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RÉSUMÉ

L’objectif principal de cette recherche était d’examiner l’interaction entre élèves d’ALS et de FLS de sixième année du primaire du Québec et de l’Ontario communicant par clavardage et utilisant l’approche en Tandem. Plus spécifiquement, elle visait à vérifier si ces apprenants offraient de la rétroaction corrective et, le cas échéant, si cette dernière suscitait de la réparation. L’opinion des participants par rapport à leur expérience de communication en Tandem a été examinée. Les sessions de clavardage ont eu lieu sur une période de quatre mois produisant 16 séances de clavardage (8 en anglais et 8 en français). Les résultats montrent que des apprenants de langue seconde ont offert de la rétroaction corrective à 370 occasions. L’examen des données révèle que les sujets ont utilisé les trois types de rétroaction: la rétroaction explicite, la reformulation et la négociation de la forme. Contrairement à ce qui a pu être observé dans d’autres études antérieures impliquant de jeunes apprenants, une des découvertes majeures de cette recherche fut l’utilisation, par les participants, de la rétroaction explicite plutôt que la reformulation. Par contraste avec la recherche de Morris (2005) qui impliquait également de jeunes apprenants de niveau primaire utilisant le clavardage, le taux de réparation a été plutôt bas. La grande majorité des élèves d’ALS ont aimé utiliser l’ordinateur comme moyen d’apprentissage de leur L2 et de leur L1 contrairement aux élèves de FLS. Les implications pédagogiques des résultats de cette recherche ainsi que des suggestions pour de futures recherches sont également discutées.
ABSTRACT

The main objective of this research was to examine the interaction between ESL and FSL sixth graders in Quebec and Ontario communicating in a Tandem chat project. More specifically, it aimed to find out if participants provided each other with different types of corrective feedback and whether this feedback led to repair. It also examined how the students viewed this project. The chat sessions took place over four months and involved the completion of 16 tasks (8 in English and 8 in French). The results showed that L2 Grade 6 students provided feedback to their chat partners in 370 instances. The students in both the ESL and FSL exchanges provided three types of feedback: explicit, recasts, and negotiation of form. A major finding is that unlike previous studies involving young learners, the preference was for explicit feedback rather than recasts. In contrast to the Morris’ (2005) study which also involved young learners engaged in chat, the rate of repair was very low. Unlike the FSL students, the great majority of ESL students liked the chat exchange and found it useful not only for learning their L2 but also their L1. The pedagogical implications of this study as well as suggestions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This research project focuses on the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in second or foreign language learning. Although the Internet is widely used for a range of activities with such learners, projects involving exchanges with students from other schools are still rather rare, especially as pertains to those students in elementary and secondary schools.

The key objective of the present study is to examine the interaction between English second language (ESL) and French second language (FSL) sixth graders in Quebec and Ontario communicating in a Tandem chat project. The chat sessions took place over four months and involved the completion of 16 tasks (8 in English and 8 in French). Tandem learning is defined as the communication between a novice learner and an expert of different first languages helping each other learn the language of the other.

More specifically, the present study aimed to find out if participants provided each other with different types of corrective feedback and whether this feedback led to repair. The transcripts of tandem partners communicating using chat were examined to find evidence of corrective (negative) feedback and whether the latter led to uptake.

In the chapters which follow, Chapter I will provide a statement of the problem particularly as pertains to computer-mediated communication and its relevance for second language learning. In this chapter the context for the study will be discussed and the research questions identified. Chapter II will focus on the theoretical framework which will be used to situate the research, namely the interactionist perspective on second language acquisition. In Chapter III, the studies of most relevance to the present research project will be reviewed. In Chapter IV the methodology used to carry out the study will be delineated. Following this in Chapters V and VI, the results of the research project are presented and discussed. To conclude, Chapter VII provides an overview of the research project as well as suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER II
PROBLEM STATEMENT

2.0 Introduction

This research project focuses on the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) in second or foreign language learning. Its main objective is to examine the interaction between English second language (ESL) and French second language (FSL) sixth graders communicating in a Tandem chat project. Tandem learning is defined as the communication between a novice learner and an expert of different first languages helping each other learn the language of the other. In this chapter, the following sections will be presented: computer-mediated communication (2.1), Tandem learning (2.2), the Quebec ESL Curriculum and the role of ICT (2.3), the research questions (2.4) and the conclusion (2.5).

2.1 Computer-mediated communication

Computers have long been tools helping learners develop competency in language learning. In more recent years, however, computers have increasingly been used as communication tools largely due to the access of the internet in schools. To reflect this transformation, the traditional designation as computer assisted language learning (CALL) has given way to other terms in particular networked-based learning (Kern & Warschauer, 2000), telecollaboration (Belz, 2002), and computer-mediated communication (CMC).

As noted by Pellettieri (2000): “Recent technological advancements in network-based communication (NBC) hold special promise for second and foreign language teachers and learners, as they provide for connectivity between a wider range of speakers than previously believed possible” (p.59). In this regard, a number of researchers have stressed how CMC can enhance the social aspects of language learning (Belz, 2002; Kern & Warschauer, 2000; Salaberry, 1996; Warschauer, 1999). Within the second language acquisition (SLA) literature, CMC has been divided into two categories: asynchronous (delayed) computer-mediated communication (ACMC) and synchronous (real time) computer-mediated communication (SCMC). ACMC is delayed communication (e.g.,
email) that takes place when participants communicate according to their availability with messages stored in virtual mailboxes which can be accessed whenever they want. In SCMC, participants communicate in real time with each other through various networks (chat, forums, Skype, etc.). Chat is the form of SCMC to be used in the present study.

Research studies on SCMC involving chat are increasingly numerous (e.g., Morris, 2005; Pelletieri, 2000; Smith, 2005; Shekary & Tahririan, 2006) and some present the benefits of such an environment for second language acquisition (to be elaborated on in the review of the literature chapter). From a linguistic point of view, chat has been described as having features which are reflective of both written and oral language. Like oral language, chat takes place in real time. As such, it encourages students to use language more spontaneously and can thus play a role in developing fluency (Payne & Whitney, 2002). A study by Abrams (2003) demonstrated that chat exchanges could be more effective than in-class group work in terms of developing students’ oral fluency. However, in contrast to the fleeting nature of speech, chat exchanges can also involve pauses where the learner can reread what has been written or take a longer time to formulate his/her message. As noted by Sauro and Smith (2010), “the chat window provides interlocutors with a more enduring and reviewable visual record of the exchange” (p. 556). In view of these functionalities, chat is viewed as having potential for language learning insofar as it enables students to notice new features as well as gaps in their own interlanguage (Beauvois, 1992; Kelm, 1992; Pelletieri, 2000; Salaberry, 2000; Sauro & Smith, 2005; Shekary & Tahririan; Smith, 2004). In Warshauer’s (1997) words, chat has “unleashed the interactive power of text-based communication” (p. 6). In addition, chat has been observed to motivate students to take risks with expressing themselves that might not be the case in face-to-face classroom contexts (Meunier, 1998) as well as provide for more equal participation and a reduction of anxiety (Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995).

It is of note that few studies have dealt with the analysis of the interaction of participants working in a tandem chat approach (Bower & Kawaguchi, 2011; Kötter, 2003; Chung, Graves, Wesche & Barfurth, 2005) and none has focused on the analysis of
interaction amongst children in an elementary school context who communicate as tandem partners using chat.

2.2 Tandem Learning

Tandem learning is defined by Little and Brammerts (1996) as an autonomous form of learning in which two learners of different L1s collaborate with each other to learn the partner’s first language. The collaboration of expert and novice partners ensures pairs of learners of the input of native-speakers of the second language being targeted. The two basic principles of tandem learning must be respected in order for the exchanges to be truly qualified as tandem. These principles are identified in the literature as the principles of reciprocity and autonomy. Reciprocity calls for the shared dependence and mutual support of partners in their learning journey. They need equal collaboration to reach their learning goals (i.e., half the exchange should be in one of the targeted languages, half in the other). Another defining particularity of tandem learning is that the partners give each other feedback on what they write in their L2. Their roles thus alternate between that of learner and that of expert tutor (insofar as they are drawing on their implicit knowledge of their L1). In order to help students give feedback, it is recommended that teachers discuss this issue with students and give them strategies as to how they can proceed. Autonomy deals with the responsibility of the individual learners for developing their learning processes.

Tandem learning was initially used in face-to-face exchanges starting in the 1960s. Tandem collaboration via computers was first established by Jürgen Wolff (Eck, Legenhausen & Wolff, 1994) to promote individual Spanish-German partnerships with students located in Spain and Germany. The use of computers for such exchanges expanded into what has since become the International Tandem Network (eTandem, 2001).

Tandem learning can also be seen as a tool to foster L2 acquisition. Appel and Gilabert (2002) cite various studies that suggest that tandem learning favours motivation which in turns promotes “language awareness and learner autonomy” (p. 17). In a study by Ushioda (2000, p. 125) which involved an English-German exchange by university
students, students’ identified the following features as contributing to the appeal of this activity:

- interest and enjoyment of personal interaction with a native speaker
- access to informal everyday German
- focus on own needs and interests
- the mutual partnership factor
- speed and convenience of email communication

The particular interest of this research project resides in the fact that chat exchanges using the Tandem learning approach are being focused on. Tandem learning used in combination with chat is an evolution of the way the Tandem approach was initially used and follows upon technological developments in CMC.

2.3 Quebec ESL Curriculum and the role of ICT

ICT use is a key component of the Reform proposed by the Québec Ministry of Education’s *Programme de formation de l’école québécoise* (2006). Such use is presented as an integral part of the teaching processes for all subject areas, including ESL. In recent years, Quebec schools have been provided with a greater number of computers to facilitate the integration of their use as part of the teaching tools. A better access to computer programmes by means of financial input by the Ministry of Education has helped in providing teachers with appropriate tools to facilitate ICT use as part of their teaching methods.

It is also of note that students at an early age have now developed various abilities in using this medium and for the most part have become computer savvy. This development opens the door to extending the various uses of ITC by teachers and students who better master this learning tool.

2.4 Research questions

The present research project deals with Tandem learning in a SCMC (chat) context. Since most studies on SCMC and Tandem learning have involved adults (Kötter, 2003) or
teenagers (Chung et al., 2005), this study is of particular relevance due to the fact that the participants will be 6th graders. It is also of interest due to the fact that in general very few studies have focused on Tandem learning in a chat environment.

The research questions emanating from the problem statement introduced above are stated as follows:

1. Do L2 learners participating in a tandem chat exchange provide each other with corrective (negative) feedback?
   a. during the English part of the exchange
   b. during the French part of the exchange
2. What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback?
   a. during the English part of the exchange
   b. during the French part of the exchange
3. Does corrective feedback lead to uptake?
   a. during the English part of the exchange
   b. during the French part of the exchange
4. In the case of uptake, what types of corrective feedback lead to uptake?
   a. during the English part of the exchange
   b. during the French part of the exchange
5. How do the ESL students and the FSL students view the Tandem chat exchange as a strategy for learning their L2?

2.5 Conclusion

This chapter has focused on how the present tandem chat research project is relevant with regard to CMC research and the Tandem approach in particular. The particularity of the Tandem learning approach was discussed and the research questions pertaining to this study presented.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 Introduction

The main goal of this study is to examine the transcripts of tandem partners communicating using chat to find evidence of corrective (negative) feedback and whether the latter leads to uptake. The objective of this chapter is to introduce and explain the theoretical framework which will be used to situate the research, namely the interactionist perspective on second language acquisition (Long, 1985; Varonis and Gass, 1985).

3.1 The interactionist perspective

According to Lightbown and Spada (2006), in the 1970s and 1980s cognitive and developmental psychologists turned away from Chomsky’s innatist theory which put the emphasis on the “final state” of language acquisition, i.e., the competency of adult native speakers, and began placing the focus on the developmental aspects of language acquisition. With this came the realization that what children need “to know is essentially available in the language they are exposed to as they hear it used in thousands of hours of interactions with the people and objects around them” (p.19). Within this developmental perspective, emphasis was placed on the way in which the adjustments made during interaction facilitated acquisition: “One-to-one interaction gives the child access to language that is adjusted to his or her level of comprehension” (p. 23).

With respect to second language (L2) acquisition, the importance of exposure to language was initially articulated through Krashen’s (1985) highly influential comprehensible input hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, comprehensible input was viewed as the only necessary condition to ensure language acquisition; if L2 learners were exposed to comprehensible input slightly beyond their current L2 knowledge, they would acquire the target language naturally just like children learning their first language (L1). As in L1 child acquisition, certain researchers (in particular Long, 1985; Varonis & Gass, 1985) began to examine how interactional modifications during oral exchanges could serve to make input more comprehensible, thus creating a potential for language acquisition.
Research revealed that interactional modifications could occur in NS-NNS exchanges as well as NNS-NNS. In his original seminal research, Long (1996 as cited in Foster & Ohta, 2005) identified three ways in which input could be modified during interaction: comprehension checks (e.g., the NS checks the NNS’s comprehension via a question such as Do you understand?), confirmation checks (e.g., the NS checks whether he/she has properly understood the NNS via a yes-no question), and clarification requests (e.g., questions by the NS which require the NNS to furnish new information or recode the utterance). Although these devices have been frequently observed in research conducted within an interactionist framework, a number of others have been signalled (e.g., Gass, 2002), especially as pertains to interaction conducted in a sociocultural framework (Foster & Ohta, 2005).

3.1.1 Negotiation of meaning

Drawing on Varonis and Gass, Pelletieri (2000) in the context of a study involving chat defined negotiation routines (or episodes) as “those exchanges that ‘push down’ the participants from the main line of discourse and in which there is some overt indication of the need for negotiation (e.g., echo questions, clarification requests, explicit statements of misunderstanding, inappropriate responses)” (p. 67). According to Varonis and Gass’ (1985) model, these exchanges are comprised of triggers which initiate the episode as they contain a problem source (lexical/semantic, morphosyntactic, or content-related) followed by signals which draw attention to the problem. Responses come after the signal and can be followed or not by a reaction to the response.

3.1.2 Corrective feedback

Within a cognitivist perspective on language acquisition, it has been debated whether the provision of input – positive evidence - is sufficient to ensure acquisition. As shown notably in research by Swain (1985), students in a French immersion program who had been immersed in content-based courses with a focus primarily on the message were not on a par with native Francophone children, especially as pertained to certain aspects of grammar and syntax. As a result of this and other studies, many researchers and educators see an important role for negative feedback (or corrective feedback) which draws the
learner’s attention to linguistic form in the context of meaning-focused activities (Long, 1991). Negotiation routines which draw attention to form in this manner (as opposed to content) have been termed focus-on-form episodes (FFE, Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). As pointed out by Smith (2005), this concept has also been referred to as language-related episodes (Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Williams, 1999).

More generally, the importance of negative feedback has been linked to the notion of noticing (Schmidt, 1990) and the role it can play in making learners aware of gaps in their language output (Swain, 1985). In terms of negotiation for meaning, Long (1996) summed up the relationship in the following terms:

It is proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner’s developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during negotiation for meaning. Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts. (p. 414; italics in original; cited in Gass, 2002).

As explained by Gass (2002), corrective feedback can be explicit (e.g., an overt correction) or implicit. Implicit feedback can refer to the input modifications associated with negotiation routines or to recasts (reformulation of an ill-formed utterance but without any explicit signal to this effect). Within the interactionist approach, attempting to elucidate which type of feedback may be more effective in terms of learning is of major interest in both face-to-face studies (Gass, 2002) and those involving chat modes (Bower & Kawaguchi & Kawaguchi, 2011; Morris, 2005; Pellettieri, 2000; Smith, 2005).

As discussed by Ellis (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001), FFEs are of two types: reactive and preemptive. A reactive focus on form involves negotiation of meaning in which the “interlocutors adjust their speech phonologically, lexically, and morphosyntactically to resolve difficulties in mutual understanding that impede the course
of their communication (Pica, 1992, p. 200, cited in Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001, p. 414). By contrast, a preemptive focus on form is performance-oriented: “Whereas reactive focus on form involves negotiation and is triggered by something problematic that an interactant has said or written, preemptive focus on form involves the teacher or learner initiating attention to form even though no actual problem in production has arisen.” (Ellis et al., p. 414). A typical example would involve the query of an L2 learner who wishes to say something but doesn’t have the vocabulary.

### 3.1.3 Uptake

With respect to language acquisition, although the role of input has been duly acknowledged, Swain’s (1985) work brought attention to the need for comprehensible output. Within interactionist studies, an area of interest thus pertains to whether or not negotiation leads to modified output on the part of the learner, i.e., uptake. Uptake refers to both the repairs made by learners during reactive focus on form episodes (Lyster & Ranta, 1997) as well as the incorporation of a correction made during a preemptive focus on form episode (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). Corrective feedback can be categorized as successful (the correct form is reused) or unsuccessful (the provision of feedback is acknowledged but it is not reused by the learner) (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). The presence of uptake is considered as additional evidence that the learner has noticed the gap between his/her erroneous utterance and the correct form. However, it does not mean that the item has necessarily been acquired. Conversely, the lack of uptake does not necessarily mean that the correct form has not been noticed (Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen, 2001). This latter observation can be of particular importance in chat exchanges where learners can scroll back to previous utterances. The uptake may be immediate (following the signalling of the problem) or delayed (occurring later on in the exchange after a number of turns have taken place).

### 3.2 Conclusion

This chapter reviewed notions and the definitions of key terms pertaining to the interactionist perspective on language acquisition. Although this framework was initially used for face-to-face exchanges, it is also increasingly used to investigate how learning
takes place in online environments including chat exchanges (Bower & Kawaguchi & Kawaguchi, 2011; Morris, 2005; Pelletierri, 2000; Shekary & Tahririan, 2006). In the next chapter, a review of the literature of most relevance to this study will be discussed.
CHAPTER IV
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

4.0 Introduction
This chapter first reviews research using synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC) as a means of L2 learning, then that pertaining to Tandem Learning.

