



UNIVERSIDAD ANDRÉS BELLO
FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN
PEDAGOGÍA EN INGLÉS

FIRST LANGUAGE IN THE CLASSROOM: THE FORBIDDEN FRUIT?

Seminario para optar al título de Profesor de Inglés para la Enseñanza Básica y Media y al Grado Académico de Licenciado en Educación

Autores: Isidora Angulo Herrera, Yocelyn Soledad Areyuna Campos,
Francisca Belén Muñoz Pastén, Natalia Andrea Iommi Oróstica Garrido,
Mical Betsabé Polanco Soto, Valentina Belén Yáñez Aragonés.
Profesor tutor: Dr. Masatoshi Sato

Santiago de Chile, 2016

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To begin with, we would like to thank Dr Masatoshi Sato for giving us the opportunity to conduct our thesis project under his supervision. He demonstrated to be a highly qualified and committed professor, being always willing to teach us and help us. We are truly thankful to him for being demanding at all times, for believing in us as a team, and encouraging us to keep working and improving our project. This one-year-process has not only been an instance to learn about research methodology and our topic, but also about teamwork and collaboration. We believe we managed to keep a healthy environment, being respect for each other and commitment to this project our two main pillars. Therefore, we would like to thank each other within our group, for managing to stay together and work as a team, despite the minor differences we had a few times. We are sure that our discussion and agreement skills, which were developed throughout this process, are of enormous value for our futures. Lastly, we want to thank all the teachers and mentor teachers who were part of our learning process. Each and every one of them provided us with different learning experiences, which made us the professionals we are about to become officially.

(Isidora Angulo) Firstly, I would like to thank my family for their unconditional support during my undergraduate studies. I am deeply thankful to my parents for believing in me and trusting my decision of becoming a teacher. I would also like to give special recognition to my grandmothers for constantly encouraging me to protect my freedom of choosing, and

highlighting the importance of studying and building my own path according to my beliefs. To my relatives living in Santiago, I truly appreciate you taking care of me during the past years and making me feel home. I am truly grateful to my teachers for putting up with my personality and still managing to teach me. Last but not least, to all my dear friends all over the world, for all their support and love, and cheering me up every time I went through difficulties.

(Yocelyn Areyuna) I would like to thank my friends, who are the family I was so lucky to choose. I would also like to express all my gratitude to my John, for being my constant support and believing in me like nobody else can. Special thanks to professors Magaña and Romero, who taught me the hard way to never give up.

(Francisca Muñoz) I would like to thank my family and friends for always being willing to listen and for putting up with my mood swings. I know I am not the easiest person to get along with, principally in circumstances where I am under stress, and I am truly grateful for your understanding. I would also like to thank my teachers for their constant support and ongoing patience. A special thanks is extended to Miss Patricia Sánchez, who has been part of my career as a teacher and has encouraged me to reach my full potential. Last but not least, I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to everyone who has inspired me to read and write. If I had not developed such skills, I would not be the person I am today.

(Natalia Oróstica) Personally, I would like to thank my family and friends that have been rooting for me through this journey. I particularly would like to express my deepest appreciation to my mother for her constant support,

kindness and love. Without her I would have given up in life a long time ago, but she has always kept me going. I would also like to thank my father for trying, that is all I could ever ask for. I would like to express my appreciation to my best friend, Consuelo, thank you for putting up with me during these stressful months, and for always having the perfect words to cheer me up. Finally, I would like to thank my boyfriend, Felipe, for his endless patience. Words cannot describe how thankful I am for everything you have done to help me.

(Mical Polanco) First of all, I would like to thank God for giving me the opportunity to finish this important process in life, in which I have seen his faithfulness and love. I would also like to thank all my family for their unconditional support throughout all these years, especially my beloved husband whose support has been crucial in this year full of new things for us. Thank you for bearing all the times in which I had to prioritize thesis over home. I'm also grateful to my friends who have been constantly worried about all this process. Lastly, I want to thank my teachers at university for their constant support and encouragement throughout all these years.

(Valentina Yáñez) I would like to thank my parents for their support during all my career, especially these last months. Even though it is difficult for me to express my feelings, they managed to understand me and stayed with me. I would also like to thank my aunt Pame and my grandparents Sonia and Jorge for their support when they knew about my thoughts during the whole career and the thesis. To my dancing crew, Cherry Blossom, and all of those with whom I have shared happy moments through dancing, thank you for

making me happy and laugh when I needed it. You made me forget about all the difficult times I was going through during this complex process. Last but not least, thanks to my friend Kim, who was always there to read my messages when I needed to express my feelings. I will always do my best for me and all of you who believe in me, being always positive as my friend "Peach" taught me to do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
ABSTRACT	IX
RESUMEN	X
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 INTERACTION AND SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING.....	4
2.1.1 <i>Interaction Hypothesis</i>	4
2.1.2 <i>Sociocultural Theory</i>	7
2.1.3 <i>Peer Interaction in the Classroom</i>	9
2.2 THE ROLE OF L1 USE	12
2.2.1 <i>Neglected Resource</i>	12
2.2.2. <i>L1 Functions in the classroom</i>	15
2.2.3 <i>The Effect of L1 Use</i>	18
2.3 VOCABULARY LEARNING IN THE CLASSROOM.....	19
2.3.1 <i>The Development of Vocabulary Knowledge</i>	19
2.3.1.2. <i>Depth of vocabulary knowledge</i>	22
2.3.2 <i>Vocabulary Learning during Interaction</i>	23
2.3.3 <i>L1 Use and Vocabulary Learning</i>	24
2.4. THE PRESENT STUDY	25
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	27
3.1 OVERALL DESIGN.....	27

3.2 CONTEXT AND PARTICIPANTS	27
3.2.1 <i>Chilean Context</i>	27
3.2.2. <i>Current Study Context</i>	29
3.2.3 <i>Participants</i>	31
3.3 PROCEDURE	31
3.4. INTERVENTION	32
3.4.1 <i>Extensive Reading</i>	32
3.4.2 <i>Collaborative Peer Interaction Activities</i>	33
3.5 DATA COLLECTION	33
3.5.1 <i>Pre and Posttest</i>	33
3.5.2 <i>Interaction</i>	35
3.6 DATA ANALYSIS	35
3.6.1 <i>Vocabulary Knowledge Scale</i>	35
3.6.2. <i>Interaction.</i>	36
3.6.2.1 <i>L1 functions</i>	36
3.6.2.2 <i>LREs and LRES in L1</i>	39
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	43
4.1 FIRST LANGUAGE FUNCTIONS	43
4.2 LANGUAGE RELATED EPISODES	45
4.3 LRES AND L1 USE.....	48
4.4 PRE AND POSTTEST	49
4.5 LRES AND VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT.....	50
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION	52
5.1 LANGUAGE USE IN THE CHILEAN EFL CLASSROOM	52

5.1.1 L2 use	52
5.1.2 L1 use	55
5.2. PEER INTERACTION AND VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT	58
5.2.1 Peer interaction and Lexical Related Episodes (LREs).....	58
5.2.2 L1 Use within LREs.....	62
5.3. LREs AND VOCABULARY DEVELOPMENT	65
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS	73
6.1 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	73
6.2 LIMITATIONS	73
6.3 PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	75
6.3.1 Group work in general.....	75
6.3.2 Limits of L1 use in the classroom.....	75
REFERENCES	77
APPENDICES.....	84
APPENDIX A: CONSENT FORMS.....	84
APPENDIX B: DIAGNOSTIC TEST	87
APPENDIX C: TARGET WORDS	89
APPENDIX D: VKS (PRE-POST TEST)	90
APPENDIX E: INTERVENTION 1.....	97
APPENDIX F: INTERVENTION 2.....	98
APPENDIX G: WRITTEN PRODUCTS	99

ABSTRACT

Over the past years, the use of students' first language (L1) in the classroom has been a highly discussed topic in the EFL classroom as well as in the field of second language (L2) teaching/learning research. There is a tendency that advocates communicative language teaching which suggests that L1 use should be forbidden in the classroom. However, research has yet to discover whether L1 use has a positive or negative impact on L2 learning. Hence, the present study aimed to examine L1 functions and the impact of L1 use on L2 development. The present study was conducted in a private school in Santiago, Chile. The participants of this study ($N = 34$) were engaged in two collaborative writing tasks about the book they were reading in their English literature classes, and their discussions were audio-recorded and later analyzed. A quasi-experimental method was utilized in order to observe the influence that group work had on their L2 vocabulary development. The results demonstrated that the students' L1 played a major role in their interaction while together working on the collaborative tasks, and it served for the development of L2 vocabulary. Specifically, the results suggest that the way in which individual learners contributed to interaction affected their learning outcomes.

Key words: L1 use, peer interaction, vocabulary development, EFL.

RESUMEN

En los últimos años, el uso de la primera lengua de los estudiantes ha sido un tema altamente discutido en las salas de clases y en la investigación de la enseñanza de inglés como Lengua Extranjera. Existe una tendencia general de prohibir el uso de la primera lengua, sin embargo, aún existen vacíos sobre la influencia positiva o negativa que esta podría tener en el aprendizaje de vocabulario. El presente estudio se realizó en una escuela privada en Santiago, Chile. El propósito del mismo fue observar las funciones que cumplía la lengua nativa en la interacción de los estudiantes y cómo esto afectaba al desarrollo de la segunda lengua en alumnos de octavo básico con alto nivel de inglés. Los participantes de este estudio fueron involucrados en dos actividades de escritura colaborativa sobre el libro que estaban leyendo en las clases de literatura inglesa, donde sus discusiones fueron grabadas en audio y luego analizadas. Se utilizó un método cuasi experimental para observar la influencia que tuvieron sus discusiones grupales —utilizando su primera lengua— en el desarrollo del vocabulario en la segunda lengua. Se aplicaron evaluaciones pre y post con el fin de tener un registro del desarrollo del vocabulario de los estudiantes y las funciones que la lengua materna cumplió fueron codificadas como sugirieron DiCamilla y Antón (2012). Los resultados demostraron que la lengua materna de los estudiantes jugó un rol mayor en su interacción mientras desarrollaban en conjunto actividades colaboración, y sirvió para el desarrollo del vocabulario de la segunda lengua. Más aun, los resultados sugieren que la forma en la que alumnos

contribuyeron individualmente en las discusiones afectó los resultados en sus aprendizajes.

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the learning of a second language (L2) is being fostered in the Chilean EFL classroom. As a way to promote the students' use of the L2, teachers have been instructed to incorporate the Communicative Approach in their lessons. In this approach, learners are encouraged to use the L2 in different tasks and for meaningful communication situations, leaving limited need for the first language (L1) to be used. However, it is impossible to deny that students' L1 is present in the classroom and that its use is normal because students that do not have the necessary linguistic resources to communicate turn to their L1, during the acquisition of a second language (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). In this respect, research supports the L1 use in the classroom; nevertheless, some teachers still avoid using the L1 because they consider it to be interfering for L2 learning.

The present study was conducted in a setting where the students share the same mother tongue (L1). In this context, evading the L1 inside the classroom is even harder to pursue, especially when it comes to interaction among learners. Even though learners know they should use the L2 as much as they can, they turn to their L1 naturally, making the L1 unavoidable in the EFL classes. Research on this topic has shown that prohibiting the L1 in collaborative interaction can result in incompleteness of understanding (i.e. students end up not understanding each other), and also, the natural learning strategies of the learners are inhibited as they feel frustrated, affecting their

performance in collaborative interaction. In fact, the use of the learners' L1 has been justified and even promoted in some specific cases, as it has been demonstrated that it is beneficial for students in prewriting and planning stages in L2 learning, helping them organize their compositions (DiCamilla & Antón, 2012). In this regard, the L1 enables students to interact in a more comfortable way and construct collaborative dialogue, which helps them complete group work successfully.

The main purpose of this study was to contribute to the classroom practices by raising awareness of students' L1 use in the EFL classroom to teachers, programs, and policy makers. More specifically, the present investigation aimed at exploring learners' L1 use during peer-interaction in the classroom, and to examine whether the L1 has a positive impact on the development of vocabulary knowledge when learners are engaged in collaborative work. As it has been shown in previous investigations, students can better learn a language when they have chances to practice it, interact with their peers, and switch to their L1 in specific situations (Atkinson, 1987; Azkarai & García Mayo, 2015; DiCamilla & Antón, 2012; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). However, it is important to mention that such studies have worked with students from contexts where English is taught as a second language (ESL), while the present study focuses on participants learning English as a foreign language (EFL).

This investigation followed a quasi-experimental design. Pre and posttests were applied to the participants to find out if they acquired vocabulary knowledge after they worked together in two different but related collaborative writing tasks, during their English Literature classes. The tasks

were designed according to the students' knowledge about certain vocabulary items taken from a book they were reading, their previous experiences working collaboratively, and their interests. It was hoped that, by the end of the interventions, the participants will have gained knowledge regarding vocabulary by being engaged in group work and making use of their L1 when necessary.

CHAPTER 2:

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Interaction and Second Language Learning

2.1.1 Interaction Hypothesis

The role of interaction has been widely studied in second language (L2) research. Most of the research done on this topic has shown empirical evidence of the positive impact of interaction on L2 acquisition through the testing of Long's Interaction Hypothesis (Sato & Lyster, 2012; Sato, 2013). The Interaction Hypothesis is a theory of L2 acquisition which states that comprehensible input and L2 development are both originated in the conversational modifications that take place when native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs) solve communication problems. What Long suggested in his theory was that these conversational modifications were placed to foster comprehensible input, and finally, L2 acquisition (Mackey, Abbuhl & Gass, 2012). Hence, L2 acquisition is positively affected by interaction.

The interactionist approach was further researched after Long presented his Interaction Hypothesis in 1980, leading to wider acceptance of the fact that there is a substantial connection among interaction and learning. Not only does interaction allow comprehensible input to occur, but also to draw attention of the learner to gaps in his knowledge. Through interaction, learners can discuss about language and realize what they do not know, and ask for assistance from their peers. Then, once the learner is aware of that gap, he will devote his attention to feedback and will modify his existing knowledge (Mackey, 2007; Mackey, Abbuhl & Gass, 2012). Lastly, for this theory to be

actually conducive to L2 development, the process of interaction must be composed of three different elements, which are input, feedback, and output.

Concerning input, findings indicate that it is provided through the interchange of ideas among people. Being NSs and NNSs, the interaction can happen between NS-NS, NNS-NNS or NS-NNS (Long, 1989; Porter, 1986; Sato & Ballinger, 2016). Different studies have explored not only the interaction among NSs and NNSs, but also the type of input that NSs provide to NNSs when communicating. For instance, Porter (1986) conducted a study in which 12 ESL learners and six NSs engaged in problem solving tasks. They were combined in dyads, balancing their language proficiencies. The discussions were recorded, transcribed and analyzed, with the aim of observing learner's input and production. Throughout this study she was able to conclude that NSs provide different input than NNSs do, as NSs input is lexically richer and syntactically more complex. However, Porter (1986) also mentioned learners that share the same L1 may be better interaction partners to one another, as they have similar interlanguage phonologies (i.e. the underlying knowledge of the L2 phonetic system).

