

9-1-2008

# The Effect of Explicit Instruction and Input Flood on Students' Use of Spanish Discourse Markers on a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview

Todd A. Hernandez

Marquette University, [todd.hernandez@marquette.edu](mailto:todd.hernandez@marquette.edu)

# The Effect of Explicit Instruction and Input Flood on Students' Use of Spanish Discourse Markers on a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview

Todd Hernández  
*Marquette University*

**Abstract:** This study investigates the effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of Spanish discourse markers on a simulated oral proficiency interview. Students in the experimental group ( $n = 10$ ) were provided with explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers to narrate an event in the past time frame. This group also received a flood of input that contained an increased incidence of discourse markers. Students were then presented with opportunities for communicative practice and corrective feedback. In contrast, students in the control group ( $n = 9$ ) did not receive explicit instruction on the use of discourse markers. This group received the same flood of input as the experimental group. The results of the experiment demonstrated that explicit instruction combined with input flood was more effective than input flood alone in promoting students' use of discourse markers. The findings support the use of explicit instruction to teach Spanish discourse markers.

**Key Words:** discourse markers, explicit grammar instruction, form-focused instruction, input enhancement, input flood, simulated oral proficiency interview

## Introduction

The role of grammar instruction in second language (L2) learning continues to be a controversial issue in second language acquisition (SLA) research. Recent discussion has focused on whether or not explicit instruction is effective in promoting L2 learning. Krashen (1985, 1994) believes that the teaching of grammar does not contribute to L2 acquisition because conscious knowledge of grammar rules does not become unconscious, acquired knowledge. He further argues that explicit grammar instruction does not facilitate the development of spontaneous L2 communication or creative language use. Rather, Krashen states that the key to successful L2 acquisition is to provide students with exposure to an abundance of comprehensible, meaning-bearing input. In contrast, Schmidt (1990, 1993, 1995, 2001) states that language acquisition is a conscious process in which learners need to "notice" the L2 forms in the input in order for acquisition to occur ("the noticing hypothesis"). He therefore argues that language instruction should attempt to direct learners' conscious attention to the target forms in the input in order to promote noticing and subsequent intake. Consistent with Schmidt's noticing hypothesis, a number of studies have found that explicit instruction does indeed facilitate L2 acquisition (Alanen 1995; DeKeyser 1995, 1998; Ellis 1993; Robinson 1996, 1997). Alanen (1995) and DeKeyser (1995), for example, investigated the effect of explicit rule presentation and exposure to the target L2 forms. Both studies found that explicit rule presentation prior to exposure had a positive effect on the acquisition of the target forms.

Research on the effect of input-processing instruction on L2 learning seems to provide further evidence to support the use of explicit instruction (or explicit information) to draw learners' attention to form-meaning relationships (VanPatten 1996, 2000, 2004; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993). The objective of input-processing instruction (VanPatten 1996, 2004) is to assist learners

Hernández, Todd

"The Effect of Explicit Instruction and Input Flood on Students' Use of Spanish Discourse Markers on a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview"  
*Hispania* 91.3 (2008): 665–675

to better notice an L2 form in the input in order to make a form-meaning connection. Processing instruction consists of three components:<sup>1</sup> (1) learners receive an explanation about an L2 structure or form; (2) learners receive explicit information about how to better notice the form in the input; (3) learners engage in structured input activities that direct their attention to form and encourage them to respond to the content of the input (Lee and VanPatten 2003). In contrast to the aforementioned studies which have found that explicit instruction facilitates L2 learning, the results of Benati (2004), Farley (2004), Sanz and Morgan-Short<sup>2</sup> (2004), VanPatten and Oikennon<sup>3</sup> (1996), and Wong (2004) all indicate that, within a processing-instruction approach, explicit instruction does not have a significant effect on language acquisition. Rather, the authors of these studies argue that structured-input activities are sufficient to draw students' attention to notice and attend to the L2 forms. Given these inconsistent findings, further research is needed that investigates the role of explicit instruction in L2 classroom acquisition.

The purpose of the present study, then, is to address the continuing debate on the role of grammar instruction in L2 learning by examining the combined effect of explicit instruction and input flood<sup>4</sup> on students' use of Spanish discourse markers on a *Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview* (SOPI).<sup>5</sup> In input flood, the input a learner receives is saturated with numerous examples of the target L2 form with the expectation that this artificial increase will assist the learner in noticing and then acquiring the form (Wong 2005). This investigation addresses the research question: Does explicit instruction when combined with input flood have a greater effect on students' use of discourse markers on a SOPI than input flood alone? The researcher predicted that explicit instruction combined with input flood would be more effective than input flood alone in promoting students' use of discourse markers on the SOPI.

