moyen de pseudonymes, conservées dans des classeurs verrouillés jusqu’à la fin de leur traitement, puis détruites) et utilisées uniquement pour la recherche (rédaction de thèse de doctorat et travaux de publications scientifiques).

Si vous acceptez de participer à cette recherche, il est important que vous signiez le formulaire de consentement ci-joint et que vous me le fassiez parvenir. Je demeure à votre disposition pour toute précision complémentaire ou, si vous le désirez, pour discuter d’un aspect particulier de cette recherche.

Je vous remercie à l’avance.
Toute question concernant mon étude de doctorat pourra être adressée à :

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique,
Université Laval
Tél. 651-9318
Courriel : sabrina.priego.1@ulaval.ca

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Université Laval
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone : (418)656-2131 poste 6367
Télécopieur : (418)656-2622
Courriel : Susan.Parks@lili.ulaval.ca

Toute plainte ou critique pourra être adressée au Bureau de l'Ombudsman de l'Université Laval :

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
Renseignements-Secrétariat : 656-3081
Télécopieur : 656-3846
Courriel : ombuds@ombuds.ulaval.ca

Sabrina Priego
Étudiante au doctorat en linguistique

Susan Parks, PhD
Professeure agrégée
Formulaire de consentement
(à l'intention de l'enseignante de français)

Étude sur l'apprentissage de l'anglais et du français par courrier électronique
(« Apprentissage en tandem »)

Veuillez remplir ce formulaire.

Je, soussigné(e) __________________________________________
(nom, prénom de l'enseignante)

☐ J'accepte de participer à la recherche.

☐ Je refuse de participer à la recherche.

Signature: __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________

Numéro d'approbation du Comité d'éthique de la recherche de l'Université Laval : 2004-217
Description de la recherche

Objectif général
Évaluer l’utilité des échanges en tandem par courrier électronique en tant qu’outil d’apprentissage d’une langue seconde.

Description des responsabilités et des tâches impliquées pour tous les participants
Pour les élèves
- Au début de l’étude, remplir un questionnaire de renseignements généraux (10-20 minutes).
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- À la fin de l’étude, remplir un questionnaire (15-20 minutes) qui visera à obtenir les renseignements suivants : (a) les ressources utilisées par les élèves lors de la rédaction de leurs courriels, (b) les attitudes des élèves quant à la rétroaction qu’ils devaient fournir à leurs partenaires en tandem, (c) la perception des élèves quant à la rétroaction fournie par leurs partenaires en tandem, (d) les raisons des élèves pour apprendre la langue cible, (e) la perception des élèves en ce qui concerne les sujets discutés, les échanges en tandem et le projet en général.
- À la fin de l’étude, participer à une entrevue (15-20 minutes) menée par la chercheure, entrevue permettant de connaître les perceptions des élèves quant à l’utilité du projet en tandem en tant qu’outil d’apprentissage.

Pour les parents :
- Permettre la participation de leur enfant aux activités réalisées dans le cadre du projet de recherche.

Pour l’enseignante de français :
- Accepter que soient examinés les travaux des élèves relatifs au projet de correspondance en tandem par courrier électronique.
- Accepter d’être interviewée à la fin de l’étude.

Pour la direction de l’école :
- Permettre à la chercheure de travailler en collaboration avec l’enseignante de français.
- Mettre à la disposition de la chercheure un local pour les entrevues.

Les participants seront identifiés par des pseudonymes, de façon à assurer la confidentialité la plus complète.