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ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF TEACHER-FRONTED AND GROUP WORK TECHNIQUES ON BEGINNING CHINESE AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS’ ACQUISITION OF GRAMMAR IN A PERFORMED CULTURE CLASSROOM

Chieh-Ting Lin

Center for Language Studies

Master of Arts

This study focuses on the effect of teacher-fronted and group work instruction on beginning Chinese as a Foreign Language learners’ understanding and ability to use grammar principles correctly in a Performed Culture class setting. Three sections of beginning Chinese classes at Brigham Young University were selected to participate in the study. Each section instructor was assigned one of the following teaching techniques: teacher-fronted, group work, or a combination of both teacher-fronted and group work. Quizzes focusing on grammar were given before and after instruction to all students as pre-tests and post-tests. The results showed that students being taught with the teacher-fronted classroom instruction style outperformed the group work section on quizzes, while there was no significant statistical difference between sections on oral performances. Surveys given to students showed that students’ attitudes towards teaching styles did not correlate with their quiz scores.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Educators in the field of language teaching are always seeking better ways to teach foreign languages to learners. Many studies in this field focus on teaching English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). In recent years, however, there has been an increase in the number of studies evaluating language instruction other than TESOL, such as Japanese and French (Lyster & Mori, 2006). Although there have been studies done to evaluate various aspects of Chinese language learning such as vocabulary acquisition (Lin, 2000; Ke, 1998), listening comprehension (Yeh, 1997; Chi, 1989), and oral proficiency (Huang, 2002; Uang, 2002), to date, the study of Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) teaching techniques is still a relatively new field for investigation. Chinese is considered a difficult foreign language for English speakers because it is culturally distant and linguistically unrelated. For this reason, Christensen and Warnick (2006) argue that CFL instructors cannot rely on commonly accepted methods for Western language instruction, but instead must use a different approach when addressing CFL learners. In their proposed Performed Culture Approach, they suggest that culture should be included closely with other linguistic code and should not be treated separately. In other words, cultural instruction should be embedded within the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Learning a language by this approach fosters not only the ability to express one’s ideas in the target language, but also facilitates listening comprehension and discourse cognition when communicating with native speakers. With the Performed Culture Approach, the fundamental goal is to learn a language in order to be able to “maintain” a “long-term relationship” (Christensen & Warnick, 2006) with native speakers, which means that native speakers
should not feel uncomfortable when talking with non-native speakers and will therefore be willing and able to communicate freely with them.

One suggested advantage of the Performed Culture Approach is the amount of practice time spent by students actively using grammatical patterns and vocabulary learned in the course. According to this approach, it is suggested that three to four-fifths of class time is devoted to practice so that students can better learn how to compensate for the lack of exposure to the target language in a non-native environment. This lack of exposure can be a major disadvantage for learners of Chinese as a Foreign Language (CFL) studying in a non-Chinese speaking community. Understanding this need, Christensen and Warnick (2006) propose that the integrated method as outlined in the Performed Culture Approach is a critical tool in achieving better results in language ability among this learner group. Over the years, the field of language teaching has embraced various methods of promoting language production through practice activities. Richards and Rodgers (2001) summarize some remarkable practice methods currently used to promote learners’ language development, such as the Grammar Translation questioning activities, Community Language Learning imitation exercises, Total Physical Response comprehensible input activities, to name a few. In general, most of these methods can be divided into two techniques: teacher-fronted and group work.

Many traditional methods, such as the Grammar Translation Method, focus primarily on teacher-fronted techniques. In this method, the teacher gives a lecture in the front of the classroom and leads a discussion by asking questions, receiving answers, and then providing feedback. For the majority of the instruction time the focus of the class is on the teacher. As a result, the teacher is able to maintain a large degree of control over the instruction and
feedback provided to the students. Not only does this ensure that learners are given accurate feedback, but it has also been shown to promote increased grammatical accuracy in students (Pica & Doughty, 1985). The main drawback of methods using the teacher-fronted technique is the decreased amount of time students have for active interaction and language practice (Storch, 1999).

In contrast to the teacher-fronted technique, a relatively recent trend of language instruction emphasizes the value and efficacy of group work (Davis, 1997; Long & Porter, 1985), with the focus being on student-student interaction. In this technique, learners are divided into groups to review and work on different principles taught previously by the instructor. The instructor’s role in this learning environment is to function mainly as an initiator of discussion and observer of students’ performance and interaction. The focus of the group work technique is on providing the maximum amount of time for student interaction and language practice. This technique has been shown to promote enhanced fluency in the target language (Pica & Doughty, 1985). The major drawback to the group work instruction style is decreased grammatical accuracy and usefulness of feedback that learners receive (Storch, 1999).

The Performed Culture Approach emphasizes a philosophy of integration where various practice activities are integrated, with a synergistic focus. During the practice time of the Performed Culture Approach, instructors implement various activities, exercises, and tasks to practice sentence and vocabulary patterns taught in the lecture portion of the course, with a focus on function. Interactions during the activities can be among students or between students and the instructor, according to the nature of the activity involved. This underlying assumption is that this approach will enhance students’ performance of culturally appropriate
language tasks. The Performed Culture Approach produces encouraging results in all the major skill areas involved in language acquisition; these being namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Christensen & Warnick, 2006). However, due to the integrated nature of the Performed Culture Approach, it is difficult to determine the source of positive outcomes. Therefore, in order to more effectively identify the impact of the teacher within the Performed Culture Approach, the current study seeks to ascertain which of the teaching techniques used in this approach more efficiently assists students’ continual progress in a specific area, such as grammar accuracy.

The purpose of this study is to discover which technique, group work or teacher-fronted, is the more effective way within the Performed Culture Approach to help students acquire accurate grammar principles through practice. The mastery of grammatical principles is crucial in learning how to communicate efficiently in any language. In order to facilitate the desired pace of acquisition as well as accuracy within language learning, it is important for instructors to determine effective techniques to use when conducting practice activities.

One of the most difficult aspects of language acquisition is learning how to communicate well with established grammar patterns (Williams, 1999). Due to the important nature and level of difficulty involved with learning grammar, it is advantageous to determine which technique, group work or teacher-fronted, will work better within the framework of the Performed Culture Approach to facilitate acquisition of grammar accuracy. Many studies have been conducted which seek to determine whether the group work or teacher-fronted style is more effective in improving grammatical accuracy among learners. The results are highly varied (McDonough, 2004; Storch, 1999; Kasanga, 1996). Since improving language learner outcomes is an everlasting pursuit, it is always worthwhile to
consider the efficacy of individual techniques in an attempt to find more effective ways to improve both teaching and learning. The present study used the existing beginning Chinese program at Brigham Young University to investigate the effectiveness of each of these techniques, teacher-fronted and group work, in promoting students’ understanding and correct usage of grammar principles.

**Definitions**

1. Teacher-fronted technique is the style of teaching in which the teacher directly guides the classroom activities through lectures or through question-answer dialogues with students. In the classroom, there is only one person, either the teacher or the student, speaking at one time while all others in the class listen and observe. The interaction is solely between the teacher and the students.

2. The group work technique is the style of teaching in which activities are focused on student-student interaction. The main job of teachers in these types of classes is to explain exercises to students, separate them into groups, observe as students interact with each other, and provide necessary feedback or answer questions. The interaction is mainly between students, with the teacher sometimes involved as necessary to give specific feedback.

3. The combined technique is the style of teaching in which teacher-fronted and group work styles are integrated for classroom exercises. For each activity, the instructor spends the first half of the time using the teacher-fronted style in which they offer instruction and then call on students to answer questions. The second half of the classroom time is allotted for group work exercises, in which students interact with each other for similar assignments demonstrated previously by the teacher.
4. The Performed Culture Approach (Christensen & Warnick, 2006) is a general philosophy which may manifest itself differently in various settings. Typically, instruction is separated into FACT/ACT days. On FACT days, teachers provided lectures and explicit explanation on grammatical, lexical, semantic, and cultural etc. concepts. On ACT days, students practice what has been previously taught with a focus on increased understanding of linguistic and cultural items, in order to reach higher fluency and accuracy. The beginning Chinese classrooms included in this study applied the Performed Culture Approach using a combined instruction method where both teacher-fronted and group work techniques were employed.

**Research Questions**

The specific research questions this study attempts to answer are:

1. Does teaching technique, whether teacher-fronted or group work, yield a different result in a beginning Chinese as Foreign Language (CFL) learners’ understanding and ability to use syntax correctly on writing quizzes?

2. Does the teaching style, whether teacher-fronted or group work, yield a different result in a beginning CFL learner’s accuracy of syntactic use during actual dialogue performances?

3. Does a beginning CFL learner’s attitude towards the teacher-fronted versus group work teaching styles affect the result of their language learning outcome?
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Group work has become an increasingly popular classroom technique used to facilitate second language (L2) acquisition (Davis, 1997; Long & Porter, 1985; Pica & Doughty, 1985). Several pedagogical arguments have been proposed validating the use of group work, which include increasing the quantity and quality of students’ production (Storch, 1999; Davis, 1997; Long & Porter, 1985) and providing feedback and engaging students in meaningful negotiation (de la Fuente, 2002; Ellis, 2000; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996). This also facilitates students’ improved language comprehension, and aids in students’ overall language development (Mackey, 1999; Loschky, 1994). Researchers also suggest that even though group work may be useful in L2 learning, there are some restrictions in classroom L2 acquisition, such as its decreased level of effectiveness in grammatical development (Mackey, Gass, & McDongough, 2000; Williams, 1999), the amount of time it takes to set up a group work task (Sachs, Candlin, Rose, & Shum, 2003; Davis, 1997), and the difficulty in creating and executing practical group work tasks (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004; Davis, 1997; Pica & Doughty, 1985). In addition, studies also show that students’ attitudes and teachers’ willingness to participate or administer group activities may also affect the outcome of any group work exercise (Storch, 2007; Basturkmen et al., 2004; McDonough, 2004). In this chapter, three hypotheses related to group work (Input Hypothesis, Output Hypothesis and interaction hypothesis) are presented. Krashen’s (1982) Input Hypothesis is discussed as it relates to the benefits resulting from a teacher-fronted technique. In contrast, Swain’s (1993, 1985) Output Hypothesis is evaluated due to the emphasis placed on student output which primarily occurs when a student-student or group work technique is used. Finally, Long’s (1996) interaction
hypothesis is reviewed as it pertains to the advantages gained from implementing an integrated approach using both teacher-fronted and group work techniques. Arguments concerning the utilization of teacher-fronted and group work techniques in classrooms are also discussed, focusing on which technique is more effective for teaching grammar to L2 language learners.

*Input Hypothesis*

Krashen (1982) explains how a second language is acquired through his Input Hypothesis and he states that “by understanding messages, or by receiving ‘comprehensible input’” (p. 2), learners move from one point to another in the process of second language acquisition. According to his theory, language learners move along the *natural order* by receiving a little bit more from their existing knowledge and stretch a little further to the next stage. However, Krashen does not define what he means by a *little bit or a little further*. In Krashen’s definition, *comprehensible input* is any language perceived by learners which is just a little more advanced than their existing language background. Neither the language structures in which learners understand thoroughly nor any language with structures which are far beyond the learners’ existing knowledge help in acquiring a second language. Krashen defines learners’ existing knowledge background as *i* and the next stage as *i+1*. To utilize the input for L2 learning, learners should be provided with information just slightly above that which they already know. Krashen believes that only through *i+1* input can learners acquire grammar; therefore, the teacher’s most important task is to provide comprehensible input which in turn can enhance students’ L2 development. It is important to find out the *i* according to students’ language development. As shown in VanPatten and Oikkenon’s (1996) findings, it is more beneficial for instructors to provide learners input modified to
students’ pace of language development on the spot rather than merely teaching lessons according to a fixed lesson plan.

In addition, even though the comprehensible input is essential for acquiring the language, it is not enough. Besides the exposure to input that is understandable, according to Krashen’s hypothesis, learners also need to be willing to accept the input, or in his words, to lower the affective filter, which is “a mental block that prevents acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition” (p. 3). In other words, if learners are to acquire second languages, they need to receive input that is slightly beyond the knowledge of the learners and learners also need to be willing to accept the input they receive. Krashen points out that “all other factors thought to encourage or cause second-language acquisition work only when they contribute to comprehensible input and/or a low affective filter” (p. 4).

One critique to Krashen’s Input Hypothesis is the definition of the relevant i +1 level. Researchers like Gass (1997) and VanPatten and Sanz (1995) question how to decide what kind of input is actually at the i +1 level, not the i + 2 or 3 level. It is important for learners to be exposed to comprehensible input for their existing knowledge but the explicit indication of which specific input should be applied raises another issue to be resolved. Furthermore, for different areas of linguistic information, people may assume that input plays an equally important role. It is thought that input has the same impact on semantics, lexical items, grammatical principles, etc., however, Gass (1997) argues that these parts of language are not equal when acquiring them. Some parts are difficult to learn even with sufficient input, while others are easier to acquire even with minimal exposure of the target linguistic information. It is suggested that for grammatical principles, modified input will direct students’ attention to
relevant elements and encourage accurate structure thus promoting better acquisition (VanPatten & Sanz, 1995).

Although Krashen’s Input Hypothesis provides a seminal contribution to L2 language acquisition, it offers only a piece of the entire L2 language acquisition research puzzle. Krashen (1982) indicates that learners may focus on the meaning and lexicon as well as other nonlinguistic message instead of syntax understanding when simply receiving information. In other words, input alone cannot address the need of syntax learning. However, producing language may be a force that helps learners figure out whether their understanding is complete or not.

**Input Hypothesis and Teacher-Fronted Technique**

One of the advantages traditional teacher-fronted style affords teachers is an ability to control the input students receive. In these classrooms, the students can benefit from a more correct demonstration from the teacher, who is a more reliable source of language, and teachers believe that in this manner classroom time can be used effectively (Basturkmen et al., 2004; Davis, 1997). For example, methods such as the Audio-lingual Method or the Grammar Translation Method are commonly adopted in traditional second language classrooms where students listen to examples provided by the teacher and simply repeat these models. By these methods, teachers can feel comfortable knowing that students receive accurate input which includes good pronunciation, correct vocabulary usage, and accurate grammatical structures. In addition, as teachers directly conduct classroom instruction, they can deliver comprehensible input that contributes to students’ language acquisition.

However, as mentioned previously, critics like Gass (1997) bring up the gap between teacher and student understanding. Teachers may think they are aware of students’ learning path, but
in reality the things students actually have learned could vary greatly from teachers’ presumptions.

**Input Hypothesis and Group Work Technique**

Group work, on the other hand, compensates for this disadvantage, because in a group work setting students offer each other input at their own level of language understanding. Garcia-Mayo and Pica (2000) find that students can give each other useful input. Ellis et al. (1994) also indicate that during group work exercises, students will provide each other with input which promotes their comprehension better than the input provided by the teacher which was carefully planned beforehand. Therefore they, along with Gass (1988) suggest that effective input which facilitates language acquisition should be *comprehended input* instead of a *comprehensible input*, which emphasizes the importance of students’ production by which the actual level of students’ understanding can be gauged. This underlines the importance of the role learners’ production, or direct language output created by students, plays in the second language acquisition process.