When interacting, interchange of ideas takes place and communication breakdowns may occur. In such instances, feedback can be provided which causes negotiation for meaning (Sato & Ballinger, 2016). Negotiation for meaning can be understood as an instance in which the NS modifies his speech with the purpose of making it more understandable for the interlocutor (Sato & Ballinger, 2016). Regarding the latter, research has demonstrated that corrective feedback (CF) triggers restructuring of inaccurate L2 knowledge and pushes the learner to self-correct (Mackey, 2012; Pica, 2013).

CF is understood as receiving implicit or explicit correction on a certain language utterance, either by the teacher or a peer. When a learner receives CF, he becomes aware of his error and is therefore led to self-correct, which occurs because restructuring was triggered. Restructuring affects the development of accurate knowledge, not only allowing the learner self-correct and reformulate, but also pushing the learner to modify what he already knows (Sato & Lyster, 2012).

An example of CF effectiveness is presented in Sato and Lyster (2012) where learners were trained to provide feedback to each other after a communication breakdown, which then led to self-corrections from one of the learners involved in the interaction. Four university English classes in Japan (167 students in total) participated in this study. Two groups were taught to provide different forms of CF and one group was assigned with prompts, whereas the other with recasts. Prompts can be defined as a feedback type, in which a word, phrase, or sentence is added in the middle of the interlocutor's utterance to continue or complete it (Porter, 1986). Recasts are a feedback type that consists in reformulating all or part of the utterance, minus the error, which allows the learner to compare the erroneous utterance. Both types of feedback enable the learner to produce modified output (MO) and as a result, the learner may automatize more accurate grammatical knowledge. A third group was only engaged in peer interaction activities. The fourth and last group was a control group. Results showed that after a semester of intervention, the CF groups improved in accuracy and fluency, while the peer interaction group showed improvement only in fluency. The described study explains that there was a positive relation between corrective feedback,

modified output and L2 development. Hence, this process demonstrates that learning takes place when modified output is produced as the result of negotiation for meaning (Long, 1989; Sato & Ballinger, 2016; Shekary & Tahririan, 2006).

2.1.2 Sociocultural Theory

Due to the Interaction Hypothesis' insufficiency to explain L2 acquisition, other theories have gained more prominence and importance in the field of educational research, being Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory one of them. From the sociocultural perspective, learning is a social phenomenon where language serves as a mediational tool for the development of collaborative relationships, the achievement of scaffolding within the extension of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and, consequently, the acquisition of an L2.

As long as socio-cultural theory has been discussed in educational research, Sato (2016) has identified learners' interactional behaviors that assist L2 development. Collaborative interactions are characteristics of a learner's mindset in regard with interactional behaviors, which lead to collaboration among partners while learning an L2. In his study, Sato (2016) analyzed two Grade 10 English as a foreign language classes in Chile (N=53) where pretask interviews with focus groups from each class were applied. Moreover, L2 development data was obtained from both classes consisting of oral and written production tests focusing on grammar and lexis, investigating how learners created learning opportunities where CF and collaborative interaction were considered. Results showed that participants who expressed more willingness to collaborate and provide CF were more likely to show collaborative interaction, whereas participants who did not engage were more

likely to show non collaborative interactions. It was concluded that interaction mindsets of the participants affected their interactional behaviors. Specifically, collaborative interactions were positive in nature, and non-collaborative interactions enabled rejection towards CF, which does not necessarily have to do with negative CF effectiveness, as the learner could still incorporate CF (Sato, 2016).

Empirical evidence supports the premise that when language is used as a mediational tool between individuals in the form of collaborative talk, novice-expert relationships emerge, providing learners with the necessary assistance to work in their ZPD (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; De Guerrero & Villamil 2000, Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Swain, 2000). Assistance to work in ZPD is understood as how learners scaffold knowledge to each other, by contributing to what they already know. Then, they are constantly assisting each other during interaction in collaborative tasks. In Antón and DiCamilla (1998), adult learners of Spanish—whose L1 was English and had little or no previous experience with the L2—enrolled in a six-week Spanish class for beginners. During these lessons they were paired and asked to complete three writing tasks in the target language. The writing tasks were informative texts and prompts—such as plan a trip with a partner, describe eating habits in the US, and write about popular sports in your country—were given in each task. The interaction during the collaborative work was audiotaped and transcribed, in order to study the strategies used by the learners during collaboration, and the nature of the latter. This study demonstrated that language is a mediational device, which enabled learners to provide each other with scaffolded help. Furthermore, findings in De Guerrero and Villamil (2000) showed that two

intermediate ESL college students engaged in collaboratively revising a written text also used language as a scaffolding tool. By being actively involved and focused on influencing his partner's actions assisting each other, the existence of different scaffolding behaviors—such as contingent responsivity and psychological differentiation—were portrayed. Hence, learners' assistance to each other helps L2 development thanks to the expansion of the ZPD of each learner.

Even though Long's Interaction Hypothesis explains how learners acquire an L2, his theory does not address how collaborative relationships may also be a beneficial resource for L2 development. Sato and Viveros (2016) intervened an EFL class in Chile, engaging the participants (N = 53, 10th graders) in collaborative group work tasks. L2 development was assessed through pre and posttests. Results showed that collaboration plays a key role in L2 acquisition when learners are engaged in communicative group work activities. Moreover, in McDonough (2004), 16 Thai EFL learners at a university were engaged in pair and small group activities, and also completed three oral tests within a period of eight weeks. Results showed that learners who participated in the task collaboratively while interacting in pairs or small groups demonstrated improvement in the production of target forms. This theory contributes to notion of the importance of learner's interaction, assistance and collaboration during the L2 acquisition process.

2.1.3 Peer Interaction in the Classroom

Among the different types of interaction, there exists peer interaction, which can happen in the classroom between the students (Lehti-Eklund, 2013; McDonough, 2004; Sato & Ballinger, 2016; Yu & Lee, 2014). As explained in

Lehti-Eklund (2013), peer interaction was ensured in the classroom when bilingual students had to work collaboratively. In this study the participants (Swedish as L2 learners) had to analyze repair sequences (amending error tasks) using their L1 (Finnish) to create understanding (i.e. learners trying together to understand the task) and to repair issues related to the task (i.e. create mutual understanding and reformulate discourse). The researcher of this study observed the practices of language choice in repair. It was observed that when the participants switched to their L1, they used formulations, question patterns and discourse practices that enabled them to convey mutual, quick, and effective understanding. Research has shown that instances in which discussions are triggered by the nature of the task, are beneficial for learning because they engage in metatalk, i.e. talking about language (Sato & Ballinger, 2016; Storch & Aldosari, 2010; Yang, 2014).

Sato and Ballinger (2016) stated that peer interaction makes students feel more comfortable when learning, in comparison to teacher-learner interaction. During peer interaction, students feel more responsible for conveying a clear message to their partners and negotiate for meaning (Gass & Varonis, 1989, in Sato & Ballinger 2016). An empirical study by Yang (2014) examined the process and interaction among three university ESL students groups (15 participants in total), while developing collaborative writing tasks for commerce courses. The researcher recorded the discussion of the groups while developing the task, and interviewed each participant, collected e-mails exchanged among the groups' participants, and took field notes from group meetings and classroom observations. As the results and analysis showed, the L1 language allowed the learners to create ideas, discuss content, and

facilitate the writing process in the L2. Additionally, other studies have shown that when learners are provided with practice during peer interaction, they are enabled to provide feedback to each other and produce modified output (Fernández Dobao, 2016, Sato & Ballinger, 2016).

Fernández Dobao (2016) explored modified output, which occurred while learners were solving language-related episodes (LREs). LREs are defined as instances in which students reflect or have discussions about language (Swain & Lapkin, 1998; Williams, 2001). Williams (2001) was able to prove, through an 8 week observation period followed by a testing phase that the learners also got involved in LREs when confronted to instances in which they paid close attention to form and meaning while engaged in a collaborative task. Hence, peer interaction has been proven to be a type of interaction with a positive impact, because it enables the chance of LREs to occur.

In the classroom, feedback can be provided not only by the teacher, but also among learners (Williams, 2001; Yu & Lee, 2014). In Williams (2001), it was shown that students had different roles as initiators and providers of LREs, the providers being the ones that facilitated feedback when solving LREs. Also, apart from presenting different roles, findings suggest that learners can create fluid expert-novice relationships when they have the chance to play both roles interchangeably, which allows them to provide feedback to each other (Donato, 1994; Storch 2002; Williams, 2001). Following the idea presented in Williams (2001), as students were initiators and providers, it often happened that initiators were novice and providers were experts, but while resolving LREs they interchangeably assisted each other. Williams' study also draws attention to the effectiveness of LREs during peer

interaction within the roles mentioned before. As learners worked collaboratively to complete different tasks while playing different roles, they perceived peer interaction as a positive instance, since there were more resources to share. For instance, while exploring the perceptions and attitudes of students regarding collaborative writing in pairs and small groups, the results showed that most of the participants considered collaboration to have a positive impact on the lexical and grammatical accuracy in the texts they wrote (Fernández Dobao & Blum, 2013; McDonough, 2004). Therefore, collaboration should be promoted in the EFL classroom considering all the benefits it provides to L2 development, especially when learners make use of the collaborative dialogue when encountering issues regarding language.

2.2 The Role of L1 Use

2.2.1 Neglected Resource

Foreign language teaching methods have evolved throughout history. Until the 1990's, Grammar-Translation, which relied on the students' L1 to teach the target language, was one of the most used methods (Storch, in press). However, the Communicative Approach became popular afterwards, and a greatly implemented method to teach an L2. This method is based on the thought that learning an L2 occurs through communicating real meaning, which fosters the maximization of the L2 use. Moreover, the comprehensible input hypothesis, which is explained as a method that contains messages that students really want to hear and that are understandable for them, supports the Communicative Approach. The benefits of this method are based on not forcing early production in the L2, but allowing the students to produce when they are "ready" to do so. This method recognizes that improvement comes

from supplying communicative and comprehensible input, developed by Krashen, and not from forcing and correcting production, but he also made clear that there was no place for the L1 inside the classroom (Krashen, 1982). The concept of implementing more communication in the classroom left aside the notion of using the L1 as a resource to learn an L2. Hence, students started to be encouraged to use the target language as much as possible, resulting in a prohibition of the use of the L1 in the classroom (Krashen, 1982).

Despite the fact that the students' use of the L1 was considered detrimental to the acquisition of an L2, Atkinson (1987) suggested that the prohibition of the L1 was outdated, but that the potential of its use in the classroom needed more exploration because it is commonly assumed that there is no role for the L1 in the L2 classroom, even though there is not enough proof to support those claims. Storch and Wigglesworth (2003) also expressed that L2 teachers should re-evaluate views concerning the use of the L1 during group and pair work. In the study conducted by Storch and Wigglesworth (2003), 12 ESL learners' pairs completed two tasks, a text reconstruction task and a short joint composition. The participants of each dyad shared the same L1 and their interaction while completing the tasks was audiotaped. Results showed that most of the pairs used their L1 during the development of both tasks, and that the L1 served different functions in each task, such as task management and task clarification. Learners noted that the shared L1 could enable them to discuss about the task in more depth, and thus, completing the task more easily. Learners found that by using their L1, they gained control over the task, which allowed them to work at a higher cognitive level than what might have been possible if they had been working

individually. Other studies have also demonstrated the positive roles of the L1 use (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Carless, 2008; Chen & Truscott, 2010). Within a sociocultural perspective they have found some positive roles of the L1 use. First, it acts as a critical psychological tool, which helps learners to construct effective collaborative dialogues through discussion. Within the critical psychological tool they found that there are three different functions: construction of scaffolded help (characterized by how learners use their L1 to maintain each other's interest in the task and how they solve specific problems while completing the task), intersubjectivity (to construct a social space that will facilitate the completion of the task, which creates a shared perspective of the task) and use of private speech (tool used to direct their own thinking while facing a difficult task)

Moreover, Sampson (2012) found six functions during code-switching, defined as the shift between L1 and L2, such as: equivalence, metalanguage, floor holding, reiteration, socializing, and L2 avoidance. Equivalence refers to the functions triggered by the absence of the lexical item in the learners' interlanguage, and it helps L2 development because it creates a connection between both languages by using contrastive analysis (comparing the L1 to the L2). Metalanguage occurs when learners perform tasks in the L2; it involves discussion about the tasks and other procedural concerns made in the L1, and it is beneficial for L2 development because it promotes focus on the task and practice of the L2 forms. Floor holding is used by learners that wish to continue without being paused and interrupted, the reason behind implementing this function is to retrieve items quickly in the L1, and the main benefits of this particular function is to avoid hesitation. Reiteration takes place

when messages have already been expressed in L2, but they are emphasized or clarified in the L1, this ensures that the message is conveyed in a code that is easily understood. Socializing functions appear to develop a sense of group solidarity. Lastly, L2 avoidance occurs when a learner appears to have the linguistic resources to convey meaning, but instead they choose to do it in the L1. As it is possible to observe, there are varied functions linked to code-switching, some positive and some that can be negative for L2 learning. However, any attempt to completely ban L1 in L2 learning could be detrimental because it ignores the amount of communication and learning that takes place while learners use the L1 (Sampson, 2012). Consequently, it is important for L2 teachers to acknowledge that the use of the L1 may be a normal psychological process during the acquisition of an L2 (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003).

2.2.2. L1 Functions in the classroom

Although the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) or Communicative Approach (CA) suggests that the L1 should be avoided, students still turn to their L1 while interacting with each other. As a matter of fact, Scott and de la Fuente (2008) observed the interaction of two groups of students while completing a form-focused grammar activity. The first group was allowed to interact using their L1, while the second group had to interact only in the L2. Findings showed, firstly, that the use of the L1 as a resource is unavoidable since students turned to it naturally through the use of different cognitive resources. When learners needed to complete a task, they used their L1 to talk to themselves as they translated the text. They also made use of their L1 when recalling grammar rules, reviewing the task, and planning what

to say in the L2. Secondly, the exclusive use of L2 appeared to inhibit collaborative interaction, impeding learners from using those different cognitive resources. De la Colina and García Mayo (2009) conducted a study in which they observed the use of L1 in oral interaction among pairs of undergraduate learners with low proficiency in the target language in an EFL classroom. The participants had to complete jigsaw, dictogloss, or text reconstruction tasks. The results of this study demonstrated that in the two latter activities the L1 use exceeded 75% of the total discourse. Storch and Aldosari (2010) observed the effect of learner proficiency pairing and task type on the amount of L1 used by learners in pair work and the functions that the L1 served in an Arabic EFL classroom. The researchers paired 30 students based on their L2 proficiency following three different patterns: high-high, high-low, and low-low. The 15 pairs were recorded while completing three tasks, which were jigsaw, composition and text-editing. In this study, the results showed that in the text-editing task, students with lower proficiency tended to use their L1 in more opportunities than students with higher proficiency due to the complexity of it. Therefore, the studies mentioned above show how the L1 is used by students in the EFL classroom.