4.1 Second language learning and SCMC: Chat
As the focus of the proposed research is on exploring how chat can serve as a tool for learning a second language, the review of the literature will be limited to those studies, which specifically deal with chat.

One of the first studies to explore L2 learning in a chat environment is that conducted by Pellettieri (2000) in which the author worked with 20 undergraduate students of Spanish enrolled in a California university. Participants worked in dyads to complete five communicative tasks: open conversations on a given topic and Jigsaw tasks. Pellettieri’s research included non-native speakers of the L2 in each dyad (NNS-NNS). The study lasted one complete semester. Her results showed that CMC did indeed provide instances of negotiation of meaning that resembled those found in oral exchanges. As in face-to-face studies, the results revealed that communicative problems triggered negotiation. The author found that morphosyntax provided fewer instances of negotiation as they carried a lesser communicative load. Lexical problems accounted for the highest percentages of triggers. Responses to triggers included clarification requests, confirmation checks, echo questions, explicit statements of non-understanding, and inappropriate responses.

Pellettieri showed that corrective feedback was primarily aimed at lexical items. Pellettieri’s results also revealed that uptake was present in 70% of instances involving explicit corrective feedback and 75% of those involving implicit feedback. According to Pellettieri, these high percentages show that learners were using the corrections offered to
them. Pellettieri concludes by saying that SCMC can play an important role in developing students’ grammatical competency. She explains: “I believe, contrary to what has been suggested in the recent literature, that chatting can play a significant role in the development of grammatical competency among classroom language learners” (p.83). Pellettieri’s research sheds light on incorporation (uptake) as being an important part of most episodes of negotiation.

In another study, Smith (2005) explored the relationship between negotiated interaction and learner uptake. In this study, learners were adults enrolled in an Intensive English program at a North American university. Twenty-four intermediate level students worked in dyads to complete jigsaw and decision-making tasks which targeted specific lexical items. Smith’s study lasted six weeks.

For his analysis, Smith used 3 categories of uptake (adapted from Ellis et al., 2001): no uptake, recognition (unsuccessful uptake), and application (successful uptake). Recognition refers to the acknowledgement on the part of the learner of information given by the interlocutor. Application is the actual productive use of the target item. His results revealed that successful uptake was infrequent in this SCMC chat context regardless of the complexity of negotiated routines. The statistical analysis of the data further showed that the relationship between negotiation routine complexity and learner uptake was not significant. In fact, immediate uptake only appeared in 7 moves. Smith explained this by the fact that learners felt pressured to respond quickly to their partners messages during chat exchanges. Smith’s findings contrast with previous face-to-face studies such as the one by Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001) which revealed that complex FFEs occurred infrequently “but were more likely to elicit successful uptake than simple FFEs” (p.50).

In addition, Smith analysed the relationship between learner uptake and subsequent acquisition. This involved using post-tests to measure the acquisition of the lexical items targeted in the task the learners were involved in. His analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in post-test scores across the three categories of uptake. Of particular
interest in this study are the explanations that Smith found to shed light on his results. First, drawing on the notion of involvement load (Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), he stated that the benefits for lexical acquisition could come from other elements of interaction rather than uptake per se. Involvement load, pertains to an interplay between three components: need, search, and evaluation. The higher the involvement load, the better the items will be processed and ultimately retained. In Smith’s study, the unit of analysis was the learner-induced negotiation routines which, according to him, could have created a context requiring high need, search, and possible evaluation (i.e., high involvement loads) for all routines, whether they led to uptake or not. Furthermore, as noted by Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001), learners attend to form more closely when they are dealing with problems that they have personally identified and this increases the depth of processing through the use of pushed output. Smith also pointed out that the availability of permanent chat records in the CMC environment may also have offset the benefits of complex negotiation routines and uptake as demonstrated in certain face-to-face studies. In the CMC environment, all participants in his study could have checked lexical items simply by scrolling back in the chat transcript without the need to engage in additional negotiation. Smith suggested that the chats logs, as the medium for the interaction, were key to explaining the low occurrence of immediate successful uptake found in his data.

In Morris’ (2005) study exploring corrective feedback, the researcher focused on interactions between 46 Grade 5 students learning Spanish in an immersion program in the United States in a CMC chat environment. Students were paired up with classmates and had to complete one jigsaw task in a 25-minute session. Morris analysed the interactions in the chat logs by coding them for the types of learner errors, learner corrective feedback, and learner repairs. The errors coded were syntactic errors, lexical errors, and unsolicited use of the L1. Morris analyzed 135 errors. He found that 64% of those errors were syntactic, 33% were lexical, and only 3% were uses of the L1.

To analyze the corrective feedback, 3 categories were identified: explicit correction, recasts, and negotiation of form. Explicit correction was defined as that which “directly and clearly indicates that what the learner has said is incorrect” (p. 34). Recasts referred to the
“immediate implicit reformulation of an ill-formed utterance” (p. 34). Negotiation was defined as signals given during interaction that facilitated repair. In contrast to recasts, negotiations do not involve giving the correct form of the utterance. Of note, too, in this study is the fact that Morris uses the term repair for what other authors refer to as uptake. In this regard, Morris’ analysis indicated that 56% of learners’ errors received corrective feedback. The types of corrective feedback used by the participants in the study were distributed as follows: negotiation of form 95% and recasts 5%. There were no explicit corrections. The study thus shows that child-to-child interactions during chat exchanges provide evidence of the prevalence of implicit negative feedback similar to patterns found in face-to-face interactions. Finally, Morris’ results indicated that 68% of errors were repaired. As the researcher points out, this rate of repair is considered to be high. To explain this finding, he attributes it to the fact that children are risk takers and comfortable with correcting their peers’ errors.

Another study, which explored the effect of corrective feedback on SLA during chat exchanges, was that by Loewen and Erlam (2006). In this study, thirty-one elementary level learners of English had to complete two communicative tasks during which they received corrective feedback. The feedback focused on the use of the regular past tense which was a required component of the tasks used. Of these students, one group received implicit feedback in the form of recasts (implicit feedback) and a second group explicit feedback involving metalinguistic comments; a third group which did not do the tasks functioned as the control group for both tasks. It is of note in this study that the feedback was provided solely by the researchers who monitored the students’ messages and intervened as much as possible whenever there were errors with the targeted structure. To further determine if the corrective feedback given during the chat sessions led to acquisition, Loewen and Erlam administered pre- and post- timed and untimed grammaticality judgment tests. The study is also of note as it attempted to partially duplicate a similar study which had been done with students in a face-to-face classroom context.

Results of the study did not show improvement in students’ performance as measured by the grammaticality judgment tests for experimental or control groups in either
the timed or untimed conditions. These results thus ran counter to the earlier face-to-face study which had demonstrated that students who had received the metalinguistic treatment outperformed both the group that had received implicit feedback and the control group.

Loewen and Erlam explained their results for the lack of difference in the effectiveness of corrective feedback on learning first by the fact that the elementary learners involved in the study had probably not achieved the level of development of L2 competency that would have enabled them to take advantage of the feedback to perfect their use of the regular past verb forms; in the face-to-face study, the students were at a low intermediate level of proficiency. Another explanation put forth by Loewen and Erlam was that feedback in the chat sessions did not always immediately follow the ill-formed utterance. According to the authors, because of the delay in the provision of corrective feedback, learners might not have seen these items as instances of feedback and just ignored them. A third reason explaining why there was no gain in learning following corrective feedback related to the problems encountered by the researcher to keep students on task during the SCMC exchange. Examination of the chat transcripts showed that the participants frequently wandered off the task at hand and might have ignored or not seen the corrective feedback if they were busy talking about something else other than the task. This study is of particular note as it draws attention to how differences between classroom and online contexts may influence learning outcomes.

Shekary and Tahririan (2006) also explored corrective feedback and episodes of negotiation of meaning. They worked with university level Persian EFL students grouped in NNS-NNS dyads. The participants had to complete various tasks: dictogloss, jigsaw, and free discussion tasks. This study lasted one month.

In order to carry out the analysis of how meaning was negotiated, Shekary and Tahririan adapted Loewen’s (2005) fine-grained analysis of language related episodes (LREs). As originally proposed by Swain and Lapkin (1998), they defined LREs as collaborative mini-dialogues in which participants talk about language or ask questions
about it. In their terms, an LRE starts with the identification of a language problem and ends with its resolution. With respect to Loewen’s analysis, one of the characteristics, which it served to identify, was students’ response to feedback in terms of uptake, which is known as the learner’s observable immediate response to the corrective feedback he or she has received.

Results of the study showed, first of all, that there were episodes of LREs in SCMC and they allowed participants to notice the gaps in their interlanguage. Based on a preliminary analysis of the rate of LREs per minute, it would appear that considerably fewer were produced than in other studies involving face-to-face oral interaction (Lyster, 1998; Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001). However, when an analysis was done which controlled for the number of words, the results were more favourable. Indeed, in this instance, the results of this study revealed that the ratio of LREs to amount of talk exceeded that found in the only other study reporting on the ratio of LREs. Amongst the dyads investigated, Shekary and Tahririan situated their ratio between 56.78 to 136.98 LREs per 10,000 words compared to 1.46 to 2.50 in the Williams study. Shekary and Tahririan explained the ratio of LREs in their study by saying that “The text-based medium allows different opportunities for noticing the gap” (p.567). In other words, LREs are produced and offer opportunities for noticing the gap in the interlanguage of the subjects.

Using individualized post-tests geared to what had been negotiated in the LREs, the results of their study also showed that incidental noticing was linked to subsequent L2 learning. In fact, participants in this study were able to remember linguistic items in 70% of cases in immediate individualized post-tests and in 57% of cases in delayed individualized post-tests. As in the case of Loewen’s (2005) study, the strongest predictor was successful uptake. Unlike previous studies involving SCMC, Shekary and Tahririan’s results thus suggest an important causal link between negotiation of meaning and L2 acquisition.
4.2 Second language learning and SCMC: Tandem

Tandem learning is defined by Little and Brammerts (1994) as an autonomous form of learning in which two learners of different L1s learn the first language of the other. In this section, three studies using the tandem approach to learning are reviewed: Köttter (2003); Chung, Graves, Wesche, and Barfurth (2005); and Bower and Kawaguchi (2011).

Kötter’s (2003) study, which involved a Tandem chat exchange, explored how learners dealt with utterances that they did not understand as well as how the participants exploited the fact that they were working as tandem partners. The study involved 29 students learning English and German as an L2. Fourteen participants came from the University of Münster in Germany and 15 from Vassar College in the US. The study took place from October to December 1998. The participants interacted via a MOO (Multi-object oriented text-based online virtual reality system) twice a week for periods of 75 minutes each time. The participants completed the projects of their choice. Kötter collected data from two distinct sources: questionnaires (self-reports) given at the end of the study and an analysis of the chscript.

The responses in Köttter’s questionnaire revealed that the participants used various strategies to overcome non-understanding of their partner. On the one hand, American participants revealed in their questionnaires that they preferred translations of difficult words or sentences. Three-quarters of them (75%) also tried to guess the meaning of utterances that appeared difficult to them. German students, on the other hand, preferred paraphrase. Köttter explained these differences in strategy preference by the fact that German students were more proficient in their L2 than their American peers and it was therefore easier for them to understand their partners without using translations. According to the author, there also seemed to be a sociocultural aspect to these results related to the fact that in their German classes the American participants were instructed to guess as much as possible at their partner’s output, which can probably explain the more widespread use of this strategy by the American learners.
When participants found it hard to express themselves in the L2, a vast majority of American participants (92%) reported in the questionnaires that they borrowed single words from their L1 (i.e., used code switching) and 42% of them did so for entire sentences. Most German students (77%) and to a lesser extent the less proficient American (42%) participants also used paraphrase to express themselves in their L2 when they found it difficult. Finally, it was found that half of the American learners and more than one third of German participants asked their partners to translate items during the exchanges. Kötter claims that this was a clear sign of the use of metalinguistic knowledge on the part of the partners from both institutions. Participants were willing to model the use of particular items in their L1 and provide input in their L2 (use of paraphrase). Finally, questionnaires revealed that many partners simplified their output to ensure understanding by the chat partners.

In analysing the chatscripts, Kötter found, however, that there were discrepancies between what the participants reported in their self-reports (questionnaires) and what the chatscripts actually revealed. Although in the questionnaires participants had reported a fairly substantial use of translation, analysis of the chat transcripts revealed that they “drew less often than expected on their partner’s lexical expertise” (p.155). In fact, recourse to translations appeared only once or twice per chat session. Also of note is the fact that 70% of translation requests were made by the less proficient American students. This last aspect was in line with the responses given in the questionnaires by these students.

Despite the limited use of translation, learners on both sides of the Atlantic nevertheless showed a great deal of cooperation as requests for help were answered quickly. Kötter’s analysis also showed that one third of all appeals for lexical assistance “led to the provision of additional background information about the usage of the word, or sparked a discussion about the term” (p.155). In other words, as explained by Kötter, a metalinguistic discussion ensued and this helped deepen the participants’ metalinguistic knowledge and language awareness.
According to Kötter, such instances of metalinguistic discussion provided evidence that Tandem worked in a chat context because learners in his study showed enthusiasm at answering their partners’ requests for lexical assistance. Kötter also maintained that tandem partners with different proficiency levels could still communicate effectively in this virtual online environment. Finally, the author suggested that learners did not ask for lexical assistance more often than they actually needed to because they felt that they could be understood by their partners even if their output was not perfect. The desire to maintain the conversation was an important factor and this was seen by Kötter as a positive aspect of tandem exchanges.

Kötter also analysed the chatscripts of the participants in his research to identify the forms and frequencies of negotiation of meaning. While working in tandem, learners helped their partners by providing feedback. Compared to previous face-to-face studies (Long & Porter, 1985; Pica & Doughty, 1985), participants in Kötter’s study made more frequent use of clarification requests. Kötter explained this preference by the fact that learners in a chat environment had no problem asking their partners to “modify their output” (p.158). Kötter also suggested that the use of clarification requests confirms the assumption that in this environment “students usually preferred their partners to rephrase or amend their utterances” (p.158).

Kötter noted that the participants in his research produced similar amounts of indications of agreement/understanding and clarification requests regardless of their level of competency. His findings were interpreted as supporting the hypothesis that online participants engage in more correction than those in face-to-face exchanges as shown by Sullivan (1998). After analyzing his results, Kötter interpreted the participants’ learning behaviour in his study by stating that tandem in a chat environment also supported Pellettieri’s findings who discovered that only 7% of all negotiation routines were left without any sign that learners understood their partners. Participants in Kötter’s study clearly indicated that they agreed with their partners in one third of instances (33.2%). Kötter tallied the indications of understanding and agreement plus the emoticons used by
the partners and found that 16.6% of turns contained positive feedback. Learners did not hesitate to “indicate that they agreed with their partners” (p.159).

Kötter also analysed the chatscripts for evidence of code switching. The author cited the study of Anton and DiCamilla (1998) who found that the use of the L1 can have a strategic cognitive role in scaffolding. Kötter’s research is unique in that it attempted to zero in on how tandem partners used two languages to scaffold their tasks. Although within tandem exchanges, in line with the principle of reciprocity, partners are supposed to do 50% of the exchange in one language and 50% in the other, it is important to note that participants in Kött’s research were allowed to decide for themselves exactly how this might be done. As Kötter points out this freedom of choice can be problematic if neither language “is used long enough to allow learners to derive sufficient grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic information about their L2 to improve their interlanguages from their partners’ contributions” (p.160). Such a format may also deprive learners of the opportunity to use “pushed output” and they might resort to using their L1 instead of their L2. As it turned out, in Kötter’s study, three partnerships alternated between German and English from session to session. Three others decided to switch languages halfway through a chat session. However, the remaining partnerships could not find a uniform format to use in their chat exchanges. In some instances, Kötter observed that the lack of clarity in terms of the language to be used meant that at times stronger students (e.g., Germans using English) tended to dominate the exchange and the weaker American students had difficulty trying to keep the exchange in German. Such difficulties were thus problematic both in terms of the principle of reciprocity and mutual support in the language learning process. Finally, Kötter asserted that his data did not allow him to draw any firm conclusions with respect to negotiation of meaning and actual language acquisition.

Another study which deals with tandem learning in a chat environment is that of Chung et al. (2005). In this study, Chung, who was also the teacher of the course, worked with 26 Canadian teenagers of Korean origin who were seeking to improve their English or Korean and who chatted using both languages. The study took place in 24 Saturday classes lasting 3.5 hours each in the 2002/2003 school year. The participants worked on 6 different
topics related to the Korean and Canadian cultures, including Korean Moon festival, Canadian Thanksgiving, and teen culture in Korea and Canada. Using a multi-level data collection strategy (transcripts, online interviews, pre- and post-course questionnaires, L2 vocabulary evaluations, and student-generated emails), Chung et al. explored how synchronous online interaction could contribute to L2 learning and the understanding of cultural practices of the teenage participants.

The results of this study show that the participants used different ways of influencing their L2 learning during the chat exchanges. During the course, both the Korean and English-speaking students were observed to appropriate the words of their more expert interlocutors. As one important instance of this, the English-speaking learners in this study progressively made use of Korean honorific discourse throughout the year. In line with this convention, the English-speaking learners began using the honorific forms of address to show respect to older students. In order to scaffold their partners, the learners resorted to a variety of strategies including the use of guiding questions, step-by-step explanations, reformulation of words, and translations. Also of interest in this study is the fact that pre- and post-vocabulary tests were used to statistically show that students engaged in the tandem exchanges increased their vocabulary knowledge in the targeted thematic units.

For their part, Bower and Kawaguchi (2011) worked with eTandem pairs of Japanese and Australian university students to compare the role of corrective feedback provided during the synchronous chat exchanges and during follow-up asynchronous emails. Eleven pairs completed all three chat sessions. Participants were asked to discuss and give information about themselves, university life, and their respective cultures. Tasks were open-ended. Pairs chatted over a period of six weeks. The analysis of the feedback was based on 66 chatlogs equally divided up between English and Japanese as well as 38 email transcripts.