**Output Hypothesis**

In 1985, Swain proposed an Output Hypothesis in which language learning takes place through the process of a student producing language in the L2 learning environment.

The Output Hypothesis proposes that through producing language, either spoken or written, language acquisition/learning may occur...that language production provides the opportunity for meaningful practice of one’s linguistic resources permitting the development of automaticity in their use…one gains in fluency by using the language as frequently as possible. (p. 159)
Swain outlines four ways in which the Output Hypothesis facilitates second language learning: first, producing language in a learning environment provides learners opportunities to practice their linguistic knowledge in the target language. Richards and Rodgers (2001) also emphasize this point, explaining that, unlike studying Latin, which most people use only for reading classical literature and historical documents, the purpose of most second language acquisition is to communicate with people. Therefore, it is important to practice and actually use the language one is studying. After learning the principles of the target language, students begin to have basic ideas about those principles and it is important for them to put it into practice. Morgan-Short and Bowden (2006) find that with the same instruction input received, students with meaningful output practice outperform the other groups without sufficient output practice. Thus, they further suggest that linguistic development needs to be reached by output-based instruction styles, not just merely using input-based instruction styles. Besides, without actively using the target language, people could not achieve any significant level of fluency. Therefore, the assumption is that giving students opportunities to speak also allows them to use the language more often and thereby helps the students increase in fluency.

The second way that language production facilitates language acquisition is that it makes learners shift their focus from meaning to syntax (Swain, 1993). Language production generates an active knowledge of the language, as opposed to reading which requires only a passive knowledge. This means students cannot just remain in the stage of merely understanding the meaning of the passages as they are reading because the rest of the linguistic aspects, such as syntax, grammar, etc have already been taken care of. To actually
express the message, learners not only need to put vocabulary together, they also need to use their syntax and grammar knowledge so that their addressee may understand ideas correctly.

*Hypothesis testing* is the third way producing language assists language learning. As Swain (1993) explains, “output provides the opportunity to test out hypotheses— to try out means of expression and see if they work” (p. 160). No matter how thorough the instruction is, it is normal to assume that learners may still have gaps in the principles learned. Producing language provides the opportunity for them to find these gaps, whether they are or are not aware of them at the beginning, and then they are able to analyze in depth both input received and any previously existing knowledge they have acquired (Swain and Lapkins, 1998). Many examples of this were found in student think aloud transcripts where students would ask questions such as, “Can I say it that way?” to show their uncertainty and their intended purpose in experimenting. Even if most of the things students assume are accurate, they still need to experiment in order to assure themselves that what they thought they understood is accurate.

The fourth way in which language production helps language learning is feedback, which may take the form of explicit corrections, recasts, elicitations, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetitions (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). When learners produce the language, they provide the opportunity for other people to access the language. Based on the response of the listener, feedback may help the speaker find out the sources of incomprehensibility or mistakes in their utterances and “lead learners to modify or ‘reprocess’ their output” (Swain, 1993, p160).

Swain (1993) also suggested that:
Learners need to be pushed to make use of their resources; they need to have their linguistic abilities stretched to their fullest; they need to reflect on their output and consider ways of modifying it to enhance comprehensibility, appropriateness and accuracy. (pp. 160-161)

One way to achieve this is through interaction; students can have more input and output that fits their current language level. Shehadeh (2001) emphasizes the fact that learners need not only time, but also require multiple opportunities to create and complete their own sentences.

While it is often hypothesized that teachers provide more accurate feedback than students, within the limited amount of time allotted for classroom instruction, group interaction can usually offer more practice time for each individual student than a teacher-fronted class (Davis, 1997).

**Interaction Hypothesis**

In 1996, Long suggested that by providing conversational and linguistic input, interaction can promote second language acquisition. In his interaction hypothesis, he posited that through *negotiation*, learners show their incomprehensibility about certain issues and the use of negotiated interaction provides opportunities for them to understand those incomprehensible concepts:

...*negotiation for meaning*, and especially negotiation work that *interactional* adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways. (Long, 1996, pp. 451-2)
It is proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner’s developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during *negotiation for meaning*. Negative feedback obtained during negotiation work or elsewhere may be facilitative of L2 development, at least for vocabulary, morphology, and language-specific syntax, and essential for learning certain specifiable L1-L2 contrasts. (p. 414)

Long also suggests that students can produce more output as well as receive more input through comprehensible interaction. Students participating in group negotiated L2 language interaction move their comprehension into a more advanced understanding of the language. Interaction goes beyond the pre-modified input provided by a teacher or the curriculum, where instead, in language negotiation, students have the opportunity to use their own level of understanding that promotes comprehensible interaction with their student peers. This statement is supported by Mackey (1999) in her research on grammatical development. She found that “conversational interaction did facilitate second language development” (p. 575). In her study, the results showed that only the groups which used an active interaction as part of the curriculum showed definitive evidence of development. The interaction groups not only showed significant increase of development in grammatical knowledge, but also showed a higher level of language structure production.

Mackey also discovered that “the extent of the increase would be related to the nature of the interaction and the role of the learner” (p. 575). Students not only need to be in a group activity but also need to participate in personal interaction. The interaction itself should provide the student opportunities to use the language to negotiate their meaning. She
confirms that students who merely observed others participating or who took part in memorized script conversation did not receive the same benefits as those students who actively participated in language negotiation. She claims that her study shows that “the interactional modifications led to SL development and more active involvement in negotiated interaction led to greater development” (p. 583). Similar results can also be found in Loschky’s (1999) study in a Japanese class in Hawaii. His results show that whether the input is pre-modified or not, groups without negotiated interaction did not have as high a level of comprehension of the input they received as the group with interaction. These similar findings agree with McDonough’s (2004) study in a Thai EFL classroom, wherein de la Fuente (2002) also supports Long’s hypothesis in her own research regarding L2 vocabulary learning. In her study she evaluates the different conditions of language negotiation on L2 vocabulary comprehension. She provides “empirical evidence for the important role of negotiation in facilitating the comprehension and acquisition of L2 vocabulary” (p. 81). Her evidence is supplied by analyses of controlled input, non-forced interaction and forced interaction. The results emphasize that only forced interaction show the highest level of progress in both language acquisition and vocabulary expansion. Non-forced interaction shows improvement in productive acquisition but does not produce a better result in the receptive acquisition. The controlled input group does not outperform either of the other two groups in either productive acquisition or receptive acquisition of the language. This shows the importance of active participation in the interactive process which affects the outcome of student L2 language acquisition. These results agree with the study of Gass and Varonis (1994) which also finds that negotiated interaction has a positive impact on L2 production and comprehension.
Ellis et al. (1994) also suggest that through interaction, learners are provided with opportunities to understand the target language, and that this comprehensible input is helpful for L2 learning. However, he does not agree that students who merely observe interaction without direct participation receive less language learning benefits. His research based on two classroom designs, one similar to a group work class and the other similar to a teacher-fronted class, studies the effect of interaction on students’ vocabulary comprehension and acquisition in Japanese high school students studying English. His findings produce two specific results: first, that students involved in input that is modified through interaction (group work) have a better understanding of the language and they acquire more new vocabulary than students involved with a curriculum that used input that is already modified by the teacher beforehand (teacher-fronted) and second, that there is no difference between students who actively participate and the students who vicariously observe in both their comprehension and vocabulary acquisition of the language. As long as students were present for these interaction activities, whether observing or actively participating, their understanding of vocabulary increased. Kuiken and Vedder (2002) found similar results in their study of Dutch ESL classes. In their investigation, there was no significant difference in grammar comprehension and usage frequency for those who participated in interaction activities and those who merely participated through observation. To explain their findings, Ellis et al. (1994) stated that:

Learners achieve comprehension because interaction gives them a degree of control over the input they receive and because it buys them time to focus their attention on key or problematic items. Without the opportunity to stop the flow on input, learners may become swamped. (p. 482)
Their findings show that interactions allow participants and observers the opportunity to set the pace of the learning process to their individual needs. In the group work class setting, where interactions occur among students, students can benefit from a comfortable environment with their peers, but critics may argue the feedback from fellow learners may not be as sophisticated or accurate as input from teachers (Pica et al., 1996). On the other hand, although teachers provide accurate input and modified feedback in their interactions with students, the pressure they give students may affect the effectiveness of these productions (Gass, 2005; VanPatten & Oikkenon, 1996).

Kasanga (1996) questions the effect of peer interaction in yielding more target input during negotiation, as well as its potential for enhancing second language learning. Kasanga believes that there:

is still not enough convincingly firm evidence of what induces more interaction in what circumstances, how this takes place, what effect (positive and/or negative) this would have on learning, and, if it was the case that interaction had positive effects on learning, what areas of language learning would benefit most from interaction. (p. 612)

Finally, Kasanga’s review points out the key issue that although researchers believe that interaction promotes language acquisition, a detailed mechanism has yet to be developed. Similar arguments are also presented in Ellis’ (2000) study where he demonstrates the lack of empirical evidence to prove that acquisition can be promoted by negotiation.

**Group Work and Teacher-Fronted Classrooms**

It is important to evaluate the quality and the quantity of the input, output and interaction hypotheses in a real classroom setting. In a classroom, instructional input mainly comes from the teacher, while interaction can be among the teacher-student or student-
student. The quality of the student output is modified by both the classroom setting as well as the way in which the curriculum uses different levels of input and interaction (Lightbown, 1998). In the traditional teacher-fronted classroom setting, the teacher is the major source of all three categories which are: input, output, and interaction. The teacher provides accurate input and also offers corrective feedback of student responses. The teacher monitors all interactive responses between himself/herself and the students and can have better control over which linguistic principles are used. Once students are asked questions by the teacher, they are forced to create output, which helps promote second language acquisition, and they also received more feedback from the teacher in a teacher-fronted class than from their peers in groups (de la Fuente, 2002; Pica & Doughty, 1985).

However, in the traditional teacher-fronted classroom setting, each student is limited in his/her time of active participation and is given fewer opportunities to create output (Davis, 1997). Pica and Doughty (1985) also found that more “completions and corrections” occurred in student-student interaction than teacher-student interaction, which was contradictory to their hypothesis. One of the reasons may be because in a teacher-fronted classroom, the time is shared by the whole class, not owned by individual students. When a student is asked a question, the pressure is not only on the student, who may be intimidated and forget what to say on the spot, the pressure is also on the teacher, who is responsible to finish the lesson plan in a limited amount time. For many teachers, the solution is to just finish the sentence for the students. Besides, to keep the communication flowing in the class, teachers also tend to avoid too many corrections in the classroom (Lightbown, 1998).

Student-student interaction group work setting, on the other hand, has no such limitation. Students are more comfortable with their peers and it is not necessary for them to worry
about the whole class. Therefore, they have more time to finish their sentence and are more willing to receive correction (Davis, 1997).

In a more modern approach, student-student interaction (group activity) has become the trend of language acquisition (Storch, 2007, 1999; Sachs et al., 2003). This kind of activity provides abundant opportunities for students to interact with one another. After Varonis and Gass (1985) investigating the pattern of conversations between non-native speakers, they point out two benefits of this kind of learners’ interaction. First, learners have a non-threatening environment in which to exercise their developing language. Second, they have the chance to get input and feedback from fellow students which they are able to understand during the interaction. Studies also show that group work activities are beneficial in promoting comprehension, lexical acquisition, and some grammar development (Storch, 1999; Loschky 1994). McDonough (2004) also finds in her study positive results that group work participation promotes the production of target language.

With regards to the output individuals produced in both classroom settings, the results indicate that in group activities students use more target language by taking more turns talking than in teacher-fronted activities (Pica & Doughty, 1985). This is a reasonable result due to the nature of these two different classroom settings. For example, in a forty-minute class with twenty students each student will have an average of two minutes to interact with the teacher in a teacher-fronted classroom setting. If the time of the teacher’s and student’s utterance is equal, the actual time of output for each student will be divided by two, which leaves each student only one minute to produce output. This does not include the time the teacher uses to lecture or provide feedback. On the other hand, students in the same class can have up to an average of twenty minutes for their own if they are split into groups of two in
the group work classroom setting. As such, Pica and Doughty’s (1985) findings about the increased level of student interaction in group work versus that found in teacher-fronted classes encourages teachers to promote group work “with regard to the amount of practice time it offers students in forming hypotheses about the target language and the opportunities it provides for enhancing development of second language fluency” (p. 247).

However, there are diverse opinions concerning the use of group work in classrooms. Most criticism comes from the fact that the teacher is unable to directly monitor each student’s performance, which may create a situation where the student is given the wrong feedback or proper correction is not given to students during their interaction (Storch, 2007, 1999). Del Pilar Garcia Mayo and Pica (2000) find in their study that even though there are no significant differences between learner-learner interaction and learner-native speaker interaction in the aspect of their role in input, output, and feedback, the language inaccuracy in learners’ production indicates there are flaws in group interaction. They further point out that although learners can provide one another modified input and output as well as correct grammatical feedback, these types of contributions did not occur frequently. Besides, instead of negotiation back and forth to complete their designated communicative work, they used other self-completing strategies such as self-correction and completion just to fulfill the assignment. Pica et al. (1996) find similar results in their study about learners’ interactions. However, even though the result shows that learner-learner interaction is beneficial for their input, output, and feedback needs, sometimes it is still not comparable to the interaction with native speakers, especially on the modified input aspect.

The teacher also has less control over what the student actually learns. During the group work activity, most of the conversation is focusing on the negotiation of meaning (Varonis
and Gass, 1985). Students, in their group work exercises, tend to focus on meaning instead of the target syntax or lexical principles (Mackey et al., 2000; Pica, 1994), and due to the lack of direct monitoring, have no one to guide and focus their exercises towards these important grammatical topics (Lightbown, 1998; Williams, 1999). This potentially can be the critical limitation of group work activities when teachers intend to use this technique in teaching specific linguistic principles, especially grammar. In Williams’ (1999) research of students with different proficiency levels’ production in group work activity, she finds that students of all levels staggeringly focus on vocabulary instead of grammatical principles. As such, she also postulates that students might not be receiving the full usefulness of this potentially beneficial classroom exercising technique. Furthermore, she also points out that students, especially beginning level students, will recognize that they have only the most basic understanding of the target language, and can possibly be discouraged by the prospect of what they must still learn.

Another commonly accepted advantage of group work exercises is that students can have a less intimidating situation, among their peers, with which to practice their newly gained linguistic knowledge. Thus, they can lower their “affective filter” (Krashen 1982). However, recent studies show that some researchers have differing opinions regarding the effect of group work on students’ affective filters. They believe that although group work provides a more comfortable environment for students to test their language, it intuitively raises a student’s affective filter which blocks out possible language acquisition through the students’ lack of confidence in their peers’ ability to produce correct language, or they may not be willing to provide necessary feedback because of their lack of confidence in
themselves or to avoid offending peers (Storch, 2007, 2002; Lyster & Mori, 2006; McDonough, 2004).