Since the L1 is a tool present in the classroom, students' use of the L1 can serve different functions and these functions emerge from the different needs students have while completing a task. According to de la Colina and García Mayo (2009), the uses of the L1 are driven by task demands, meaning that the amount of L1 used by the students will depend on the needs students have while facing the task. There are two main studies that establish possible functions that the L1 can serve during peer interaction. DiCamilla and Antón

(2012) explored the possible functions that the L1 can serve during peer interaction and found the following functions: 1. Content (1a) creating, discussing, and/or agreeing to content in L1 or L2, (1b) translating content created in L1 into L2; 2. Language (2a) dealing the resolution of lexical and/or grammatical problems, (2b) evaluating L2 forms, and re-evaluate what they have produced, (2c) understanding meaning of L2 utterances without resorting to translation, (2d) stylistic choice, meaning that students varied the choice of words and improved the style of the composition; 3. Task management (3a) defining and limiting the task, referring how students establish, clarify, limit and agree what needs to be done in order to complete the task, (3b) planning the task, deals with planning, organization and general task management; 4. Interpersonal relations, this includes utterances that contribute to establishing a good rapport with the rest of the group, and personal comments triggered by the task. On the other hand, Swain and Lapkin (2000) established three main functions, which are (1) to understand and make sense of the requirements and content of a task; (2) to focus attention on language form, vocabulary use, and overall organization; and (3) to establish the tone and nature of students' collaboration.

As several researchers have stated, there are different functions that the L1 can serve in the classroom, and these functions help learners reach higher knowledge (i.e obtain linguistic resources that are beyond their level) in the L2. Furthermore, the L1 can help learners in the completion of certain tasks, being collaborative tasks the ones in which students' L1 can be more present (De la Colina & García Mayo, 2009). In these types of tasks students turn to their L1 as a linguistic resource for discussion of certain aspects of content or

language, leading to meaningful discussions through which learners acquire the L2 with more easily.

2.2.3 The Effect of L1 Use

Previous studies have shown that students' L1 use in the classroom not only serves different functions, but also has different effects on L2 learning. Among these functions and effects, it is possible to find cognitive and social ones, including the construction of scaffolded assistance and collaborative dialogue, which increases the opportunity for language acquisition to take place (Antón & DiCamilla 1998; de la Colina & García Mayo, 2009; Swain & Lapkin 2000). When learners use their L1 to gain control of a task, they are extending their Zone of Proximal Development since there exists scaffolded assistance among the students, which helps them reach a higher cognitive level that may not be reached by only working individually (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003). The use of L1 among students also enables them to accomplish tasks effectively and thoroughly, which may not happen if the students rely only on the target language (Swain & Lapkin, 2000). Swain and Lapkin (2000) conducted a study in which they observed the use of the L1 by 22 pairs of French immersion students while completing a dictogloss and a jigsaw task, which outcomes were written stories produced by each pair. The researchers coded the uses of L1 during interaction, and were able to conclude that judicious use of the L1 can certainly work as an important cognitive tool. Hence, productivity while working in the task, i.e. the way the work in order to complete the task effectively, is also affected by the use of students' L1 during peer interaction.

When students interact with each other, they discuss about the language problems making sense of its forms and the tasks they have to complete. This is called mediation, and it can occur in the L1 of the learners (Swain & Lapkin, 2000), which leads to feedback also taking place in the L1. Yu and Lee (2014) conducted a study in which 22 Chinese-speaking EFL students had to provide written feedback to a classmate's essay. Before giving feedback, the students were asked to freely choose which language they wanted to use when giving their comments. Results showed that when feedback on content and organization was involved, learners tended to switch to their L1, which resulted in providing more effective feedback because they communicated effectively the corrections to their peers. Swain and Lapkin (1998) were also able to observe that LREs could be solved in the L1 too, especially when focusing on specific L2 structures and when generating and assessing alternatives. Therefore, the L1 served as a mediational tool for these French immersion students. These studies demonstrated that students are able to have discussions about the target language in their L1 and these discussions enable them to reach consensus and acquire the language features that were discussed.

2.3 Vocabulary Learning in the Classroom

2.3.1 The Development of Vocabulary Knowledge

The learning component being considered to be a prerequisite for successful language understanding and developmental feature of language accuracy is vocabulary acquisition. The latter is understood as "all processes involved in lexical items in sufficient depth to be able to use them both productively and receptively, by means of multiple incidental and intentional

encounters with these items in varied contexts” (González-Fernández & Schmitt, in press). Due to its developmental importance and role in learning, vocabulary acquisition has become an important research field investigated in the EFL classroom because of its nature and role as developmental language predictor. In the current study, vocabulary acquisition is considered relevant due to all the processes and elements it involves, and more importantly, due to its applications on the incremental process of language learning (González-Fernández & Schmitt, in press).

Within the development of vocabulary, learners also encounter two types of knowledge, which are related to the size and quality of vocabulary units (Read, 2007; Schmitt, 1994). Breadth of vocabulary is related to the amount of words that a learner acquires, providing him with opportunities to increase morphological aspects of vocabulary (i.e. depth). Depth of vocabulary refers to what a learner knows about a specific word and how he utilizes it within a context reaching quality of word knowledge. Research suggests that both vocabulary aspects do not develop in parallel, they both contribute to one another in order to reach vocabulary acquisition. In accordance to what involves language teaching, in order to measure these two types of knowledge, i.e. breadth and depth, receptive and productive test formats can be administered to learners, depending on the purpose of the assessments (Read, 2007; Schmitt, 1994).

2.3.1.1. Implicit Vocabulary Learning Strategies vs. Explicit Vocabulary Learning Strategies. Empirical studies on the use and effectiveness of implicit and explicit learning strategies have provided researchers with different results (Fraser, 1999; Paribakth & Wesche, 1999).

These strategies are related to the tools students generally use to solve issues regarding vocabulary; those strategies are not generally developed with formal previous instruction from the teacher, as the learner can develop them on his own. Accordingly, Fraser (1999) conducted a study in which she observed the lexical processing strategies students used for vocabulary incidental learning. Those strategies consisted of ignoring vocabulary items, consulting a dictionary or a classmate, and inferring word meaning. The data was gathered from eight volunteer participants from a French university (enrolled in an intermediate ESL class), who encountered different unfamiliar words in eight different texts during a five-month period. The results in this study showed that the L2 learners mainly used productive strategies (consulting and inferring) rather than ignoring or not paying attention to unfamiliar words. As a consequence of the strategies used, learners retained more lexical units in incidental vocabulary learning. Thus, Fraser's (1999) study demonstrated that reading for comprehension in the L2 can lead to incidental vocabulary learning. It is also important to mention, that the study refers to different vocabulary learning processes that learners develop when participating in reading activities as it shows that learners had higher retention rates when an inference was based on associations made with existing information in the L1 or L2. Paribakht and Wesche (1999) conducted a similar study in which they observed how 10 intermediate-level students in a university ESL class accidentally acquired new lexical knowledge by reading texts related to themes previously seen in class. The results in this study showed these university ESL students acquired new vocabulary through the extensive use of inferring when encountering unknown words. Among the knowledge sources that the

participants used in inferencing, there were extralinguistic sources (i.e. world knowledge) and linguistic sources (i.e. grammar, morphology, word associations) Conforming to both studies, implicit learning strategies are used considerably more than explicit learning strategies by L2 learners. In addition to previous research, recent empirical research has contributed to the origins of further hypotheses. For instance, Ender (2014) conducted a study in which she explored the incidental vocabulary acquisition of 24 French students when they were reading for comprehension. The ways students dealt with unknown vocabulary was labeled into different lexical processing strategies similar to the ones that Fraser (1999) stated: (1) ignoring the unknown word, (2) using a (bilingual or monolingual) dictionary, (3) inferring the word's meaning with the help of various cues or (4) inferring the word's meaning and subsequently using a dictionary to check it. Results in Ender's study showed that not only explicit learning strategies, but also implicit learning strategies combined with explicit learning strategies, i.e. inferring and consulting a dictionary, double the chances of learning vocabulary and are substantially more effective than using only implicit learning strategies when learners are engaged in reading for comprehension. Therefore, a combination of both ways of dealing with new vocabulary items, i.e. different lexical processing strategies, may be effective for vocabulary acquisition.

2.3.1.2. Depth of vocabulary knowledge.

Read (1993) defined depth of vocabulary as "the quality of the learner's vocabulary knowledge" (cited in Henriksen, 1999). Even though it may seem quite important to assess how deeply students acquire new vocabulary, Read (2007) pointed out that testing vocabulary depth is recently used for research

purposes, due to the fact that lexical items become functional units in the learner's L2 lexicon, since vocabulary depth knowledge concerns deeper language features to study (i.e. pronunciation, spelling, morphological forms, and syntax). This is the reason why some researchers have used tests that measure depth of vocabulary knowledge to investigate different aspects of vocabulary acquisition in L2 learning, especially in research that aims at collecting information on how participants acquire new vocabulary through the implementation of certain teaching strategies or interactional patterns (Ender, 2014; Kim, 2008). Ender (2014) and Kim (2008), among other researchers, who have used VKS (i.e. Vocabulary Knowledge Scale) tests to measure depth of knowledge in their pre and post-tests, have been able to observe participants' vocabulary gain in order to provide deeper explanations of vocabulary development in reading comprehension tasks.

2.3.2 Vocabulary Learning during Interaction

As stated in several studies, interaction promotes L2 vocabulary acquisition when learners work collaboratively in meaning-focused tasks and engage in lexical-related conversations between learners when encountering a lexical problem (i.e. Lexical-LRE) (DiCamilla & Antón, 2012; Fernández Dobao, 2014, 2016; Kim, 2008; Swain, 2001). Swain and Lapkin (2001) observed two 8th grade French-immersion classes' interaction during the completion of two collaborative tasks, a dictogloss and a jigsaw. The researchers paid attention to how students focused on form while discussing collaboratively, and they found out that great part of the completion of the jigsaw task served for vocabulary learning, as it provided learners with major opportunities to focus attention on form due to the contribution of visual

prompts. Hence, the discussions about language through interaction helped learners deal with new vocabulary. Kim (2008) conducted a study with Korean as L2 learners, in which the participants had to complete a dictogloss task. Half of the participants had to complete the task in pairs, whereas the other half had to work individually. Learners who were engaged in the collaborative group task, i.e. dictogloss, were exposed to almost twice as many lexical LREs as those working in individual tasks, which consequently led them to perform better in the vocabulary posttest. Fernández Dobao (2016) also conducted a study exploring the interaction of 32 English-speakers, who were learning Spanish, when writing collaboratively. Findings showed that LREs were beneficial not only for the ones who triggered and solved them, but also for those who acted as observers. Therefore, by interacting, students can gain new vocabulary, as they are able to discuss about language, using their individual knowledge and resources to resolve LREs (Fernández Dobao, 2016).

2.3.3 L1 Use and Vocabulary Learning

Due to the fact that interaction promotes vocabulary acquisition, when interacting, learners are likely to use different resources apart from the lexical processing strategies listed above. One of these resources is not only inferring, but also using the L1, especially when interacting in pairs or groups. Some studies have shown that, in the classroom, learners often use their L1 to discuss and solve lexical issues (Alley, 2005; Azkarai & García Mayo, 2015). In Alley (2005), as well as in Azkarai and García Mayo (2015), the L1 was used in different aspects of communication, such as casual talk, metacognitive talk (i.e. talk about the task), discussions about grammar, and vocabulary talk

that helped learners understand or clarify vocabulary or lexical issues when they encountered them, and enhance learners' vocabulary acquisition. Thus, students' awareness of language through these conversations about language (done in the L1) contributed to L2 learning. Alley (2005) conducted his study with 18 Spanish students from a high school in rural Georgia, in which he observed the participants' discourse in group work. Findings showed that while the participants were involved in group work, their interaction occurred mainly in their L1 (English) represented by 71% of the overall language used. Although most of their discourse was in the L1, the researcher found that the use of it served for clarifying procedures in order to complete the task, and also for producing key vocabulary items. Therefore, the L1 may serve some specific roles when students try to solve issues regarding new vocabulary.

2.4. The Present Study

This study aimed at observing whether the participants' use of the L1 in peer interaction served for their vocabulary development. Even though previous research has observed the role of the L1 in the classroom, there has not been enough research done in regard to the roles that students' L1 can serve in the EFL classroom. Moreover, there is lack of research regarding which languages Chilean learners use when dealing with issues related to language, independently of their language proficiency. Lastly, there is a gap concerning whether the use of the L1 in peer interaction can help learners in their L2 vocabulary development.

In order to address the gaps in literature, the following research questions were formulated:

1. How do Chilean EFL learners use the L1 during peer interaction?
2. Which language do students rely on when they encounter language-related issues?
3. Does L1 use in peer interaction have a positive impact on the development of vocabulary development in the EFL classroom?

CHAPTER 3:

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overall Design

This research was concerned with (a) the functions that learners' L1 may serve during peer interaction, (b) interaction patterns, and (c) development of L2 vocabulary during peer interaction. As this study involved the examination of students' L1 use in peer interaction as a predictor of an outcome, i.e. L2 vocabulary acquisition, through the application of pre and posttests and the researchers' observation of the participants' interaction during the completion of collaborative tasks, the most suitable approach to follow was quasi-experimental (Creswell, 2012). As mentioned in Creswell (2012), the pre and post testing of the participants allows investigators to assess whether the activity in which the participants are involved has an impact on their results. In this research, such evaluative measures helped us determine the extent to which our intervention had an impact on our participants' L2 learning outcomes, which was one of the central questions of our investigation.

3.2 Context and Participants

3.2.1 Chilean Context

The acquisition of English as a foreign language is becoming increasingly important in present-day Chile. In the global world, English is the primary source of communication and a critical business tool. Thus, having a clear understanding and good use of the language would give Chileans the opportunity to achieve a higher global presence. Based on that premise, the Chilean government installed a framework to ensure that all students become

fairly proficient in the language. In Chilean schools, English is now a compulsory subject from fifth grade onwards, but some schools start teaching it from first grade. In the past few decades, many changes have been made in regard to how English should be taught. The most recently introduced changes are compiled in “The National English Strategy 2014 - 2030,” where the Chilean Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) provides a methodological and pedagogical framework with strategies for teaching English. The main objective of such strategies is “to strengthen the proficiencies of the Chilean population in the English language, in order to accelerate the integration of Chile into a global world and therefore improve Chileans’ competitiveness” (translated; MINEDUC, 2014, p. 9). In addition, the current national curriculum promotes the idea that English should be taught through the development of the four communicative skills (listening, reading, writing and speaking) via authentic, meaningful and communicative tasks. According to the Chilean Ministry of Education, these communicative tasks are supposed to give learners self-confidence to reach high levels of achievement in their L2. The national curriculum also argues for cooperative language learning, as this is an educational approach that fosters interaction and collaboration among students for the completion of communicative tasks. In this regard, the national curriculum states that “the students of a language develop communicative competence when participating in diverse interactive situations in which communication is the main objective” (translated; Bases Curriculares, 2014, p.3).

Even though the Chilean government has been promoting changes in English teaching, the results of SIMCE (Sistema de Medición de la Calidad de

la Educación) have not shown substantial changes. In the English SIMCE 2012, applied to 11th graders, only 18% of all the candidates were certified (i.e. they were placed between A2 and B1 level). Since this test only measures listening and reading comprehension, there is no further knowledge about the average level students may have in the productive skills (writing and speaking). However, it is possible to assume that communicative competence lags behind the learners' receptive knowledge because it requires the use of productive skills that have not been completely developed yet. The national average score for reading comprehension was 48 points out of 100, and for listening comprehension the score was 49 points (Agencia de Calidad de la Educación, 2013). These results showed that there is still a huge gap to fulfill regarding English teaching in this country.