Results showed that negotiation of meaning was present in the data but less so than in studies with more structured tasks. During the chat exchanges, corrective feedback was
provided at low rates with only 0.8% of all errors being focused on in the English part of the sessions and 4.1% in the Japanese parts. To explain the results, Bower and Kawaguchi evoked various factors including the type of tasks, the age of the participants, their educational backgrounds, and the social relationship between participants. Compared to previous studies involving tandem learning, Bower and Kawaguchi considered that the students’ perception of their role as tutors was less apparent. In this regard, Bower and Kawaguchi recommended that more specific encouragement to the participants to give corrective feedback could have possibly brought up the levels of correction. Citing Zourou (2009), Bower and Kawaguchi also evoked the question of symmetrical power relationships as a reason for the low levels of corrective feedback. As they explained, the expectation of equal power in tandem exchanges as reflected by the need to devote equal time to both L2s can provide less opportunity for corrective feedback compared to experiments involving asymmetrical power relationships.

With respect to provision of corrective feedback, the results showed that much more feedback was provided in the follow-up emails than during the actual chat exchanges. However, in this regard, the Japanese tended to provide substantially more metalinguistic explanations and reformulations of ungrammatical items or forms than the Australians. Bower and Kawaguchi explained these results by the high exposure of Japanese participants to the L2 from junior high language classes through high school as well as the importance accorded to grammar instruction in both the L2 and the L1. By contrast, for the Australian participants foreign language classes were not a “curricular priority” (p. 62). In addition, Bower and Kawaguchi also explained the striking difference in the provision of corrective feedback during the follow-up emails by the fact that participants could spend more time reflecting on errors in the written corpus. This “extra” time gave subjects the opportunity to focus on a variety of error types.

4.3 Conclusion

The first part of this chapter reviewed work on second language learning and SCMC, specifically chat. Studies by Pellettieri (2000), Smith (2005), Morris (2005), Loewen and Erlam (2006) and Shekary and Tahririan (2006) were presented. The second
part of the chapter dealt with SLA and tandem learning. A brief definition was given followed by the review of the studies by Kötter (2003), Chung et al. (2005), and Bower and Kawaguchi (2011).

After reviewing the SLA literature involving chat, it was found that only one study, that of Morris (2005), involved elementary school learners. As in the present study, the children involved were in the sixth grade. However, unlike the present study, the children in Morris’ study were American speakers of English who were learning Spanish; they were only involved in carrying out one task, and this task was done with students in the same class, not as a tandem exchange. As the research questions used in the Morris study dealt with corrective feedback, it was further considered of interest to examine whether results in the present study would be similar, especially as concerned the type of feedback given. With respect to studies involving tandem learning chat, only three were found and neither dealt with young learners. The next chapter presents the methodology used in this research project.
CHAPTER V
METHODOLOGY

5.0 Introduction

This research aims at examining the corrective feedback received by tandem partners engaged in a chat exchange. In this chapter, the following sections are presented: the methodological paradigm of the research (5.1), school and classroom context (5.2), participants (5.3), data collection procedures (5.4), data analysis (5.5), ethical considerations (5.6), and conclusion (5.7).

5.1 Methodological paradigm

This thesis was conducted as a qualitative study. As noted by Patton (1987), qualitative methods allow for the studying of “selected issues, cases, or events in depth and detail” (p. 9). This approach is of particular use in regard to “programs that are developing, innovative, or changing, where the focus is on program improvement, facilitating more effective implementation, and exploring a variety of effects on participants.” (p. 18). A major objective of qualitative research is to understand the targeted phenomenon as it relates to a particular context and to explore the perspectives of those involved. In the present case, the objective was to explore the implementation of an innovative teaching approach – chat tandem exchanges. The study also sought to understand how the students involved in the exchanges viewed this practice. In this study, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected: “Qualitative data can be collected and used in conjunction with quantitative data. The beginning point for using qualitative methods is simply an interest in observing and asking questions in real-world settings” (p. 21). Within a qualitative approach, the researcher can function to varying degrees as a participant or as an observer. In the case of the present study, the researcher who was also the teacher of the ESL students functioned as a full participant (Patton, p. 74). One advantage in terms of the present study was that as an insider, she had a long experience working with ESL students in intensive classes and this helped provide insights into the interpretation of the results (Chapter V). In this study, the researcher will be referred to as the teacher-researcher.
5.2 School and classroom context

The present project was conducted with students from schools in Quebec and Ontario. The Quebec school is located in a small town in the heart of the province. The population in the area is mainly comprised of French-speaking people (97% of the population). At the time of the study, the school had a student population of approximately 145 students and classes ranged from Grade 1 to Grade 6.

The school had been offering an intensive Grade 6 English program (IEP) for the past seventeen years. As a matter of fact, this school was the first to offer such a program in the school board. The IEP started in 1996 and welcomes around 52 students each year. These students are divided into two groups who start the school year at the same time. To accommodate the latter, the school year is divided into two distinct five-month cycles. One of the groups begins the year with the following classes all conducted in French: French, Mathematics, Science and Arts. The other group starts in English. In the IEP program, the students learn English through various activities, including work on vocabulary and grammar. Classes given in French are limited to Physical Education, Music, and Ethics and Religious Culture. The groups are interchanged at the end of January and the second cycle of the program then starts.

The students enrolled in the IEP are selected according to their level of autonomy, interest in learning their second language, study and work habits, capacity to handle a large amount of homework, and grades in English from Grade 5. Students in the program have varied levels of academic competencies.

The Ontario school is located in a small town in Ontario. The surrounding population of the school is predominantly English-speaking. At the time of the study, the student body of the school was comprised of 512 students in elementary and junior high (end of Grade 8). The school had been offering an Intensive French program (IFP) since the fall of 2007 and students enroll on a voluntary basis. No selection is made.
5.3 Participants

The students who participated in the present research project involved two intact Grade 6 groups. The participants from Quebec were attending the school where the teacher-researcher had been teaching the English part of the IEP for more than 17 years. There were 27 students in the Francophone group and the students were on average 11.5 years old. The group was comprised of 13 boys and 13 girls. The teacher from the Ontario school, she was found after emailing different schools offering a French immersion program in that province (and others). The Anglophone group was comprised of 24 students (10 boys and 14 girls) and their average age was 12. Few responses were received but this Grade 6 teacher was highly interested and motivated in having her students chat with French-speaking children their own age. The research project was conducted with the first group of IEP students who started their English program in September. The teacher-researcher, due to her position in the Quebec school, acted as the teacher and a resource person to provide suggestions for tasks and technical support.

5.4 Data Collection

5.4.1 The tasks

All the tasks contained a specific topic and suggestions of what could be discussed but students were also free to come up with ideas for the output they would use to express themselves on a given topic. The tasks were prepared in order to reflect target real-life situations that the students could easily relate to such as Halloween, Christmas, their family or other subjects relevant to their young lives. It was decided to use this approach to tasks in order to provide children with just enough support to help them construct their exchanges and sufficient prior knowledge of the different topics to elicit utterances suitable for the interaction. All the instructions for the tasks were given in the L1 of the students (French for Quebec students and English for Ontario students). All the tasks are presented in Appendix A.
5.4.2 Computer site

One of the challenges of this project was to find an appropriate chat site. A number of chat sites were researched and none of them were satisfactory with regards to the possibilities that they offered. In this regard, they either contained too much publicity, which in compliance with the school regulations had to be avoided or the transcripts of the chat conversations could not be accessed in an easy fashion. Considering these two factors, the Email service offered by Google called Gmail was chosen. This chat site fulfilled both requirements concerning publicity and printing of transcripts. It enabled the students and teachers to print the transcripts of the chat conversations easily and quickly in order for the students in both provinces to be provided with their individual transcripts immediately after the chat exchanges. The students needed these transcripts to answer the questions on their reflection forms (see below).

5.4.3 Instruments

Chat transcripts. Following each chat session, the transcripts were printed out by each participant and placed in a binder. The teacher-researcher then proceeded to collect the chatscripts form the students’ binders for the purpose of this research.

Questionnaires. An initial questionnaire (see Appendix B) was given to all the participants both in Quebec and in Ontario before the research project started. It contained questions pertaining to students’ attitudes towards L2 learning, ability to use the computer and chat, their perception of their competency in the L2, and preferences for their chat partners. The questionnaire was used to pair students according to the answers found in the various sections. At the end of the study, a questionnaire (see Appendix C for English and French versions) was administered to all the participants to gather information about their experience in the Tandem chat project. Specifically, the questions aimed to elicit information about the participants’ personal appreciation of the chat sessions, including the tasks, the use of the computer as a means of learning the L2 and the L1, and the use of reflection forms. A four-item Likert scale was used for the questions. Questions were adapted from Appel and Gilabert (2002). As no previous study had made reference to the reading of transcripts in a Tandem chat exchange, a point in this regard was also added.
5.4.4 Data collection procedures

The schedule and main procedures for carrying out the project are summarized in Figure 1. The project took place between October 2009 and January 2010 for both chat groups. As shown in Figure 1, during week 1, students were informed of the project by their respective teachers and asked to complete the initial questionnaire (see Appendix B). With respect to language proficiency, in addition to having students rate themselves, the teachers also rated the students. During week 1, the French teacher and the students of both classes also signed their consent forms. Parents’ letters of consent were sent home during the same week and returned by the end of it.

Figure 5.1: Procedures and scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>List of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1   | ● First and second information sessions concerning project given by FLS and ESL teachers to their respective students.  
            ● Initial questionnaire completed by students. Based on answers, teams were formed by teachers.  
            ● Consent forms were given to the FSL teacher and the FSL and ESL students: letters went out to parents and were collected. |
| Week 2   | ● Third information session given by FLS and ESL teachers to their respective students.  
            ● First and second trial run sessions with computers using the chat interface (Gmail) in both schools. The FLS and ESL teachers supervised their respective students who were practising with each other. |
| Weeks 3 to 11 | ● Period during which the FLS and ESL chat sessions took place with partners. Two one-hour chat sessions were held each week. |
| Week 12  | ● End-of-project questionnaire administered by FLS and ESL teachers to their respective students. |
Using the information in the questionnaires along with the teachers’ evaluations of their students’ proficiency, the teacher-researcher formed the pairs. When matching students regarding the L2 proficiency level, students of the same overall level or of close levels were paired following this pattern: excellent-excellent; excellent-good; good-good; good-so-so; so-so-so-so; so-so-weak. It was decided not to put two weaker students together so that a minimum level of conversation could take place. Students were also paired according to their level of computer competence again avoiding to put two students with no experience with chat together. Students with little computer experience were seated next to those with more experience during the chat sessions so they could more easily get help if needed. As far as possible, the hobbies and pastimes mentioned by the students were taken into consideration in order to pair them with partners who could exchange about their common or closely related hobbies.

Due to the larger number of Quebec students (n=27), three Ontario students (n= 24) were paired with three Quebec students and thus did the chat sessions twice; these students were not included as part of the analysis. As there were a limited number of computers in the Quebec school, chat sessions were done on two different days in the same week so that the exchanges were always done one-on-one. To respect the Tandem format, the sessions were held for the first thirty minutes in one language and then thirty minutes in the other. The sessions started with English and finished with French to facilitate getting the sessions started. As the French teacher was less familiar with the chat interface, it was decided that the Québec students would invite their Ontario counterparts and initiate the sessions. The chat sessions lasted for a total of nine weeks. Students completed eighteen tasks (two per session with different topics for the ESL and FSL exchanges to ensure students had things to say).

A third information session was held in Week 2 in order to answer any remaining questions students might have had. Also in Week 2, two other meetings with the students were held. These were referred to as trial run meetings since they involved working with computers in order to practise the use of the chat interface. Two trial run sessions were conducted allowing students to access their Email account. During the second trial run
session, students chatted with students in their own class. At the beginning of the second trial run meeting, each student was given a slip of paper with his or her partner’s name, the partner’s Gmail address, and his/her personal password. A Gmail Procedure Booklet (Appendix F) was given to each student to familiarize them with the steps to use to access their Gmail accounts and to explain to them, in terms they could readily understand, how to proceed with printing their transcripts for the researcher.

In order to keep students organized, each student was given a binder referred to as the “Journal”. This binder was used to keep various documents relevant to the project including the Gmail Procedure Booklet, the tasks handed out at the start of each chat session as well as all the reflection sheets given and filled out at the end of each exchange. The reason for handing out the task sheets progressively was to avoid having students write up texts or ideas ahead of time. The exchanges needed to keep their spontaneous quality for the duration of the project. The same thing was true for the reflection sheets. It was also important to ensure that the students answered the questions after the chat sessions, not in advance.

In Week 3, the chat sessions started. The core of the project was conducted from Week 3 through Week 11. The chat sessions lasted for a total of nine weeks. Students completed eighteen tasks (two per session). Participants in both provinces printed out their chatscripts immediately following the end of each chat session. The students then had to fill a reflection form which can be found in Appendix D.

The end-of-project questionnaire was administered to students at the end of all the chat sessions. It was answered individually by the Quebec and Ontario students. The ESL and FSL teachers supervised their respective students.

5.5 Data Analysis

In this section, each research question is introduced accompanied by the method of data collection and analysis pertaining to each (see Table 1 for an overview). All chatscripts
were printed out, transcribed and put in a binder for each of the pairs. Due to the great amount of data generated by all the chat sessions, it was decided to reduce the amount of data for the analysis. Although students were supposed to have participated in nine chat sessions, it was observed upon examination of the data that the data for all pairs were not complete. Some students were absent at various moments of the project; others had encountered technical problems. It was therefore decided that the data analysis would be done with the pairs that had completed 6 chat sessions. The selection of the pairs used for analysis purposes was made to insure that all had the same amount of practice (same number of chat sessions completed).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do L2 learners participating in a Tandem chat exchange provide each other with corrective (negative) feedback</td>
<td>Chatscripts</td>
<td>- number of corrective feedback episodes for English and French exchanges - types of corrective feedback a. explicit b. recasts c. negotiation of meaning - descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. during the English part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. during the French part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback?</td>
<td>Chatscripts</td>
<td>- types of errors a. syntactic b. lexical c. lexico-syntactic d. unsolicited use of L1 e. spelling - descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. during the English part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. during the French part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. during the English part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. during the French part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the case of repair, what types of corrective feedback lead to repair?</td>
<td>Chatscripts</td>
<td>- types of corrective feedback (Question 1) - types of repair (Question 3) - descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. during the English part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. during the French part of the exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do students view the Tandem chat exchange as a strategy for learning their</td>
<td>End-of project questionnaire</td>
<td>- tabulation of results for questions - descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In preparing for the analysis, the first step was to identify episodes pertaining to corrective feedback. These episodes were marked off directly on the chatscripts. The identification of episodes of correction was done using Pellettieri’s (2000) description of negotiation of meaning, which begins with a trigger that initiates the episode followed by signals that indicate a problem. A response comes after the signal and can be followed or not by a reaction. Research questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 all involved analysis of the episodes of corrective feedback moves in the chatscripts. In the discussion that follows, when excerpts from the transcripts are cited, “A” will be used to refer to the Anglophone partner and “F” to the Francophone partner. The spelling and capitalization of the original transcripts were retained. Clarifications and other explanations for the reader will be added in square brackets.

The first research question was the following:
Do L2 learners participating in a Tandem chat exchange provide each other with corrective (negative) feedback?
   a. during the English part of the exchange;
   b. during the French part of the exchange.

Using the definitions of Morris (2005), instances of corrective feedback were analysed in terms of three categories: explicit corrections, recasts and negotiation of form.

Explicit correction is “when a partner directly and clearly indicates that what the learner has said is incorrect” (p. 34). In the present study, typical comments which served to identify explicit correction were as follows: you should say..., do you mean..., you mean..., on dit ..., c’est préférable de dire.... As illustrated in the following excerpt, the Francophone student’s feedback is coded as explicit based on the use of the indicator on dit.
Excerpt 1 (Pair 10, session 3)

A: est ce que tu sais cette film?
F: on dit est ce que tu connais ce film

Recasts are “immediate implicit reformulation of an ill-formed utterance and reformulate all or part of the utterance” (p. 34). In the following excerpt, the Francophone student has a problem with the word order of adjectives in English:

Excerpt 2 (Pair 10, session 2)

F: What is your programme t.v. favourite???
A: my favourite tv programme is much music

As demonstrated, the Anglophone partner corrects the word order problem by reformulating his partner’s utterance but without explicitly indicating that there is a mistake.

According to Morris, negotiation of form “provides learners with signals that facilitate peer or self-repair rather than mere rephrasing of the utterances. Negotiations differ from explicit corrections and recasts in that negotiations do not provide learners with a correct form” (p. 34). In the following excerpt, negotiation of form occurs when the NS Anglophone student asks the NNS Francophone student for clarification using the question word what:

Excerpt 3: (Pair 13, session 4)

F: which persone work on your school
A: what
F: which persone work in your school

This query leads the Francophone partner to modify his utterance by changing on to in. The total number of instances of corrective feedback for English and French was tabulated.

The second research question was stated as follows:
What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback?
a. during the English part of the exchange
b. during the French part of the exchange

Five types of learner errors were identified: syntactic, lexical, lexico-syntactic, unsolicited use of L1 and spelling. Classification of the types of errors was done using Morris’ study (2005) as a point of departure and subsequently adapted to fit the needs of the data. The three types of errors identified by Morris were: syntactic, lexical and unsolicited use of L1. The other two types (lexico-syntactic and spelling) were added by the researcher.