Storch (2007) questions the commonly used group work activities in second language classes. In her classes, she notices that when she tries to use group work activities for writing tasks or grammar oriented assignments, those students from seem reticent to work together in this setting, instead preferring to work on these assignments alone. She finds that some students prefer to finish these assignments individually, so they can have more chances to practice, and some students are even concerned about receiving the wrong grammar feedback from their fellow students. In her study, she compares group work with individual work on a specific editing assignment. Her results show that there is hardly any difference in the level of editing accuracy done by those students who work individually and those who work in groups, even though students in the groups can still reach certain levels of correct results. However, she points out that even though group work cannot reach a higher grammatical accuracy, group work can provide students with opportunities to use their language for other functions, such as listening comprehension and speaking skills, which also assist second language acquisition. She then suggests that in order to fully reap the benefit of group exercises, explanation should be made to the students that group work has its positive aspects, especially in facilitating language learning processes. Even though group work doesn’t achieve a higher grammatical accuracy, the students won’t really acquire incorrect grammar from their peers, because in most cases they can reach some grammatically accurate resolutions together. On the other hand, one might think that students would be more hesitant to interact with the teacher due to their lack of confidence or fear of being embarrassed in front of the class and would therefore have more interaction when working with peers in a
group work setting. Furthermore, teachers who believe in promoting maximum language usage in the classroom tend to avoid correcting learners’ errors too much, thus keeping the learner’s affective filter low (Lightbown, 1998).

**Grammar Acquisition and Group Work**

As stated above, even though group work is widely adapted in second language pedagogy, there are still some scholars who dispute its effectiveness in some linguistic issues, such as grammar acquisition. Positive evidence has been shown in various studies that group work does provide more chances for learners to communicate with each other than exist in a teacher-fronted class. However, researchers also found that these group work exercises lack the involvement of grammatical negotiation. Group work may have advantageous results in the finite areas of students’ interpersonal communication skills, as well in students’ comprehensive accuracy in the usage of grammar, but results fluctuate with different grammatical principles (Storch, 1999; Williams, 1999; Swain, 1998).

Pica and Doughty (1985) warned that using group work as a tool to promote grammatical knowledge may not be as effective as the traditional teacher-fronted teaching style. In their study of three ESL classrooms, they compared the effectiveness of teacher-fronted and group work interactions in the level of grammatical input. They found that more grammatical input occurred in the teacher-fronted class. However, the findings also showed that it was not because students working in groups produced less grammatical utterances than they did in interactions with the teacher. In fact, most of the grammatical productions in the teacher-fronted class were made by the teacher. When comparing the students’ utterances in the teacher-fronted and group work classrooms, there were no statistically significant differences between both settings. This finding is reflected in Kuiken and Vedder’s (2002)
investigation concerning the effect of interaction on grammar acquisition in their Dutch EFL class, where no significant difference between the interaction group and non-interaction group is found either in recognition or in the frequency of target grammatical form usage.

Williams (1999) also finds similar results in her research that “learners overwhelmingly choose to focus on lexical rather than grammatical issues” (p. 583). In her small scale study of different proficiency levels in English learners with different L1 backgrounds, she points out that beginning learners tend to focus more on meaning than the grammatical aspects of their target language. She indicates the reason may be because beginning learners have to spend most of their attention on conveying their message and trying to maintain communication with their peers and therefore they cannot put enough focus on other linguistic principles they learned into their conversation. Mackey’s et al. (2000) investigation on learners’ perception in group work exercises reveals comparable findings wherein students have overall accurate perceptions regarding lexicon, sentence patterns, and pronunciation, but students fail to understand higher level grammatical principles such as morphosyntactic issues. Both of these reports agree with Pica’s (1994) claims that negotiation could be beneficial in learning lexicon, but could be less advantageous in morphosyntactic acquisition. She states that this is perhaps because the focus point of the students’ attention is on finishing the assignment. As a result, they concentrate on more basic linguistic items, such as lexicon, semantics, etc rather than noticing grammatical patterns.

Even though there are researchers who question the efficacy of group work exercises on grammatical acquisition, some studies still yield positive results showing that group work exercises somehow promote a certain level of accurate grammar (Gass, 2005; del Pilar Garcia Mayo and Pica, 2000; Mackey, 1999). Starch’s study (1999) also attempts to explain
this phenomenon. One thing she brings up is that this kind of improvement in accuracy may be because of the longer duration of exercise time students spend to complete their assignments as groups than doing it individually or working as a class with the teacher. Students have the opportunities to revise their production many times in group work exercises, but if they were just asked by the teacher they don’t have as much time to review their sentences before they need to provide an answer, especially since the entire class is waiting for their response. Another trend that she identified was that sentences produced from group work exercises tend to be shorter and less complex than those produced individually. Her study finds that students have higher accuracy in sentence making exercises, but in the more complex items such as articles, group work seems to lead to wrong decisions. In addition, this accuracy isn’t consistent throughout all grammar items. For more complicated grammatical concepts, group work failed to produce a desirable outcome.

**Group Work in Second Language Classroom**

There are not many empirical studies regarding the implementation of group work exercises in second language classrooms. Most research concerning this topic is specifically related to English as Second Language (ESL) classrooms. In the classrooms that actually implement the group work pedagogical theory, many teachers find it is not easy to include group work exercises in their curriculum. Researchers like Davis (1997) investigate the teachers’ opinions towards these types of learner centered techniques and find out both new and seasoned teachers seem to face some problems in creating or implementing tasks in their classrooms. Basturkmen et al. (2004) point out that some teachers are hesitant to use group work exercises because they think it is a waste of time due to the inefficiency of students’ acquisition of the target language principles. They also found an interesting phenomenon in
their case study about teacher’s beliefs and their actual practice in the classroom. The teachers’ stated beliefs are not all consistent with their observed behaviors. In their investigation, even though teachers try to avoid focusing on grammar or structure and to promote a communicative flow in the classroom, they still take time to focus on those grammatical issues and provide corrections. The study also indicates that students may even bring their focus on these linguistic forms themselves.

Another critique comes from Sachs’ et al. (2003) study about developing cooperative learning in the second language classroom. In their study, they provide support to teachers in creating and utilizing group work exercises in the classroom and observe what actually happened in the classroom. The team noticed that teachers seem to take too much time preparing students for the exercise even though the teachers in their study feel the time they spend is necessary in lowering the level of anxiety that students feel and ensuring that the students know what the purpose of the exercise is. However, with limited classroom time, this leaves even less time for students to carry out the assignments. This causes teachers to be less willing to include group work in their curriculum. Besides, the results show that the differences of outcome among the experimental groups are not significant.

Although there are some studies evaluating the use of group work in settings other than ESL, such as Spanish (de la Fuente, 2002) and French (Swain & Lapkins, 1998) education, there are no published empirical studies focusing solely on the evaluation of the use of group work in Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) classrooms. Some of these studies find that the results of implementing similar technique may be different from language to language. Lyster and Mori (2006) find that there are different strategies used in teaching ESL to Japanese students then when teaching ESL to French students. Since French is considered
a cognate language to English, because it uses a similar sentence structure and written form, French learners tend to focus more on negotiation for meaning in their communicative activity. Japanese students, on the other hand, are more attentive to the form rather than the meaning in these activities. Chinese, like Japanese, is a so-called truly foreign language because it is linguistically unrelated and culturally distant from English (Jordan and Walton, 1987), which makes it even more difficult to design a method to facilitate Chinese acquisition. Christensen and Warnick (2006) argued that there should be a different approach in CFL acquisition.

In their proposition of a Performed Culture Approach, it is suggested that culture should be included closely with the linguistic code and should not be treated separately. In their design, there are FACT classes, in which the teacher explicitly explains the grammatical and cultural concepts, and ACT classes, in which students participate by practicing and actually performing the culture. There are many different ways to implement this approach. For example, teachers may go through one lesson in a 5-class-hour period. If desired, there can be a main instructor directing the FACT hours, while teaching assistants can help the provide instruction in the ACT hours. In FACT hours, the instructor explicitly teaches the grammar and culture concepts and may choose to focus on writing and reading. Students need to memorize the designated dialogue in the text and recite it in class during the first hour. Assistants to the main instructor can provide various exercises to help students practice during the ACT hours; in the final ACT hour, students make up their own dialogue and perform it in groups. However, while each hour is designated for certain activities in the Performed Culture Approach, some hours are more flexible in the system. Within these flexible hours, instructors are free to design various exercises to help students practice what
they have learned in the FACT hours. As a result, instructors may use different techniques to provide focused practice. In implementing the Performed Culture Approach it is therefore important to identify the teaching techniques that can have the greatest impact on learner outcomes. This study focuses on an evaluation of teacher-fronted and group work techniques, in order to identify the role of each technique in facilitating students’ CSL acquisition during the flexible ACT hours of the Performed Culture Approach as used in beginning Chinese classes at Brigham Young University.

**Summary**

While research on the topic of grammar in a group work setting has been researched many times, the results of these studies remain varied. Each study points out the various advantages and disadvantages of group work and teacher-fronted teaching styles. Theories behind these pedagogical claims can be separated into three main domains. First, the Input Hypothesis points out the importance for learners to receive comprehensible input so that they can move to a higher level of linguistic knowledge. Learners also need an environment that is comfortable enough for them to be willing to receive this input. Second, the Output Hypothesis emphasizes the importance for learners to actually utilize the language they learn to increase fluency through practice, to shift their focus from meaning to syntax, to test their hypotheses about their newly learned principles, and to receive feedback about their production. Third, the interaction hypothesis highlights the benefits of negotiation among learners in creating abundant opportunities for input and output, as well as the capacity for providing learners opportunities to progress at a their own pace of comprehension, while acknowledging the flaws in their language.
Teacher–fronted classes are considered more efficient in providing students’ comprehensible input, but because of class time limitations, students only have limited opportunities to produce output. However, they are more likely to receive quality feedback from the teacher and the teacher can have better control over what is to be taught in the class. Group work, on the contrary, ensures that most of the class time is allotted for students’ interactions, thus increasing the amount of time students have to produce direct output. The drawback to group activity is the uncertainty of students’ production. The teacher has less direct control over the students’ focus and the feedback which students give to each other. There is also a difficulty in teaching grammar through group work because students tend to focus on lexicon, pronunciation, and meaning instead of grammar patterns. In the real classroom, teachers often prefer to use the teacher-fronted style of instruction over using group work activities, because of the difficulty of creating and carrying out original tasks, as well as the time-consuming nature of group work activities. Students also have various opinions towards each of these different teaching styles. Some prefer group work because of the more relaxed setting for producing language and receiving feedback from their peers, while others are reluctant in participating in group work because of their distrust in the language ability of their classmates. Most students are used to the traditional teacher-fronted classroom setting and trust the control of the teacher, even though they are perhaps intimidated to carry on actual dialogue with the teacher in front of the whole class.

Chinese as a Second Language courses are relatively new to the United States, and as such, there is a specific need to find more improved methods of instruction for this linguistically and culturally challenging language. The Performed Culture Approach is introduced as one of the ways in which to deal with the specific problems presented by this
language. This approach integrates both teacher-fronted and group work styles of instruction in order to maximize the benefits of each style. Its’ design of explicit explanation (FACT) and sufficient practice (ACT) provides a synergistic approach that takes advantage of the direct instruction method of the teacher-fronted style of instruction as well as the increased level of output provided by the group work style of instruction. The current study attempts to compare the effect teacher-fronted and group work techniques have on students’ grammatical acquisition. It also investigates the correlation of students’ attitude towards these techniques and their individual language outcomes.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses of this study are based on a synthesis of the findings and implications of Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1982), Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1993, 1985), and Long’s Interaction Hypothesis (1996). Krashen’s (1982) Input Hypothesis maintains that providing learners with comprehensible input is paramount in the language acquisition process. This study assumes that the teacher is able to more accurately identify learner i+1 levels and provide sufficient and accurate input. Therefore, it was assumed that the teacher-fronted technique will improve learners’ language use. Although the research (Davis, 1997; Long & Porter, 1985) suggests that a group work technique would promote higher levels of learner output, and this alone would seem sufficient to merit hypotheses favoring this technique, it is important to note that the primary outcome of group work language production was an increase in fluency, not accuracy. Therefore, due to the selection of grammar accuracy as the key indicator of technique efficacy, it is assumed by this study, that the teacher-fronted technique would have a more significant impact on the accuracy of learner output. Finally, Long’s (1996) research regarding interaction suggests that learner performance is enhanced
when immediate and accurate feedback is provided. In this study, it is anticipated that the best source of immediate and accurate feedback would be the teacher, therefore the teacher-fronted technique would promote better learner performance.

Hypothesis 1: Students in the teacher-fronted class will outperform the group work class in usage of correct syntax on written quizzes.

Hypothesis 2: Students in the teacher-fronted class will produce more accurate syntactic phrases than the group work class in actual conversational performance.

Hypothesis 3: There will not be a direct correlation between learners’ attitudes towards the teaching style and their actual language learning outcomes.
Chapter Three: Method

This chapter outlines the instructional and institutional framework which controlled the procedure and material content used in this study. In addition, a detailed description of the participants, both students and teachers is introduced and an explanation is given of the materials and special adjustment design which were used in this study.

The purpose of the present study is to determine whether beginning CFL (Chinese as a foreign language) learners’ understanding and ability to use correct grammatical principles is affected by curriculum delivery, being teacher-fronted, group work instruction style, or a mixture of both. The difficulty for native English speakers to acquire correct grammatical principles in a non-cognate language such as Chinese cannot be overemphasized. It has been estimated that it takes a native English speaker almost three times as much training to develop proficiency in a non-cognate language, such as Chinese, as it takes to develop the same level of proficiency in a cognate language such as Spanish (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Therefore, it is important to discover more efficient methods to teach Chinese as a foreign language.

The current research on this topic is divided. Some researchers argue for the effectiveness of teacher-fronted curriculum delivery; teachers can provide accurate feedback which promotes correct syntax use by the student as opposed to group work exercises where students’ syntax use could be left uncorrected by their group cohort (Swaffar, Arens, & Byrnes, 1991). Other researchers argue, however, that decreased teacher-fronted curriculum and increased group work at the beginning language learner level for foreign language learners increases the amount of opportunity for student language output and facilitates language learning (Davis, 1997). It should also be noted that the current research focuses
mainly on cognate languages to English and there is a lack of literature that addresses foreign language acquisition of English speakers learning non-cognate languages. Discovering the answer to this question addresses the need for more information about non-cognate language learning outcomes for English speakers and provides direction for curriculum development for beginning CFL learners.