3.2.2. Current Study Context

The current study was conducted in a Chilean school in Lo Barnechea, Santiago. The context of this school differed from the general Chilean context described above. As a matter of fact, the scores that this school obtained in the SIMCE were: 96 points in reading comprehension, and 98 in listening comprehension, and 100% of the students who sat for the test obtained a certificate of their level of English (between A2 and B1). The differences between this school and the general Chilean context are vast since the average of this school in SIMCE were 97 points whereas only 49 points represented the national average (Agencia de la Calidad de la Educación, 2013). Therefore, the students of this school were highly proficient in English, at least in listening and reading, which are the skills that SIMCE assesses. This was a private bilingual educational institution with local and international

students who were able to use Spanish and English from medium to high levels of proficiency. As it was a bilingual school, subjects like English, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Natural Science were taught in English until seventh grade. However, when students reached eighth grade, most lessons were given in Spanish, except from English, Debate, and Natural Science. The switch from English to Spanish was a measure taken by the school to start preparing students for the Chilean standardized university admission examination, also known as Prueba de Selección Universitaria (PSU). Nonetheless, from eighth grade onwards, students still had nine hours of English classes per week.

This school highly emphasized the importance of developing students' comprehension skills, oral production, and written production in all subjects by including lessons that aimed at strengthening learners' critical thinking, and making students work collaboratively in the completion of problem-solving and investigation tasks. Starting from sixth grade, students were evaluated in these three pillars – content comprehension, oral production, and written production – for each given unit. To assess content comprehension and oral production, learners were commonly encouraged to participate in debates and to have small group discussions. To evaluate written production, they were usually instructed to write essays and to make short reflections.

The reason behind choosing a bilingual school that promoted learners' collaborative work was the need of having participants who were highly competent in English and were able to maintain a fluent conversation in the target language. Ensuring that the students were able to have discussions in

the target language was thought crucial. That way, they would rely on their L2 to have discussions and would make use of their L1 only when necessary.

3.2.3 Participants

Thirty-four students from eighth grade participated in this study. These students shared the same social and economic background, as they all came from high-income families who belonged to a small sector of Chile's overall population. Even though there were three participants who were non-native speakers of Spanish, all of the students were fluent Spanish and English speakers. The students were independent users of English, as their level of proficiency in the language was B2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR; Council of Europe, 2003). These participants were already acquainted with working collaboratively and were also familiarized with group-based tasks, which were common activities in most of their subjects, especially in their English literature classes. As part of English Literature, the students would commonly discuss content related to the literary pieces taught in the subject and would join groups to share their views on the different topics seen in the lesson. The participants considered in this study were 12 females and 22 males, who regularly attended their English Literature lessons and completed both pre and posttests. They were given random names in order to maintain confidentiality.

3.3 Procedure

The present study consisted of a four-week process. In the first week, all the participants answered a diagnostic test that contained 50 words taken from the novel "The Giver", which was the book that they were reading in their English Literature classes. In this test, the participants had to select "Yes" (I

know this word) or “No” (I don’t know this word) in the column right next to the word. This diagnostic test was not considered as an instrument in this study, since it only provided the necessary information for the selection of words from the pre and post-test (see Appendix A). During the second and third week, the students took the pretest, which followed the VKS format, which will later be explained, and worked collaboratively in the completion of two different tasks. There was no previous teaching related to the words because the participants had already seen the vocabulary throughout the reading of the novel. Lastly, in the fourth week, the participants took the posttest, which was the same VKS they had previously completed in the pretest.

3.4. Intervention

3.4.1 Extensive Reading

As part of their regular English Literature classes, the participants were reading the book “The Giver” by Lois Lowry. Since the researchers did not want to interfere with the regular flow and content of the classes, the intervention focused on the book the students had been reading during the semester. Nonetheless, it is important to stress that reading the book was considered as part of the current study. Specifically, in the study, (a) the target vocabulary was chosen from the book and (b) it was hypothesized that being exposed to the vocabulary prior to the intervention activities (i.e., collaborative group work activities) would allow students to acquire partial knowledge that they could deploy during meaningful interaction. It is also important to highlight that this study’s research materials had connection with the teaching materials used in the present study. Read (2007) pointed out that the current communicative approach questions the notion that decontextualized teaching

material was the basis for effective proficiency development in an L2. Therefore, this study utilized the authentic material participants were engaged in so as to know whether the participants were able to provide assistance to each other when dealing with new lexical items based on the previous understanding they had of the words from their reading.

3.4.2 Collaborative Peer Interaction Activities

According to previous research, collaborative tasks contribute to the learners' dialogic creation and discussions about the language when trying to write collaboratively (Fernández-Dobao, 2016; Storch, 2011; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). For the intervention of this study, the participants were engaged in two different collaborative tasks. The first task, which was completed in groups of four students, consisted in writing a new chapter for the book (100 to 150 words). In the first task, they were given 10 targeted words, out of the 20 words from the pretest, to include in their written work. Such words were chosen from the targeted vocabulary. In the second task, the students had to work collaboratively to write a new ending for the story they had read. For this second task, the participants were given the other 10 targeted words, which they also had to include in their texts. The students formed different groups for each task in order to give the participants the opportunity to interact with different people.

3.5 Data Collection

3.5.1 Pre and Posttest

The first data source implemented was a Vocabulary Knowledge Scale (VKS), which is a self-report based on how deeply students know a word (Wesche & Paribakht, 1996). For the completion of the VKS, the participants

from this study had to select a statement (from I to V) that best represented their knowledge of the target word. Statement I meant not being acquainted with the word, while statement II meant being familiarized with the word, but not knowing its meaning. In the case of statements III and IV, the participants were allowed to write the definition or synonym in their L1 or L2. However, in statement III they did not have to know the exact definition, whereas in statement IV they needed to provide a more precise meaning of the word. In the case of statement V (sentence creation), the participants also had to provide the meaning of the word (statement IV). The VKS was administered to each participant of this study in both pretest and posttest, as a way to measure the depth of their vocabulary knowledge. Therefore, this pretest-posttest design was aimed at collecting information regarding each participant's knowledge of the specific targeted lexical items. The test consisted of a set of 20 words chosen from the diagnostic test. Specifically, those 20 words were the ones that the learners showed little or no knowledge of. Among the selected words, there were ten nouns, six verbs, and four adjectives. In order to avoid confusion regarding where the words should be placed in a sentence and avert ambiguity in the participants' answers, most of the target lexical items chosen were nouns. The students were not told in advance about the test, because it was meant to be included as one of their regular lessons in order not to interfere much in their classes. This test aimed at measuring their understanding of the words presented in the novel without previous instruction. Both pre and post-test took around 30 minutes. Figure 1 shows an example of the VKS scale (the rest of the tested words can be found in Appendices C and D).

<p style="text-align: center;">NURTURER</p> <p>I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.</p> <p>II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.</p> <p>III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.</p> <p>IV. I know this word. It means _____.</p> <p>V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).</p> <p>_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).</p>
--

Figure 1. VKS scale

3.5.2 Interaction

The participants' interaction was audio-recorded in order to obtain information regarding their collaboration and the language they were using when encountering language-related issues. This interaction aimed at observing whether some participants were able to use the words seen in the pretest by helping their classmates understand the words they were discussing. As part of the gathered data, there were 16 audio recordings, which lasted 35 minutes each, giving a total of 9 to 10 hours of audio-recorded data.

3.6 Data analysis

3.6.1 Vocabulary Knowledge Scale

The results from the pre and posttest were counted and labeled from 1 to 5, as this gave broader evidence of the improvement – if any – that students had (Kim, 2008). Whenever the participants selected a statement from III to V,

and it was correct, they were given the score that corresponded to that statement. For instance, if participants completed statement III accurately, they were given a score of 3. If they selected a statement from III to VI and their answer was incorrect, they were given a score of 2, which corresponded to: “I have seen or heard this word, but I don’t know what it means”.

The scores that each participant obtained in both pre and posttest were compared in order to calculate the gain that the participants had for each target word (Fernández Dobao, 2012; Kim, 2008). For example, if a participant had a score of 2 in the pretest and obtained a score of 3 in the posttest, the gain was 1. Similarly, when a participant was given a score of 3 in the pretest and 5 in the posttest, the gain was 2. In the case a participant obtained a score of 5 in the pretest and 3 in the posttest, the gain was -2 (negative gain). However, when a participant had a score of 5 in the pre-test and maintained or lowered his score in the post-test, the gain was 0.

3.6.2. Interaction.

3.6.2.1 L1 functions. In order to answer the first research question, How do Chilean EFL learners use their L1 in peer interaction? The interaction among participants was transcribed into written form. Transcribing was a necessary step to better code the data. For transcribing, the researchers listened to the audios, identified the voice of each participant and started writing their utterances according to transcription conventions. Some of the key features included were the use of “[]” for transcribing speech in another language, “/---/” for unintelligible speech, “--” for interrupted speech, “%%” for simultaneous speech, “...” for unfilled pause, “uh” for filled pause, and the use of italics for the transcribers’ comments. For coding, the participants’ L1 use

was divided into different functions based on DiCamilla and Antón's (2012) coding scheme.

The functions observed were color-coded and counted by turns whenever a participant turned to their L1 to contribute in the task. The turns which were off-task were not included neither in the counting nor in the analysis. Hence, every time a participant made use of their L1, the turn was coded depending on its purpose. The following are some examples of L1 functions:

Example of F1: Content.

(F1a) creating, discussing, and/or agreeing to content in the L1.

Manuel: Entonces digamos que Jonas muere, entonces sacrificio así. Y, para traer las memories de vuelta... para dar la verdad a la gente. (F1a) [So, let's say that Jonas dies, as a sacrifice and, in order to take back the memories... to give truth to people.]

Carlos: Y como que pone a Gabe en el universo. (F1a) [And it puts Gabe in the universe.]

(F1b) translating content created in the L1 into the L2.

Joaquin: Fiona was very confused, así como que, [just like] he, he saw everyone, everyone going crazy receiving all this memories and didn't know what to do with those, and the things and then eh como, ¿alegar? [Like, to complain?]

Carlota: Complain?

Example of F2: Language.

(F2a) solving lexical and/or grammatical problems.

Marcela: And there I saw, ehh, Asher. ¿Cómo se escribe? [How is it spelled?]

Esperanza: Como suena. [As It sounds.]

Francesca: Como el cantante que canta con Justin Bieber. [Like the singer that sings with Justin Bieber.]

Marcela: ¿Así? [Like this?]

Esperanza: Sí. [Yes.]

(F2b) evaluating L2 forms.

Elena: The giver placed his hands on Jonas' back... emerged from the darkness when Jonas saw with his eyes closed... he was standing on the side of a red woman ... red-haired woman! Oh my God.... a red woman jajaja.

Salvador: La mujer roja. [The red woman.] The red woman.

(F2c) understanding meaning of L2 utterances.

Tomas: ¿Qué es meticulous según tú? [What is 'meticulous' according to you?]

Benjamín: Según yo es como, como muy perfecto. [I think it is like very perfect.]

Simón: Perfectito y cuidadoso. [Perfect and careful.]

(F2d) Stylistic choice.

Martín: Pon comas y puntos, no todo seguido. [Use commas and period; not everything together.]

Esperanza: /-/ Párrafo largo no más. [Just a long paragraph.]

Example of F3: Task management.

(F3a) defining and limiting the task.

Trinidad: No es el máximo o el mínimo, tenemos que poner las 10 palabras. [It is not the maximum or minimum. We have to use the 10 words.]

Martin: ¿Cuántas palabras nos faltan? [How many words are we missing?]

(F3b) planning the task.

Miguel: ¿Vamos a turnarnos por párrafo? [Are we going to take turns every paragraph?]

Elena: ¿Vámonos turnando por palabra? Gracias. [Shall we take turns every word? Thanks.]

F4. Interpersonal relations.

José: ¿Qué te pasa? [What's the matter?]

Catalina: Me hacen bullying con todo lo que hago... [You bully me for everything I do.]

3.6.2.2 LREs and LRES in L1. The different language-related episodes that arose during the participants' discussion were also coded, indicating whether they were initiated or solved in Spanish (L1), English (L2), or in both languages (L1 and L2) and whether they were lexical, grammatical, or mechanical LREs (Alley, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). To indicate if the LREs were in Spanish, English or in both languages, the words that were in each LRE were counted in order to establish which language was used the most by the students when encountering language-related issues (Alley, 2005). After counting, the resulting numbers were added into an Excel spreadsheet and analyzed. Lexical, grammatical, and mechanical LREs were

labeled into LREs of the target words or LREs of non-target words. These results were included in a different Excel spreadsheet for its analysis. The following are some examples of LRE discussed in Spanish and English:

Example of LRE in Spanish

José: ¿Qué es sled? [What is sled?]

Carlos: Sled es el trineo. [Sled is sled.]

José: ¿Inclinado? [Leaning?]

Carlos: No, es el trineo. [No, it is sled.]

Manuel: Es esa cosa que pasai cuando... [That's the thing you cross when...]

Carlos: El trineo. [The sled.]

Catalina: Ah sí, sí, sí. [Uhm, yes, yes, yes.]

Manuel: Cuando pasai, ¿entendí o no? [When you cross. Do you understand, or not?]

Catalina: Un trineo. [A sled.]

José: Ya caché, ya caché, sí sé lo que es un trineo. [I got it, I got it... I know what a sled is.]

In this LRE, José initiated a discussion about the word “sled”, one of the 20 targeted words used in this study, by asking what the word meant in Spanish. As a reply, Carlos gave the correct definition of the word. José, in return, asked for another definition of sled by providing an incorrect meaning of the word. However, Carlos insisted on the definition that he gave at the beginning of the discussion and Manuel tried to give an example of what the word meant in Spanish. Carlos completed the example that Manuel was providing and Catalina was able to understand the meaning of the word. The

LRE was successfully resolved in Spanish after José was also able to confirm his knowledge about the word.

Example of LRE in English

José: What is smack?

Bastían: Como [like] hit.

Débora: Así...Mira, mira, así. [Like this... look, look, like this.]

Bastían: Smack the car.

José: I understand, I understand the idea of smack, man.

Bastían: Smack the car.

José: He smack his wife.

Débora: He, no, he smack himself to wake up.

José: He smack himself to wake up and start dancing.

In this LRE, José initiated a discussion in English about the word “smack”, one of the 20 target words used in this study, by asking his group what the word meant. In return, Bastían provided a definition for the word and Débora continued with an exemplification of the word. As a way to confirm that the LRE was resolved, Bastían, José, and Débora gave several examples of how the word could be used in a sentence and be included as part of their story.

3.6.3. Linking VKS and Interaction Data

The LREs, of the target words were also analyzed. The researchers observed the number of LREs per target word and whether they were discussed in L1, L2 or both languages. Then, the overall gain per word (i.e. the average gain of all the participants per word) was observed in order to

establish a relationship between the language the participants used to discuss the LRE and the average gain per word.

The researchers were concerned about the participants who showed a higher gain in vocabulary knowledge—those who obtained a gain higher than 3—and the level of involvement they had in the discussion of LREs. To establish a possible relation between the participants' engagement in the LREs and their gain in vocabulary development, the researchers looked at the difference of scores between the pre and posttest, i.e. gain, and checked the LREs of the words where the participants had a higher gain, so as to see if they contributed actively to those LREs. For example, if a participant had a gain of three points in the target word “nurturer”, the researchers looked for the LRE in which that target word was discussed, and observed whether the level of engagement had a relation with the gain that this participant showed.

CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS

4.1 First Language Functions

One of the aspects that was observed in this study were the functions that the first language (L1) served in students' speech. The participants of this study made use of their L1. Their L1 served different purposes, which corresponded to the functions listed by DiCamilla & Antón (2012). As presented in table 1, the participants were engaged in 2,725 turns in L1, out of which 31.63% were related to content (F1), 36.11% to language (F2), 23.77% to task management (F3), and 8.47% to personal relations (F4). With regard to the specific subcategories of the functions, the participants used the L1 to (F1a) create, discuss or agree content (98.25%), and (F1b) translate L1 into L2 (1.74%). They also used their L1 to (F2a) solve lexical or grammatical problems (17.88%), (F2b) evaluate L2 forms (6.3%), (F2c) understand meaning of L2 utterances (67.88%), and for (F2d) stylistic choice (7.92%). Concerning task management, they used their L1 to (F3a) define and limit the task (37.19%), and (F3b) plan the task (62.80%). Table 2 summarizes the subcategories of the L1 functions.

Table 1. L1 Functions

Function	Number	Percentage
F1. Content	862	31.63%
F2. Language	984	36.11%
F3. Task management	648	23.77%
F4. Interpersonal relations	231	8.47%
Total	2725	

Table 2. L1 Functions Subcategories

Function (subcategories)	Number	Percentage
1a. Creating, discussing or agreeing content	847	98.25%
1b. Translating L1 into L2	15	1.74%
2a. Solving lexical or grammatical problems	176	17.88%
2b. Evaluating L2 forms	62	6.3%
2c. Understanding meaning of L2 utterances	668	67.88%
2d. Stylistic choice	78	7.92%
3a. Defining and limiting the task	241	37.19%
3b. Planning the task	407	62.80%

4.2 Language Related Episodes

The participants were involved in 173 language related episodes (LREs). Table 3 shows different LREs of target and non-target words discussed in the L1, L2 or using both languages (English and Spanish). Within the LREs discussed in the L1, 87.39% were of the target words, and 12.6% of non-target words. Among the LREs with L2, 50% were about the target words and 50% of non-target words. In relation to the LREs discussed using both languages, 78.94% were of the target words and 21.05% of non-target words. The LREs shown in table 3 include lexical, grammatical, and mechanical LREs. Table 4 shows the total of the LREs of target and non-target words, and which language the participants used. Overall, 82.08% of all the LREs were of the target words and 17.91% of non-target words. Moreover, 68.78% of all the LREs were discussed in the L1, 9.24% discussed in the L2 and 21.96% discussed using both languages.

Table 3. LREs

LREs w/L1		LREs w/L2		LREs mixed		Total
Target	non-target	target	non-target	target	non-target	
104	15	8	8	30	8	173
87.39%	12.60%	50%	50%	78.94%	21.05%	

Table 4. Target and non-target words LREs

	LREs w/L1	%	LREs w/L2	%	LREs mixed	%	Total	%
Target	104	72.23	8	5.63	30	21.12	142	82.08

Non-target	15	48.38	8	25.8	8	25.8	31	17.91
Total	119	68.78	16	9.24	38	21.96	173	

The following are examples of LREs:

(1) LRE using the L1

Lexical LRE “nurturer” (target word)

Martín: Nurturer era... [Nurturer was...].

Vicente: El papá de Jonas, según yo [Like Jonas’ father, according to me].

Martín: Era el que hacía los partos. [He was the one who delivered babies.]

Vicente: Sí, eran los que cuidaban de los bebés. [Yes, they were the ones who took care of babies.]

In this episode, the participants used their L1 to discuss about the word “nurturer”. They gave examples of the book in order to convey meaning of the word, and related it to the piece of writing they needed to complete.

(2) LRE using the L2

Lexical LRE “bare” (target word)

Elena: Ok, ok, so.... Bare is like the lack of. Barefoot, with the foot without a shoe. Barely como [like] barely almost nothing, ¿cachai? [you see?]

Ismael: Entonces ahí [so, there is] bare hand?

In the case of this LRE, the participants discussed about the target word “bare” using the L2. Here, Elena provided the definition of the word in English,

and she also gave an example of it. This discussion allowed Ismael to relate the word with what they were writing (bare hand).

(3) Lexical LRE using both languages

Lexical LRE “remorse” (target word)

Esperanza: ¿Y remorse? [And remorse?]

Elena: Como regret. [It is like regret.]

Martina: Remordimiento. [Remorse].

Elena: Regret, regret.

Martina: No, no, no, no, no.

Elena: Como regret. [It is like regret.]

Martina: No, no, no es regret, no es exactamente regret. [It isn't regret exactly.]

Elena: Se parece. [It is similar.]

Martina: Se parece, pero no es exactamente. [It is similar, but it is not exactly the same.]

Elena: No, pero se parece. [No, but it's similar.]

Trinidad: Se parece jaja. [It is similar.]

Elena: Como [like] regret something you didn't do or that you did.

Martina: Como, mira, cuando you regret something, normalmente you feel guilty about something, no necesariamente te sientes triste, según yo, pero con remorse, con remordimiento, yo creo que uno se siente triste, como muy mal por lo que hizo. [Like, look. When you regret something, you usually feel guilty about something. You don't necessarily feel sad; I think so. In the case of remorse, I think that someone feels sad and bad for what they did.]

Elena: ¿Cachai? Es como más o menos la misma causa. [You see? It is more or less the same reason.]

Martina: Sí, pero no es exactamente igual. [Yes, but it is not exactly the same.]

In this LRE, the participants were involved in a discussion about the target word 'remorse'. They used both languages to provide synonyms and examples in order to establish the difference between the words remorse and regret.

4.3 LREs and L1 use

As presented above, the participants were engaged in a total of 173 LREs. Even though these participants were highly proficient in the L2, the participants made use of their L1 extensively. One of the questions that this study aimed to answer was related to the language the participants used when encountering LREs. Thus, all the words presented in the LREs were counted and categorized by groups as table 5 shows. Their use of the L1 was represented by 73.35% of their total speech when encountering language-related issues, whereas their use of the L2 resulted in 26.64% of the overall speech when engaged in LREs.

Table 5. L1 and L2 use within LREs

LREs	L1 words	%	L2 words	%
173	3,425	73.356	1,244	26.643

4.4 Pre and posttest

The VKS scores of each participant in the pre and posttest were counted and summarized in Table 6. Since this study observed students' scores in the pre and posttest, the average score of each word among the 34 participants was counted in order to see the gain the participants had for each target word. The whose which score increased the most in the posttest was "sled" (Gain=0.94), whereas none of the target words presented gains higher than 1.

Table 6. VKS average scores

Word	Pre	Post	Gain
Nurturer	2.352	2.823	0.470
Dwelling	2.029	2.617	0.588
Defiant	2.0588	2.588	0.529
Sameness	3.147	3.441	0.294
Envy	2.852	3.470	0.617
Shiver	2.676	3.176	0.5
Remorse	1.882	2.588	0.705
Serene	2.882	3.323	0.441
Ribbon	2.911	3.323	0.411
Sled	2.666	3.441	0.941
Tellings	2.117	2.970	0.852
Transgression	1.823	2.117	0.294
Smack	3.323	3.588	0.264
Meticulous	2.176	2.705	0.529
Drift	2.470	2.764	0.294

Indolence	1.882	1.970	0.088
Bare	2.147	2.529	0.382
Emerge	3.147	3.294	0.147
Condemn	2.323	2.5	0.176
Impede	2.970	3.5	0.529

4.5 LREs and Vocabulary Development

Most of the LREs focused on the target words were made in the L1 (73.2%). The target words that were discussed the most were: defiant (9.39%), dwelling (8.05%), remorse (8.05%), sled (7.36%), and nurturer (6.71%). The words that presented higher gain were: sled (Gain = 0.94), tellings (Gain = 0.85), remorse (Gain = 0.7), and envy (Gain = 0.62). Hence, target words that showed more incidence in the LREs were not the same as the ones that presented higher gain. Table 7 summarizes the LREs and gain per target word.

Table 7. LREs and gain per target word.

	N° LREs				
Word	L1	L2	Mixed	Total	Gain
Nurturer	10	0	0	10	0.470
Dwelling	10	0	1	11	0.588
Defiant	10	0	4	14	0.529
Sameness	4	0	1	5	0.294
Envy	4	0	0	4	0.617
Shiver	5	0	1	6	0.5
Remorse	10	1	1	12	0.705

Serene	5	0	0	5	0.441
Ribbon	6	0	0	6	0.411
Sled	5	0	2	7	0.941
Tellings	2	1	3	6	0.852
Transgression	4	0	3	7	0.294
Smack	1	1	2	4	0.264
Meticulous	3	1	3	7	0.529
Drift	6	1	1	8	0.294
Indolence	6	0	1	7	0.088
Bare	3	1	3	7	0.382
Emerge	3	2	3	8	0.147
Condemn	6	0	0	6	0.176
Impede	1	0	1	2	0.529

CHAPTER 5:

DISCUSSION

5.1 Language use in the Chilean EFL classroom

5.1.1 L2 use

The first finding, which was rather unexpected, was that despite of their high proficiency in the L2, the participants still used their L1 to a great extent when completing the task. However, the use of their L1 was not an impediment for completing the tasks successfully and delivering a good piece of writing in the L2. The participants of this study used grammatical forms accurately, which evidenced their high level of proficiency in the L2. Some examples of the paragraphs the participants produced during the interventions are presented as Written Products 1 and 2 below. They were transcribed without making any changes and the target words were underlined by the researchers to draw attention to their usage. The entire set of pieces of writing can be found in Appendix E.

Written Product 1

Drift into Conscienceness

One day Jonas woke up more defiant than ever. He went downstairs to the dinning area of his dwelling and saw his father with a nurturer uniform on. He was about to take the pill, the small capsule that stopped the stirrings, decreased all feelings and made everyone a part of sameness. Just a thought of sameness made him shiver. It was true that it brought benefits, for example the end of discrimination and envy, but it took out many good things that

people had before. Some of the things Jonas saw in the memories were as simple as snow, hills and sleds, but if the community saw that it would be enough to make him feel remorse for ending all the differences. Now, as his father helped Lily tie her ribbons, Jonas came slowly... He was about to tell him everything...

Written Product 2

Everybody was going insane. From a "serene" society to a crazy one. Fiona was very confused. She didn't know what to do with the memories that had emerged from the dust. Planes were flying to the direction Jonas went. They wanted to arrest him, to judge him, to release him. Fiona was worried, ever since the memories came back she started feeling things for him, she wanted him to be safe. She heard rumors that the security guard were going to do something bad to him. Today she was going to Asher's dwelling and ask him for help, she was going to rescue him.

It is important to take into consideration that students' did make minor mistakes (mainly in spelling) but those mistakes did not interfere with the overall understanding of their written products. In the specific case of Written Product 1, the content of their works was up to the level, and they managed to complete the task, using most of the target words. In Written Product 2, the students focused more on the content of the story, so they did not pay much attention to the target words.

Excerpt 5.1 (Group 3)

1. Martina: Opinions! About transgression.
2. Salvador: I think is, transgression is eh bully to the—
3. Simon: —Transgender?
4. Salvador: No, bullying to a transgender, that is what I think. Hey, it is an idea.
5. Simon: Transgression, transgression.
6. Tomas: Hi, my name is Tomas and I think a transgression is similar to a money transaction in a bank.
7. Martina: No, I think transgression is kind of a juicio, ¿juicio? [Judgment, judgment?] I do not know. Or to change something and making another thing? Because... What do you think is transgression?
8. Simon: I think it is a transaction I think like /---/ It is wrong.
9. Martina: And what do you think it is a transact—transgression?
10. Salvador: I already said it. Bullying to someone that is from your gender but it is a trans.
11. Simon: Noooo.
12. Salvador: Hey! That is my opinion!
13. Martina: ¿Por qué no la transgression puede ser un juicio? [Why can't a transgression be a judgment?] Como [like] we're gonna put Jonas in a transgression y Fiona pregunta como... [and Fiona asks like...] What is a transgression? Y/---/ como a bank transaction in a juicio. [And /---/ like a bank transaction in a judgment.]

Excerpt 5.1 shows that students were able to maintain a conversation in English where they also discussed about language. Students had the necessary linguistic resources to carry out a conversation in the L2. However, there were only few instances (line 7 & line 13) where they resorted to their L1. This demonstrates that despite the fact that students had a high proficiency in the L2, they still turned to their L1 in some occasions. For instance, they made use of their L1 to decide how how they were going to use the word in the story.

5.1.2 L1 use

As shown in previous studies, the present investigation observed students' L1 being used extensively during peer interaction in the EFL classroom (DiCamilla & Antón, 2012; Sampson, 2012). In this regard, and in order to answer the first research question, the students' L1 served the functions found in DiCamilla and Antón (2012). During peer interaction, the participants relied on the L1 for mainly two functions, language and content, which were also divided into different subcategories. The most used subcategory for language was F2c (understanding meaning of L2 utterances). On this matter, there were many occasions where the students encountered grammatical or punctuation issues in the L2 and discussed those utterances using their L1.

In contrast to DiCamilla and Antón (2012), Sampson (2012) found that learners turned to their L1 due to different reasons, which were not only related to cognitive functions. Sampson explained L2 avoidance as the instances where even though learners had the linguistic resources to convey the message in the L2, they still chose to turn to their L1. In Sampson's study, learners mentioned that they felt more confident when using the L1 and they

recognized the usefulness of L1 to provide synonyms to each other. However, the switch from L2 to L1 appeared to serve mainly as a socializing function. What Sampson (2012) was able to observe in his research was also noticeable in the current study. The participants from this investigation relied mainly on their L1 to complete the task and also used their L1 to socialize with one another.

In spite of the similarities between the present study and previous research done on L1 use, there were also substantial differences. For instance, DiCamilla and Antón (2012) observed the functions that the L1 served in two classes, with participants that had different proficiency levels while completing a collaborative writing task in pairs. The results in their study indicated that advanced-level students used their L1 notably less than beginning-level students. DiCamilla and Antón concluded that lower proficiency participants used the L1 in a frequency range that went from 70% to 82%, whereas almost all of the interactions of the higher proficiency dyads were done in the L2. In contrast to DiCamilla and Antón (2012), the participants from this study, who also had the necessary linguistic resources to communicate in the L2, still used the L1 in great part of their turns, especially when dealing with issues concerning language. The lack of L2 in the discussions of the present study could have occurred due to different factors such as learners' age, the context, and motivation of the participants, factors that were not observed in depth in this study. However, it is possible to highlight that in the case of DiCamilla and Antón's (2012) study, the participants were university students, whereas the participants of the present study were eighth graders. It stands to light that eighth graders can be

attributed different characteristics from those given to university students. For instance, they have contrasting ideas about learning new contents, different preferences regarding the learning of English, and they can be less mature. These factors could have affected the way they perceived the task and how to complete it. Therefore, the participants may have not been as interested in the task, or they might have not considered it as something important because it did not include a grade. Additionally, the present investigation can be contrasted to Swain and Lapkin's (2000) research. In their study, the participants' use of the L1 was observed cognitively and collaboratively while the participants were engaged in the completion of written collaborative tasks (jigsaw and dictogloss). Swain and Lapkin (2000) concluded that the functions of the L1 served as communicative tools, i.e. they enabled the participants to complete the task and also to socialize with each other. Unlike Swain and Lapkin (2000), the present study did not analyze interpersonal interactions focused on off-task conversation, as the aim of this investigation was to analyze how the L1 helped the students produce in the L2. Hence, in the case of this study, interpersonal interactions were analyzed only when students were engaged in the completion of the task, especially when participants' assisted one another in the L1 while discussing about language.