As defined by Morris, syntactic errors refer to “a lack of or use of articles, determiners, prepositions, pronouns, errors with subject/verb agreement, gender, verb morphology, pluralisation, and word order” (p. 34). In the present study, an utterance was coded as having a syntactic error only if one error was involved. In the following excerpt, the Francophone student corrects his Anglophone partner’s mistake with the gender of a possessive adjective:
Excerpt 5: (Pair 2, session 3)

    A: est ce que tu veux dire le nom de ton blonde
    F: ta blonde

Lexical errors are those referring to “inaccurate, imprecise or inappropriate choices of lexical items and non-target derivations of nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives” (p. 34). As for the syntactic category, those coded as lexical were also limited to one specific occurrence within the utterance as in the following example:
Excerpt 6: (Pair 8, session 2)

    A: quel age est il?
    F: on dit (quel age a-t-il) il a treize ans

In this example, the Anglophone partner made an inappropriate choice of the lexical item être when expressing someone’s age in French. The verb avoir would have been the appropriate choice.
It is of note that in Morris’ original study (2005), the examples provided in his article for syntactic and lexical errors were all very clear cut insofar as they were limited to discrete, single occurrences within an utterance. By contrast, the data of the present study provided numerous instances when more complex reformulations of an utterance resulted in corrections involving different types of errors. To this end, the lexioco-syntactic error category was created. Lexico-syntactic errors refer to instances involving two or more corrected items pertaining to syntactic or lexical errors or the use of the L1.

Excerpt 7: (Pair 6, session 2)

A: quell est ta livre preferer
F: c’est préférable de dire quel est TON LIVRE PRÉFÉRÉ
A: oh ok

In this example, the Anglophone student made two errors: 1. ton (the gender of the possessive adjective in reference to livre) and 2. preferer (the form of the adjective). The Francophone student corrected both errors by reformulating the problematic phrase as ton livre préféré.

As defined by Morris, unsolicited L1 use refers to instances when participants use their L1 when the L2 would be more appropriate and/or expected.

Excerpt 8: (Pair 11, session 3)

A: mon ordinateur est junk
F: ah! Ton ordinateur est pas bon

As shown above, the English word junk was used by the Anglophone student whereas the expression pas bon in French (L2) would have been more appropriate.

Spelling errors refer to instances when the learners used a misspelled word.

Excerpt 9: (Pair 11, session 1)

F: referring to snowboard brands qu’est ce c’est un gronic
A: c’est la marc (brand)
F: … ce nais pas marc c’est marque

In this example, the French word marque was misspelled and corrected by the Francophone student. Although Morris did not attend to spelling errors in his study, it was decided to
include them in this study as students frequently focused on them. As shown in the data, although some episodes involved only spelling items, others could involve spelling along with combinations of other types of errors (syntactic, lexical, lexico-syntactic errors or L1). Within a given utterance, spelling errors, whether involving one or more items, were tallied as one instance. Only spelling errors that were actually corrected were tallied. It is also of note that spelling errors within an utterance were tallied separately from other types of errors. In other words, an utterance containing one syntactic error and one spelling error was coded as two instances of corrective feedback: one coded as spelling and one as syntactic.

Instances of each type of error which led to corrective feedback (previously identified in question 1) were tallied and presented as percentages. Following this, the distribution of errors receiving feedback in relation to type of corrective feedback (as percentages) was calculated to answer the second research question.

The third research question was formulated as follows:

Does corrective feedback lead to repair?

  a. during the English part of the exchange
  b. during the French part of the exchange

As defined by Morris (2005), repair refers to “immediate responses to feedback” (p. 35). For the purpose of this research which involved turns in a chat exchange, the response did not have to be immediate. Due to the technical aspect of typing in a chat context, delays in turn-taking could occur. Thus, a response could have come later in the exchange and was counted as such as long as it was clearly connected to the correction provided. In terms of repair, instances of corrective feedback were coded as a repair if the correct targeted form was used by the learner who had had the difficulty. Acknowledgements of repairs (e.g. via an OK) which did not involve reuse of the correct form were tabulated as acknowledgements only.

The fourth research question was the following:
In the case of repair, what types of corrective feedback lead to repair?

a. during the English part of the exchange
b. during the French part of the exchange

Using calculations made for research question #3, the distribution of types of corrective feedback leading to repair were tallied.

The fifth research question was as follows:
How do ESL students and FSL students view the Tandem chat exchange as a strategy for learning their L2?

Responses to the questionnaire were tallied and the results presented as raw scores and percentages in a table.

Although the researcher was involved in all analyses, interrator reliability was insured by having a second researcher evaluate the types of errors, the type of corrective feedback, and whether or not there was repair. For the purpose of this analysis, 30% of the episodes of corrective feedback were used. The researcher involved in this analysis was fluent in English and French and had a doctorate in applied linguistics. Interrator agreement was 95%.

5.6 Ethical Considerations

Teachers, students, and parents were provided with consent letters (see Appendices F-M). All the consent forms and letters were submitted to the Université Laval Ethics Committee and were officially approved.

5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the methodology used to carry out this study was explained. In the next chapter, the results will be presented.
CHAPTER VI
RESULTS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results found in this study. Each research question is introduced separately along with the results pertaining to it. Tables are also presented to show the tabulation of results when necessary.

6.1 Results for research question 1

The first research question of this study is stated as follows: Do L2 learners participating in a Tandem chat exchange provide each other with corrective (negative) feedback?

a. during the English part of the exchange
b. during the French part of the exchange

As shown in Table 5.1, a total of 370 corrective feedback episodes were found among the 13 pairs analysed. It should be noted, however, that corrective feedback varied from one pair to the next. For the pair with the lowest number of instances of corrective feedback, there were 10 whereas for the pair with the highest 44. 42.2% of corrective feedback episodes were found in the English exchanges and 57.8% in the French. A substantive number of corrective feedback episodes were thus identified in both the English and French chat exchanges.
Table 6.1: Distribution of corrective feedback episodes (CFE) for English and French chat exchanges for all pairs (n = 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of CFE</th>
<th>Number of CFE in English part of chat</th>
<th>Number of CFE in French part of chat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Results for research question 2

The second research question of this study is stated as follows: What types of learner errors lead to what types of corrective feedback?

a. during the English part of the exchange
b. during the French part of the exchange

As shown in Table 5.2, almost 62% of instances of corrective feedback pertained to syntactic (32.2%) and lexico-syntactic errors (29.7%). Spelling errors accounted for 24.6% of the corrective feedback. Lexical errors accounted for only 10% of the feedback given. As also shown in Table 3, most of the corrective feedback given by the partners was explicit (62.4%). Recasts were used in 27% of instances of corrective feedback whereas negotiation of form accounted for the fewest number of occurrences (10.5%).
Table 6.2: Distribution of types of corrective feedback per type of learner error for all pairs (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of learner errors</th>
<th>Types of corrective feedback</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Recast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>72 (19.5%)</td>
<td>46 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>23 (6.2%)</td>
<td>3 (less than 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>70 (18.9%)</td>
<td>20 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited use of L1</td>
<td>6 (1.6%)</td>
<td>3 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexico-syntactic</td>
<td>60 (16.2%)</td>
<td>28 (7.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution/type of corrective feedback</td>
<td>231 (62.4%)</td>
<td>100 (27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.3, in the French chat sessions, syntactic errors led to more than twice as many instances of corrective feedback in the French chat exchanges as in the English exchanges (22.4% compared to 9.7%). In other words, the Francophone students were giving considerably more feedback in response to syntactic errors than their Anglophone counterparts did in the English exchanges. More specifically with respect to these corrections, 12.7% involved explicit feedback in the French chat exchanges compared to 6.8% in the English exchanges. In the case of recasts, however, the Francophone students intervened more than three times as frequently during the French exchanges as Anglophone students during the English exchanges (9.5% compared to 3%). With respect to spelling errors which accounted for the second highest number of explicit corrections (18.9%), during the English exchanges corrections by Anglophone students accounted for 10% of the total compared to 8.9% by Francophone students during the French exchanges.
Table 6.3: Distribution of types of corrective feedback for English and French sessions for all the pairs (n=13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types and number of errors</th>
<th>Type of feedback</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>Negotiation of form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic</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></td>
<td>25/370 (6.8%)</td>
<td>47/370 (12.7%)</td>
<td>11/370 (3%)</td>
<td>35/370 (9.5%)</td>
<td>0/370 (0%)</td>
<td>1/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>36/370 (9.7%)</td>
<td>83/370 (22.4%)</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>(&lt; 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical</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></td>
<td>10/370 (0.3%)</td>
<td>13/370 (3.5%)</td>
<td>1/370 (0.3%)</td>
<td>2/370 (0.6%)</td>
<td>4/370 (1.1%)</td>
<td>7/370 (1.9%)</td>
<td>15/370 (4%)</td>
<td>22/370 (5.9%)</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</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></td>
<td>37/370 (10%)</td>
<td>33/370 (8.9%)</td>
<td>12/370 (3.2%)</td>
<td>8/370 (2.2%)</td>
<td>0/370 (0%)</td>
<td>1/370 (0.3%)</td>
<td>49/370 (13.2%)</td>
<td>42/370 (11.4%)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>(&lt; 1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexico-syntactic</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></td>
<td>32/370 (8.6%)</td>
<td>28/370 (7.6%)</td>
<td>9/370 (2.4%)</td>
<td>19/370 (5.1%)</td>
<td>10/370 (2.7%)</td>
<td>12/370 (3.2%)</td>
<td>51/370 (13.8%)</td>
<td>59/370 (15.9%)</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsolicited use of L1</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></td>
<td>2/370 (0.5%)</td>
<td>4/370 (1%)</td>
<td>0/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>3/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>1/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>3/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>3/370 (&lt; 1%)</td>
<td>10/370 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
<td>&lt; 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Results for research question 3

The third research question of this study is stated as follows: Does corrective feedback lead to repair?

a. during the English part of the exchange;
b. during the French part of the exchange.
Although as shown in Tables 5.4 and 5.5, corrective feedback was frequently acknowledged in both the English and French chat exchanges, actual repair, although it did occur in both parts of the exchange, was fairly infrequent. Out of a total of 154 instances of corrective feedback in the English exchanges, only 24 involved repair (15.6%). Of the 216 instances of corrective feedback identified in the French chat exchanges, 21 (9.7%) led to repair.

6.4 Results for research question 4

The fourth research question is stated as follows: In the case of repair, what types of corrective feedback lead to repair?

   c. during the English part of the exchange
d. during the French part of the exchange

As shown in Tables 5 and 6, 15.5% of instances of corrective feedback led to repair in the English part of the chat exchanges and 9.7% in the French part. In the English part of the exchanges, recast and negotiation of form accounted for 5.2% and 5.8% instances of repair respectively. In the French part, negotiation of form led to 6.9% of the repairs followed by explicit corrections (2.3%). For the combined groups, the most frequent type of corrective feedback that led to repair was negotiation of form. In the French part, recasts were the least effective in terms of leading to repair.

Table 6.4: Types of corrective feedback leading to acknowledgement of corrective feedback and repair in the English chat sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of corrective feedback</th>
<th>English part of the chat sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledgement of corrective feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>63 (40.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of form</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 6.5: Types of corrective feedback leading to acknowledgement of corrective feedback and repair in the French chat sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of corrective feedback</th>
<th>Acknowledgement of corrective feedback</th>
<th>Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(42.6%)</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation of form</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(1.9%)</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(216)</td>
<td>(57.4%)</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5 Results for research question 5

The fifth research question of this study is stated as follows: How do ESL students and the FSL students view the Tandem chat exchange as a language learning activity? As shown in Table 5.6, the great majority of ESL students (91.3%) liked using the computer for learning their L2. As for using the computer as a means to learning their L1, 100% of ESL students liked it. By contrast, the FSL students were less favorable to using the computer as a tool for learning their L2 or their L1, 63.2% and 68.4% respectively (Table 5.7).
### Table 6.6: Appreciation of the computer as a learning tool for ESL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu apprécié l’utilisation de l’ordinateur comme moyen d’apprentissage de l’anglais?</td>
<td>19/23 (82.6%)</td>
<td>2/23 (8.7%)</td>
<td>2/23 (8.7%)</td>
<td>0/23 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21/23 (91.3%)</td>
<td>2/23 (8.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu apprécié l’utilisation de l’ordinateur comme moyen d’apprentissage du français?</td>
<td>10/22* (45.5%)</td>
<td>12/22 (54.5%)</td>
<td>0/22 (0%)</td>
<td>0/22 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22/22 (100%)</td>
<td>0/22 (0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One student did not answer this question.

### Table 6.7: Appreciation of the computer as a learning tool for FSL students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students (N=19)</th>
<th>I liked it a lot</th>
<th>I liked it</th>
<th>I liked it more or less</th>
<th>I didn’t like it at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you like using the computer as a tool for learning French?</td>
<td>3/19 (15.8%)</td>
<td>9/19 (47.4%)</td>
<td>5/19 (26.3%)</td>
<td>2/19 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.8 shows that with respect to learning new things, 95.7% of ESL students compared to 79% of FSL students liked using the computer a lot or some for this purpose.

Table 6.8: Appreciation of the computer to learn new things

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>Beaucoup</th>
<th>Assez</th>
<th>Un peu</th>
<th>Pas du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utiliser l’ordinateur pour apprendre de nouvelles choses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the computer to learn new things</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.9, almost 70% of ESL students believed that chatting helped them to learn English a lot or some. By contrast, with respect to learning French, the majority had checked some (47.4%) or a little (47.4%). The results thus show that the FSL were less favorable to the use of chat for learning their L2 than the ESL students.
Table 6.9: Appreciation of the use of chat for L2 learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>Beaucoup</th>
<th>Assez</th>
<th>Un peu</th>
<th>Pas du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crois-tu que le clavardage t’a aidé/e dans l’amélioration de l’anglais?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that chatting helped you improve your French?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 shows that 87% of ESL students said that they had reused something they had learned while chatting compared to only 52.6% of FSL students.

Table 6.10: Appreciation of reuse of something learned during chat sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu pu utiliser quelque chose que tu as appris en clavardant?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to reuse something you had learned while chatting?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 5.11, 65.2% of ESL students saw the reading of chatscripts as a tool to help them learn their L2 compared to 31.6% of FSL students. There is therefore a much greater appreciation of the use of chatscripts for language learning purposes among ESL students.

Table 6.11: Appreciation of chat transcripts for learning an L2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESL students</th>
<th>Beaucoup</th>
<th>Assez</th>
<th>Un peu</th>
<th>Pas du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La lecture de tes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversations de</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clavardage t’a-t-elle</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aidé/e à apprendre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus d’anglais?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSL students</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did reading over your</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation transcripts help you learn more French?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter presented the results of this research project. It showed that sixth graders provided each other with corrective feedback in Tandem chat sessions. Syntactic errors led to the most feedback but a very low number of instances of learner errors led to full repair. In this case, negotiation of form led mostly to repair. Most of the ESL students liked using the computer as a means to learning or improving both their L1 or L2. This was less so with the FSL students. The next chapter presents the discussion of the results.
terms of four key issues: provision of feedback, type of feedback, repair, and pedagogical implications.
CHAPTER VII
DISCUSSION

7.0 Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the results found in this research. The discussion revolves around four issues: provision of feedback (6.1), type of corrective feedback (6.2), repair (6.3), and pedagogical implications (6.4).

7.1 Provision of feedback

Results showed that L2 Grade 6 students involved in a French-English tandem exchange provided feedback to their chat partners in 370 instances. These results support those of Morris (2005) who also demonstrated that children in the elementary grades, specifically Grade 5 Spanish L2 students, were able to provide each other with feedback. The present study contributes to those rare studies which demonstrate that children involved in real time synchronous interaction are indeed capable of providing feedback.

Although in the present study both Anglophones and Francophones gave feedback, it was observed that more feedback appeared to be given by the Francophone students during the French sessions than by the Anglophones during the English sessions (57.8 % vs. 41.9% of total instances respectively). Several reasons might be evoked to explain these differences. First, the Anglophone students’ L2 appeared to be weaker than the Francophone students’. On this basis, it might be argued that there were more opportunities for correction provided to the Francophone students.

Another possible explanation for the results pertains to students’ perception of their respective L2s. In this regard, it is to be remembered that the students enrolled in the intensive Quebec ESL program chose to be there and had a positive attitude to learning
English. By contrast, the Anglophone students, as confirmed by their teacher, had a more
negative attitude toward learning French. Although it is important to recognize individual
differences, the lack of motivation by Anglophone students for learning French in Ontario,
particularly boys, has been discussed elsewhere (Kissau & Turnbull, 2008).

In terms of the present study, the differences in attitude to learning their respective
L2s also seems to be reflected in the way the students oriented to the project. As discussed
in the Results section, 91.3% of Francophone students, compared to 63.2% of Anglophone
students, were positive with respect to using the computer as a tool for learning the L2.
69.5% of Francophones, as compared to 47.7% of Anglophones, considered that the chat
project helped them improve their L2. As reported by the teacher-researcher, many
Francophone students complained that their chat partners were not keeping on task and did
not provide enough corrections. As shown in both Tandem learning projects (Priego, 2002)
and other types of L2 learning contexts (Parks, 2000; Parks, Huot, Hamers, & Lemonnier,
2005), the way students orient to the learning task can have implications for language
learning strategies and learning outcomes. In the case of tandem exchanges involving L2
students in the elementary grades, future research needs to pay greater attention to the way
individual students invest or fail to invest in the tasks at hand in terms of both the strategies
deployed and learning outcomes.

7.2 Type of corrective feedback

In terms of the present study, both Anglophones and Francophones provided all
three types of feedback: explicit, recasts and negotiation of form. However, of particular
note is that the preference was for explicit feedback (62.4% of the total instances of
feedback given). This result contrasts with the Morris (2005) study where the Spanish L2
students had a preference for implicit negative feedback, mainly in the form of
negotiations. In his article, Morris points out that in general studies involving corrective
feedback show that explicit feedback is eschewed by both adults and children in face-to-
face contexts. His own study also confirmed this finding pertained to children within a chat
context. In terms of understanding why explicit feedback is eschewed, especially as pertains to adults, the notion of face-saving was evoked; in other words, participants might perceive this form of correction as “abrupt and impolite” (p. 31) (also see Foster & Ohta, 2005). With respect to children, their willingness to correct errors has been attributed to the fact that children are risk-takers (see Dekeyser, 2000; Singleton, 1995).