**Framework of the Current Study**

*Procedures in BYU Chinese 101 Classes*

The instructional methodology for beginning Chinese courses at BYU is based on the Performed Culture Approach. In this manifestation of the Performed Culture Approach, classes are divided into two different sessions: the FACT hours which focus on disseminating declarative knowledge and the ACT hours which focus on procedural knowledge (Christensen & Warnick, 2006; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990). As each student has individual learning styles, the FACT/ACT approach has been set up to “accommodate both inductive and deductive learning styles” (Christensen & Warnick, 2006, p 58). The deductive style of learning benefits students by explicit explanation of grammar and language rules, while the inductive style of learning benefits the student with opportunities to exercise their knowledge of grammatical principles and cultural ideologies. The disadvantage of a pure deductive style is the lack of real life interpersonal communication skills to be applied in the target language’s cultural setting. The disadvantage of using a purely inductive style is the fact that it leaves students feeling they have not completely grasped the grammatical principles. In FACT classes, the teacher caters to the deductive style of learning by teaching the principles of the language and knowledge about the culture explicitly in the learner’s base language, English. In ACT classes, the teacher caters to inductive styles of learning by helping students...
practicing and performing these principles entirely in Chinese. The ratio of time spent on both FACT/ACT class sessions is recommended to be at least one to four respectively. While FACT sessions provide foundations of grammatical knowledge and cultural information, ACT classes provide opportunities for students to practice new and previously learned knowledge and apply their skills through various activities and exercises (Christensen & Warnick, 2006).

The purpose of the FACT session is to provide explanation of the target language and culture, in other words, declarative knowledge (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990). It is important for the instructor to convey information explicitly, since doing so is more productive in the limited amount of time allocated for instruction and gives learners a more direct and holistic understanding of the language and its usage. In FACT sessions, the instructor should be the center of and maintain control over the class discussion. The instructor may present information in a lecture format in the students’ native language, but FACT instruction is typically more involved than this, with the instructor often serving in the role of a coach, assisting students in uncovering related information.

The FACT classes include discussion about the language and the culture, such as explanations about how to produce the sounds of the target language, grammar patterns and how they are used, when and how certain vocabulary items are used, when and how natives of the target culture make apologies, how business cards are exchanged, and what the restaurant script for the target culture is like (Christensen & Warnick, 2006, p 59).
In this manner, the FACT sessions seek to provide a solid foundation for students’ performance, which the ACT sessions build upon.

While a FACT session is centered on the idea of discussing grammar and culture, the ACT class focuses on the students’ performance in the target language. The instructor in the ACT class plays the role of a “theatrical director” who guides the students’ performances as they rehearse grammar and language skills, instead of direct lecturing.

The ACT classes provide opportunities for learners to perform in the culture, in contextualized settings that allow them to make apologies or exchange business cards or enact restaurant settings. It is essential that the situations are culturally authentic and that the learners understand the genre and the style involved, including the five elements of performance—the time, the place, the roles, the script and the audience (Christensen and Warnick, 2006, p59).

It will be much more effective if the ACT sessions are conducted entirely in the target language, with the students doing most of the talking. Instructors should attempt to give students multiple opportunities in many different capacities for the purpose of allowing learners ample chances to utilize the knowledge which they have gained in FACT classes and from personal study time. Different activities or drilling exercises are implemented in ACT sessions, so that students can actively participate in many different scenarios. The instructor also should make sure there are no passive learners hidden in the back of the classroom by involving all the students by calling on them or giving them different assignments to accomplish individually or with groups.

The ideal weekly schedule to use for the Performed Culture Approach follows the one to four ratio, with at least one FACT class in a work week and the other four days being ACT
classes. In order to facilitate a simulated immersion experience, the instructors use some English in order to explain the grammar in the FACT class, while English is prohibited in ACT classes. At the beginning of the weekly instruction period, the class will start with the performance of a memorized dialogue. Students should use their personal time outside of class to memorize the designated dialogue and come to class ready to perform it. The second day of instruction is designated as a FACT class where the instructor introduces grammatical patterns, vocabulary usages, and cultural explanations, etc. The following day of instruction is another ACT day, with drills, exercises, and performances to enhance the comprehension and practical implementation of the previously taught language principles. The fourth day is usually used for reading and writing exercises, and quizzes on sentence patterns, vocabulary, characters etc. The last day of the instructional week is a summary and review of the entire week’s lesson. When students reach a basic level of proficiency, they will use the sentence patterns and grammatical structures taught throughout the week to create their own dialogues, memorize them, rehearse with classmates outside of class, and then perform them in front of the class. Since beginning learners have limited language skills, they need to be able to manipulate the limited vocabulary and sentence patterns that they learn throughout the week to create their dialogues; “this is an ideal way to end the instructional cycle” (Christensen & Warnick, 2006, p63).

The Performed Culture Approach emphasizes the importance of maximizing students’ contact with the target language. The time students spend outside of class preparing memorized dialogues, both those specified by the instructor and those the students prepare themselves, and the time they spend in class learning and reviewing vocabulary, sentence patterns, and grammatical structures all contribute greatly to the maximization of time
students spend in contact with the target language. Student participants in this study live in a predominantly English speaking culture with limited exposure to the target language outside of class. Therefore, it is even more important to make sure that all available class time is used efficiently.

**Current Curriculum Delivery**

The beginning Chinese course (Chinese 101) is a four credit class that meets Monday- Friday for fifty minutes each day. It is taught by two teachers, the main instructor, who is a faculty member at BYU, and a teaching assistant, who is supervised by the main instructor. The main instructor teaches vocabulary usage, grammatical principles, sentence patterns, and socio-cultural information on Tuesday, while Thursday instruction, also conducted by the main instructor, consists of reading and writing exercises. Quizzes are also given on Thursday instruction to evaluate students’ understanding and ability to utilize knowledge learned. Monday, Wednesday, and Friday classes are lead by a TA. On these days, most of the class time concentrates on using practical exercises which focus on performance, including cultural concepts, vocabulary usage, and grammar introduced by the main instructor on Tuesday. New lessons usually begin on Monday, where students are to memorize a designated dialogue and recite it in class. On Wednesday, TAs use various activities or drilling exercises to enhance language principles previously taught by the main instructor. There are specific homework assignments given to students in order to prepare for class on Friday. When ready, students will create their own dialogues and rehearse them before class. They should prepare it well enough that they are able to memorize it and perform it in front of the class without looking at any notes. Friday instruction is usually the last day of each lesson cycle, and as a lesson summary exercise, students are told they can
put anything they have learned from that week’s lesson into their performance. The above concepts are illustrated in the following table:

Table 1

*BYU Beginning Chinese Classes Weekly Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Main instructor</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Main instructor</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>FACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students perform</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Instructor introduces</td>
<td>Student perform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explains</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>character reading</td>
<td>exercises from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designated</td>
<td>grammar and</td>
<td>exercises for</td>
<td>and writing;</td>
<td>the current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dialogue</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td>concepts</td>
<td>grammar/vocabulary</td>
<td>week’s lesson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concepts</td>
<td>learned</td>
<td></td>
<td>quiz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the main instructor remained constant throughout the course of the semester. The TAs responsible for directing the practice exercises, however, did not remain constant in order to avoid variation inherent in teacher performance in the data outcome. After the sixth lesson, the TAs in the experimental groups switched, while the TA in the control group remained the same. There were three sections used in this study. Section One used the teacher-fronted style of instruction, Section Two was the control group that was exposed to both teacher-fronted and group work techniques, while Section Three was only
exposed to the group work teaching technique. Since this study was dependent on sections consisting of pre-existing groups, there was very limited control over the student makeup of each section. To collect data to evaluate the language learning outcomes of each student, a short pre-test was given in the first five minutes of Wednesday instruction and a post-test was administered at the beginning of Thursday instruction. The pre-test serves as an origin point upon which to base evaluation, while the post-test was administered to determine the outcome of the effectiveness of the different teaching styles, so that only the effectiveness of Wednesday instruction is evaluated.

**Participants**

The Chinese 101 course at Brigham Young University is a one semester beginning level Mandarin Chinese course. The course is designed for students who have little or no experience with Mandarin Chinese. The course focuses on the four basic skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing, with an emphasis on speaking and listening in order to promote comprehensive language proficiency among students. The methodology used is based on the Performed Culture Approach with the goals of helping students develop functional language ability and to be able to use Mandarin Chinese in linguistically and culturally appropriate ways. The classes used for this study were comprised of three sections of the beginning Chinese 101 four-credit course that met at eight o’clock AM for fifty minutes each weekday. These classes met separately on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays with their individual teaching assistants, but met together on Tuesdays and Thursdays with the main instructor. Participants in this study consisted of forty-one Chinese 101 students, one main instructor from the faculty of Brigham Young University, and three student teaching assistants.
Students

The forty-one students enrolled in the Chinese 101 course were from all three morning sections at Brigham Young University in fall semester 2005. These sections consisted mainly of freshmen and sophomores ranging in age from eighteen to twenty-four. During the registration period for the class, students were able to choose the section that they wanted to be enrolled in, however all sections appeared to be the same, showing only the main instructors name and not listing the name of the teaching assistants. No students were allowed to switch sections after registration; therefore, the three sections used in this study consisted of pre-existing groups. These sections met in three different classrooms for Monday, Wednesday and Friday exercises and gathered together in the same classroom for Tuesday and Thursday instruction. There were no prerequisites for this course; however, student participants had various backgrounds and different proficiency levels in several languages, including Mandarin Chinese. Most of the students (Thirty-nine) had previously studied foreign languages, and of those, thirty had some kind of experience with more than one language, as shown in Figure 1. Information taken from student surveys at the end of the semester indicated that seven of the students had at least one parent that speaks Chinese, two in Section One, three in Section Two and two in Section Three; thirteen had been to countries which use Chinese as their main language, staying from between two weeks to two years; eleven had previous exposure to Mandarin Chinese before enrolling, such as at a weekend Chinese school or through a private tutor, ranging from two months to eight years. However, these students were evenly distributed among three sections. In addition, the reason they enrolled in this course was because none of them had ever been enrolled in formal or intensive classes and deemed themselves beginning language learners. This classification
was confirmed by the main instructor. Thirty-six students had more than two-years experience in learning other foreign languages, mostly non-Asian languages, including Spanish, French and German. Three students had previously studied East Asian languages other than Chinese; two students had studied Japanese for over ten years, one student had studied Korean for one year. One special case in Section Three had served as a full-time Cantonese-speaking missionary for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Hong Kong for two years. In those two years, this student had learned Cantonese through very little formal instruction, but rather from daily contact with native speakers. Even though there are differences between Mandarin and Cantonese, this student still demonstrated a much higher proficiency level in vocabulary usage, grammatical knowledge, and writing/reading ability than all other students. After interviewing this student, the main instructor decided to let him remain enrolled in the course, because his proficiency in Mandarin was at a level deemed appropriate for this course. While this group of students was varied in language learning experience and exposure to Mandarin Chinese, each student that had previous exposure to Mandarin Chinese was interviewed by the main instructor to ensure that they were at the appropriate level to enroll in this class.
Figure 1. Summary of languages students were previously exposed to.

Instructors

Four teachers, including one main instructor and three teaching assistants, were involved in this study. The main instructor was the same for each of the three sections, while each section had a different teaching assistant. Teachers in Brigham Young University’s Chinese Program have to take a teacher training course (Chinese 377) before they are qualified to teach any Chinese class. In addition to this teacher training, all teachers were also specifically trained for this study before the beginning of the semester. This training consisted of demonstrations of each specific teaching style, useful ideas for drilling and practice exercises, and things to avoid that would influence the results of the study.

Throughout the course of the semester, weekly meetings were also held in order to review the progress of students, discuss challenges involved in students’ performance and comprehension of course materials, and identify the target grammar principles to be used for evaluation. In order to best facilitate the instruction schedule and to fulfill the purposes stated
above, these meetings were held after Tuesday instruction. Ideas of activities to be used on Wednesday exercises were also presented in Tuesday meetings to ensure that similar exercises are used within each section, while still verifying that the purity of each teaching style is maintained. For example, information gap was used for the practice of time and schedule in Lesson Eight. Two schedules were developed, one on blue paper and the other on pink paper. Both were the same time schedule, but with different spaces left empty on them. Students with the pink schedule needed to talk to the students with the blue schedule in order to find out what belongs in the blanks on their specific piece of paper and vice versa. In Section One, the teacher-fronted group, the teacher had a blue sheet and students had the pink sheet, so the students had to interact with the teacher in order to find out what to write in on the blanks on their pink sheets, and also gave the teacher the answers to fill in the blanks on the blue sheet. As such, the students have the opportunity to directly ask questions to and get answers from the teacher. In this activity, the teacher called on one random person at a time for this conversation, while the other students observed the conversation. In Section Three, the group work class, half of the class had a pink sheet, while the other half had a blue sheet. The students with the pink sheets were to carry on a conversation with different students who had blue sheets in order to fill in the information gap on their individual sheets and vice versa. The teacher actively supervised the activity by walking throughout the class and listening to different students conversations, and giving direction when necessary. In Section Two, the control group, the first half of the activity was conducted by the teacher using the same method as Section One, while the second half of the activity was done using the same method as Section Three. Half of the blanks on the sheets were filled in by teacher interaction, while the other half of the blanks were filled in through interaction with
classmates. Although teachers were given detailed training and were provided with detailed lesson plans which employed the designated teaching technique for their section, teachers were not observed and were not forced to use the lesson plans or techniques outlined. However, during the weekly meetings, teachers from each section reported that they were not only using the techniques and lesson plans provided, but would also express a positive attitude towards these techniques.

The main instructor for this class was a native Mandarin Chinese speaker from Taiwan who has been teaching Mandarin in various universities in the United States for over twenty-five years. She has taught Chinese 101 courses at Brigham Young University for several years and is renowned for her refined ways of delivering the assigned curriculum.

The teaching assistant for Section One was also a native Mandarin Chinese speaker from Taiwan. The teaching assistants for Sections Two and Three were non-native Chinese speakers from the United States. Although their Chinese was not equal to that of a native speaker, they had both studied Chinese for several years and their language ability was considered sufficient to teach beginning Chinese with no fundamental negative impact. This variable is considered in greater detail in the Analysis section of this research. All three teaching assistants had previously taught Chinese 101 at Brigham Young University for two semesters.

As mentioned earlier, a teacher-fronted exercise style was used in Section One, a group work exercise style was used in Section Three, and a combined style of both teacher-fronted and group work was applied in Section Two which served as the control group. Teaching assistants in Sections One and Three were switched after the sixth lesson to minimize the teacher as a factor that might affect results rather than the teaching style, while
the teaching assistant in Section Two remained the same throughout the semester. The exercise styles remained the same in all three sections throughout the entire semester.

**Materials**

*Integrated Chinese* (Yao & Liu, 1997) was used as the textbook for this research, because it was currently the textbook in use at Brigham Young University. Ten lessons from this textbook are covered in one semester (fifteen total weeks) for beginning Chinese classes at Brigham Young University. Students complete one lesson per week; however, there are also designated review weeks integrated throughout the course of the curriculum. The grammatical principles tested in each lesson were those found in the textbook.