In summary, this study supports research done on the L1 regarding its use in peer interaction and the functions that it serves in the classroom. In line with what has been reported in previous investigations, the most observed functions were F1a and F2a (DiCamilla & Antón, 2012), which are related to content and language, respectively. Therefore, the answer to the first research question of this study is that these Chilean learners used their L1 mainly to

convey meaning that they did not understand in the L2, and to talk about content they were including in the specific tasks. Nevertheless, it is important to clarify that the existence of the L1 in the classroom did not impede the production of written work and the use of proper structures and linguistic features in the L2.

5.2. Peer Interaction and vocabulary development

5.2.1 Peer interaction and Lexical Related Episodes (LREs)

In respect to peer interaction, Sato (2016) conducted a study in a Chilean EFL classroom, in which he chose the highest and lowest proficiency classes from 10th grade and made them work collaboratively so as to examine three different features: the interaction mindsets of the participants, the learning processes of the participants, and the learning outcomes of the participants by applying pre and posttests. Among the results discussed by the researcher, it is relevant to this study how both groups improved their vocabulary size and how their interaction enabled productive practice opportunities. In this regard, learners become aware of what they are not able to express when they use the vocabulary that they know and new vocabulary. Lastly, the researcher also pointed out that when interacting, learners find themselves in a safe environment for learning, as they do not feel threatened when they make mistakes. In the present study, we also could observe that the participants became aware of the words they did not know, and relied on their pre-existing knowledge. We also noticed that in most groups, the learners were not afraid of sharing doubts related to content or language use. In most cases, when these discussions took place, they occurred in a proper and respectful environment that enhanced opportunities for meaningful learning.

It is widely acknowledged that when students develop collaborative tasks, they can encounter LREs (Storch, 2013; Swain, 2001). In the case of the present study, the collaborative nature of the task allowed participants to discuss the target words, but also other features of language. The participants of this study were actively engaged in discussions about language, but they paid particular attention to the discussions of the meaning of the target words, i.e. they were engaged in lexical LREs (L-LREs). In general, the participants of this study were able to contribute with their knowledge to the resolution of LREs, especially Lexical LREs.

Group work also allowed the participants to remain engaged in LREs. This study confirms that if learners are grouped, they can contribute to the resolution of LREs and co-construct new knowledge in the L2 through collaborative interaction (Fernández Dobao & Blum, 2013; Fernández Dobao, 2014; Kim, 2008; Swain, 2001). In the present study, the engagement of students in the LREs was determined by allowing them work in groups since all the participants made some kind of contribution, some more extensive than others, to the discussions in the writing task. Even though this study did not aim at exploring participants' roles in their groups, it was possible to observe that some students maintained an active role whereas others maintained a passive one. On the one hand, the students who maintained an active participation were the ones who constantly solved or initiated the LREs, inviting their classmates to confirm what they were saying. On the other hand, the students who maintained a passive participation, contributed by confirming what the other participants were discussing. Fernández Dobao (2016) observed some roles that learners had while encountering LREs. She labeled

student's roles into four categories: trigger, solver, contributor, and observer. In the present study, all these roles were observed and they served a way to determine how some students—especially the ones who had higher level of proficiency—participated actively.

Excerpt 5.2 (Group 13)

1. Esperanza: Y sameness es igualdad, ¿no? [And sameness is equality, right?]
2. Martina: Sameness, sí. [Yes.]
3. Esperanza: Ya, igualdad. [Ok, equality.]
4. Elena: Sameness, no, no es equality, pero es como sameness without differences pero boring, ¿cachai? Como la versión mala. [No, it is not equality, but it is like sameness without differences but boring, do you understand? Like the bad version.]
5. Esperanza: Ah ya. [Ah ok.]
6. Martina: Como sameness donde todo el mundo es igual. [Like sameness where everyone is the same.]
7. Trinidad: Ah.

In Excerpt 5.2, Esperanza initiated the LRE (line 1) by trying to confirm the meaning of the word 'sameness'. Elena and Martina were highly proficient in the language, but they differed in the meaning of the word. Elena made a contribution that was extensive enough to provide the rest of the members of the group with an accurate definition of the word 'sameness'. Also, during the discussion, Esperanza, Elena, and Martina had the opportunity to negotiate and agree on the meaning of the word 'sameness'.

The contributions that the participants made were also connected to the quality of the interaction. Whenever the participants took advantage of the moment in order to solve the language issues, proper discussions took place, whereas when participants did not contribute to the LRE as a whole, the word ended up ignored or unsolved.

In spite of the fact that successful collaboration existed in almost every group of participants, there were still some cases in which participants did not reach any level of collaboration with each other while performing the task. Excerpt 5.2, illustrates non-collaborative relation where the teacher and participants discussed their lack of collaboration in the task in L2.

Excerpt 5.3 (Group 11)

1. Researcher: Ok, all of you work, there is no one working here.
2. Benjamin: Pero miss, yo quise hacer el primer párrafo. [But, miss I wanted to do the first paragraph.] Don't you understand?
3. Researcher: Yes, but I already told you were supposed to be working in groups.
4. Benjamin: Yes, I was finishing the paragraph.
5. Researcher: I know... but, you were supposed to be working collaboratively.
6. Benjamin: Ok.
7. Miguel: Everyone was crazy and...
8. Benjamin: A mí me interesan más las palabras. [I am interested in the words.]

9. Researcher: Maybe you can tell Cristian in the meantime what you wrote about?
10. Benjamin: Ok.
11. Miguel: It wasn't good.
12. Salvador: It wasn't good.
13. Miguel: Nice!

Non-collaborative relations are explained in the example previously shown (Excerpt 5.3), as Benjamin claimed that he was writing by his own without any collaboration involved, which means that he was not willing to participate in collaboration. As explained by Sato (2016), a non-collaborative relationship could be defined by the interference of social relationships within social situations (e.g. the collaborative task that students were involved in this study), which could be driven by the rejection of others' corrective feedback (CF). In this case, the whole group trusted Benjamin to do the written production as he was the one who presumably knew the meaning of most of the target words. Such behavior may not be conducive to L2 learning and might not be beneficial for the group, since it can be interpreted as he was doing everything by himself and was not willing to help his classmates in the acquisition of new vocabulary.

5.2.2 L1 Use within LREs

As discussed previously, the interaction in groups triggered by the collaborative nature of the task allowed participants to discuss about the language. As a way to answer the second research question, it was found that great part of the discussions about the language was done in the L1. In fact, 73.35% of all the words the participants used when encountering LREs were in

their L1. Due to the level of proficiency of students, these results were absolutely unforeseen especially because the participants in this study were told to complete the task (including the discussion) in English.

Through the use of the L1, the participants were able to scaffold. It was not only the interaction the tool through which the participants could assist one another, but also their L1. Since the participants shared the same L1 (including the natives that were highly proficient in Spanish as well), it was easier and quicker for them to solve or discuss the LREs (Sampson, 2012). Moreover, the participants whose L1 was not Spanish, also made their contributions in Spanish in order to clarify content, language, and meaning to their classmates.

Excerpt 5.4 (Group 1)

1. Agustín: Ya, ¿pero tellings son dichos o no? [Ok, but tellings are sayings or not?]
2. Miguel: Cállate. [Shut up.]
3. Elena: Tellings es como historias. [Tellings are like tales.] Tellings of my mother.

In Excerpt 5.4, Elena's L1 was not Spanish, but she was able to provide the accurate meaning of the target word 'tellings' to Agustín whose L1 was Spanish. As a result, the L-LRE of the word 'tellings' was solved through the L1. It is believed that the reason why Elena resorted to Spanish was because it was considered the predominant language within the group, and she was being empathetic with the rest of her peers.

Excerpt 5.5 (Group 16)

1. Ismael: Jonas was in Fiona's Dwelling, Fiona's Dwelling. Punto.
[Period.]
2. Simón: Jonas was shivering from excitement because he wanted to.
3. Renato: He wanted to what? —oh yes.
4. Simón: —Wanted to play with his sled in the snow.
5. Francesca: No po, porque estaba en... [No, because he was in...]
Fiona's dwelling, en el lugar de Fiona. [At Fiona's place.]

In the excerpt 5.5 the students were involved in the creation of the task. They were focused on the content of the story they were creating, and were also trying to include the target words. Francesca wanted the rest to understand that it did not make sense to continue the story like that (line 5), so she turned to the L1 and explained what one of the words meant, while discussing the content of the task. Therefore, she was utilizing the L1 not only to discuss about the content of the story, but also to provide the definition of the target word 'dwelling'.

In relation to the second research question, the language in which these EFL learners relied the most when encountering language-related problems was Spanish. As a matter of fact, these participants discussed a great number of target words in the L1, especially because many of those words were abstract nouns or adjectives, as they were taken from a novel and are literary vocabulary. The target words required a higher level of discussion, or more resources to convey meaning. Therefore, the participants' L1 served as a

cognitive tool not only to convey meaning, but also to accomplish the task completely and successfully (Swain & Lapkin, 2000).

5.3. LREs and Vocabulary Development

As results showed, there was gain in the scores of target words due to the discussions made in the L1, but it was not a substantial increase. These results served to answer the third research question. The reason behind the gain in scores could be attributed to different factors such as participants' level of engagement in the discussions, engagement in the task or even other external factors that were not explicitly analyzed in this study. The length of the study, as well as the number of interventions, may have also affected the results since there was no prior or explicit teaching of the words, nor further practice of what students had discussed in their tasks.

One possible reason that could explain why the overall gain score was not substantially high could be the fact that some participants' score did not increase in any way in the posttest. A possible explanation as to why they obtained negative or no gain could be due to the low-quality discussions, indifference to the initiation of the LRE, confusion in the discussion or even tiredness when answering the posttest. Low-quality discussions, indifference to the initiation of the LRE, confusion in the discussion or even tiredness could have caused this problem. The following Excerpts show some examples of discussions in which some students, whose scores did not increase, participated.

Excerpt 5.6 (Group 14)

1. Camilo: Nurturer es el papá. [Nurturer is what the father does.]
2. Javiera: Nutricio... nutrición... [Nutrit... nutrition...]

3. Camilo: Es en lo que trabaja el papa. [It's the profession of the father.]
4. Javiera: ¡Nutricionista! [Nutritionist!]
5. Amanda: Nutric... [Nutrit...]
6. Camilo: El papá era el que... [The father was the one that...]
7. Javiera: Era como el que hacia los [The one who did the] release.
8. Camilo: Es como el que recibe a los bebés. [he is the one who receives the babies.]
9. Javiera: Ah... ¿qué? [What? ...]
10. Leandro: ¿Nutricionista? Nutrio... [Nutritionist? Nutrio...]
11. Camilo: No...
12. Javiera: Ya. [Ok].

In Excerpt 5.6, the participants were involved in the discussion of the target word 'nurturer'. On the one hand, Camilo suggested that the word described the job of one of the characters from the book. In fact, Camilo explained what a nurturer was by saying that it's someone who receives babies (line 8). On the other hand, Javiera and Amanda suggested that 'nurturer' was the same as 'nutritionist'. Since there were different versions of what the word could mean, they were not able to come to agreement, and it was reflected on their scores in the posttest. Amanda's scores in this target word were 2-2 in pre and posttest respectively. Javiera's scores were 2-2, Leandro's 2-2, and Camilo's 3-3. The lack of agreement in this discussion could explain why these participants decided to maintain the same answers they gave in the pretest. Therefore, the explanation of the absence of gain can be attributed to the quality of the LRE, which was low in this case.

Excerpt 5.7 (Group 15)

1. José: ¿Qué es sled? [What is sled?]
2. Carlos: Sled es el trineo. [Sled is sled.]
3. José: ¿Inclinado? [Leaning?]
4. Carlos: No, es el trineo. [No, it is sled.]
5. Manuel: Es esa cosa que pasai cuando... [That's the thing you cross when...]
6. Carlos: El trineo. [The sled.]
7. Catalina: Ah si, si, si. [Ah, yes, yes.]

In excerpt 5.7, the participants discussed the target word 'sled'. José initiated the discussion by asking the meaning of the word. As a response, Carlos provided the group with the correct definition of 'sled'. José, however, did not pay attention to the definition given by his classmate and brought up another definition of the word to the discussion. Carlos insisted on the definition he provided and Manuel tried to give an example to clarify the meaning of the word. Catalina successfully ended the discussion by agreeing to what her classmates previously explained. Nevertheless, the participants from this group did not all show a significant gain. While Catalina showed a gain of 3 points and José obtained 1 point more from pre to posttest, Carlos scored from 3 to 2 points. In Manuel's case, he went from 5 to 3 points in the pre and posttest, respectively. This could have happened because Manuel did not pay attention to the discussion that took place and he was just concentrated in his own ideas, whereas Catalina was involved in knowing the meaning of the word 'sled'. At the end, she agreed with the definition and that

is how a positive result is reflected in her 3 points gain from the pre to the posttest.

Despite of the fact that the overall scores in the posttest did not increase as expected from the pretest, it is important to remark that there were some cases in which participants benefited considerably from the discussions done in the L1. Moreover, several participants' scores increased from scores 2 to 5 in the VKS. This means that at the beginning of the study they had selected the statement that represented that they had heard or seen the words, but they did not know how to provide a synonym, translation or definition. However, by the end of the study, they were able to write a sentence not only using the word correctly, but also giving its definition, synonym or translation. The gain in the scores that these students had could have been related to their level of engagement in the tasks and discussions. As a matter of fact, the participants that showed substantial improvement in their vocabulary development were the ones who were constantly involved in the LREs. The following excerpts evince the participation of some students whose scores increased to a great extent in the VKS.

Excerpt 5.8 (Group 14)

1. Camilo: Shiver es cuando tenís frío. [It is when you are cold.]
2. Leandro: Sí sé eso yo. [I already know that.]
3. Amanda: Shiver, shiver es cuando uno tiritita. [It is when one shivers.]
4. Javiera: Sí, ya. [Yes, ok.] Eh... Sled.
5. Camilo: Te va a dejar tiritando. [It's going to make you shiver.]

In Excerpt 5.8, Leandro could have known the word (line 2), but he probably was not sure of how to use it. Therefore, he used the prompts that his classmates gave (line 1), to confirm what he had heard or seen regarding the word. This could explain how the discussion of the word was beneficial for this participant, which was evident in his increase in score. In the case of Camilo, who was the one who provided the correct translation of the target word, his scores were 3 and 3 in the pre and posttest respectively. It is interesting how his assistance allowed Leandro to obtain a better score in the posttest, but he was not able to create a sentence using the same word he had provided. This is a case of scaffolding, when learners assist each other to reach a higher level of knowledge, which in this case, was vocabulary development.