Although the willingness to take risks appears to hold in the case of the present study, it is also important to note that a second reason may be due to the way the project was set up, namely as one involving tandem learning in which giving feedback is part of the pedagogical focus and built into the way the study was conducted. In this regard, Priego (2002) has noted that "l’établissement de ce contrat didactique entre les partenaires en tandem permet de minimiser les ‘atteintes à la face’ engendrées par les sollicitations d’aide..." (p.76). Although certain studies involving tandem learning have demonstrated that adults (Priego, 2007; Vinagre & Monoz, 2011) and adolescents (Priego, 2002) involved in email exchanges do provide each other with explicit feedback, the present study, to our knowledge, appears to be the first in which the ability to do so has involved children in the elementary grades. In terms of this study, it is also important to remember that students were instructed in the three ways that they could give feedback (by both the ESL and FSL teachers). As well, they were asked to comment on this in their reflection forms.

However, in addition to the project per se, another influence could be the classroom culture itself. As explained by Morris (2005) with respect to his study involving Spanish immersion 5th graders, the focus in the classroom was more on communication to get the meaning across with close to no attention to form. In his words, the programme “emphasizes thematic and cultural content over linguistic form” (p.32). By contrast, as reported by the teacher-researcher, the intensive ESL program, although content-based and communicative, also emphasized instruction on grammar and vocabulary. After consultation with the FSL teacher, it was determined that the French immersion programme in the Ontario school was more content-based and communicative than the intensive
English programme in Quebec. As well, it is important to remember that within Quebec grammatical accuracy is an integral part of L1 instruction. Taking into account both the L1 and L2 instruction to which Francophones were exposed may help explain why the ESL students gave more feedback overall (as well as for each of the three different types of corrective feedback). Although this topic requires further investigation, a study by Gagné and Parks (2013), also involving intensive Grade 6 Quebec ESL students, showed a preference by these L2 learners for explicit feedback while engaged in face-to-face cooperative learning tasks. As noted by Gagné and Parks, these learners “were at ease in terms of both asking for and giving help with the language”. As well, emphasis given to grammar teaching in L1 and L2 contexts was evoked by Bower & Kowaguchi (2011) as one reason to explain differences in feedback provided by Japanese and English university students during a tandem exchange.

7.3 Repair

Although in this research, a high number of acknowledgements were found in both the English and French parts of the exchanges, actual repair was quite low. This contrasts with the results of Morris’s study where repair was high. The total rate of repair found by Morris was 68% compared to only 16% and 10% in this study for the English and French parts of the exchanges. One possibility is that this may be due to the nature of the tasks involved. Morris used Jigsaw activities which are closed tasks which research on face-to-face interaction tasks has shown to be particularly useful in terms of generating negotiation, corrective feedback, and repair (Pica, Kanagy & Falodum, 1993). By contrast, the tasks used in this research involved discussion of various topics and were open in nature. This issue of type of task in the context of synchronous CMC exchanges requires further research.

7.4 Pedagogical implications

As previously mentioned in the Results section, to explain the low rate of repair observed in the present research as compared to the Morris (2005) study, type of task was
evoked. To this end, it is recommended that teachers pay closer attention to both the type of tasks students are asked to do online during the chat sessions as well as follow-up reinvestment tasks. With respect to online tasks, in addition to open-ended tasks such as the discussion topics used in the present topic, closed tasks such as jigsaw could be used. With respect to reinvestment tasks, one type of activity would be for teachers to use the chat transcripts to identify common errors and give feedback to students in various types of classroom activities.

Another type of reinvestment task could be for teachers to encourage reuse of the corrections provided by partners. In the present study, this was done to a certain degree by having students identify corrections in a follow-up journal task. However, more substantive reinvestment tasks could be proposed. For example, for the present study, participants could have done a poster and presentation of their chat partners. Such a task could provide students with an ultimate goal which could increase the need to negotiate during the chat exchanges as well as motivate students to complete the project. Previous studies on tandem learning have pointed to differences in motivation in function of the tasks used (Appel & Gilabert, 2002). In the present study, students varied in terms of their motivation, particularly the Ontario students. Developing a sense of community and belonging might over a longer period of time lead to a higher level of motivation. In this regard, once links are established with partner schools, more activities could be done. For example, students could use Skype to communicate and see their partners live. Participants could also publish written presentations of their partners on Stone Soup (a website where young learners can publish written texts). Surveys could also be done and shared between partners via the Internet.

As for pedagogical implications, another one pertains to possibilities for improving the quality of the Francophone students' French. As observed in Priego's (2002) study of high school Francophone students in Quebec, students made mistakes with their French. In the present study, errors with French within the chat transcripts occurred fairly frequently,
especially in the case of certain students. As within the Quebec French-medium school system, the quality of French is a major concern, French teachers could be invited to use the transcripts to highlight common errors and give feedback to their students. This is particularly the case as 100% of the Francophone students had rather surprisingly responded on their questionnaires that they had found the Tandem exchange useful for improving their French. From a pedagogical perspective, the fact that students in providing feedback and corrections to their Anglophone partners are placed in a tutor role could be motivating and an impetus to encourage them to improve.

7.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, the results of this study were discussed with reference to four key issues: provision of feedback, type of feedback, repair and pedagogical implications. In the following chapter, a conclusion is provided in the form of a summary of the key points explored in this research project.
CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSION

The present study aimed at filling a gap with regards to research on computer-mediated interaction and its influence on the language learning of elementary grade students involved in a tandem chat exchange. Sixth graders enrolled in French immersion in Ontario were paired with sixth graders in Quebec enrolled in intensive English. The pairs were given topics, which they discussed in English and French during 8 weekly sessions for equal amounts of time (30 minutes per session for each language). The analysis focused on the chatscripts of 13 dyads and a questionnaire administered at the end of the exchange period.

In the SLA literature, very few studies (Morris, 2005) have been conducted with elementary school students to see if they can provide each other with corrective feedback and use repair in a CMC environment involving synchronous interaction. The present study thus contributes to this limited literature by showing that Francophone and Anglophone sixth graders involved in a tandem learning exchange were indeed capable of giving each other corrective feedback while engaged in chat discussions. Contrary to what Morris (2005) found for his fifth graders who were learning Spanish and who gave each other implicit feedback, the participants in this project mainly provided each other with explicit corrective feedback. As revealed by the number of corrective feedback episodes, the Francophone ESL students tended to give more feedback to their Anglophone partners than the reverse. The results also showed that almost 62% of the instances of corrective feedback were triggered by syntactic and lexico-syntactic errors. In the present study, instances of repair were much less frequent than in the Morris study. However, as in Morris’ study, most instances of repair were found following instances of corrective feedback involving negotiation of form. Analysis of the questionnaires revealed that the Francophone participants of this research liked using the computer and the chat activity as a means for learning not only their L2 but also as means for perfecting their L1; this latter
fact has not been previously signalled in research on tandem learning. By contrast, the Anglophone students were less appreciative on both counts.

The discussion of the results focused on four issues: the provision of feedback, the type of corrective feedback, repair, and pedagogical implications. The unequal provision of feedback was partially explained by differences in linguistic competency and students’ perception of their respective L2s. As the Anglophone FSL students appeared to be less proficient in their L2, there may have been more opportunities to provide corrective feedback than in the case of their ESL counterparts. In addition, the FSL students did not perceive their L2 learning or the tandem exchange project as positively as the ESL students and might, therefore, have made a lesser effort to learn it. One reason evoked to explain why, in contrast to Morris’ study, explicit feedback was so prevalent in the present study pertained to differences in the way the projects were set up. In the present study, providing explicit feedback to partners was a part of the Tandem learning procedures and was emphasized in the task instructions. As well, the classroom culture may have played an important role. In contrast to the FSL students in Ontario or the Spanish second language students in Morris’ study, a focus on grammatical accuracy appears to have been more emphasized in the instruction received by the Quebec students in both their ESL and French L1 classes. As for the low number of instances of repair found in the present study, the nature of the tasks (open as opposed to closed as in the Morris study) may have been a factor.

With respect to the pedagogical implications of the present project, it was recommended that more attention be paid to the type of tasks students are asked to carry out both during the exchange and as follow-up reinvestment tasks. As the amount of repair appeared to be influenced by the type of task, it is recommended that, in addition to open tasks, students be provided with closed tasks such as Jigsaw. It was also suggested that language teachers could focus on common errors observed to have been made during the exchange and have students work on them in follow-up classroom tasks and activities. As
well, students could be asked to do more comprehensive follow-up reinvestment tasks such as having them do a poster presentation of their chat partner. It was also suggested that to help develop students’ motivation, a greater sense of community could be fostered by having the students involved in a broader variety of activities over a longer period of time. To improve the ESL students’ French, it was suggested that the French teachers be implicated in the project.

The results of the present study also point to the need for more research in a number of areas. More research should be done, for example, on how task orientation by individual students relates to how they invest in the tasks proposed and the strategies they use to carry them out. A second area pertains to classroom culture, particularly in terms of the degree to which grammatical accuracy and focus on form are values emphasized by the teacher. Lastly, the influence of the types of tasks on feedback and repair could also be more thoroughly investigated.

The results of the present study also point to the need for more research in a number of areas. In this study it was shown that pairs of students varied in terms of the numbers of LREs. An important area of future research in this regard would be to investigate how task orientation by individual students relates to how they invest in the tasks proposed and the strategies they use to carry them out. A second area pertains to classroom culture, particularly in terms of the degree to which grammatical accuracy and focus on form are values emphasized by the teacher. Thirdly, the influence of the types of tasks on feedback and repair could also be more thoroughly investigated. Finally, language tests administered prior to the start of the study would enable one to have a more precise measure of the students’ language proficiency. This factor could also be taken into account in terms of how the pairs are formed.
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Appendix A: Tâches

Tâche 1

Premier contact:

Tu peux te servir des suggestions faites dans le rectangle à la page suivante pour t’aider à trouver des idées pour ta conversation.

Tu dois parler anglais pour commencer!
Au bout de 30 minutes, tu seras averti d’échanger en français!

Tu fais «SEND» après chaque phrase!
Tâche 1

Premier contact:
Voici le moment de commencer à échanger avec ton partenaire! N’oublie pas que tu devras présenter ton partenaire à la fin du projet, alors tu dois trouver de l’information sur lui. Vas-y avec ton premier sondage!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu dois essayer de découvrir...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pour commencer, tu dis bonjour à ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu lui demandes son nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui son âge et de se décrire physiquement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu lui demandes dans quelle ville il demeure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essaie de trouver quels sont ses goûts et ses intérêts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quand tu as fini ton premier sondage, tu peux parler d’un tout autre sujet avec ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quand ce sera le temps, tu continueras ta conversation en français.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 2

Deuxième contact:

Tu dois parler anglais pour commencer!  
Au bout de 15 minutes, tu seras averti d’échanger en français!

Tu n’as pas de corrections à faire ou à recevoir pendant cet échange.

N’oublie pas de remplir ta fiche de réflexion après ton échange.
Tâche 2

Deuxième contact:

Voici le sujet suivant: vos dernières vacances d'été! Je vous donne quelques idées pour vous aider dans votre conversation!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pour commencer, <strong>tu dis bonjour</strong> à ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu lui demandes ce qu'il a fait pendant ses dernières vacances d'été.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pose-lui des questions sur les <strong>activités spéciales</strong> qu'il a faites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouve quels <strong>sports</strong> il a pratiqués l'été dernier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informe-toi sur ce que ton partenaire a le plus aimé l'été dernier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux discuter d'un autre sujet avec ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quand ce sera le temps, tu continueras ta conversation en français.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 3

Troisième contact:

N’oublie pas, tu dois parler anglais en commençant! Au bout de 30 minutes, tu seras averti d’échanger en français!

N’oublie pas de corriger ton/ta partenaire lorsque c’est nécessaire!
**Tâche 3**

Troisième contact:

Voici des suggestions d'idées pour parler de vos émissions de télé préférées!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pour commencer, <strong>tu dis bonjour</strong> à ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui quelle est <strong>son émission de télé préférée</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui quand son émission passe à la télé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui ce qu'il aime dans cette émission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu lui demandes quel est son personnage préféré et pourquoi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui de te faire des suggestions d'émissions de télé que tu pourrais regarder pour améliorer ton anglais.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux discuter d'un autre sujet avec ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quand ce sera le temps, tu continueras ta conversation en français.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 4

Quatrième contact:

Tu dois parler anglais pour commencer!
Au bout de 30 minutes, tu seras averti d'échanger en français!

N'oublie pas de corriger ton partenaire lorsque c'est nécessaire!
Tâche 4

Quatrième contact:

Vous parlez aujourd'hui de l'Halloween!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu essaies de découvrir...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pour commencer, <strong>tu salues</strong> ton partenaire;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire si il aime l'<strong>Halloween</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire ce qu'il a fait pour <strong>fêter</strong> l'Halloween.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui quel était son <strong>costume</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'il te reste du temps, échange avec ton partenaire sur un autre sujet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 5

Cinquième contact:

Remplis ta fiche de réflexion immédiatement après la fin de la session de clavardage et mets-la dans ton journal de bord!

N’oublie pas de corriger ton partenaire lorsque c’est nécessaire!
**Tâche 5**

**Cinquième contact:**

*Aujourd'hui, tu découvres le restaurant préféré de ton partenaire.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton/ta partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tu dis bonjour à ton/ta partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui le nom de son restaurant préféré et où il est situé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informe-toi de ce qu'il aime le plus manger à son restaurant préféré.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui de te donner les noms de deux autres restaurants qu'il te suggère pour bien manger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui de quoi il voudrait parler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 6

Sixième contact:

Tu remplis ta fiche de réflexion immédiatement après la fin de la session de ciappardage et tu la mets dans ton journal de bord!

N'oublie pas de corriger ton partenaire quand c'est nécessaire! C'est important!
Tâche 6

Sixième contact:

Vous allez maintenant parler du film que vous aimez le plus!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui bonjour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire le nom du film qu’il préfère.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pose-lui des questions sur son film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de te parler du personnage principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu lui demandes le titre d’un autre film qu’il a beaucoup aimé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vous pouvez maintenant parler d’un autre sujet qui vous intéresse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 7

Septième contact:

Vous allez parler de vos écoles.
C'est votre sujet préféré, n'est-ce pas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu tentes de découvrir...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de nommer son école.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pose-lui des questions pour identifier quelques personnes qui travaillent à son école. Ex.: secrétaire, directeur, deux autres profs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de nommer ses amis/es.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Découvre ce qu'il aime de son école et ce qu'il aime moins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux parler d'un autre sujet qui te plaît.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 8

Huitième contact:

Discute avec ton partenaire d'un pays ou endroit qu'il a déjà visité.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salut ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de nommer l'endroit ou le pays qu'il a visité.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande-lui de décrire une ou des chose/s qu'il a vue/s à cet endroit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de t'expliquer ce qu'il a aimé de l'endroit qu'il a visité.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informe-toi à ton partenaire avec qui il est allé faire de voyage ou cette visite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu peux parler d'un autre sujet qui te plaît.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 9

Neuvième contact.

Parlons maintenant de vos temps libres? Discute de ce sujet avec ton partenaire!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui quel est son passe-temps préféré.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui depuis combien de temps il a ce passe-temps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ton partenaire a-t-il un autre hobby? Demande-lui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui avec qui il fait ce hobby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux parler d'un autre sujet qui te plait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tâche 10**

 Dixième contact:

Aujourd'hui vous parlez de vos familles*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui de parler de sa famille en nommant tous les membres qui la composent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pose-lui différentes questions sur le travail que font les membres de sa famille.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande de parler des activités qu'il fait avec sa famille.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S'il reste du temps, aborde un sujet de ton choix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quand le mot famille est utilisé, nous entendons la famille au sens traditionnel du terme, la notion de foyer d'accueil ou tout autre forme d'arrangements de vie de l'élève.
Tâche 11

Onzième contact:

Tu essayes aujourd'hui de découvrir l'animal préféré de ton partenaire!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de nommer son animal préféré.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui s'il possède un tel animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui de décrire son animal préféré: Ex.: sa grosseur, ce qu'il mange et où il vit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui comment il faut prendre soin de cet animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vous pouvez parler d'un autre sujet qui vous plaît.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 12

Douzième contact:

Aujourd’hui tu questionnes ton partenaire pour savoir quel a été le Noël dont il a gardé les plus beaux souvenirs.

Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de parler de ce qu’il a fait à Noël.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y a-t’il des cadeaux qu’il a été très content de recevoir?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui s’il a fait des activités spéciales pendant la période des fêtes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui ce qu’il aime le plus de Noël.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux parler d’un autre sujet qui te plaît.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 14

Quatorzième contact:

Parlez aujourd'hui de votre cinquième année.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de nommer l'école qu'il fréquentait l'année dernière.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande-lui de nommer son professeur et de dire combien il y avait d'élèves dans sa classe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de parler de deux activités faites en cinquième année et qu'il a aimées.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demande-lui d'expliquer ce qu'il aimait de sa cinquième année.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tu peux parler d'un autre sujet qui te plait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 15

Quinzième contact:

Discutez aujourd'hui de vos vacances du temps des fêtes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu dois découvrir...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui ce qu'il a fait pendant le congé de Noël.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionne ton partenaire pour découvrir deux activités qu'il a faites et s'il s'est amusé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande à ton partenaire de parler de deux mets qu'il a mangés et qu'il a aimés.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y a-t-il des choses qu'il a faites avec sa famille? Tente de le découvrir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux parler d'un autre sujet qui te plaît.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tâche 16

Seizième contact:

Voici ce dont vous allez parler: votre avenir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ce que tu demandes à ton partenaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salue ton partenaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-t-il hâte de changer d’école l’an prochain?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veut-il se marier? Pose-lui la question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui s’il veut avoir des enfants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si oui, combien?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demande-lui ce qu’il veut faire comme métier plus tard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu peux parler d’un autre sujet qui te plait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis-lui au revoir.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: General Information Questionnaire

General Information Questionnaire

English speaking students

1. Your name: ________________

2. Your surname: ________________

3. Your age: ______

4. Gender: F____ M_____  

5. First language: English _____ Other (Specify): ______

6. Birthplace: 

   Town: ______________________

   Province: ________________

   Country: __________________

7. Address: ______________________

8. Phone: __________________

9. Grade: __________________

10. School attended: ________________
General Information Questionnaire  
(Continued)

11. In addition to English, do you speak any other language? Please specify and check with an « X » the level you are speaking this language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Fluently</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>With difficulty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify;</td>
<td>Speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Why did you choose to learn French?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Enough important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will need it for my future studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to use it for my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have relatives who speak French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to discover the French culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Aside from those given at school, have you ever taken any other French courses?