To evaluate the outcome of these different teaching styles, two different types of quizzes were given both as pre-tests and post-tests for each lesson (See Appendix B and C). These tests were developed by the researcher and were not analyzed for validity or reliability. This was due to the necessity of using the pre-existing testing framework within the BYU Chinese curriculum. Pre-tests were given to the students on Wednesday which only tested students’ understanding of the previously taught grammatical principles. Those pre-test questions focused only on grammatical concepts, in order to gauge students’ understanding after Tuesday instruction. The post-test quizzes were part of the BYU beginning Chinese curriculum and were used to determine students’ final grade. The questions on these quizzes were designed to evaluate students’ knowledge of the different aspects of language learning, including vocabulary, grammar, reading, and writing. These quizzes were administered on Thursday, with only the grammar portion being evaluated for current study. In order to keep the results anonymous, each student was given a random three digit number as their identification number to be used throughout the entire study. The questions on the pre-tests
were similar, but not the same as the grammar questions on the post-test. Both pre-tests and post-tests were short, with five minutes of class time allocated to take them. Pinyin was provided for all grammar questions on both tests, in order to lessen bias due to inability to recognize characters. Both pre- and post quizzes from each section were graded by the same person to avoid bias created by different grading styles.

The last portion of each lesson was the dialogue performance on Friday. Students formed their own study groups to make up their own dialogue before each Friday class and then performed their dialogue in front of the class on Friday. These performances were short dialogues made up of ten to twenty sentences, which were written by the students based on what they had learned in previous classes. The students were allowed to choose their own groups, with each group consisting of two to three people who usually met after Thursday classes to work out a plot for the dialogue. The dialogue usually built upon students’ existing knowledge gained throughout the course, but students were specifically encouraged to use the vocabulary and grammatical principles taught during that week’s classes. These performances were recorded for analysis for this study. The quizzes were used to investigate students’ declarative knowledge, while the performance recordings were used to assess students’ procedural skills.

At the end of the semester, students were given an anonymous survey so that their background data could be obtained. It also asked about their attitude towards the teaching style used in their class. This final survey was a questionnaire that was designed so that the students’ attitudes towards different class exercises and activities could be expressed. It consisted of various types of questions, including open-ended, fill-in-the-blank, and scalar response items. There were two main parts of the questionnaire. The first portion had
questions about the class. It used six scalar response questions, with categories ranking from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There were four main items including Monday, Wednesday, Friday exercises, and their overall experience. Under each item there were five questions in which students were asked if the exercises helped them develop communicative skills, reading and writing skills, grammatical understanding, cultural understanding, as well as asking them if they enjoyed the exercise. They were followed by an open-ended question asking them the reasoning behind each answer. Only questions concerning Wednesday exercises and overall experience were analyzed for this study. The other questions served as distracters. The second portion asked about the students’ personal background relating to Chinese, with questions relating to previous language learning experience, time spent abroad, classroom preparation time, etc (See Appendix D).
Chapter Four: Data Analysis

The current study compares outcome performance among different exercise styles to investigate the effects these styles have on beginning CFL learners. These outcome performances include the pre-test and post-test results on written grammatical knowledge and the actual conversation performance by students. Throughout a whole semester, all students in three sections received the same explicit instruction on certain grammatical principles in the same classroom from the same main instructor on Tuesdays. On Wednesdays, students were separated into three different classrooms and received different exercise styles from their teaching assistants. A pre-test was given on Wednesday before the exercise began to record the students’ knowledge before the exercise, while a similar post-test was given on Thursday. On Friday, students were separated back into their sections again to perform a pre-written dialogue with their partner in front of the class. All the quizzes and performances were used to assess students’ understanding about certain grammatical principles. At the end of the semester, questionnaires asking about the students’ opinion towards the teaching style used in their class were given out to investigate the relationship between students’ attitude and their performance. The three hypotheses proposed for this study, with results and data analysis are provided below.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Students in the teacher-fronted class will outperform the group work class in usage of correct syntax on written quizzes.

Hypothesis 2: Students in the teacher-fronted class will produce more accurate syntactic phrases than the group work class in actual conversational performance.
Hypothesis 3: There will not be a direct correlation between learners’ attitudes towards the teaching style and their actual language learning outcomes.

Analysis of Quiz Results

Research Question One: Does teaching technique, whether teacher-fronted or group work, yield a different result in a beginning Chinese as Foreign Language (CFL) learners’ understanding and ability to use syntax correctly on writing quizzes?

To answer this question, pre-tests and post-tests were used for each lesson. This question was examined in two parts. First, was to test if students yield overall better results in their post-tests than their pre-tests. Second, was to determine which group had better improvement between their pre-tests and post-tests. The data was collected from Lesson Four to Lesson Ten as labeled in the textbook, Integrated Chinese. However, the data for Lesson Six was not considered, because the teaching assistant of Section Two failed to give students the pre-test. Therefore, this analysis was done by comparing the result from all six lessons together and by each lesson separately.

Overall Post-test against Pre-test Results

Because the grammatical portion in each quiz had a different number of questions and score, instead of using the absolute scores, percentages were used to compare the results between pre-tests and post-tests in this study. Table 2 shows the average percentage scores of the pre-tests and post-tests among three sections.
Table 2

*Average Percentage Scores among Three Sections*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Average pre-test score</th>
<th>Average post-test score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1</strong></td>
<td>Teacher-fronted</td>
<td>68.04%</td>
<td>84.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2</strong></td>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>69.71%</td>
<td>84.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 3</strong></td>
<td>Group work</td>
<td>65.85%</td>
<td>74.61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ANOVA test was used between pre-test and post-test to see if the exercises did bring an improvement to students’ post-test scores. It was analyzed with all students' results of pre-tests and post-tests. For the overall test results, the numerator degree of freedom was one (pre-test plus post-test minus one). Among the 41 students, there were some who missed either the pre-test or post-test, therefore only 39 samples were used, which makes the denominator degree of freedom to be 38 (39-1). The F value shows if the result is statistically significant when the value of Pr>F is less than 0.05, which means the chance of the result to be random is less than 5 percent. The result of this analysis shows the Pr > F (<.0001) is less than 0.05, which indicates a statistically significant difference. Data analyses were performed with SAS 9.1 statistical software (SAS Inc, Cary, NC). Table 3 shows the result of comparison between pre-tests and post-tests for all students.
Table 3

ANOVA Analysis for Overall Pre-test/ Post-test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test v. Post-test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.71*</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05

To determine which group (pre-test or post-test) has a statistically better score, a simple T test was run. The result is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

T-test Result of Pre-test and Post-test

| Test      | Estimate | Error   | DF  | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|-----------|----------|---------|-----|---------|------|---|
| Post-test | 0.8126   | 0.01554 | 38  | 52.28*  | <.0001|
| Pre-test  | 0.6771   | 0.01554 | 38  | 43.56*  | <.0001|

* p < 0.05

The result of the T-test gives confidence intervals for the pre-test means and post-test means which show that the post-test scores are higher. Figure 2 demonstrates the average percentage of the overall pre-test and post-test scores which show the average scores from all students in their post-tests are higher than their pre-test scores.
Figure 2. The average percentage of pre-test and post-test results.

One of the possible variables that might affect the result is the teacher factor, because there are three different teaching assistants administrating class activities. Therefore, a similar ANOVA test was employed to compare the test scores between the teacher exchange that occurred between sections one and three, in order to determine whether the teacher affected the result. A table summarizing the test is shown below:

Table 5

*Summary of the Test of Teacher Effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>test__</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100.60</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section__</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.0207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests * Sections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.6552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows no difference between results before and after the switch. A variable Tests * Sections is included to compare the result of the lesson both before and after the teacher switch. If the p-value of this result is less than 0.05 it is considered statistically significant. Since the p-value, 0.6552, is much higher than 0.05, the result is not statistically significant, which indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in how students performed before and after the teachers were switched.

**Quiz Result Comparison between Sections**

The previous analyses indicate that students’ performance improves when comparing all students’ post-test results against all their pre-test results. The second portion of the quiz result analysis is to compare the results among different sections. Two parts of analyses are included in this portion, the overall results from six lessons altogether and the results from each lesson separately. To determine if the section might be associated with post-test score, a linear mixed model was employed, with student as a repeated measure and the percentage score as the response. Pre-test percentage scores are included in the model as a covariate.

**Overall Quiz Results between Sections.** All the test scores from six lessons were used as subjects for this test and the results are compared between sections. The summary of overall result comparison between sections is shown below:
Table 6

*Summary of Overall Result between Sections*

| Sections                             | Estimate | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|--------------------------------------|----------|---------|------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined) | 0.02029  | 0.71    | 0.4779 |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work) | 0.08038  | 2.75*   | 0.0065 |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work) | 0.06009  | 1.97    | 0.0500 |

* p < 0.05

In order to compare the performance between sections, the difference is used for analysis, two sections at a time. The estimate shows the average difference between two sections. For example, the estimate 0.02029 indicates that all six lesson quiz results from Section One are about 2% higher than Section Two averagely, while they are 8% (0.08038) higher than Section Three in average. Section Two, on the other hand, averages about 6% (0.06009) higher in their overall quiz score than Section Three. The p-value of Section One and Two comparison is much higher than 0.05 showing that there is a high chance it is just a random result and the difference between Section One and Two is not statistically significant. The p-value of Section One and Three comparison, 0.0065, is considered statistically significant which points out there is a different outcome between Section One and Three. The p-value of Section Two and Three comparison, 0.0500, is not less than 0.0500, so it is still considered statistically insignificant. Figure 3 shows the average difference between sections for all lessons.
Figure 3. Result comparison between sections for all lessons.

This chart shows the average difference of the overall quiz results between sections using percentage scores. As shown above, the difference was greatest between Section One, the teacher-fronted group, and Section Three, the group work class, by 8%. Even though this chart also shows that Section One also outperforms Section Two, and Section Two outperforms Section Three, these differences are not statistically significant to draw any solid conclusions from.

**Quiz Results between Sections by Lesson.** For this study, different grammatical concepts were taught in different lessons. Therefore, in order to analyze the effect of different teaching styles on progress in specific grammatical principles, testing was also run on a per lesson basis. The same testing used for the overall results was also performed by lesson to analyze any differences that might occur. The summaries of the average difference between sections by lesson are shown below:
Table 7

*Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 4*

| Sections                        | Estimate   | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined) | 0.06941044 | 1.21    | 0.2355 |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work) | -0.03640982 | -0.62   | 0.5384 |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work) | -0.10582026 | -1.83   | 0.0757 |

The Estimate numbers show that Section One, on average, got about 7% (0.06941) higher score than Section Two in their quiz results for Lesson Four, but 4% (-0.03640) lower than Section Three, while Section Two got about 11% (-0.105820) lower than Section Three on average. However, the p-values of each comparison are all higher than 0.05, which means there is no statistically significant difference between sections to draw any solid conclusion.

For Lesson Five, the Estimate numbers show that Section One, on average, got less than 1% (0.00930) higher score than Section Two in their quiz result, and about 14% (0.13847) higher than Section Three, while Section Two got about 13% (0.129165) higher than Section Three on average. In the comparison of Section One and Two of Lesson Five, the p-value is 0.8723, showing no statistical significance. However, the p-value on the comparison between Section One and Three is 0.0277, showing that there is a statistically significant difference to these teaching styles on progress between sections. The same is demonstrated for the comparison between Section Two and Three, where the p-value is 0.0458, showing the difference between the control group teaching style and the group work teaching style is statistically significant.
Table 8

*Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 5*

| Sections                             | Estimate    | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------|------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined) | 0.00930804  | 0.16    | 0.8723|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work) | 0.13847398  | 2.33*   | 0.0277|
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work). | 0.12916594  | 2.10*   | 0.0458|

* *p < 0.05

*Figure 4. Result comparison between sections for Lesson 5.*

This chart shows the difference in progress for Lesson Five between sections using percentage scores. As shown above, the difference was greatest between Section One, the teacher-fronted group, and Section Three, the group work class, by about 14%. There is also
a statistically significant difference between Sections Two and Three on this test, with a difference of 13%. Even though this chart also shows that Section One also outperforms Section Two, this difference is not statistically significant to draw any solid conclusions from.

Table 9

Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 7

| Sections                              | Estimate    | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------|------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined) | 0.01249535  | 0.18    | 0.8614 |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work) | 0.00336324  | 0.04    | 0.9694 |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work) | -0.00913210 | -0.11   | 0.9125 |

The estimate numbers show that Section One, on average scored about 1% (0.012495) higher than Section Two on their quiz results for Lesson Seven, and less than 1% (0.003363) higher than Section Three, while Section Two scored less than 1% (-0.009132) lower than Section Three on average. However, the p-values of each comparison are all higher than 0.05, which means there is no statistically significant difference between sections to draw any solid conclusion.

For Lesson Eight, the estimate numbers show that Section One, on average scored about 2% (0.019765) higher than Section Two on their quiz results, but 12% (-0.118354) lower than Section Three, while Section Two scored about 14% (-0.138120) lower than Section Three on average. However, the p-values of each comparison are all higher than
0.05, which means there is also no statistically significant difference between sections to draw any solid conclusion.

Table 10

*Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 8*

| Sections                                      | Estimate  | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined)    | 0.01976554| 0.25    | 0.8054|   |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work)  | -0.11835485| -1.17  | 0.2493|   |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work)         | -0.13812039| -1.46  | 0.1536|   |

Table 11

*Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 9*

| Sections                                      | Estimate  | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------|---|
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined)    | 0.02611266| 0.41    | 0.6828|   |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work)  | 0.17323263| 2.66 *  | 0.0139|   |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work)         | 0.14711997| 2.15 *  | 0.0420|   |

* p < 0.05

The estimate numbers show that Section One, on average, got about than 3% (0.026112) higher score than Section Two on their quiz result for Lesson Nine, and about 17% (0.173232) higher than Section Three, while Section Two got about 15% (0.147119) higher than Section Three on average. In the comparison of Section One and Two for Lesson Nine,
the p-value is 0.6828, showing no statistical significance. However, the p-value on the comparison between Section One and Three is 0.0139, showing that there is a statistically significant difference between the sections. The same is demonstrated for the comparison between Section Two and Three, where the p-value is 0.0420, showing the difference between the control group teaching style and the group work teaching style on students’ progress is statistically significant.

Figure 5. Result comparison between sections for Lesson 9.

This chart shows the differences of progress in Lesson Nine between sections using percentage scores. As shown above, the difference was greatest between Section One, the teacher-fronted group, and Section Three, the group work class, by 17%. There is also a statistically significant difference between Sections Two and Three on this test, with about
15% higher in average. Even though this chart also shows that Section One also outperforms Section Two, this difference is not statistically significant to draw any solid conclusions.

Table 12

*Result Comparison between Sections for Lesson 10*

| Sections                              | Estimate     | t Value | Pr > |t| |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|---------|------|--|--
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 2 (Combined) | 0.01449696   | 0.25    | 0.8035 |
| Section 1 (Teacher-fronted) vs 3 (Group work) | 0.12564329   | 2.08*   | 0.0456 |
| Section 2 (Combined) vs 3 (Group work). | 0.11114633   | 1.84    | 0.0748 |

* p < 0.05

The estimate numbers show that Section One, on average, scored about 1% (0.014496) higher than Section Two on their quiz results for Lesson Ten, and about 13% (0.125643) higher than Section Three, while Section Two scored about 11% (0.111146) higher than Section Three on average. In the comparison of Section One and Two, the p-value is 0.8035, showing no statistical significance. The same is demonstrated for the comparison between Sections Two and Three, where the p-value is 0.0748, showing that there really is no statistically significant difference between the control group and the group work sections in Lesson Ten. However, the p-value on the comparison between Sections One and Three is 0.0456, showing that there is a statistically significant difference to these teaching styles on the rate of progress between the sections.
This chart shows the differences of progress in Lesson Nine between sections using percentage scores. As shown above, the difference was greatest between Section One, the teacher-fronted group, and Section Three, the group work class, by about 13%. Even though this chart also shows that Section One also outperforms Section Two, and Section Two outperforms Section Three, these differences are not statistically significant to draw any solid conclusions.