Excerpt 5.9 (Group 13)

1. Trinidad: ¿Qué significa defiant? [What does 'defiant' mean?]
2. Martina: Defiant, como desafiante. [Like defiant.]
3. Elena: Iba a decir. [I was going to say.] Defiasante.
4. Martina: Yo soy alguien muy desafiante con mis papás, por ejemplo. Como que si me dicen algo, yo les digo lo contrario, como "¿En serio?" [I am a vey defiant person with my parents, for example, if I am told something, I would say the opposite, like "really?"]
5. Trinidad: Así un debate con tus papás. [Like a debate with your parents.]
6. Martina: Y damos vueltas, y vueltas, y vueltas, y cada vez escala más, porque yo soy muy desafiante y hago las decisiones más

idiotas de mi vida, pero no importa. Eso es ser desafiante, como que no te gusta que te digan o que te hagan... [And we argue over and over and over and every time it gets worse because I am so defiant and I make more stupid decisions about my life. Being defiant is like when you do not like what others say to you or what they do.]

7. Trinidad: Que tienes que contradecir. [You have to contradict.]
8. Martina: Sí, y peleas como con todo lo que te dicen. Así como si te dicen “Come bien”, tú dices “¿Por qué?” [Yes, and if you discuss with almost everything you are told. As if you were told “eat healthy”, you just say “why?”]
9. Elena: ¿Que no te da miedo cómo enfrentarte a las personas? [Don’t you get worried at contradicting people?]
10. Martina: Sí. [Yes.]
11. Trinidad: Eso. [That.]
12. Esperanza: ¿Qué es eso? [What is that?]
13. Trinidad: ¡Desafiante! ¿No sabías qué era eso? [Defiant! Did not you already know what it was?]
14. Martina: Jonas does the most defiant things ever. He broke the biggest rule.

Excerpt 5.9 shows the discussion about the target word ‘defiant’ in which all the participants from this group were involved. Trinidad (line 1) triggered the LRE by asking about the meaning of the target word. Martina provided not only the translation of the word, but also some examples using the L1. Moreover, Martina provided an example of how to use the word in context by relating it to

the task (line 4). It is important to point out the different roles in this discussion because although Trinidad triggered the LRE and Martina solved it, Elena was the one who benefited the most from it. In fact, Trinidad's score did increase, but it was not considerable (1 to 2), whereas Martina's score remained the same (5 to 5) because she already knew the word and how to use it in a sentence. Therefore, this is also a case of scaffolding, in which not only the person who triggered the LRE was benefited, but also the rest of the members of the group.

Excerpt 5.10 (Group 9)

1. Alonso: ¿Pero [but] sled qué es? [What is it?]
2. Bastián: Eh como—[Uhm, like...]
3. Bernardo: Trineo. [Sled.]
4. Bastián: Trineo... [Sled.] Eh, but when he got out with his sled, he saw a boy with a better ribbon.

In excerpt 5.10, Alonso initiated the LRE by asking for the meaning of the target word 'sled'. Bernardo solved the LRE and Bastián contributed confirming the meaning of the word by giving an example in the L2 properly contextualized. In the case of Bastián, his score improved from 2 to 3, whereas Alonso's improved from 2 to 5. Bernardo's score remained the same (5 to 5) since he already knew the word and how to use it. Thus, the positive involvement that the participants demonstrated led to positive outcome, especially for Alonso, who was the one who triggered the discussion.

Excerpt 5.11 (Group 12)

1. Débora: ¿Qué es sled? [What is sled?]
2. Ignacio: Como un trineo. [Like a sled.]

3. Gabriel: Trineo. [Sled.]
4. Almendra: Ah.
5. Ignacio: Entonces [so] all I could see was a sled. A sled wrapped in a ribbon.

In excerpt 5.11, Débora initiated the LRE by asking about the target word 'sled' (line 1), whereas Ignacio and Gabriel provided the translation of it. Ignacio not only provided the translation of the target word, but also an example in a sentence, which resulted beneficial for Débora's later understanding of the word. In addition, the fact that Ignacio and Gabriel agreed on the translation of the word could have confirmed that it was the correct one. Whereas Débora's score increased from 1 to 5, Almendra's score did not increase (2 to 2). In the case of the boys, who were the ones who provided the translation of the word, Ignacio's scores increased from 2 to 3, whereas Gabriel's scores remained the same (5 to 5).

In general, the participants demonstrated gain in their vocabulary development of the 20 target words. Even though several participants did not show a considerable improvement in vocabulary knowledge, there were some others whose increase was remarkable. As previous examples portrayed, there was a clear relation between the involvement in the discussions within LREs and the posttest gain that the participants of that episode showed.

CHAPTER 6:

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 General conclusions

The purpose of this study was to observe the functions that the first language (L1) served in learners' interaction, and how it affected second language (L2) vocabulary development through the discussions of the target words. The results demonstrated that the students' L1 played a major role in their interaction while developing the collaborative task, and it served for the development of L2 vocabulary.

In general terms, the participants had the necessary linguistic resources to engage in communicative interaction in the L2, as evidenced by their high-level grammar use and accurate vocabulary; therefore, they were able to deliver the written product of the intervention task in the L2 with high quality. Despite their high proficiency, the results showed that the participants used a significant amount of their L1 when solving language related episodes (LREs). Moreover, the functions that the L1 served were not only social, but also cognitive, allowing participants to assist one another when dealing with issues regarding language. In sum, this study showed that peer interaction in the classroom is an effective tool for L2 vocabulary development as well as the L1 if used to fulfill linguistic or content-related discussions in certain occasions.

6.2 Limitations

Firstly, one of the limitations of this study was regarding time. The intervention was applied only twice over a four-week period, limiting the opportunities for participants to be engaged in more discussions about the

target words. Hence, if participants had had more interventions to practice the words, they might have gained more vocabulary knowledge.

The format of the pre and posttest was also considered a limitation. The vocabulary knowledge scale (VKS) was quite tedious for the participants since each word had 5 categories to choose from, and in some of them the participants had to write either the definition of a word or a sentence using the word. It is possible to infer that this weakness in the VKS could have caused tiredness in the learners while completing the posttest. Being the latter the case, this phenomenon could explain why some participants obtained negative gains. In other words, there is no logical explanation other than the test effect for learners to lose vocabulary knowledge (e.g., from being able to use a word in a contextualized way to not knowing its meaning at all).

Another limitation in this study was the context —especially the type of school— in which this study was conducted since it did not represent the average Chilean classroom. This lack of representation of the Chilean reality makes this study not generalizable. Nevertheless, the results of the present study regarding the use of the L1 during peer interaction could be extrapolated to the national context, as there is several research conducted in different contexts, which show that the L1 during peer interaction —if used judiciously— has a positive effect on the L2 acquisition.

In numerous studies, the participants tended to be university students, so our participants were less mature than the ones in other studies, being a limitation for this investigation. In our study, the participants' age was between 13 and 14 years old, which might explain why they did not take the posttest as seriously as the pretest. An example of this was the fact that some students

went from completely knowing what a word meant —scoring 5 in the pretest—to scoring 3, being able to provide an example to the statement “I have seen or heard this word before”, meaning that the students had negative gain.

Given the weaknesses, we call for further investigation of L1 use during peer interaction especially in a foreign language classroom.

6.3 Pedagogical implications

6.3.1 Group work in general

This study demonstrated that collaborative work fosters learning of L2 (Sato, 2016) since it not only allowed participants to improve their cognitive skills but also the social ones, as they managed to remain in the task by being engaged in language discussions. Cognitive skills are understood as a learner’s ability to process and acquire new language, while social skills correspond to a his abilities to interact or mediate with others (DiCamilla & Antón, 2012; Swain & Lapkin, 2000). As showed with excerpts, the participants were generally engaged with each other’s ideas and enjoyed the collaborative writing tasks. Peer interaction was also important because it triggered LREs, which facilitated the acquisition of target vocabulary or forms (Fernández Dobao, 2012; Kim, 2008). Therefore, we suggest that collaborative work is a tool that must be present in the classroom in order to promote learner-centered classes, as well as the implementation of communicative lessons.

6.3.2 Limits of L1 use in the classroom

Even though this study observed the functions that the L1 served in the EFL classroom, this study did not aim to encourage the extensive use of it. In fact, it is important to highlight that the functions that the L1 can serve are beneficial but only in certain opportunities. Teachers should also instruct and

narrow down the use of the L1 in the classroom in order to avoid having all the interaction in the L1. If there is no control of the L1 use, students will turn to it easily, leaving the L2 aside. In fact, using L1 has been proved to be an important aspect of L2 learning and we indeed support the use of the L1 in the classroom. In the Chilean EFL context it is crucial that learners practice the L2 as much as possible since the opportunities to practice it outside the classroom are limited. To reiterate, however, there is no ground to prohibit L1 use at all because L1 use can serve different and effective roles for L2 learning.

Through this study teachers should be encouraged to consider that learners may turn to their L1 in certain occasions, but it does not mean that they are not learning. Certainly, if learners resort to their L1, it could be because they are trying to use different tools and resources in order to acquire the L2.

REFERENCES

- Agencia de Calidad de la Educación. (2013). Resultados puntaje SIMCE, from <http://www.simce.cl/>
- Alley, D. C. (2005). A study of Spanish II high school students' discourse during group work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 250.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54(3), 314-342.
- Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource?. *ELT journal*, 41(4), 241-247.
- Azkarai, A., & Mayo, M. D. P. G. (2015). Task-modality and L1 use in EFL oral interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(5), 550-571.
- Carless, D. (2008). Student use of the mother tongue in the task-based classroom. *ELT journal*, 62(4), 331-338.
- Chen, C., & Truscott, J. (2010). The Effects of Repetition and L1 Lexicalization on Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(5), 693-713.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative. New Jersey: *Upper Saddle River*.
- De Guerrero, M., & Villamil, O. S. (2000). Activating the ZPD: Mutual scaffolding in L2 peer revision. *The Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 51-68.

- De la Colina, A., & García Mayo, M. (2009). Oral interaction in task-based EFL learning: The use of the L1 as a cognitive tool. *IRAL-International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(3-4), 325-345.
- DiCamilla, F. J., & Antón, M. (2012). Functions of L1 in the collaborative interaction of beginning and advanced second language learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 160-188.
- Donato, R. (1994). *Collective scaffolding in second language learning*. Vygotskian approaches to second language research, 334-56.
- Ender, A. (2014). Implicit and explicit cognitive processes in incidental vocabulary acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-26.
- Fernández Dobao, A. F. (2014). Vocabulary learning in collaborative tasks: A comparison of pair and small group work. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 497-520.
- Fernández Dobao, A. F. (2016). Peer interaction and learning. Peer Interaction and Second Language Learning: *Pedagogical potential and research agenda*, 45, 33.
- Fernández Dobao, A. F., & Blum, A. (2013). Collaborative writing in pairs and small groups: Learners' attitudes and perceptions. *System*, 41(2), 365-378.
- Fraser, C. A. (1999). Lexical processing strategy use and vocabulary learning through reading. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21(02), 225-241.

- Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisentein (Ed.) , *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 71-86). New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Gonzalez-Fernández, B., & Schmitt, N. (in press). Vocabulary acquisition. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds). *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Henriksen, B. (1999). Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21(02), 303-317.
- Kim, Y. (2008). The contribution of collaborative and individual tasks to the acquisition of L2 vocabulary. *The Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 114-130.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. *Learning*, 46(2), 327-69.
- Lehti-Eklund, H. (2013). Code-switching to first language in repair—A resource for students' problem solving in a foreign language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 17(2), 132-152.
- Long, M. (1989). Task, group, and task-group interaction. *University of Hawaii Working in English as a Second Language*, 8, 1-26
- Lowry, L. (1993). *The Giver*. (1st Ed.). Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mackey, A. (2007). Introduction: The role of conversational interaction in second language acquisition. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational*

interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A. (2012). Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 classrooms. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., Abbuhl, R., & Gass, S. M. (2012). Interactionist approach. *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition*, 7-23.

McDonough, K. (2004). Learner-learner interaction during pair and small group activities in a Thai EFL context. *System*, 32(2), 207-224.

Ministerio de Educación (2013). Bases Curriculares: Idioma Extranjero Inglés para 7° y 8° básico/I° y II° Medio. Ministerio de Educación, Gobierno de Chile.

Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and “incidental” L2 vocabulary acquisition. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21(02), 195-224.

Pica, T. (2013). From input, output and comprehension to negotiation, evidence, and attention. *Contemporary approaches to second language acquisition*, 9, 49.

Porter, P. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 200-222). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Read, J. (1993). The development of a new measure of L2 vocabulary knowledge. *Language testing*, 10(3), 355-371.

- Read, J. (2007). Second language vocabulary assessment: Current practices and new directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 7(2), 105-126.
- Sampson, A. (2012). Learner code-switching versus English only. *ELT Journal: English Language Teaching Journal*, 66(3), 293-303.
- Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 611-633.
- Sato, M. (2016). Interaction Mindsets, Interactional Behaviors, and L2 Development: An Affective-Social-Cognitive Model. *Language Learning*, 1-35.
- Sato, M., & Ballinger, S. (2016). Understanding peer interaction: Research synthesis and directions. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 1–30). *Amsterdam: John Benjamins*.
- Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(04), 591-626.
- Sato, M., & Viveros, P. (2016). Interaction or collaboration?. The proficiency effect on group work in the foreign language classroom. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer Interaction and Second Language Learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda*, (91-112). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/Ilt.45.

- Schmitt, N. (1994). Vocabulary Testing: Questions for Test Development with Six Examples of Tests of Vocabulary Size and Depth. *Thai TESOL bulletin*, 6(2), 9-16.
- Scott, V. M., & De La Fuente, M. J. (2008). What's the Problem? L2 Learners' Use of the L1 During Consciousness-Raising, Form-Focused Tasks. *Modern Language Journal*, 92(1), 100-113.
- Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 557-573.
- Storch N. (in press). Sociocultural theory in the L2 classroom. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds). *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition*. New York: Routledge.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of Interaction in ESL Pair Work. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 119.
- Storch, N. (2011). Collaborative writing in L2 contexts: Processes, outcomes, and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31(1), 275-288.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355-375.
- Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of the L1 in an L2 setting?. *TESOL quarterly*, 37(4), 760-769.
- Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J.P. Lantolf (ed.) *Sociocultural Theory*

and Second Language Learning, (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (2001). Integrating Language and Content Teaching through Collaborative Tasks. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(1), 44.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 320-337.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language teaching research*, 4(3), 251-274.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*, (pp. 99-118). Harlow, UK: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. *Harvard university press*.

Williams, J. (2001). The effectiveness of spontaneous attention to form. *System*, 29(3), 325-340.

Yang, L. (2014). Examining the mediational means in collaborative writing: Case studies of undergraduate ESL students in business courses. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 23, 74-89.

Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2014). An analysis of Chinese EFL students' use of first and second language in peer feedback of L2 writing. *System*, 47, 28-38.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Forms

Santiago, 29 de agosto, 2016

Apoderados de
8º A – 8º B

Presente

Por medio de la presente informo a usted que a partir del día martes 30 de agosto hasta el día 15 de septiembre, los alumnos/as de 8º Año han sido invitados a participar del estudio de investigación de la estudiante Francisca Muñoz, de la carrera de Pedagogía en Inglés de la Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, la cual se encuentra realizando su práctica profesional en nuestro colegio en el ramo de Inglés.