Yes ____  No ____

If yes, where? ____________________

For how long? ____________________

14. For you, learning French is:

Very important ____  Important ____  Fairly important ____  Not important ____

15. Have you ever chatted with friends speaking another language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which language were you using?</th>
<th>How long was this exchange?</th>
<th>How did you like the experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Do you have a computer?
Yes ___ No ___  If yes, MAC ___ PC ___

17. Are you connected to Internet?
Yes ___ No ___

18. Are you at ease with a computer?
Yes ___ No ___

If yes, check with an X in the proper boxes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I am very at ease</th>
<th>I am at ease</th>
<th>I am quite at ease</th>
<th>I am not at ease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Word processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</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>
19. Are you already using chat? (Check with an X the answer corresponding to your choice)

Very Often ___  Often ___  Rarely ___  Never ___

21. Have you ever chatted with French speaking people?

Yes ___  No ___

22. Do you believe that communicating with a French partner through chat might help to improve your French?

Yes ___  No ___  Don’t know ___

If yes, how

________________________

I thank you for filling this questionnaire!

Miss G
Appendix C: End-of-Project Questionnaire

End-of-project questionnaire (for Ontario students)

- Answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge.
- Take your time to reflect back on the project as a whole.
- Do not provide your name.

Part A

Check the answer corresponding to your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I liked it a lot.</th>
<th>I liked it.</th>
<th>I liked it more or less.</th>
<th>I didn’t like it at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you like using the computer as a tool for learning French?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you like using the computer as a tool for learning English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B

Put a checkmark in the space corresponding to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I liked using the computer to learn new things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe chatting helped me improve my French.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reading over the conversation transcripts helped me learn more French

Part C

Put a checkmark in the space according to your answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to reuse something you had learned while chatting?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for participating in this project and for helping me with my research.
Miss G.
Questionnaire de fin de projet (pour les élèves du Québec)

- Réponds aux questions suivantes au meilleur de ta connaissance.
- Prends le temps de bien réfléchir au projet dans sa totalité.
- N’inscris pas ton nom.

Partie A

Fais un crochet dans la case correspondant à ton choix de réponse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé utiliser l’ordinateur pour apprendre l’anglais?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé utiliser l’ordinateur pour apprendre le français?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partie B

Fais un crochet dans la case correspondant à ton choix de réponse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beaucoup</th>
<th>Un peu</th>
<th>Très peu</th>
<th>Pas du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J’ai aimé utiliser l’ordinateur pour apprendre de nouvelles choses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je crois que le clavardage m’a aidé à améliorer mon anglais.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La lecture des transcriptions du clavardage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
m’a aidé à apprendre plus d’anglais.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As-tu réutilisé des choses que tu as apprises en clavardant?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partie C

Fais un crochet dans la case correspondant à ton choix de réponse.

Merci d’avoir participé à ce projet et à m’avoir également aidée dans ma recherche. Miss G.
Appendix D: Journal de bord

Guide d’utilisation de ton Journal de bord
Guide d’utilisation de ton journal de bord

Voici comment tu dois utiliser ton journal de bord pour qu’il te soit pleinement utile pendant et après le projet de clavardage.

Tu inscris ton nom sur chaque fiche de réflexion.

Tu écris avec un crayon de plomb et tu effaces avec une gomme à effacer. Tu ne barbouilles pas une réponse que tu veux changer, tu l’effaces.

Après chaque session de clavardage avec ton partenaire, tu remplis IMMÉDIATEMENT les fiches de réflexion correspondantes aux tâches que tu viens de terminer. Tu ne remplis aucune fiche à l’avance. Ce travail se fait en classe.

Avant de répondre, tu réfléchis bien et tu donnes la réponse qui correspond VRAIMENT à ce que tu penses. CECI EST TRÈS IMPORTANT!

Tu ne demandes pas d’aide pour les fiches de réflexion c’est un travail individuel. Si tu ne comprends pas une question alors tu demandes à ton enseignante de t’aider.

Tu t’assures toujours de remettre tes fiches de réflexion dans ton journal de bord après les avoir remplies. Ne l’oublie pas!

Tu auras à faire la présentation de ton partenaire à l’autre classe d’intensif de l’école. Tu trouveras les explications pour ce travail final dans les tâches à accomplir.
Tu verras que les tâches contiennent des suggestions pour te guider dans tes conversations avec ton partenaire. Lorsque tu as parlé d’un premier point, va tout de suite voir ce que tu as à demander à ton partenaire.

Il sera strictement défendu d’aborder des sujets à caractère sexuel, raciste, violent ou désobligeant. Tout élève surpris à tenir des propos inacceptables sera automatiquement exclu du projet. Également, tout élève surpris à ne pas être à son affaire sera exclu du projet.

Lorsque ton partenaire te parlera dans sa langue seconde (le français), il abordera le 2e sujet de conversation de la session de clavardage.

Je veux te dire qu’il n’y a ABSOLUMENT aucune gêne à parler anglais avec ton partenaire car il est là pour t’aider. Ce sera la même chose pour lui quand il s’agira de parler français. Vous travaillez ensemble pour vous aider et améliorer votre langue seconde!

À tout moment, pendant les sessions de clavardage, tu peux demander de l’aide à ton partenaire si tu ne comprends pas quelque chose.

Profite de ton expérience et va y chercher le maximum!

Et SURTOUT n’oublie pas d’apprendre tout en gardant le sourire!

Bon projet!
Miss G.
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________
Premier contact.

Fais un « X » dans la case correspondant à ton choix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J'ai aimé beaucoup</th>
<th>J'ai assez aimé</th>
<th>J'ai aimé</th>
<th>Je n'ai pas aimé du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé ton premier contact avec ton partenaire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé découvrir ton partenaire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé l'utilisation du clavardage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé clavarder en anglais?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé clavarder en français?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé le sujet de l'échange?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ______________________

Premier contact.

1. Qu’as-tu le plus aimé de ton premier contact avec ton partenaire?

2. Y a-t-il quelque chose qui a moins bien fonctionné lors de ton premier échange? Oui __ Non __
   Si oui, quoi?

3. _____________________________

4. Y a-t-il des mots ou des expressions que tu as appris lors de ce premier contact? Oui __ Non __
   Si oui, lesquels?
   ______________________________
   ______________________________
   ______________________________

5. Qu’as-tu utilisé pour t’aider lorsque tu avais de la misère à trouver un ou des mots pour t’exprimer?

   Je n’ai pas eu besoin d’aide __

6. As-tu bien compris la conversation avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____ Non ____
   Si tu réponds non, que s’est-il passé?

   ______________________________
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Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ________________________________

Deuxième contact.

1. Comment s’est déroulé ton deuxième contact avec ton partenaire?
   ____ Très bien    ____ Assez bien    ____ Bien    ____ Mal

   Si ça s’est mal passé, peux-tu préciser la ou les raison(s)?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

2. Peux-tu énumérer quelques corrections que as-tu reçues?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

3. Y a-t-il des mots ou des expressions que tu as appris lors de ce deuxième contact? Oui ____ Non ____
   Si oui, lesquels?
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________

Deuxième contact.

Fais un « X » dans la case correspondant à ton choix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J'ai aimé beaucoup</th>
<th>J'ai assez aimé</th>
<th>J'ai aimé</th>
<th>Je n'ai pas aimé du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé ton deuxième contact avec ton partenaire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé découvrir ton partenaire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment as-tu aimé l'utilisation du clavardage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé clavarder en anglais?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé clavarder en français?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé le sujet de l'échange?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: __________________

Troisième contact.

Fais un « X » dans la case qui correspond à ta réponse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J'ai aimé beaucoup</th>
<th>J'ai assez aimé</th>
<th>J'ai aimé</th>
<th>Je n'ai pas aimé du tout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé le sujet abordé?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé échanger avec ton partenaire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé le rythme avec lequel s'est déroulé le clavardage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé faire des corrections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As-tu aimé recevoir des corrections?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ______________________

Troisième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ____________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
**Fiche de réflexion**

Ton nom: ____________________________

Quatrième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____ Non ____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t'aident en anglais?
   Oui ____ Non ____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: __________________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____ Non ____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trouvez-vous que ça va bien avec votre partenaire de clavardage?</td>
<td>Oui, Non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trouvez-vous que vos échanges t'aident en anglais?</td>
<td>Oui, Non</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnez-vous?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peut-être expliquer une ou deux corrections que vous avez reçues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu avais écrit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Après la correction de votre partenaire, vous pourriez écrire:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vous vous sentez gêné de parler anglais avec votre partenaire?</td>
<td>Oui, Non</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ______________________

Sixième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donne-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ______________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pouvais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton/ta partenaire?
   Oui ____  Non ____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: __________________

Septième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clamardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?
   _____________________________________________________________
   _____________________________________________________________

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ______________________________________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:
   _____________________________________________________________

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
**Fiche de réflexion**

Ton nom: __________________

Huitième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: __________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________

Neuvième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t'aident en anglais?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ____________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pouvrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____  Non ____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: _______________________

Dixième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____ Non ____
   Pourquoi?
   ______________________

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui ____ Non ____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?
   ______________________

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?
   ______________________
   ______________________

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ______________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:
   ______________________

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____ Non ____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ______________________

Onzième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t'aident en anglais?
   Oui ____  Non ____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ______________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____  Non ____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________

Douzième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t'aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ____________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pouvais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________

Quatorzième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ____________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom:____________________

Quinzième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui ____  Non ____  
   Pourquoi?

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t'aident en anglais?
   Oui ____  Non ____  
   Si oui, de quelles façons?

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit:____________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui ____  Non ____
Fiche de réflexion

Ton nom: ____________________

Seizième contact.

1. Trouves-tu que ça va bien avec ton partenaire de clavardage?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Pourquoi?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

2. Trouves-tu que tes échanges t’aident en anglais?
   Oui _____ Non _____
   Si oui, de quelles façons?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

3. Quelles sortes de corrections donnes-tu?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

4. Peux-tu expliquer une ou deux corrections que tu as reçues?
   Tu avais écrit: ____________________________________________
   Après la correction de ton partenaire, tu pourrais écrire:
   __________________________________________________________

5. Te sens-tu gêné de parler anglais avec ton partenaire?
   Oui _____ Non _____
Procédure d’utilisation de Gmail

Guide de l’élève

Ton nom: __________________________

Automne 2009
Tu dois suivre les consignes suivantes pour accéder à Gmail et ainsi pouvoir commencer à échanger avec ton partenaire de clavardage.

1. Tu ouvres Internet Explorer en cliquant sur le symbole suivant :

![Internet Explorer 7](image)

2. Tu cliques sur Google.

![Google Canada](image)

3. Tu écris : www.gmail.com dans la fenêtre du centre :

![Google Search](image)
4. Tu cliques sur « recherche Google » (voir flèche).

5. Cliqués sur « Welcome sur Gmail ».

6. Tu te trouves alors sur le site de Gmail!

La messagerie selon Google.

Gmail est un nouveau service de messagerie sur le Web ayant pour objectif de rendre les échanges plus intuitifs, efficaces et utiles. Et qui sait... peut-être plus divertissants également. Avec Gmail, vous bénéficierez des fonctionnalités suivantes :

Recherche rapide
Utilisez la fonctionnalité de recherche de Google pour retrouver le message exact dont vous avez besoin, quelle que soit sa date d'envoi ou de réception.

6. Tu inscris ton nom d’utilisateur. Ce sont les premières lettres de ton adresse courriel jusqu’au @.

Exemple : Mon adresse est teachermg@gmail.com, mon nom d’utilisateur est « teachermg ». C’est ce que j’inscris dans la fenêtre indiquée par la flèche.

7. Tu inscris ensuite ton mot de passe. Tu l’as reçu en même temps que ton adresse courriel. Tu ne dois pas donner ton mot de passe à qui que ce soit ! C’est très important !
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8. Tu es maintenant dans ton compte Gmail | Ça ressemble à ceci :

![Image of Gmail interface](image_url)

9. Tu inscris l’adresse courriel de ton partenaire dans la fenêtre indiquée par la flèche. Pour la session de pratique, tu inscris l’adresse de la personne de ta classe avec qui tu vas clavarder aujourd’hui.
10. Ensuite, tu cliques sur « Inviter à chatter » (regarde ce que t'indique la flèche).

11. Tu devrais avoir l'image suivante :

12. Tu cliques alors sur « Envoyer des invitations » (indiqué par la flèche).
13. L’adresse de ton partenaire apparaît maintenant sous le tien (flèche).

14. Place ton curseur sur « Inviter à chatter » (voir flèche #2).

15. Ton partenaire recevra ton invitation et ça ressemblera à ceci :

17. Tu verras alors ceci :

18. Tu cliques sur « Chatter » (flèche)
19. Tu verras alors ceci :

20. Tu cliques alors sur « Fenêtre extrême » (flèche).

21. Tu as alors la fenêtre qu’il te faut pour écrire ton message et commencer à clavarder.

22. À chaque fois que tu as terminé ta phrase, tu fais « Enter/Entrée » et ton message est envoyé. Tu attends la réponse de ton partenaire et tu lui réponds. Voilà, tu chattes.
27. Cliques sur le chat en question

27. Lorsque tu vois le texte complet
28. Cliques sur transférer

29. Tu mets l’adresse de Miss Gi (Teachermgi@gmail.com)
30. Et tu presses sur « Envoyer »

La mission est accomplie.

Merci et bon chat !
Appendix F: Consent Form - Parents

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Consent Form - Parents

Presentation of the researcher

This study is done as a research project by Mrs. Christine Giguère as part of her Master’s degree directed by Ms. Susan Parks from the Department of Languages, Linguistics, and Translation at Laval University.

Before you agree to participate in this project, it is important to take the time to read and understand the information that follows. This document explains the objective of the research project, its procedures, and its advantages. Please feel free to ask all the questions you deem useful to the researcher who introduces you to this document.

Nature of the research

To analyse Child-to-Child interaction and corrective feedback (an indication given to a learner that his or her second language use in incorrect) during Tandem chat exchanges in relation to second language acquisition.

Participation procedure

Participation to this research consists of the following:

For the students:

- To chat with their partner of the other province to complete the tasks given to them. These chat sessions will take place over a period of 8 weeks with 2 sessions per week lasting one hour each.
- To agree to fill in a 30 minute questionnaire before the start of the project and another at the end of the project that will take the same time, to hand in their Journal to the researcher at the end of the project, and to take part in a 30 minute individual interview if the students is selected for it. This interview will be tape recorded.
- To send a picture of themselves to their chat partner. This picture will not be broadcast in any way and will only be used for the purpose of this research project.

Use of electronic equipment

In order to fulfill the research aspect of this project, your child will use the computer. The computer will enable him/her to communicate with his/her partner by using a chat interface.
Advantages related to the participation of your child

- All the students in your child’s class can take part in this project. They will be greatly satisfied and it will be an interesting opportunity to practise their French while using this new learning tool.
- Moreover, this project will provide your child with opportunities to stop and reflect upon his/her learning strategies.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal right

You are free to withdraw your child from this research project at all time without having to justify your decision. Since your child’s participation in this research is totally independent from the school curriculum, the decision to let him/her take part in this project or not will have no effect on his/her academic results.

Confidentiality and data management

The following measures will be applied to ensure total confidentiality of information provided by the participants:

- The participants and their teacher will be identified using pseudonyms.
- Only the researcher will have access to the answers to the two questionnaires.
- When the thesis is finished, around September 2014, all data (questionnaires, interview transcripts, and chatscripts) will be destroyed.
- Data collected by the researcher will be kept in a locked cabinet.
- All the students’ pictures will be collected at the end of the data collection process in the schools.

Supplementary information

Any question regarding this project can be forwarded to:

Christine Giguère  
Master’s student in linguistics, 
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD  
Research supervisor  
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction  
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4  
Phone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367  
Fax: (418) 656-2622  
Email: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Thanks

Your collaboration is precious for the realization of this study and I thank you in advance for allowing your child to participate.
Choice of participation and signature

Please indicate your decision by circling the number corresponding to your choice and by filling in the related section.

1) Participation in the project

I, _________________________, freely agree to let my child participate in the study entitled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project» and I agree to let him/her send a picture of himself/herself to his/her chat partner. I took note of this form and I understood the goal of the study, its nature, and its advantages. I am satisfied with the explanations, the precisions, and the answers, if need be, given by the teacher and related to my child’s participation to this project.

2) Non-participation in the project

I, _________________________, refuse to let my child participate in the study entitled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

A brief summary of the results of the study will be sent to the parents who will request it by giving their email or postal address. The results will not be available before December 2009. If the given address were to change until then, please inform your child’s teacher of the new address where the summary should be sent.

Email address: ______________________

Postal address: ______________________

_______________________

Complaints or criticism

Any complaint or criticism about this project can be forwarded to the Ombudsman Office of Laval University.