**Analysis of Performance Recordings**

Research Question Two: Does the teaching style, whether teacher-fronted or group work, yield a different result in a beginning CFL learner’s accuracy of syntactic use during actual dialogue performances?

In the Performed Culture class setting, students create their own dialogues and perform these dialogues with their classmates for the whole class at the end of each lesson cycle. For the current study, students in each section performed a prepared dialogue with one
or two of their classmates, usually on Fridays. These dialogues were each approximately two minutes in length, and students were expected to utilize the grammatical patterns and vocabulary learned in that week’s lesson cycle. All of the dialogues were recorded for specific grammatical accuracy analysis. Analysis was done qualitatively and quantitatively, with the quality and accuracy of grammatical patterns compared, and with quantity measured by the frequency with which the students used the lesson’s grammatical principles. Only grammatical principles used for quiz analysis were selected for the analysis of these dialogues for the same lesson. Since the number of students per section varied, the total times a certain grammatical principle was used correctly was added up for the whole class and then divided by the number of total sentences attempted by students (both right and wrong) in order to get a classroom average of correct grammar usage frequency by student. The summary is shown in the following table.

Table 13  
Summary of Grammatical Accuracy Usage Rate by Lesson and Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Lesson 4</th>
<th>Lesson 5</th>
<th>Lesson 6</th>
<th>Lesson 7</th>
<th>Lesson 8</th>
<th>Lesson 9</th>
<th>Lesson 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in the above chart, there seems to be no obvious difference between the actual conversational performances in different sections throughout the lessons. Different numbers
of grammatical principles were considered for each lesson, which may have influenced the quantitative aspect of the students’ grammar usage frequency. For example, in Lesson Six only three grammatical items were considered, but in Lesson Five four grammatical items were selected. Of course, grammatical difficulty could also influence the accuracy and quantitative outcome. Therefore, the numbers for this chart were only examined if there was any correlation between teaching style and grammatical accuracy in conversation. Overall, there appears to be no notable difference between each section’s performances. However, there are some irregularities such as Section Three’s improved performance, the group work section, on Lesson Six and Section One’s improved performance, the teacher-fronted section, on Lesson Seven. It appears that these irregularities may have been caused by individual events such as an instructor’s admonition to improve performance. Nevertheless, these irregularities are random outliers and seem unrelated to the teaching techniques or grammar concepts that are the focus of this study. Therefore, these occurrences cannot contribute to any theoretical claim.

**Analysis of Questionnaire Results**

Research Question Three: Does a beginning CFL learner’s attitude towards the teacher-fronted versus group work teaching styles affect the result of their language learning outcome?

At the end of the semester, an anonymous questionnaire was given to investigate students’ opinions towards the effectiveness of the exercises they had in their sections. At the beginning of the semester, students were informed that they were participating in a research project, but students were not aware of the specific nature of the research, namely that different teaching styles were being used and evaluated between sections. The questions were
asked in scalar style, with the specific categories of: *Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Somewhat Agree, Agree and Strongly Agree*. For quantitative analysis these categories were given scores from one to six. Even though questions were asked concerning various language skills used on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday classes, only nine questions were used for analysis. Question One to Three were concerning their experience on Wednesday only, while Question Four to Nine were asking about their overall experience of interaction in class on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Even though on Wednesday, students were limited in their interaction among sections, they basically shared similar experiences on Monday and Friday, when they had plenty of opportunities to interact with their teacher and their classmates. Therefore, while Questions One to Three targeted their experience on Wednesday, Questions Four to Nine tried to investigate students’ feelings about their overall experience interacting with both the teacher and their classmates. The nine questions are as follows:

1. Wednesday exercises help me develop oral communicative skills.
2. Wednesday exercises help me develop grammatical understanding.
3. I enjoy participating in Wednesday exercises.
4. Interaction with the teacher (e.g. answer the teacher’s question) helps me develop oral communicative skills.
5. Interaction with classmates (e.g. activities in class “liang ge liang ge lian xi”) helps me develop oral communicative skills.
6. Interaction with the teacher helps me develop grammatical understanding.
7. Interaction with classmates helps me develop grammatical understanding.
8. I enjoy participating in interaction with the teacher.
9. I enjoy participating in interaction with classmates.

A one-way ANOVA was applied in this analysis to determine which survey questions were associated with post-test score, and a generalized linear model was used. Pre-test scores were also included in the model as a covariate. This test was performed using all three sections’ students together, and also using each section separately. Table 14 shows the analysis result using the survey response and the tests scores from all three sections. Table 15 shows the analysis result using the survey response and the test scores only from Section One; Table 16 shows the analysis result from Section Two and Table 17 shows the analysis result from Section Three.

Table 14

*Summary of Survey Result from All Three Sections*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Wednesday activities vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.02304087</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Wednesday activities vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00023086</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.8758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Enjoying Wednesday Activities)</td>
<td>0.00239014</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.6157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Interaction with teacher vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00753553</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.3751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Interaction with classmates vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00287454</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.5821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Interaction with teacher vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.01403683</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.2290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Interaction with classmates vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00362019</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.5372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Enjoying interaction with teacher)</td>
<td>0.00098219</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.7473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Enjoying interaction with classmates)</td>
<td>0.02221602</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.1332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*Summary of Survey Result from Section One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Wednesday activities vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00510193</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.6503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Wednesday activities vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00365932</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.6995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Enjoying Wednesday Activities)</td>
<td>0.00057506</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.8769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Interaction with teacher vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00003146</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Interaction with classmates vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.01172131</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.5022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Interaction with teacher vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00007900</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Interaction with classmates vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00569022</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.6329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Enjoying interaction with teacher)</td>
<td>0.00001447</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Enjoying interaction with classmates)</td>
<td>0.06294381</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.1762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

*Summary of Survey Result from Section Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Wednesday activities vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00974356</td>
<td>74.76</td>
<td>0.0733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Wednesday activities vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.01234402</td>
<td>94.71</td>
<td>0.0652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Enjoying Wednesday Activities)</td>
<td>0.00002438</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.7401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Interaction with teacher vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.01100315</td>
<td>84.43</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Interaction with classmates vs. oral skills)</td>
<td>0.00110177</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>0.2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Interaction with teacher vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.03557706</td>
<td>272.98</td>
<td>0.0385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Interaction with classmates vs. grammar)</td>
<td>0.00605769</td>
<td>46.48</td>
<td>0.0927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (Enjoying interaction with teacher)</td>
<td>0.00020764</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (Enjoying interaction with classmates)</td>
<td>0.00086146</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>0.2362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When looking at the p-values in the above charts, it is clear that neither any of the questions, any of the sections, or the sections combined as a whole show any statistically significant (>0.05) difference. Besides the scalar questions, there were also open-ended questions on the questionnaire, asking students why they enjoyed the exercises and asking for recommendations on ways to improve exercises. The result of these open-ended questions are addressed in the conclusions portion of this paper. The questionnaire results illustrate that students’ attitudes towards different learning styles really had no observable affect on their learning outcomes.

**Summary**

As the data demonstrates, Wednesday exercises promoted an overall marked improvement in each section’s students’ ability to use grammatical principles correctly on Thursday quizzes. When comparing the difference between sections, it is further
demonstrated that the teacher-fronted exercise style yielded a statistically significant better performance in students’ quiz results over the group work style. When the analysis was applied on a lesson by lesson basis, there was a higher score shown by Section One, the teacher-fronted section, and Section Two, the control group, over Section Three, the group work section in Lessons Five (completion particle of *le*) and Nine (comparison principle of *gen.*. *yiyang*). On Lesson Ten (comparison principles of *bi* and *geng*), the statistical significance only exists between Sections One and Three, showing that the teacher-fronted method yielded better over the group work style on this lesson. There was no significant difference between teacher-fronted Section One and the control group combined technique Section Two. For the results of Friday performances, there was no notable difference on grammatical accuracy usage during students’ prepared dialogues among the three sections. The results from the questionnaire also showed that there was no correlation between students’ attitudes towards teaching styles and the actual outcome of these teaching styles.
Chapter Five: Conclusions

The central purpose of this study was to determine which teaching style, whether teacher-fronted or group work, is a more effective technique in improving students’ understanding of syntax and promote accurate grammar usage. This study was conducted during Brigham Young University’s (BYU) 2005 Fall Semester. There were a total of forty-one students who participated in this research, all of whom were enrolled in the beginning Chinese course at BYU. While these students had a variety of different language learning and Chinese-specific language learning backgrounds, they were all classified as novice Mandarin learners, and they all voluntarily participated in this study. Students were divided into three sections with different teaching styles employed in each section, these being: teacher-fronted, group work, and a combined group used as a control.

The teacher-fronted instruction style emphasizes the interaction between the teacher and the student. The teacher provides explicit explanation and provides standard examples, as well as direct feedback to students’ responses. Students in classes that utilize the teacher-fronted style of instruction mainly respond to teachers’ questions or repeat the standard demonstration provided by the teacher. The group work instruction style is centered on student-student interaction, with the teacher filling the role of a director or a coach. The teacher gives students their assignment to accomplish and walks around the class to observe the group conversations and provides feedback as necessary. Students actively interact with each other. The combined group uses a teacher-fronted style for the first half of activities, in which the teacher provides the demonstration and interacts with a few students. For the second half of the activities, the students gather together in groups and repeat the interaction previously demonstrated by the teacher.
To evaluate the outcome of these different teaching styles on students’ language development, three different types of evaluation were used. Students took grammar-focused quizzes which evaluated their ability to recognize proper grammatical patterns as well as testing their ability to accurately utilize the grammatical principles in example situations. These quizzes were administered twice a week, with the first test given before the specific exercise styles were used. These quizzes served as a pre-test to form the basis from which to evaluate students’ progression, when they were compared with post-test results, which were given after the exercise methods had been employed. The second type of evaluation used was in the form of weekly dialogue performances done by the students in front of the class. These performances were opportunities for students to utilize grammatical patterns in a specific conversational situation. These performances were recorded in order to analyze students’ actual accuracy of grammar usage in a mediated-free conversation environment. The third part of the study used a questionnaire to investigate the relation between students’ attitudes towards different teaching styles and their actual performance.

Summary of Results

The comparison of the pre-test and post-test results from all three sections show that there was a statistically significant increase in students’ scores, which indicates that the Wednesday exercises, as a whole, may be one of the factors that facilitate students’ understanding of the target grammatical principles. Further, the results of this pre-test/post-test comparison also found that among the teaching styles used, the teacher-fronted style yields a higher rate of improvement in students’ overall accuracy of grammar usage than does the group work style. The statistical significance of this was demonstrated when the pre- and post-test results were compared between sections, showing that Section One, the teacher-

fronted section, had a higher average score than Section Three, the group work section. Thus, the results show that the first hypothesis of this study was accepted, namely that the students in the teacher-fronted class would outperform the students in the group work class in their understanding and usage of correct grammar on written quizzes. These findings agree with Mackey and McDongough (2000), Sachs et al. (2003), and Storch (2007), etc., who also suggest that group work exercises don’t make a statistically significant difference in promoting grammatical understanding in declarative knowledge.

Beyond the overall difference mentioned above, this study also found that there were some statistically significant differences on certain lessons, while other lessons had no significant differences between the different teaching styles. This suggests that for different grammatical principles, not only is there a different level of difficulty, but there is also a difference created in student learning of various grammatical principles which is caused by teaching style. Researchers such as Storch (1999) also find that different types of grammatical patterns and structures derived different benefits from different types of classroom instruction. While the difficulty of each individual principle was not evaluated in this study, instead the difficulty was evaluated on a lesson by lesson basis, it is evident that the lessons with grammar that students found to be more difficult (i.e., the sentence particle 了 completion particle in Lesson Five and comparisons in Lesson Nine and Ten) were the ones that showed statistical significance in progress varying by teaching style. This seems to suggest that the teacher-fronted technique, while at least as effective on more basic, easy-to-grasp grammatical principles, is even more effective on those grammar patterns which students have difficulty grasping. When the results were discussed with the experienced main instructor, she was not surprised, because she stated that from her experience, students
seem to be able to grasp these principles only after she repeatedly explains them, and teacher-fronted exercises provides the type of explicit repetition students need in order to fully comprehend these principles. However, she was surprised that some abstract grammar principles that typically require more procedural learning, such as 就 jiu (similar to then) and 才 cai (similar to only), didn’t show higher scores in the group work section. To her, these are the grammatical principles that would seem to require a lot of example sentences to help students understand instead of relying on explanation of the syntax rules. Therefore, she would have assumed that group work, which is supposed to create more student production, would better aid in the acquisition of these principles. Findings from Williams (1999), Storch (1999), and Pica et al. (1996) may provide some possible explanations. In their findings, students seem to overlook the grammar portion of interaction; instead focusing on meaning and fluency, which may explain why even though group work has more interaction; it doesn’t really promote good grammar acquisition skills. Considering this in light of the findings from this research, more investigation needs to be conducted to evaluate the causes of this result, particularly as it relates to the content of students’ interactions.

In addition to the results obtained from students’ quizzes, many things of interest were learned from analyzing the videos of students’ Friday performances of their personally prepared dialogues. While the results in students’ quizzes showed that the teacher-fronted style of instruction benefitted students in their declarative knowledge, the question remained as to whether or not teaching style affects students’ ability to use grammar learned in conversational performance (i.e., procedural knowledge). According to the second hypothesis of this study, the expectation was that students in the teacher-fronted class would produce more quality syntactic phrases than those students in the group work class when doing
performances of actual conversation. After analysis of the videos of the students in all three sections’ performances, however, no notable differences were discovered. Students in the control section, the teacher-fronted section, and the group work section showed no observable difference in the quality and accuracy of their grammatical usage during their performances. Thus, it can be inferred that there were no obvious results relating to teaching style and students’ actual grammar usage in conversational performances. There may be some fluency and pronunciation differences among the different sections. However, since the focus of this study is the accuracy of grammar usage, these differences are not considered here.

The final hypothesis of this study addressed the issue of how students’ attitudes affect learning outcomes. The question of whether or not a students’ opinion towards teaching style outlined in the third hypothesis, assumed that there would be no direct correlation between the learners’ attitudes towards the teaching style used and their actual language outcome. Research on this issue provides no conclusive answers, with many diverse results (Storch, 2007; McDonough, 2004; Krashen, 1982). In this study, students’ attitudes towards various teaching styles used in exercises were measured in the final questionnaire. The results confirm the hypothesis. There was no difference significant to show any correlation between students’ attitudes towards the teaching style and students’ learning outcomes. The same phenomenon can also be found in the open-ended questions. Students in the same section may have very different responses, quotes like “I never really learned anything on Wednesdays” and also referring to Wednesday instruction “They were helpful, but also fun” both came from Section One, the teacher-fronted section. While one student from the control group says that Wednesday activities are “fun and relaxed, there is no pressure of a grade,
and we can experiment with grammar and ask questions”, another student recommended that Wednesday exercises should focus more on grammar, with less activities and more instruction. However, after comparing the students’ attitude-based responses from the questionnaire and their performance-produced pre-test/post-test rate of progress, no statistically significant relation could be drawn within any of the sections to indicate that these divergent attitudes influenced student outcomes.