El estudio tiene como fin investigar el uso incidental del español durante la interacción entre pares en las clases de inglés y cómo su uso puede tener un impacto positivo en el desarrollo de conocimiento de vocabulario de los alumnos.

La recolección de datos para este estudio se realizará dentro de las horas de inglés de los alumnos y en la misma sala de clase, con Miss Valentina Vergara, profesora de inglés a cargo de 8vo Año, estando siempre presente y sin que esto afecte la planificación previamente estipulada por el colegio. Este estudio será audio-grabado manteniendo estricta confidencialidad y anonimato tanto de los alumnos participantes como del colegio, existiendo la posibilidad de que éste sea publicado para fines académicos.

Se ruega devolver la presente, firmando en señal de autorización de la participación de su hijo/a en este estudio.

Atentamente,

Gloria Grosso
Principal 5th – 8th

(Favor devolver colilla firmada con el alumno/a)

Autorizo a mi hijo/a a participar del estudio “Maximizing the effectiveness of peer interaction on second language learning: A series of pedagogical interventions” de la Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello.

Curso 8º __:

☐

Sí

☐

No

Firma del Apoderado

CONSENT FORM



Research Purpose:

This research, called *Maximizing the effectiveness of peer interaction on second language learning: A series of pedagogical interventions [1160838]*, will investigate how interaction between second language learners facilitates language development. It also aims to contribute to language education especially in contexts where learners do not have much opportunity to use the target language such as Chile.

Principal Investigator:

Dr. Masatoshi Sato, Department of English, Universidad Andres Bello, Santiago, Chile:

Phone: 6618708 / Email: masatoshi.sato@unab.cl

Research assistants:

Isidora Angulo

Yocelyn Areyuna

Francisca Muñoz

Natalia Oróstica

Mical Polanco

Valentina Yáñez

Ethics Committee:

Dr. Rodolfo Paredes, President of Universidad Andres Bello Bioethics Committee, Santiago:

Phone: 6618021 / E-mail: rparedes@unab.cl

Procedure:

- During regular class time, you will participate in activities designed to promote second language development. During the activities, your conversational or written exchanges may be recorded.

Conditions of Your Participation:

- A part of this study involves data collection from classroom activities. However, your participation will not affect the evaluation of the course in any way.
- The data and results will be used for research purposes only.
- There are no risks involved in participating in the study. Rather, by participating, you will be given opportunities to improve your English skills.

- The data along this form will be safely kept in our password-protected computer. No one other than us as the researchers will have access to them. All data will remain completely confidential. Your names or school names will not be used in any of reports describing the results of this study.
- Even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw from the study at any time you wish.

I have read and understood the descriptions of the research and hereby agree to participate by partaking in the classroom activities as well as extra activities.

Name:

RUT:

Signature:

Date:

Appendix B: Diagnostic Test

Diagnostic Test

- I. Look at the following words, and select yes if you know the words or no if you don't.

Words	Yes	No
Counsel		
Dwelling		
Defiant		
Sameness		
Sympathetic		
Nurturer		
Awe		
Apprehensive		
Fortunate		
Envy		
Self-conscious		
Shiver		
Humiliation		
Remorse		
Reflective		
Awkward		
Serene		
Ribbon		
Sledding		
Reluctant		
Birthmother		
Emblem		
Reprieve		
Inadequate		
Accompany		
Tellings		
Annex		
Transgression		
Smack		
Syringe		
Meticulous		
Drift		
Bare		
Apologize		
Precision		
Prompt		
Attribute		
Indolence		

Unanimous		
Receptacle		
Numb		
Emerge		
Plea		
Condemn		
Languid		
Relentless		
Meager		
Yearn		
Lethargy		
Impede		

Appendix C: Target words

Words to be tested
Nurturer
Dwelling
Defiant
Sameness
Envy
Shiver
Remorse
Serene
Ribbon
Sled
Tellings
Transgression
Smack
Meticulous
Drift
Indolence
Bare
Emerge
Condemn
Impede

Appendix D: VKS (Pre-post test)

Vocabulary Knowledge Scale

DIRECTIONS:

Carefully consider each of the words below and select the ONE statement that best describes how well you know the meaning of each word. If you select category III or IV, you can provide a synonym or a definition in English or Spanish

NURTURER

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

DWELLING

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

DEFIANT

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

SAMENESS

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

ENVY

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

RIBBON

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

SLED

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

TELLINGS

I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.

II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.

III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.

IV. I know this word. It means _____.

V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).

_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

SHIVER

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

REMORSE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

SERENE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

TRANSGRESSION

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

SMACK

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

METICULOUS

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

DRIFT

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

INDOLENCE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

BARE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

EMERGE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

CONDEMN

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

IMPEDE

- I. I don't remember having seen or heard this word before.
- II. I have seen or heard this word before, but I don't know what it means.
- III. I have seen or heard this word before. I think it means _____.
- IV. I know this word. It means _____.
- V. I can use this word in a sentence (write a sentence that includes the word).
_____. (If you do this section, please also do section IV).

Appendix E: Intervention 1

Members:

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book “The Giver” written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

- | | |
|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Dwelling | 6. Shiver |
| 2. Nurturer | 7. Defiant |
| 3. Ribbon | 8. Sameness |
| 4. Sled | 9. Envy |
| 5. Drift | 10. Remorse |

Appendix F: Intervention 2

Members:

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book “The Giver” written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

- | | |
|------------------|--------------|
| 1. Serene | 6. Indolence |
| 2. Tellings | 7. Bare |
| 3. Transgression | 8. Emerge |
| 4. Smack | 9. Condemn |
| 5. Meticulous | 10. Impede |

Appendix G: Written Products

Chapter ~~22~~ 19 $\frac{7}{2}$ / ☺

Jonas took of his tunic and laid on the back of the Giver, with his serene look, placed his hands on Jonas' back. An ~~image~~ ^{image} emerged from the darkness, which Jonas saw with his eyes closed. He was standing in ~~the~~ ^a waiting room, and a ~~man~~ ^{with} tall woman came ~~out~~ ^{with} a ~~door~~ ^{archway} which said "Surgery".

"I'm sorry she has cancer, she has ^{a small} few time left".

Jonas felt so bad that he smacked a chair with his bare hands feeling like he was condemned to live in eternal pain. He knew she was going to die and so it happened. Jonas realized what real pain was and he couldn't even resist it on a memory. ~~He~~ That's why he ran away. into his home ~~to~~ and took a gun. ~~He and his wife~~ now one could suppose ~~what was going to~~ from doing what he had to do.

Sonias pulled the trigger and a second after that he felt the sweet transgression from the memory to real life. He sitted down on the bed and looked around. He saw the book shelves full of tellings of ~~the~~ other eras, then he saw the giver, who looked at him with indolence. He was shocked by the experience.

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. Serene ✓
2. Tellings ✓
3. Transgression ✓
4. Smack ✓
5. Meticulous ✓

6. Indolence ✓
7. Bare ✓
8. Emerge ✓
9. Condemn ✓
10. Impede ✓

(chapter 24)

Jonas was hiding in the annex room, waiting for the Giver's signal for he too emerge to the outside and escape. But then he heard that he was really amazed of what had happened. he went to the Giver and said "Please, don't die, I need you to help me" but the Giver said "I am proud of whatever you have done". So he started closing his eyes slowly, Jonas cried, but he knew he had to continue with his journey.

Nº 55

Members:

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

- | | |
|------------------|--------------|
| 1. Serene ✓ | 6. Indolence |
| 2. Tellings | 7. Bare |
| 3. Transgression | 8. Emerge ✓ |
| 4. Smack | 9. Condemn |
| 5. Meticulous | 10. Impede |

Everybody was going insane. From a "serene" society to a crazy one. Fiona was very confused. She didn't know what to do with the memories that had emerged from the dust. Planes were flying to the direction Jonas went. They wanted to arrest him, to judge him, to release him. Fiona was worried, ever since the memories came back she started feeling things for him, she wanted him to be safe. She heard rumors that the security guard were going to do something bad to him. Today she was going to Asher's dwelling and ask him for help, she was going to rescue him.

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. Serene ✓
2. Tellings ✓
3. Transgression ✓
4. Smack ✓
5. Meticulous ✓

6. Indolence ✓
7. Bare ✓
8. Emerge ✓
9. Condemn ✓
10. Impede ✓

A New chapter has emerged.

Today is 2nd of September and I just Graduate from highschool. And I was very nervous for what was going to happen in the future because I barely knew about other things but mainly the memories. One week later I went to the University and entered in my first class, everyone started looking at me. And there I saw Asher but he was angry at me so he stand up and smack in the face. Jonas started thinking that ashier smacked him because he didn't listen to his tellings. Jonas solved his problem talking with Asher and he told him he has to be more meticulous for the next time. But Asher ignored what he said, and Asher started running to a forest that was next to the univesity.

The Giver

It was a serene afternoon and Jonas was very stressed. He had a nightmare where he tried to impede his death. Jonas smacked himself to wake up but he was sweating. He needed to get freshened up so he took out a noticeable flavored ice cream. He was convinced to the dream so he couldn't wake up. He barely knew what was going on.

When he was on his way to school, he took out a book of tellings. Finally he received a call of his mom telling him she have a transgression on his job so Jonas emerge from school to help his mother.

#49

Jonas woke up from horrible dream. It happened, he was dreaming the war memory. This time though it was more vivid. He saw children getting smacked. It was unbearable for Jonas he thought "surely these people must be condemned." There was nothing he could do to impede it. What Jonas thought that was the worst is that they did it very organized, it was meticulous they put them in line and hit them, abuse, he couldn't even named what happened. After the dream Jonas barely had the courage to get out of bed but it emerged. ~~After the dream~~ At the afternoon he went to the asher room he told his tellings to the receiver who seemed serene about it. "Don't worry Jonas, it happens." At the day Jonas forgot about the transgression.

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. ~~Serene~~
2. ~~Tellings~~
3. ~~Transgression~~
4. ~~Smack~~
5. ~~Meticulous~~

6. ~~Indolence~~
7. ~~Bare~~
8. ~~Emerge~~
9. ~~Condemn~~
10. ~~Impede~~

Jonas had to be meticulous with all the memories given by the Giver, he must keep serene if not he will lose his mind. The "receiver" job could be considered as a condemn for life; but he couldn't impede it, he had to bare with it.

The destiny chose Jonas and the only option he had was to accept it. He was unique, and the elders knew he had something special he just needed to emerge. His job was hard, but the chiefs acknowledged that Jonas was able to do the work with indolence. If he committed a transgression he will be smack or punished more seriously, like being released. The Giver told Jonas a telling that say "..... to be continued

53

150. Make sure all ~~the~~ *Enpropriado*

- violence

nobody know what was happening.

Wanted to return to the Society but Fiona condemn and impeded Jonas from returning to the Society. It was a really big risk. He asked ~~for~~ Fiona to give him Gabe and when he saw into Gabe eyes meticulous. They were different. He smack himself, Gabe has heard the tellings. Those stories had a lot of transgression.

There were about the stupid indolence problems and he wasn't able to know but it was too late.

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. Dwelling

2. Nurturer

3. Ribbon

4. Sled

5. Drift

6. Shiver

7. Defiant

8. Sameness

9. Envy

10. Remorse

Jonas Woke up in his dwelling, still shivering from the hunger and cold from yesterday's memory. He compared the memory with the community, before there was no sameness, people were treated bad just because they were poor. He started thinking that the African kids would have envy of him.

Of him being born all comfy, with his blue nice ribbon in the head, with his nurturer taking care of him. Then he drifted away from that memory, Jonas thought his life

was too easy, he wanted a more defiant life, with more problems. Jonas was tired of bad memories, he wanted a good one, like riding a sled in the yellow snow. And without having a heavy remorse on Asher.

Everything started at the dream. Jonas remembered drifting in the sled through the downhill of nothing. Suddenly everything became darker, Jonas felt cold and started to shiver. Then he began to feel scared about that unexpected flashback. He felt sameness about what was happening in the dream and the reality. Then he woke up in his dwelling by the defiant voice of the Giver. He had tied up Jonas with ribbons, Jonas felt angry at that moment of the control the Giver had upon him. Jonas didn't want to be the next receiver, he wanted to become a nurturer. Suddenly the Giver felt remorse and killed Jonas.

I woke up and it was all snowy. All I could see outside my window was a sled tied with a ribbon. As I unwrapped it I got into it and went down the hill drifting. I fell down and got covered by snow. I felt a shiver going down my spine. It felt really cold, well ice is going down my back. Everytime I was sliding faster and faster. My nose was freezing. Snowflakes felt in my face and my feeling was filled with envy as I couldn't do it in the real world, because of all the sameness. I woke up with all my family ^{including a girl with her ribbon} and a Nurturer surrounding my bed, they told me that I was doing strange movements in my sleep. I asked with a defiant attitude "What are you doing here?!" Suddenly I felt remorse because of my attitude. He

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. Dwelling ✓
2. Nurturer ✓
3. Ribbon ✓
4. Sled ✓
5. Drift ✓

6. Shiver ✓
7. Defiant ✓
8. Sameness ✓
9. Envy ✓
10. Remorse ✓

Drift into conscienceness

One day Jonas woke up more defiant than ever. He went downstairs to the dining area of his dwelling and saw his father with a nurturer uniform on. He was about to take the pill, the small capsule that stopped the stirrings, decreased all feelings and made everyone a part of sameness. Just a thought of sameness made him shiver. It was true that it brought benefits, for example the end of discrimination and envy, but it took out many good things that people had before. Some of the things Jonas saw in the memories were as simple as snow, hills and sleds, but if the community saw that it would be enough to make them feel remorse for ending all the differences. Now, as his father helped Lily tie her ribbons, Jonas came slowly... He was about to tell him everything ... Tan! Tan! Tan!!!
(everybody goes cray-cray!)

-C

The Giver

Jonas went again to the mountain to see if he will break his leg again. He took his sled with him and finally he got to the top of the mountain. It was very cold so Jonas was shivering, he finally went down the mountain on his sled, he was going really fast so Jonas panicked and try to stop the sled by doing that he make the sled drift and he crashed into a tree and broke his other leg, the crash was so powerful that he was left unconscious. He woke up in the giver room and next to him was Gabe. He saw Gabe sleeping so peacefully he felt envy about him. Jonas was using a ribbon on his head, so he in a defiant mode tell the giver to take him the ribbon off. He felt remorse because his attitude in the giver.

INSTRUCTIONS:

In groups, write a new chapter for the book "The Giver" written by Lois Lowry. You can write a minimum of 100 words and a maximum of 150. Make sure all the words below are included in your chapter.

1. Dwelling
2. Nurturer
3. Ribbon
4. Sled
5. Drift

6. Shiver
7. Defiant
8. Sameness
9. Envy
10. Remorse

Jonas was in Fona's Dwelling. And he saw Asher and Fiona together. Jonas was shivering ~~of~~ anger, so much so he challenge Asher to a sled competition. The winner ~~will~~ will win a ribbon that will get Fona's hand. When Jonas started the race with Asher suddenly a wild tree appeared, he drifted to dodge the tree. He couldn't and fell into his misery. He got envious because he Asher won, but suddenly his Nurturer Father appeared, he told Jonas he was defiant and Jonas started to cry in remorse and then he woke up in sameness of his "Ordinary" days.