Pavillon Alphonse-Désjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Quebec (Québec) G1V O6A
Administration: (418) 656-3081
Fax: (418) 656-3846
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca
Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».
Approval number: ________________________________

Date: _________________________

_____________________________
Christine Giguère
Master’s degree student
Appendix G: Formulaire de consentement - Parents

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Formulaire de consentement - Parents

Présentation de la chercheure

Cette recherche est réalisée dans le cadre du projet de maîtrise de Madame Christine Giguère, dirigée par Madame Susan Parks, du département des langues, linguistique et traduction à l’Université Laval.

Avant d’accepter de participer à ce projet de recherche, il serait important de prendre le temps de lire et de comprendre les renseignements qui suivent. Ce document vous explique le but de ce projet de recherche, ses procédures et ses avantages. Nous vous invitons à poser toutes les questions que vous jugerez utiles à l’enseignante de votre enfant ou à la chercheure à l’adresse donnée plus bas.

Nature de la recherche

Pendant le déroulement de ce projet, les élèves de 6ᵉ année du groupe d’anglais intensif feront du clavardage avec des élèves de 6ᵉ et 7ᵉ années inscrits à un programme de français intensif en Ontario. La moitié des échanges se feront en anglais et l’autre moitié en français pour permettre aux élèves de pratiquer leur langue seconde respective, de recevoir de la rétroaction et de l’aide de leurs partenaires. De tels échanges sont appelés «Échanges en tandem».

L’objectif de la recherche sera de faire l’analyse des interactions enfant-à-enfant et de la rétroaction corrective (indication donnée à un apprenant l’informant sur l’usage incorrect fait de la langue seconde) pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage, et ce, en rapport avec l’apprentissage d’une langue seconde.

Déroulement de la participation

La participation à cette recherche consiste à:

Pour les élèves:

- Clavarder avec le partenaire de l’autre province pour compléter les tâches qui leur seront données. Ces sessions de clavardage se dérouleront sur 8 semaines à raison de 2 sessions par semaine d’une heure chacune.
- Accepter de répondre à un questionnaire avant le début du projet d’une durée de 30 minutes et un autre à la fin qui prendra sensiblement la même temps, de remettre leur Journal de Bord à la chercheure à la fin du projet et de participer à une entrevue.
individuelle de 30 minutes si l’élève est choisi pour le faire. Cette entrevue sera enregistrée sur magnétophone.

- Envoyer une photo d’eux à leur partenaire de clavardage. L’utilisation de cette photo sera strictement réservée aux fins de la recherche et ne sera en aucun moment diffusée.

**Utilisation d’équipement électronique**

Afin de réaliser le volet recherche de notre projet, votre enfant utilisera l’ordinateur. Celui-ci lui permettra de communiquer avec son partenaire en ayant recours au clavardage.

**Avantages pour votre enfant de sa participation à ce projet**

- Tous les élèves de la classe de votre enfant auront la chance de participer à ce projet. Votre enfant en retirera beaucoup de satisfaction et il pourra pratiquer son anglais en utilisant un nouvel outil.
- De plus, le projet offrira à votre enfant l’occasion de s’arrêter et de réfléchir sur ses stratégies d’apprentissage.

**Participation volontaire et droit de retrait**

Vous êtes libre de te retirer votre enfant du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier votre décision. Puisque sa participation à la recherche est complètement indépendante du programme scolaire, votre décision de laisser votre enfant participer ou de le retirer n’aura aucun effet sur ses résultats académiques.

**Confidentialité et gestion des données**

Les mesures suivantes seront appliquées pour assurer la confidentialité des renseignements fournis par les participants:

- Les participants et les enseignantes seront identifiés par des pseudonymes.
- Seulement la chercheure aura accès aux réponses des questionnaires.
- Quand le mémoire sera terminé, aux alentours de septembre 2014, toutes les données (questionnaires, transcriptions des entrevues et transcriptions de clavardage) seront détruites.
- Les données recueillies par la chercheure seront gardées dans un classeur barré à clé.
- Toutes les photos des participants seront recueillies à la fin de la période de collection des données, et ce, dans les deux écoles.
Renseignements supplémentaires

Toute question concernant ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée à:

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique,
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique
et traduction
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367
Télécopieur: (418) 656-2622
Courriel: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Remerciements aux parents

La collaboration de votre enfant est précieuse dans la réalisation de cette étude et nous vous remercions à l’avance de permettre à votre enfant d’y participer.

Choix de participation et signature

Merci de bien vouloir nous indiquer clairement votre décision en encerclant le chiffre correspondant à votre réponse.

1) Participation avec envoi de photo.
J’accepte que mon enfant participe au projet de clavardage en tandem et qu’il fournisse sa photo de façon à la faire parvenir à son partenaire de clavardage.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ consens librement à ce que mon enfant participe à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage » et qu’il fournisse une photo à son partenaire de clavardage. J’ai pris connaissance du formulaire et j’ai compris le but, la nature et les avantages du projet de recherche. Je suis satisfait(e) des explications, précisions et réponses que la chercheure m’a fournies, le cas échéant, quant à ma participation à ce projet.

2) J’accepte que mon enfant participe au projet de clavardage mais il ne fournira pas sa photo.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ consens librement à ce que mon enfant participe à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage » mais je refuse qu’il fournisse une photo à son partenaire de clavardage. J’ai pris connaissance du formulaire et j’ai compris le but, la nature et les avantages du projet de recherche. Je suis satisfait(e) des explications, précisions et réponses que la chercheure m’a fournies, le cas échéant, quant à ma participation à ce projet.
3) Je refuse que mon enfant participe au projet de clavardage.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ refuse que mon enfant participe à la recherche intitulée « *Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem* ayant recours au clavardage ».

Un court résumé des résultats de la recherche sera expédié aux parents participants qui en feront la demande en indiquant l’adresse courriel ou postale où ils aimeraienont recevoir le document. Les résultats ne seront pas disponibles avant septembre 2014. Si cette adresse changeait d’ici cette date, vous êtes invité(e) à informer la chercheure de la nouvelle adresse où vous souhaiter recevoir ce document.

Adresse courriel: _________________________

Adresse postale: _________________________

____________________
____________________
____________________

**Plaintes ou critiques**

Toute plainte ou critique sur ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée au Bureau de l’ombudsman de l’Université Laval:

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Québec (Québec) G1V 06A
Renseignement-Secrétariat: (418) 656-3081
Télécopieur: (418) 656-3846
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca

Titre de la recherche: « *Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem* ayant recours au clavardage ».

**Numéro d’approbation:** ________________________________

**Date:** ________________________________

____________________
Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique
Appendix H: Consent Form - Students

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Consent Form - Students

Presentation of the researcher

This study is being conducted as a research project by Christine Giguère as part of her Master’s degree under the supervision of Professor Susan Parks of the Department of Languages, Linguistic and Translation at Laval University.

Before you agree to participate in this project, it is important to take the time to read and understand the information that follows. This document explains the objective of the research project, its procedures, and its advantages.

Please feel free to ask your teacher any questions you may have concerning the research project or, as necessary.

Please feel free to contact the researcher for information regarding any questions you may have about this project.

Nature of the research

During this project you will chat online with students who are learning English as a second language in an intensive Grade 6 program in Quebec. Half of the exchanges will be in English, half in French so you can practice your second language and possibly receive feedback and help from your partner. Such an exchange is referred to as a Tandem exchange.

The objective of the study will be to analyse how you interact with your partner and help each other learn your respective second languages.

Participation procedure

To participate in this research, you will have to:

- Chat with your partner of the other province to complete the tasks given to you. These chat sessions will take place over a period of 8 weeks with 2 sessions per week lasting one hour each.
- Fill out a 30 minute questionnaire before the start of the project and another at the end of the project that will take the same time, to hand in your
- Journal to your teacher at the end of the project, and to take part in a 30 minute individual interview if you are selected for it. This interview will be tape recorded.
• Send a picture of yourself to your chat partner. This picture will not be distributed in any way and will only be used for the purpose of this research project.

Use of electronic equipment

In order to complete this project, you will use the computer to engage in chat sessions with your partner.

Advantages related to your participation in this project

• All the students in your class can take part in this project. They will be greatly satisfied and it will be a great opportunity to practise their French while using this new tool.
• Moreover, this project will provide you with opportunities to stop and reflect upon your learning strategies.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal right

You are free to withdraw from this research project at any time without having to justify your decision. Since your participation in this research is not a program requirement, the decision to take part in this project will not affect your grades.

Confidentiality and research data management

The following measures will be applied to ensure total confidentiality of information provided by the participants:

• The participants and their teacher will be identified using pseudonyms.
• Only the researcher will have access to the answers to the two questionnaires.
• When the thesis is finished, around September 2014, all data (questionnaires, interview transcripts, and chatscripts) will be destroyed.
• Data collected by the researcher will be kept in a locked cabinet.
• All the students’ pictures will be collected at the end of the data collection process.

Additional information

Any question regarding this project can be forwarded to:

Christine Giguère
Master’s student in linguistics,
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD
Research supervisor
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Phone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367
Fax: (418) 656-2622
Email: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca
A thank you to the students

Your participation in this study is much appreciated and I would like to thank you in advance for allowing your students to participate.

Choice of participation and signature

Please indicate your decision by circling the number corresponding to your choice and by filling in the related section.

1) Participation in the project

I, _________________________, freely agree to participate in the study entitled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project». I read over this form and I understand the goal of the study, its nature, and its advantages. I am satisfied with the explanations, the clarifications, and the answers provided by my teacher, if such were necessary, as pertains to my participation in this project.

2) Refusal to allow participation in the project

I, _________________________, refuse to participate in the study entitled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Complaints or criticism

Any complaint or criticism about this project can be forwarded to the Ombudsman Office of Laval University.

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Quebec (Québec) G1V O6A
Administration: (418) 656-3081
Fax: (418) 656-3846
E-mail: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca

Approval number: _________________________ Date: _________________

_________________________
Christine Giguère
Master’s degree student
Appendix I: Formulaire d’assentiment - Élèves

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Formulaire d’assentiment - Élèves

Présentation de la chercheure

Cette recherche est réalisée dans le cadre du projet de maîtrise de Madame Christine Giguère, dirigée par Madame Susan Parks, du département des langues, linguistique et traduction à l’Université Laval.

Avant d’accepter de participer à ce projet de recherche, il serait important de prendre le temps de lire et de comprendre les renseignements qui suivent. Ce document t’explique le but de ce projet de recherche, ses procédures et ses avantages. Nous t’invitons à poser toutes les questions que tu jugeras utiles à la personne qui te présente ce document.

Nature de la recherche

Faire l’analyse des échanges que toi et les autres élèves de ta classe feront avec vos partenaires de l’autre province et de la façon dont vous vous y prendrez pour vous entraider pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage. Tout ceci se fera pour voir si ton expérience de clavardage t’aidera dans ton apprentissage de la langue seconde.

Déroulement de la participation

Ta participation à cette recherche consiste à:

- Clavarder avec ton partenaire de l’autre province pour compléter les tâches qui te seront données. Ces sessions de clavardage se dérouleront sur 8 semaines à raison de 2 sessions par semaine d’une heure chacune.
- Accepter de répondre à un questionnaire avant le début du projet d’une durée de 30 minutes et un autre à la fin qui prendra sensiblement la même temps, de remettre ton Journal de Bord à la chercheure à la fin du projet et de participer à une entrevue individuelle de 30 minutes si tu es choisi/e pour le faire. Cette entrevue sera enregistrée sur magnétophone.
- Envoyer ta photo à ton partenaire de clavardage. L’utilisation de cette photo sera strictement réservée aux fins de la recherche et ne sera en aucun moment diffusée.

Utilisation d’équipement électronique

Afin de réaliser le volet recherche de notre projet, tu utiliseras l’ordinateur. Celui-ci te permettra de communiquer avec ton partenaire en ayant recours au clavardage. Le site de clavardage a été sélectionné de façon à ce que ta vie privée soit préservée et que tu ne sois pas exposé/e à de la publicité.
Avantages liés à ta participation à ce projet

- Tous les élèves de ta classe auront la chance de participer à ce projet. Tu en retireras beaucoup de satisfaction et tu pourras pratiquer ton anglais en utilisant un nouvel outil.
- De plus, le projet t’offrira l’occasion de t’arrêter et de réfléchir sur tes stratégies d’apprentissage.

Participation volontaire et droit de retrait

Tu es libre de te retirer du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier ta décision. Puisque ta participation à la recherche est complètement indépendante du programme scolaire, ta décision de participer ou de te retirer n’aura aucun effet sur tes résultats académiques.

Confidentialité et gestion des données

Les mesures suivantes seront appliquées pour assurer la confidentialité des renseignements fournis par les participants:

- Les participants et les enseignantes seront identifiés par des pseudonymes.
- Seulement la chercheure aura accès aux réponses des questionnaires.
- Quand le mémoire sera terminé, aux alentours de septembre 2014, toutes les données (questionnaires, transcriptions des entrevues et transcriptions de clavardage) seront détruites.
- Les données recueillies par la chercheure seront gardées dans un classeur barré à clé.
- Toutes les photos des participants seront recueillies à la fin de la période de collection des données, et ce, dans les deux écoles.

Renseignements supplémentaires

Toute question concernant ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée à:

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique,
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367
Télécopieur: (418) 656-2622
Courriel: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Remerciements aux élèves

Ta collaboration est précieuse dans la réalisation de cette étude et nous te remercions à l’avance d’y participer.
**Choix de participation et signature**

Merci de bien vouloir nous indiquer clairement ta décision en encerclant le chiffre correspondant à ta réponse.

1) Participation. J’accepte de participer au projet de clavardage en tandem.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ consens librement à participer à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ». J’ai bien lu le formulaire et j’ai compris le but, la nature et les avantages du projet de recherche. Je suis satisfait(e) des explications, précisions et réponses que la chercheure m’a fournies, le cas échéant, quant à ma participation à ce projet.

2) Je refuse de participer au projet de clavardage.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ refuse de participer à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ».

Un court résumé des résultats de la recherche sera expédié aux parents participants qui en feront la demande en indiquant l’adresse courriel ou postale où ils aimerait recevoir le document. Les résultats ne seront pas disponibles avant septembre 2014. Si cette adresse changeait d’ici cette date, vous êtes invité(e) à informer la chercheure de la nouvelle adresse où vous souhaiter recevoir ce document.

Adresse courriel: _________________________

Adresse postale: _________________________
_______________________
_______________________
_______________________

**Plaintes ou critiques**

Toute plainte ou critique sur ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée au Bureau de l’ombudsman de l’Université Laval :

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320  
2325, rue de l’Université  
Université Laval  
Québec (Québec) G1V 06A  
Renseignement-Secrétariat: (418) 656-3081  
Télécopieur: (418) 656-3846  
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca
Numéro d’approbation: ___________________ Date: ________________

____________________________
Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique
Appendix J: Consent Form - Teacher

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Consent Form - Teacher

Presentation of the researcher

This study is done as a research project by Mrs. Christine Giguère as part of her Master’s degree directed by Ms. Susan Parks from the Department of Languages, Linguistics, and Translation at Laval University.

Before you agree to participate in this project, it is important to take the time to read and understand the information that follows. This document explains the objective of the research project, its procedures, and its advantages. Please feel free to ask all the questions you deem useful to the researcher who introduces you to this document.

Nature of the research

The nature of this project is to analyse Child-to-Child interaction and corrective feedback (an indication given to a learner that his or her second language use in incorrect) during Tandem chat exchanges in relation to second language acquisition.

Participation procedure

Participation to this research consists of the following:

For the students:

- To chat with their partner of the other province to complete the tasks given to them. These chat sessions will take place over a period of 8 weeks with 2 sessions per week lasting one hour each.
- To accept filling out a 30 minute questionnaire before the start of the project and another at the end of the project that will take the same time, to hand in their Journal to the researcher at the end of the project, and to take part in a 30 minute individual interview if the students is selected for it. This interview will be tape recorded.
- To send a picture of himself to his chat partner. This picture will not be broadcast in any way and will only be used for the purpose of this research project.
For the teacher:

- To present and explain the project to her students.
- To hand out the letters of consent for the parents and the students and to collect them the next day.
- To answer her letter of consent.
- To supervise her students during the chat sessions.
- To take part in the 30 minute individual interviews at the end of the project. This interview will be tape recorded.

Use of electronic equipment

In order to fulfill the research aspect of our project, your students will use the computer. The computer will enable them to communicate with their partner by using a chat interface.

Advantages related to the participation of your students

- All the students in your class can take part in this project. They will be greatly satisfied and it will be a great opportunity to practise their French while using this new learning tool.
- Moreover, this project will provide your students with opportunities to stop and reflect upon their learning strategies.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal right

You are free to withdraw from this research project at all time without having to justify your decision. Since your participation in this research is totally independent from the school curriculum, the decision to let your students take part in the project or not will have no effect on their academic results.

Confidentiality and data management

The following measures will be applied to ensure total confidentiality of information provided by the participants:

- The participants and their teacher will be identified using pseudonyms.
- Only the researcher will have access to the answers to the two questionnaires.
- When the thesis is finished, around September 2014, all data (questionnaires, interview transcripts, and chatscripts) will be destroyed.
- Data collected by the researcher will be kept in a locked cabinet.
- All the students’ pictures will be collected at the end of the data collection process in the schools.
**Supplementary information**

Any question regarding this project can be forwarded to:

Christine Giguère  
Master’s student in linguistics,  
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD  
Research supervisor  
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction  
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4  
Phone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367  
Fax: (418) 656-2622  
Email: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

**Thanks**

Your collaboration is precious for the realization of this study and I thank you in advance for your participation.

**Choice of participation and signature**

Please indicate your decision by circling the number corresponding to your choice and by filling in the related section.

1) Participation in the project

I, ________________________, freely agree to participate in the study entitled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project». I took note of this form and I understood the goal of the study, its nature, and its advantages. I am satisfied with the explanations, the precisions, and the answers, if need be, given by the teacher and related to my participation to this project.