**Implications**

Group work techniques have been widely adopted in many second language classrooms, and these techniques are sometimes favored over other more traditional techniques, such as the teacher-fronted style (Davis, 1997). However, the empirical evidence of the benefits of the group work techniques are often not demonstrated in the research, and research is also rarely focused on the results of teacher-fronted classrooms.

From the results gathered in the data analysis of this study, certain pedagogical implications can be drawn. First, since the results show that the teacher-fronted techniques yield a higher rate of written declarative grammatical knowledge among beginning Chinese as Second Language learners than group work techniques, when designing grammatical exercises, it is suggested that teacher-fronted techniques may be more effective, particularly when teaching Chinese completion particle such as *le* and the comparison forms such as *gen...yiyang* and *bi/geng*. In this way, students will have more comprehensible examples to follow, and will also receive more instantaneous and accurate feedback. While group work has its specific benefits, this study suggests that in the specific area of written declarative grammatical knowledge reinforcement, teacher-fronted methods can also be beneficial.
Secondly, while group work today stands as a mainstream technique in second-language acquisition, this study provides some caution about using it as a blanket approach to language instruction, especially in the specific area of grammar acquisition. This may relieve some of the guilt language teachers feel when they cannot come up with original, creative group work activities for grammar instruction (Sachs et al., 2003; Davis, 1997). Instead, they can focus energy on coming up with various examples of grammar functionality to share and practice with the class as a whole.

**Limitations**

**Participants**

Participants were from the existing beginning Chinese class at Brigham Young University. There were no prerequisites or prescreening required for these students to take this course. Students were all native English speakers, with various levels of exposure to second-language instruction and acquisition. Students’ ages were also varied within each group. Even though this study was conducted targeting the beginning Chinese learner in a beginning Chinese class, there was no proficiency test administered to rate students’ actual level. Because students came from different backgrounds, some with heritage backgrounds, some with previous second language learning experience, including Chinese as a second language, students’ outcomes cannot necessarily all be judged equally. However, there were no notable outliers found in the pre-test results, showing that the students were performing on the same novice level in the area of focus of this study. This includes the student who had spent two years serving a Cantonese speaking mission in Hong Kong.

The main instructor and one of the teaching assistants were native Chinese speakers. The other two teaching assistants were native English speakers. Although the teaching
assistants had studied Chinese for several years and were considered by their peers to have acquired a sophisticated use of the language, the only prerequisite for employment was to take and pass a Chinese Teaching Methodology course. For this reason, it can be assumed that the proficiency level of the teaching assistants was substantially below that of a native speaker. This may have affected the learning ceiling of students. In addition, even though teaching assistants were given training regarding the target teaching techniques and were given explicit lesson plans and they reported positive implementation results, there was no actual observation of the implementation of techniques and lesson plans. Although the teaching assistants were alternated and the comparative results did not show any significant difference between the different sections, this must still be evaluated as a potential limitation.

Quizzes

Since this study was conducted with pre-existing groups, all treatment design had to accommodate the actual school requirements, such as the number of students per class, the length of quizzes, and the material to be covered. Therefore, the number of subjects involved in this study is small, and the questions used in quizzes are not many. There were no pilots conducted to test the reliability of the in-class quiz items. Therefore, a limited number of items were used, preventing the use of repetitive items necessary to determine reliability. In addition, due to the limited time in class, quizzes for pre-tests and post-tests were short and consisted of less than ten questions. This also contributed to the lack of questions which may have caused a decrease in the reliability of the assessments. In addition, the data analysis for quizzes used percentage scores instead of actual scores, because the number of questions differed from pre-test to post-test. This may be a little misleading, because the number of questions is few. Furthermore, although the study stipulated that students should only be
given five minutes to complete each quiz, teachers often allowed students additional time.

Also, even though students were encouraged to prepare for Thursday quizzes (post-tests) and Friday performances, and were aware that this grade would be included with their final scores, there were no requirements for time spent preparing. The uncontrolled timing and preparation for quizzes may call into question the comparative results for individual students and individual sections.

In addition to reliability constraints, the content of the quiz items may also have affected the impact of the results. Grammar selected to be used in the student evaluations were selected from the textbook used for this course, but there were no explanations about why the grammar was ordered in said fashion and there were no studies cited regarding the difficulty level of different grammatical items for this book. Hence, the ordering of the grammar in the textbook could have influenced some of the results in the area of progress rate, depending upon level of difficulty.

**Small-Scale Results**

Although the results of this study suggest that teacher-fronted techniques may have an impact on learners’ written declarative grammar acquisition, particularly with certain Chinese grammar principles such as the completion particle *le* and the comparison forms of *gen...yiyang* and *bi/geng*, it is important to note that due to the small sample size and reliability limitations, these results cannot be over-generalized to include every aspect of language acquisition or classroom instruction techniques. This study was focused only on the relationship between instruction style and grammatical acquisition. This study does not suggest that teacher-fronted techniques should always replace group work techniques. Rather, both group work and teacher-fronted instruction techniques each have their strong
points, and this study merely found a statistically significant relationship between the teacher-fronted instruction style and improvement in written declarative grammar acquisition.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

As mentioned in the introduction, there are few if any studies conducted investigating the pedagogical portion of teaching Chinese as a second language. Since Chinese is an increasingly popular language for study in the United States, it is important to find more effective ways to instruct Chinese language learners. As mentioned by Christensen and Warnick (2006), Chinese is very different from English, and it shouldn’t be assumed that the same techniques used to teach cognate languages should, or can effectively, be used when teaching Chinese to English speakers. This study represents preliminary research that attempts to investigate real instruction occurring in Chinese as foreign language classrooms. However, the limited number of subjects used in this study cannot be generalized to all language learners. Therefore, research on a larger scale should be conducted.

Even though the data analysis shows that there is a higher rate of specific grammatical progress in teacher-fronted classrooms, the detailed mechanism is yet to be found. In addition, the inconsistent results of lesson to lesson analyses indicated that different teaching styles may have various levels of influence on different grammatical concepts, for example the Chinese completion particle such as *le* and the comparison forms such as *gen...yi yang* and *bi/geng*. Future research should attempt to control the grammar concepts so that the effect of individual techniques can be more accurately assessed, and recommended for use when practicing specific grammar items. In addition, controlling the participant
grouping may also reduce learner variables and bring greater insights to the actual impact of teaching techniques.

Another interesting thing that future studies could cover would be what effect various teaching styles have on other aspects of language learning, going beyond the focus on grammar accuracy as it is addressed in this study. While some of the benefits of the teacher-fronted instruction style have been illustrated in this study, it would be interesting to see the benefits the group work instruction style has on specific language learning categories. Gaining more information on this topic could facilitate the development of an integrated teaching style, using aspects of various techniques that bring the best results in specific language learning categories such as fluency or pronunciation.

Indeed, one of the main purposes of this study is to encourage and facilitate the further study of techniques to be used when teaching Chinese as a foreign language. It is hoped that, as more research is gathered, teachers will be empowered to use techniques that have been proven useful. In this way, the effectiveness of teaching Chinese as a foreign language will continue to improve, and learners will have more effective ways to acquire Chinese.
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Appendix A: Consent Form
Consent to be a Research Subject

Introduction
This research study is being conducted by Chieh-Ting Lin at Brigham Young University to determine how different drilling techniques effect the result of students’ performances. You were selected to participate because you are currently taking a Chinese 101 class.

Procedures
You will be asked to take a pre-test at the beginning of the 3rd hour of each lesson, starting at lesson 3. The pre-tests consist of questions about the grammatical concepts taught on the day before. The grades of the pre-test will not be included in the final grade of the class. They will only be used for research purposes. Only the PinYin sentences you wrote in the sentence-making questions of the quiz in each lesson, starting at lesson 3, will be analyzed as the post-test. Performances on Fridays will be video-typed for analysis. Besides, a questionnaire concerning your attitude towards the drilling technique will be distributed after the final exam. It will take approximate 10 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Risks/Discomforts
There are minimal risks for participation in this study. TAs will switch in the middle of the semester in order to balance the variables inherent in teacher performance, students may need to adjust that different TA. However, the lesson plan will be prepared by the same person so the consistency will be kept through the whole semester. Besides, the grading system won’t be different since all the tests will be graded by an independent grader to the main instructor.

Benefits
There are no direct benefits to subjects. However, it is hoped that through your participation researchers will learn more about the effect of different drilling techniques and be able to assist the Chinese Program in improving their teaching techniques for future classes.

Confidentiality
All information provided will remain confidential and will only be reported as group data with no identifying information. All data, including questionnaires and tapes/transcriptions from performance, will be kept in a locked storage cabinet and only those directly involved with the research will have access to them. After the research is completed, the questionnaires and video tapes will be destroyed.

Compensation
One extra credit point will be given for each pre-test for 8 pre-tests and 5 extra credit points will be given for the questionnaire. For those who do not wish to participate in the research, 5 extra credit points can be earned by participating in a Chinese cultural event. An additional 8 points are available to those who wish to write a 100 characters paper about the event.

Participation
Participation in this research study is voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at anytime or refuse to participate entirely without jeopardy to your class status, grade or standing with the university.

Questions about the Research
If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Chieh-Ting Lin at 427-6829 or goodstudent@byu.edu.

Questions about your Rights as Research Participants
If you have questions you do not feel comfortable asking the researcher, you may contact Dr. Renea Beckstrand, IRB Chair, 422-3873, 422 SWKT, renea_beckstrand@byu.edu.

I have read, understood, and received a copy of the above consent and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.
Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Appendix B: Pre-tests

Chinese101 Lesson 4

Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Translate the following sentences into PinYin.

1. Do you like listening to music?

2. I feel like to eat Chinese food this weekend.

3. I think that movie is not interesting.

4. Because dancing is interesting, I want to go dancing tonight.

5. Let’s go seeing a movie tomorrow, my treat.
Chinese101 Lesson 5

Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Choose the number for where the character in the parenthesis ought to be placed.

___ 1. 我 wǒ 们 mén ①五 wǔ 点 diǎn ②跳 tiào 舞 wǔ ，③他 tā ④九 jiǔ 点 diǎn ⑤来 lái 。( 才 cái )

___ 2. 他 tā ①早 zǎo 上 shàng ②看 kàn ③五 wǔ 個 ge ④电 diàn 影 yǐng ⑤。 (了 le )

___ 3. ①我 wǒ ②和 hé 小 xiǎo 王 wáng ③聊 liáo 天 tiān 、④吃 chī 饭 fàn ⑤。 (一 yī 起 qǐ )

___ 4. 我 wǒ ①昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng ②十 shí 点 diǎn ③吃 chī ④饭 fàn ⑤。 ( 才 cái )

___ 5. 昨 zuó 天 tiān ①我 wǒ ②在 zài ③家 jiā 看 kàn ④电 diàn 影 yǐng ⑤。 (了 le )

___ 6. ①你 nǐ ②看 kàn ③书 shū ④吧 ba ⑤。( 一点儿)

III. Rearrange the following words.

1. 才 cái / 睡 shuì 觉 jiào / 我 wǒ / 昨 zuó 天 tiān / 十 shí 二 èr 点 diǎn / 晚 wǎn 上 shàng

2. 饭 fàn / 吃 chī / 我 wǒ 们 mén / 昨 zuó 天 tiān / 一 yī 起 qǐ / 了 le / 在 zài 学 xué 校 xiào
Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Use PINYIN to create meaningful sentences with the following words.

1. 得 děi (have to)

2. 要 yào (will)

3. 要 yào 是 shì

4. 但 dàn 是 shì

5. 別 bié

Rearrange the following words.

1. 給 gěi / 今 jīn 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng / 我 wǒ / 媽 mā 媽 ma / 打 dǎ 電 diàn 話 huà

2. 今 jīn 天 tiān / 看 kàn / 我 wǒ / 他 tā / 給 gěi / 他 tā 的 de 書 shū
Chinese101 Lesson 7

Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Fill in the each blank with one of the following words:
有 yǒu 一 yì 点 diǎn 兒 ér 、 一 yì 点 diǎn 兒 ér 、 一 yí 下 xià 、 一 yī 点 diǎn

1. 我 wǒ 昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wăn 上 shàng ______ 才 cái 睡 shuì 觉 jiào。
2. 請 qǐng 給 gěi 我 wǒ ______ 咖 kā 啡 fēi。
3. 我 wǒ 覺 jué 得 de 咖 kā 啡 fēi ______ 不 bù 好 hǎo 喝 hē。
4. 我 wǒ 昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wăn 上 shàng 跳 tiào 了 le ______ 舞 wǔ。

Use 就 ju or 才 cái to finish the sentence.
1. 我 wǒ 平 píng 常 cháng 十 shí 点 diǎn 睡 shuì 觉 jiào，可 kě 是 shì 今 jīn 天 tiān 八 bā 点 diǎn
   ______
2. 我 wǒ 平 píng 常 cháng 十 shí 点 diǎn 睡 shuì 觉 jiào，可 kě 是 shì 今 jīn 天 tiān 十 shí 一 yī 点 diǎn
   ______
3. 我 wǒ 七 qī 点 diǎn 請 qǐng 他 tā 吃 chī 飯 fàn，他 tā 十 shí 点 diǎn
   ______
4. 我 wǒ 七 qī 点 diǎn 請 qǐng 他 tā 吃 chī 飯 fàn，他 tā 六 liù 点 diǎn
   ______

   Translate the following sentences into PINYIN
1. He speaks Chinese quite well.
2. Teacher came very early.
3. My friend eats a lot.
4. I sing very well.
Chinese 101  Lesson 8

Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:
Rearrange the following words according to the English sentences. (Please write Pinyin)

1. When I went home, my mom was cooking.
   正 zhèng 在 zài / 我 wǒ / 媽 mā 媽 ma / 做 zuò 飯 fàn / 的 de 時 shí 候 hòu / 回 huí 家 jiā

2. We talked in Chinese yesterday.
   中 zhōng 文 wén / 用 yòng / 我 wǒ 們 mén / 說 shuō 話 huà / 昨 zuó 天 tiān

3. I’d like to ask you a question.
   一 yī 個 ge 問 wèn 題 tí / 問 wèn / 你 nǐ / 想 xiāng / 我 wǒ

4. We were reading when teacher came into the classroom.
   看 kàn 書 shū / 的 de 時 shí 候 hòu / 我 wǒ 們 mén / 老 lǎo 師 shī / 正 zhèng 在 zài / 到 dào 教 jiào 室 shì

5. I will go to my friend’s house right after I have done my homework.
   做 zuò 了 le / 玩 wán / 朋 péng 友 yǒu 家 jiā / 就 jiù / 去 qù / 我 wǒ / 功 gōng 課 kè / 以 yǐ 後 hòu

   學 xué 日 rì 文 wén / 除 chú 了 le / 還 huán / 以 yǐ 外 wài / 我 wǒ / 學 xué 中 zhōng 文 wén

7. He listened to music right after he got up this morning.
   聽 tīng 音 yīn 樂 yuè / 起 qǐ 床 chuánɡ / 以 yǐ 後 hòu / 他 tā / 就 jiù / 今 jīn 天 tiān 早 zǎo 上 shàng
Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Fill in the blanks with 怎 zěn 麼 me or 多 duō

1. 你 nǐ 的 de 衣 yī 服 fú ______ 貴 guì ? (How expensive is your clothes?)
2. 美 měi 國 guó 飯 fàn ______ 做 zuò ? (How to make American food?)
3. 你 nǐ 的 de 名 míng 字 zi ______ 說 shuō ? (How do I say your name?)
4. 你 nǐ 今 jīn 年 nián ______ 大 dà ? (How old are you?)
5. 你 nǐ 哥 gē 哥 ge ______ 高 gāo ? (How tall is your brother?)