2) Non-participation in the project

I, ________________________, refuse to participate in the study titled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project»

A brief summary of the results of the study will be sent to the teacher who will make the request for it by giving her email or postal address. The results will not be available before September 2014. If the given address were to change until then, please inform the researcher of the new address where the summary should be sent.
Complaints or criticism

Any complaint or criticism about this project can be forwarded to the Ombudsman Office of Laval University.

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Quebec (Québec) G1V O6A
Administration: (418) 656-3081
Fax: (418) 656-3846
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca
Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Approval number: ________________________________

Date: __________________________

______________________________
Christine Giguère
Master’s degree student
Appendix K: Formulaire de consentement - Enseignante

**Title of the research:** «*Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project*».

**Formulaire de consentement- Enseignante**

**Présentation de la chercheure**

Cette recherche est réalisée dans le cadre du projet de maîtrise de Madame Christine Giguère, dirigée par Madame Susan Parks, du département des langues, linguistique et traduction à l’Université Laval.

Avant d’accepter de participer à ce projet de recherche, il serait important de prendre le temps de lire et de comprendre les renseignements qui suivent. Ce document vous explique le but de ce projet de recherche, ses procédures et ses avantages. Nous vous invitons à poser toutes les questions que vous jugerez utiles à la personne qui vous présente ce document.

**Nature de la recherche**

Faire l’analyse des interactions enfant-à-enfant et de la rétroaction corrective (indication donnée à l’apprenant l’informant sur l’usage incorrect fait de la langue seconde) pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage, et ce, en rapport avec l’apprentissage d’une langue seconde.

**Déroulement de la participation**

La participation à cette recherche consiste à:

Pour les élèves:

- Clavarder avec le partenaire de l’autre province pour compléter les tâches qui leur seront données. Ces sessions de clavardage se dérouleront sur 8 semaines à raison de 2 sessions par semaine d’une heure chacune.
- Accepter de répondre à un questionnaire avant le début du projet d’une durée de 30 minutes et un autre à la fin qui prendra sensiblement la même temps, de remettre leur Journal de Bord à la chercheure à la fin du projet et de participer à une entrevue individuelle de 30 minutes si l’élève est choisi pour le faire.
- Envoyer une photo d’eux à leur partenaire de clavardage. L’utilisation de cette photo sera strictement réservée aux fins de la recherche et ne sera en aucun moment diffusée.
Pour l’enseignante:

- Faire la présentation préliminaire du projet aux élèves de sa classe.
- Recueillir les lettres de consentement des parents et les lettres d’assentiment des élèves le lendemain qu’elles ont été distribuées.
- Répondre à sa lettre de consentement.
- Travailler avec les élèves qui demeurent en classe lors des sessions de clavardage.
- Participer aux entrevues individuelles de 30 minutes à la fin du projet. Cette entrevue sera enregistrée sur magnétophone.

**Utilisation d’équipement électronique**

Afin de réaliser le volet recherche de notre projet, vos élèves utiliseront l’ordinateur. Celui-ci leur permettra de communiquer avec leur partenaire en ayant recours au clavardage.

**Avantages liés à la participation de vos élèves**

- Tous les élèves de votre classe auront la chance de participer à ce projet. Ils en retireront beaucoup de satisfaction et ils pourront pratiquer leur anglais en utilisant un nouvel outil.
- De plus, le projet offrira à vos élèves l’occasion de s’arrêter et de réfléchir sur leurs stratégies d’apprentissage.

**Participation volontaire et droit de retrait**

Vous êtes libre de vous retirer du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier votre décision. Puisque votre participation à la recherche est complètement indépendante du programme scolaire, votre décision de laisser vos élèves participer ou non n’aura aucun effet sur leurs résultats académiques.

**Confidentialité et gestion des données**

Les mesures suivantes seront appliquées pour assurer la confidentialité des renseignements fournis par les participants:

- Les participants et les enseignantes seront identifiés par des pseudonymes.
- Seulement la chercheure aura accès aux réponses des questionnaires.
- Quand le mémoire sera terminé, aux alentours de septembre 2014, toutes les données (questionnaires, transcriptions des entrevues et transcriptions de clavardage) seront détruites.
- Les données recueillies par la chercheure seront gardées dans un classeur barré à clé.
- Toutes les photos des participants seront recueillies à la fin de la période de collection des données, et ce, dans les deux écoles.
Renseignements supplémentaires

Toute question concernant ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée à:

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique,
Université Laval
Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique
et traduction
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367
Télécopieur: (418) 656-2622
Courriel: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Remerciements à l’enseignante

Votre collaboration est précieuse dans la réalisation de cette étude et nous vous remercions à l’avance de votre participation.

Choix de participation et signature

Merci de bien vouloir nous indiquer clairement votre décision en encerclant le chiffre correspondant à votre réponse et en complétant la section s’y rapportant.

1) Participation au projet

Je, soussigné, _________________________ consens librement à participer à la recherche intitulée «Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage». J’ai pris connaissance du formulaire et j’ai compris le but, la nature et les avantages du projet de recherche. Je suis satisfait(e) des explications, précisions et réponses que la chercheure m’a fournies, le cas échéant, quant à ma participation à ce projet.

2) Non- participation au projet

Je, soussigné, _________________________ refuse de participer à la recherche intitulée «Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage».

Un court résumé des résultats de la recherche sera expédié à l’enseignante qui en fera la demande en indiquant l’adresse courriel ou postale où elle aimerait recevoir le document. Les résultats ne seront pas disponibles avant septembre2014. Si cette adresse changeait d’ici cette date, vous êtes invité(e) à informer la chercheure de la nouvelle adresse où vous souhaiter recevoir ce document.
Adresse courriel: ______________________
Adresse postale: ______________________
_______________________
_______________________
_______________________

Plaintes ou critiques

Toute plainte ou critique sur ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée au Bureau de l’ombudsman de l’Université Laval:

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Québec (Québec) G1V O6A
Renseignement-Secrétariat: (418) 656-3081
Télécopieur: (418) 656-3846
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca

Titre de la recherche: «Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ».

Numéro d’approbation: ________________________________

Date: __________________________

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique
Appendix L: Authorization Form - School administration

Title of the research: «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project».

Authorization Form - School administration

Presentation of the researcher

This study is done as a research project by Mrs. Christine Giguère as part of her Master’s degree directed by Ms. Susan Parks from the Department of Languages, Linguistics, and Translation at Laval University.

Before you agree to allow your school to participate in this project, it is important to take the time to read and understand the information that follows. This document explains the objective of the research project, its procedures, and its advantages. Please feel free to ask all the questions you deem useful to the researcher who introduces you to this document.

Nature of the research

The nature of this research project is to analyse Child-to-Child interaction and corrective feedback (an indication given to a learner that his or her second language use in incorrect) during Tandem chat exchanges in relation to second language acquisition.

Participation procedure

Participation to this research consists of the following:

For the students:

- To chat with their partner of the other province to complete the tasks given to them. These chat sessions will take place over a period of 8 weeks with 2 sessions per week lasting one hour each.
- To agree to fill in a 30 minute questionnaire before the start of the project and another at the end of the project that will take the same time, to hand in their Journal to the researcher at the end of the project, and to take part in a 30 minute individual interview if the students is selected for it. This interview will be tape recorded.
- To send a picture of themselves to their chat partner. This picture will not be broadcast in any way and will only be used for the purpose of this research project.

For the teacher:

- To present and explain the project to her students.
- To hand out the letters of consent for the parents and the students and to collect them the next day.
• To answer her letter of consent.
• To supervise her students during the chat sessions.
• To take part in the 30 minute individual interviews at the end of the project. This interview will be tape recorded.

For the school principal:

• To allow students of the French Immersion program to participate in the project.
• To allow a tight collaboration with the researcher, the teacher, and the students taking part in the research project.
• To fully support the goals and nature of the project.
• To support the content of letters sent to the parents, the students, and the teacher who take part in the project.

Use of electronic equipment

In order to fulfill the research aspect of this project, the students will use the computer. The computer will enable them to communicate with their partners by using a chat interface.

Advantages related to the participation of your child

• All the students in your school’s French Immersion program can take part in this project. They will be greatly satisfied and it will be an interesting opportunity to practise their French while using this new learning tool.
• Moreover, this project will provide the students with opportunities to stop and reflect upon their learning strategies.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal right

You are free to withdraw your school from this research project at all time without having to justify your decision. Since your school’s participation in this research is totally independent from the school curriculum, the decision to let students take part in this project or not will have no effect on their academic results.

Confidentiality and data management

The following measures will be applied to ensure total confidentiality of information provided by the participants:

• The participants and their teacher will be identified using pseudonyms.
• Only the researcher will have access to the answers to the two questionnaires, the transcripts of the chat sessions, and the answers given in the Journal of each participant.
• When the thesis is finished, around September 2014, all data will be destroyed.
• All chat transcripts and interviews tape records and transcriptions will only be accessed by the researcher. They will be destroyed when the thesis will be finished, around September 2014.
• All the students’ pictures will be collected at the end of the project and destroyed when the thesis will be finished, around September 2014.

Supplementary information

Any question regarding this project can be forwarded to:

Christine Giguère  
Master’s student in linguistics,  
Université Laval  

Susan Parks, PhD  
Research supervisor  
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction  
Quebec, Canada, G1K 7P4  
Phone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367  
Fax: (418) 656-2622  
Email: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca

Thanks to the school administration

Your participation is precious for the realization of this study and I thank you in advance for allowing students under your care to participate.

Choice of participation and signature

Please indicate your decision by circling the number corresponding to your choice and by filling in the related section.

1) Participation in the project

_________________________________, freely agree to allow students of my school to participate in the study titled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during Tandem Chat Exchange». I took note of this form and I understood the goal of the study, its nature, and its advantages. I am satisfied with the explanations, the precisions, and the answers, if need be, given by the teacher and related to my school’s participation to this project.

2) Non-participation in the project

I, ________________________, refuse to allow students of my school to participate in the study titled «Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during Tandem Chat Exchange».

A brief summary of the results of the study will be sent to the parents and the school principal who will request it by giving their Email or postal address. The results will not be available before September 2014. If the given address were to change until then, please inform your child’s teacher of the new address where the summary should be sent.
Email address: ______________________
Postal address: ______________________

**Complaints or criticism**

Any complaint or criticism about this project can be forwarded to the Ombudsman Office of Laval University.

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Quebec (Québec) G1V O6A
Administration: (418) 656-3081
Fax: (418) 656-3846
Email: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca

**Approval number:** ____________________________

**Date:** ________________________

______________________________
Christine Giguère
Master’s degree student
Appendix M: Formulaire d’autorisation - Direction d’école

Title of the research: « Child-to-Child Interaction and Corrective Feedback during a Tandem Chat Exchange Project ».

Formulaire d’autorisation - Direction d’école

Présentation de la chercheure

Cette recherche est réalisée dans le cadre du projet de maîtrise de Madame Christine Giguère, dirigée par Madame Susan Parks, du département des langues, linguistique et traduction à l’Université Laval.

Avant d’accepter de participer à ce projet de recherche, il serait important de prendre le temps de lire et de comprendre les renseignements qui suivent. Ce document vous explique le but de ce projet de recherche, ses procédures et ses avantages. Nous vous invitons à poser toutes les questions que vous jugerez utiles à l’enseignante impliquée ou à la chercheure à l’adresse donnée plus bas.

Nature de la recherche

Pendant le déroulement de ce projet, les élèves de 6ᵉ année du groupe d’anglais intensif de votre école feront du clavardage avec des élèves de 6ᵉ et 7ᵉ années inscrits à un programme d’immersion française en Ontario. La moitié des échanges se feront en anglais et l’autre moitié en français pour permettre aux élèves de pratiquer leur langue seconde respective, de recevoir de la rétroaction et de l’aide de leurs partenaires. De tels échanges sont appelés « Échanges en tandem ».

L’objectif de la recherche sera de faire l’analyse des interactions enfant-à-enfant et de la rétroaction corrective (indication donnée à un apprenant l’informant sur l’usage incorrect fait de la langue seconde) pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage, et ce, en rapport avec l’apprentissage d’une langue seconde.

Déroulement de la participation

La participation à cette recherche consiste à:

Pour les élèves:

- Clavarder avec le partenaire de l’autre province pour compléter les tâches qui leur seront données. Ces sessions de clavardage se dérouleront sur 8 semaines à raison de 2 sessions par semaine d’une heure chacune.
- Accepter de répondre à un questionnaire avant le début du projet d’une durée de 30 minutes et un autre à la fin qui prendra sensiblement la même temps, de remettre leur Journal de Bord à la chercheure à la fin du projet et de participer à une entrevue.
individuelle de 30 minutes si l’élève est choisi pour le faire. Cette entrevue sera enregistrée sur magnétophone.
• Envoyer une photo d’eux à leur partenaire de clavardage. L’utilisation de cette photo sera strictement réservée aux fins de la recherche et ne sera en aucun moment diffusée.

Pour l’enseignante:
• Faire la présentation préliminaire du projet aux élèves de sa classe.
• Recueillir les lettres de consentement des parents et les lettres d’assentiment des élèves le lendemain qu’elles ont été distribuées.
• Répondre à sa lettre de consentement.
• Travailler avec les élèves qui demeurent en classe lors des sessions de clavardage.
• Participer aux entrevues individuelles de 30 minutes à la fin du projet. Cette entrevue sera enregistrée sur magnétophone.

Pour la direction:
• Permettre aux élèves du programme d’anglais intensif de participer au projet.
• Permettre une collaboration étroite avec la chercheure, l’enseignante et les élèves impliqués dans le projet.
• Assurer son support entier aux buts et nature du projet.
• Assurer son soutien préalable à toute communication faite aux parents, aux élèves et à l’enseignante qui prennent part à l’étude.

Utilisation d’équipement électronique

Afin de réaliser le volet recherche de notre projet, les élèves utiliseront l’ordinateur. Celui-ci leur permettra de communiquer avec leurs partenaires en ayant recours au clavardage.

Avantages pour les élèves de participer à ce projet

• Tous les élèves du premier groupe du volet anglais du programme intensif de votre école auront la chance de participer à ce projet. Les élèves en retireront beaucoup de satisfaction et ils pourront pratiquer leur anglais en utilisant un nouvel outil.
  • De plus, le projet offrira aux élèves participants l’occasion de s’arrêter et de réfléchir sur leurs stratégies d’apprentissage.

Participation volontaire et droit de retrait

Vous êtes libre de te retirer votre école du projet de recherche en tout temps sans avoir à justifier votre décision. Puisque la participation à la recherche est complètement indépendante du programme scolaire, votre décision de laisser votre école participer ou non n’aura aucun effet sur les résultats académiques des élèves impliqués.
Confidentialité et gestion des données

Les mesures suivantes seront appliquées pour assurer la confidentialité des renseignements fournis par les participants:

- Les participants ainsi que l’enseignante seront identifiés par des pseudonymes;
- Seule la chercheure pourra consulter les réponses aux deux questionnaires, les transcriptions de sessions de clavardage et d’entrevues, les enregistrements des entrevues et les réponses fournies dans le Journal de Bord de chaque participant;
- Lorsque la rédaction du projet sera terminée, soit aux alentours du mois de septembre 2014, toutes les données seront détruites.
- Toutes les transcriptions de clavardage ainsi que les enregistrements et transcriptions des entrevues ne seront accessibles qu’à la chercheure. Tous ces documents seront détruits quand le mémoire sera terminé, soit aux alentours du mois de septembre 2014.
- Toutes les photos des élèves seront ramassées à la fin du projet et détruites quand le mémoire sera terminé, soit aux alentours du mois de septembre 2014.

Renseignements supplémentaires

Toute question concernant ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée à:

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique,
Université Laval

Susan Parks, PhD
Directrice de recherche
Département de langues, linguistique et traduction
Québec, Canada, G1K 7P4
Téléphone: (418) 656-2131 ext. 6367
Télécopieur: (418) 656-2622
Courriel: susan.parks@lli.ulaval.ca
Remerciements à la direction

La participation de votre école est précieuse dans la réalisation de cette étude et nous vous remercions à l’avance d’accepter d’y prendre part.

Choix de participation et signature

Merci de bien vouloir nous indiquer clairement votre décision en encerclant le chiffre correspondant à votre réponse.

1) Participation.

J’accepte que l’école sous ma responsabilité participe au projet de clavardage en tandem et j’autorise Madame Christine Giguère à y recruter les participants nécessaires pour la réalisation du projet intitulé « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ».

Je, soussigné, _________________________ consens librement à ce que mon école participe à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ». J’ai pris connaissance du formulaire et j’ai compris le but, la nature et les avantages du projet de recherche. Je suis satisfait(e) des explications, précisions et réponses que la chercheure m’a fournies, le cas échéant, quant à ma participation à ce projet.

2) Je refuse que mon école participe au projet de clavardage.

Je, soussigné, _________________________ refuse que mon école participe à la recherche intitulée « Interactions enfant-à-enfant et rétroaction corrective pendant des échanges en tandem ayant recours au clavardage ».

Un court résumé des résultats de la recherche sera expédié aux parents participants ainsi qu’à la direction d’école qui en feront la demande en indiquant l’adresse courriel ou postale où ils aimeraient recevoir le document. Les résultats ne seront pas disponibles avant septembre 2014. Si cette adresse changeait d’ici cette date, vous êtes invité(e) à informer la chercheure de la nouvelle adresse où vous souhaiter recevoir ce document.

Adresse courriel: _________________________

Adresse postale: _________________________

_______________________

_______________________

_______________________

_______________________
Plaintes ou critiques

Toute plainte ou critique sur ce projet de recherche pourra être adressée au Bureau de l’ombudsman de l’Université Laval:

Pavillon Alphonse-Desjardins, Bureau 3320
2325, rue de l’Université
Université Laval
Québec (Québec) G1V 06A
Renseignement-Secrétariat: (418) 656-3081
Télécopieur: (418) 656-3846
Courriel: Info@ombudsman.ulaval.ca

Christine Giguère
Étudiante à la maîtrise en linguistique

Numéro d’approbation: ________________________________

Date: ________________________