Translate the following sentences into PINYIN

1. Although(雖 suī 然 rán) I am an American, I like Chinese food.
2. My older sister is as pretty as hers.
3. This red pants are as small as that yellow one.
4. My book is as good as yours.
5. Although I can’t write Chinese, I can speak Chinese.
Chinese101 Lesson 10

Note: The purpose of this test is only to understand what kinds of improvement you will have after class instruction. The result will NOT affect your grade in this class. However, in order to provide more reliable results, please do as much as you can. Thank you for your participation.

Your number in the class:

Fill in the blanks with 又 yòu or 再 zài

1. 前 qiān 天 tiān 下 xià 雨 yǔ，昨 zuǒ 天 tiān ______ 下 xià 雨 yǔ 了 le。

2. 我 wǒ 昨 zuǒ 天 tiān 跳 tiào 舞 wǔ 了 le，我 wǒ 想 xiǎng 明 míng 天 tiān 晚 wăn 上 shàng ______ 去 qù 跳 tiào 舞 wǔ。

3. 媽 mā 媽 ma 昨 zuó 天 tiān ____ 給 gěi 我 wǒ 打 dǎ 電 diàn 話 huà 了 le。

4. 我 wǒ 昨 zuó 天 tiān ______ 去 qù 看 kàn 紅 hóng 葉 yè 了 le。

Translate the following sentences into PINYIN

6. I am taller than my sister.

7. It’s a bit colder today than yesterday.

8. I am tall. I am even taller than Michael Jordon.

9. Today is much colder than yesterday.

10. I didn’t have time yesterday, but I do today.
Appendix C: Post-tests

Chinese 101  L4  Section: ______  English name: _________________.

Your number in Class: ______

I. Give characters to the following Chinese phrases. (4 points)
1. TV
2. music
3. sometimes
4. other people

II. Fill in the each blank with one of the following words:
   覺 jué  得 de  想 xiǎng  喜 xǐ  歡 huān  . (2 points)
1. 明 míng  天 tiān  你 nǐ  ______  去 qù  打 dǎ  球 qiú  嗎 mā  ？
2. 我 wǒ  ______  打 dǎ  球 qiú  很 hěn  有 yǒu  意 yì  思 si  。

III. Translate the following sentence into characters. (3 points)
1. Do you feel like going to see a movie tonight?

IV. Rearrange the following words. (6 points)
1. 週 zhōu  末 mò  / 看 kàn  / 和 hé  / 我 wǒ  / 去 qù  / 小 xiǎo  王 wáng  / 常 cháng  常 cháng  / 電 diàn  影 yǐng

2. 覺 jué  得 de  / 他 tā  / 有 yǒu  意 yì  思 si  / 所 suǒ  以 yǐ  / 因 yīn  為 wèi  / 想 xiǎng  / 看 kàn  電 diàn  影 yǐng  / 去 qù  / 電 diàn  影 yǐng
I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (6 points)
1. school
2. go home
3. pretty
4. happy
5. introduce
6. can; may

II. Choose the number for where the character in the parenthesis ought to be placed. (4 points)
___ 1. 他 tā ① 昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng ② 喝 hē ③ 六 liù 杯 bēi ④ 水 shuǐ ⑤。（了 le）
___ 2. 我 wǒ 们 mén ① 七 qī 点 diǎn ② 吃 chī 饭 fàn , ③ 他 tā ④ 十 shí 点 diǎn 来 lái。（才 cái）
___ 3. 昨 zuó 天 tiān ① 我 wǒ ② 在 zài ③ 老 lǎo 师 shī 家 jiā 吃 chī ④ 饭 fàn ⑤。（了 le）
___ 4. 我 wǒ ① 昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng ② 二 èr 点 diǎn ③ 睡 shuì ④ 觉 jué ⑤。（才 cái）

III. Rearrange the following words by writing them. (3+2 points)
1. 酒 jiǔ / 一 yī 点 diǎn 兒 ér / 喝 hē / 昨 zuó 天 tiān 我 wǒ 们 mén / 在 zài 家 jiā / 一 yī 起 qǐ / 了 le

2. 十 shí 二 èr 点 diǎn / 才 cái / 晚 wǎn 上 shàng / 吃 chī 饭 fàn / 林 lín 老 lǎo 师 shī / 昨 zuó 天 tiān
I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (4 points)
1. question
2. convenient
3. practice
4. to know (something)

II. Match the questions on the left side with the appropriate replies on the right. (3 points)
( ) 1. 你 nǐ 可 kě 以 yǐ 帮 bāng 我 wǒ 嗎 mā ?  A. 不 bú 客 kè 气 qì 。
( ) 2. 謝 xiè 謝 xie !  B. 沒 méi 關 guān 係 xì 。
( ) 3. 對 duì 不 bù 起 qǐ !  C. 沒 méi 問 wèn 題 tí 。

III. Rearrange the following words by writing them. (4 points)
1. 你 nǐ / 給 gěi / 我 wǒ 們 mén / 一 yí 下 xià / 介 jiè 紹 shào / 請 qǐng
2. 明 míng 天 tiān 上 shàng 午 wǔ / 考 kǎo 試 shì / 給 gěi / 學 xué 生 shēng / 老 lǎo 師 shī / 要 yào

IV. Use the following words to create meaningful sentences. (4 points)
1. 要 yào 是 shì
2. 但 dàn 是 shì
I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (4 points)

1. too slow
2. to help
3. how
4. to write

II. Fill in the each blank with 有 yǒu — 每 yī 點 diǎn 元 ěr or — 每 diǎn 元 ěr (4 points)

1. 我 wǒ 觉 jué 得 de 中 zhōng 文 wén ______ 难 nán。
2. 我 wǒ 咋 zuó 天 tiān 喝 hē 了 le ______ 水 shuǐ。
3. 我 wǒ ______ 喜 xǐ 欢 huān 他 tā。
4. 这 zhè 个 ge 考 kǎo 试 shì ______ 容 róng 易 yì。

III. Use 「就」 or 「才」 to finish the sentence. (3 points)

1. 我 wǒ 平 píng 常 cháng 六 liù 點 diǎn 半 bàn 吃 chī 饭 fàn , 可 kě 是 shì 今 jīn 天 tiān 八 bā 點 diǎn

2. 我 wǒ 平 píng 常 cháng 十 shí — 每 yī 點 diǎn 睡 shuì 觉 jiào , 可 kě 是 shì 今 jīn 天 tiān 八 bā 點 diǎn

3. 我 wǒ 们 mén 八 bā 點 diǎn 上 shàng 课 kè , 他 tā 六 liù 點 diǎn

IV. Translate the following sentences into Chinese. (4 points)

1. I sing Chinese songs very well.
2. He eats fast.
Chinese 101  L8  Section: _______English name: ____________________

Your number in Class: ____________________

I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (4 points)
1. classroom  
2. start  
3. diary  
4. semester  

II. Fill in the each blank with 能 néng or 会 huì (2 points)
我 wǒ ______ 说 shuō 英 yīng 文 wén，可 kě 是 shì 中 zhōng 文 wén 課 kè 的 de 時 shí 候 hòu 不 bù ______ 说 shuō 。

III. Rearrange the following words according to the English sentences. (6 points)
1. I was calling my friend when my father came.
   正 zhèng 在 zài / 我 wǒ / 爸 ba 爸 ba / 來 lái / 打 dǎ 電 diàn 話 huà / 的 de 時 shí 候 hòu / 給 gěi 朋友 péng yǒu

2. In addition to listening to music, he also likes to read.
   以 yǐ 外 wài / 喜 xǐ 欢 huān / 除 chú 了 le / 他 tā / 看 kàn 書 shū / 聽 tīng 音 yīn 樂 yuè / 喜 xǐ 欢 huān / 還 huán

3. I ate breakfast before I went to class this morning.
   以 yǐ 前 qián / 上 shàng 課 kè / 去 qù / 吃 chī / 早 zǎo 饭 fàn / 我 wǒ / 今 jīn 天 tiān 早 zǎo 上 shàng

IV. Use the following term to create a meaningful sentence and translate it into English. (3 points)
1. 以 yǐ 後 hòu (...)就 jiù
I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (6 points)
1. to buy
2. pants
3. cheap
4. altogether
5. size
6. shirt

II. Fill in the blanks with 怎 zěn 麽 me or 多 duō (3 points)
1. 这 zhè 个 ge 字 zi ______ 写 xiě ？(How to write this word?)
2. 你 nǐ 的 de 弟 di 弟 di ______ 高 gāo ？(How tall is your brother?)
3. 你 nǐ 今 jīn 天 tiān ______ 来 lái 得 de 這 zhè 麽 me 晚 wǎn ？(How come you are so late today?)

III. Translate the following sentences into Chinese characters. (6 points)
1. Although(虽 suī 然 rán) Chinese is hard, I can speak Chinese.
2. His clothes are as expensive as mine.
I. Give characters to the following English phrases. (4 points)
1. weather
2. to rain
3. forecast
4. next time

II. Fill in the blanks with 又 yòu or 再 zài (3 points)
1. 我 wǒ 昨 zuó 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng 去 qù 看 kàn 電 diàn 影 yǐng，今 jīn 天 tiān 晚 wǎn 上 shàng 要 yào ______看 kàn 電 diàn 影 yǐng。
2. 我 wǒ 喜 xǐ 欢 huān 吃 chī 中 zhōng 國 guó 饭 fàn，所 suǒ 以 yǐ 明 míng 天 tiān 会 huì ______吃 chī 中 zhōng 國 guó 饭 fàn。
3. 昨 zuó 天 tiān ______下 xià 雨 yǔ 了 le。

III. Translate the following sentences into Chinese characters. (8 points)
1. Tomorrow will be much colder than today. (3 points)
2. My teacher is not only tall but also handsome. (2 points)
3. My clothes are expensive. My pants are even more expensive. (3 points)
Appendix D: Questionnaires

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is intended to help researchers understand your opinion about different drilling exercises used in the Chinese 101 class. It will take about 10 minutes for you to respond to all the questions. Your help is greatly appreciated. Please write down your identifying number of the class which was given to you at the beginning of the semester. Please DO NOT write your name, your student ID or other identifiers to keep this questionnaire anonymous. Please note this is NOT an evaluation about you or your teacher. The results are only for research analysis so please answer honestly.

I. Questions about the class (Click one box for each question)

1. **Monday exercise**
   a. Dialogue memorization helps me develop oral communicative skills.
      - Strongly disagree
      - Disagree
      - Somewhat disagree
      - Somewhat agree
      - Agree
      - Strongly agree

   b. Dialogue memorization helps me develop writing and reading skills.
      - Strongly disagree
      - Disagree
      - Somewhat disagree
      - Somewhat agree
      - Agree
      - Strongly agree

   c. Dialogue memorization helps me develop grammatical understanding.
      - Strongly disagree
      - Disagree
      - Somewhat disagree
      - Somewhat agree
      - Agree
      - Strongly agree

   d. Dialogue memorization helps me develop cultural understanding.
      - Strongly disagree
      - Disagree
      - Somewhat disagree
      - Somewhat agree
      - Agree
      - Strongly agree

   e. I enjoy the Dialogue memorization.
      - Strongly disagree
      - Disagree
      - Somewhat disagree
      - Somewhat agree
      - Agree
      - Strongly agree

      Why?

   f. My commend about the Dialogue memorization:
2. **Wednesday exercise**
   a. Wednesday exercises help me develop oral communicative skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Wednesday exercises help me develop writing and reading skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. Wednesday exercises help me develop grammatical understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d. Wednesday exercises help me develop cultural understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. I enjoy participating in Wednesday exercises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Why?

   f. My commend about the Wednesday exercises:
3. **Friday Activity**

   a. Friday performance helps me develop oral communicative skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Friday performance helps me develop writing and reading skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. Friday performance helps me develop grammatical understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d. Friday performance helps me develop cultural understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   e. I enjoy participating in Friday performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Why?

   f. My commend about Friday performance:
4. General opinions (NOTE: this part is asking about your opinion towards ONLY the Monday, Wednesday and Friday classes.)
   a. Interaction with the teacher (e.g. answer the teacher’s questions) helps me develop oral communicative skills.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   b. Interaction with classmates (e.g. activities in class “liang ge liang lian xi”) helps me develop oral communicative skills.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   c. Interaction with the teacher helps me develop writing and reading skills.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   d. Interaction with classmates helps me develop writing and reading skills.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   e. Interaction with the teacher helps me develop grammatical understanding.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   f. Interaction with classmates helps me develop grammatical understanding.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |

   g. Interaction with the teacher helps me develop cultural understanding.
      
      | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Somewhat disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly agree |
      |-------------------|----------|-------------------|---------------|-------|---------------|
      |                   |          |                   |               |       |               |
h. Interaction with classmates helps me develop cultural understanding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

i. I enjoy participating in interaction with the teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?

j. I enjoy participating in interaction with classmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why?
II. Question about yourself

1. What is your number in the class? _____ (If you forget, please ask your teacher).

2. Do either of your parents speak Chinese? □ YES □ NO

3. Have you ever been to countries which use Chinese as their main language? □ YES □ NO
   If YES, When? ________________________________ .
   For how long?

4. Have you learned Chinese before taking this Chinese 101 class? □ YES □ NO
   If YES, When? ________________________________ .
   For how long? ________________________________ .

5. Have you learned other foreign language? □ YES □ NO
   If YES,
   What language? ________________________________ .
   For how long? ________________________________ .

6. How much time (average) did you spend in preparing for the class each week? ___ Hours

7. How much time (average) did you spend in preparing for the Monday memorization? ___ Hours

8. How much time (average) did you spend in preparing for the Wednesday pre-tests? ___ Hours

9. How much time (average) did you spend in preparing for the Thursday quiz? ___ Hours

10. How much time (average) did you spend in preparing for the Friday performance? ___ Hours

Thank you for your participation!