## Method

*Participants:* Participants were taken from a pool of 32 students enrolled in two sections of a third-year Spanish conversation course at a Midwestern university in the United States. Participants had to be present for each phase of the experiment in order to be included in the investigation. Thus, the final group of participants consisted of 19 students. Six of the participants (32%) were male and 13 (68%) were female. All were native speakers of English. One class (n = 10) was assigned as the experimental group and the other class (n = 9) as the control group. Both groups were taught by the same instructor who also authored this article.

*Discourse markers:* Discourse markers are words and phrases that speakers use to sequence and structure ideas and information in paragraph-length discourse. The discourse markers addressed in this study were: *al principio* "at first," *al mismo tiempo* "at the same time," *también* "also," *al final* "finally," *entonces* "then," *cuando* "when," *más tarde* "later," *mientras* "while," *antes* "before," *después* "afterwards," *en cuanto* "as soon as," *porque* "because," *pero* "but," and *por eso* "therefore." The importance of discourse markers for the development of advanced-level speaking abilities is evident in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines—Speaking* (1999). These state that one of the major differences between language performance at the Intermediate and Advanced levels is that speakers at the advanced-level can narrate and describe in all major time frames using paragraph-length connected discourse. To be rated at the advanced-level on an ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) or a SOPI, the speaker must therefore be able to use discourse markers to produce a cohesive and coherent paragraph-length narration.

*Instructional Treatments:* Instruction for both the experimental group and the control group began in the third week of the semester. Students in both groups received four hours of instruction within a two-week period on how to narrate a past event or experience. The main classroom activities for each group are summarized in Table 1.

Experimental Group	Control Group
1. Review of preterit and imperfect	1. Review of preterit and imperfect
2. Explicit explanation of discourse markers	2. --
3. Flood of input	3. Flood of input
4. Communicative practice	4. Communicative practice
5. Feedback on discourse markers as well as preterit and imperfect	5. Feedback on preterit and imperfect
6. Written assignment	6. Written assignment
7. Feedback on discourse markers as well as preterite and imperfect	7. Feedback on preterit and imperfect

**Table 1**  
**Summary of Experimental Group Instruction**  
**Versus Control Group Instruction**

Students in the experimental group (n = 10) received explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers to narrate an event or experience in the past time frame. This group then received a flood of input that contained the discourse markers. Students were thereupon presented with opportunities for communicative practice and corrective feedback. Instruction for the experimental group consisted of the following sequence of activities:

1. Students were provided with a brief review of the forms and uses of the preterit and imperfect to prepare them for communicative activities requiring them to narrate in the past.
2. In order to assist students in noticing and processing the discourse markers in subsequent input activities, the instructor distributed a handout to students concerning the function and use of discourse markers to narrate an event or experience in past time (see Appendix A).
3. Students received written input that had been modified to contain an increased incidence of discourse markers. Students were required to answer a series of comprehension questions based on the content of the input. The instructor then asked students to underline the discourse markers and explain their function within the passage.<sup>6</sup>
4. Students thereupon performed a series of communicative activities that required them to narrate in the past time. The instructor asked students to direct their attention to the use of appropriate discourse markers as well as to the preterit and imperfect in constructing their responses.
5. The instructor asked students to share their responses for the different communicative activities. Students received corrective feedback on their use of discourse markers and of the preterit and imperfect. The objective of this feedback was to draw their attention to the correct use of these forms within a communicative context.
6. The instructor asked students to complete a written assignment based on one of the communicative activities<sup>7</sup> (see Appendix B). Again, the instructor directed students' attention to discourse markers and the preterit and imperfect. To further assist students in noticing and processing the target forms, students were required to underline all of the discourse markers. The assignment was then submitted to the instructor.
7. Students were provided with corrective feedback on the written assignment. The feedback focused on discourse markers, the preterit and imperfect. The instructor also distributed a handout of a sample response (see Appendix C). In reviewing the handout, students were asked to underline all the discourse markers.

In contrast to the experimental group, students in the control group (n = 9) did not receive explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers to narrate a past event. No

explicit mention of discourse markers was provided and there was no corrective feedback. The instruction for the control group consisted of the following sequence of activities:

1. Students in the control group reviewed the forms and uses of the preterit and imperfect in preparation for subsequent communicative activities.
2. In contrast to the experimental group, students in the control group did not receive explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers.
3. Students in this group received the same flooded input as the experimental group except that there was no explicit information about the discourse markers. In contrast to experimental group, the control group answered questions limited to the content of the reading passage.
4. As with the experimental group, students in the control group performed a series of communicative activities that required them to narrate a sequence of events in the past time frame. The instructor asked students in this group to focus on the correct use of the preterit and imperfect. Again, in contrast to the experimental group, there was no explicit reference to the use of discourse markers.
5. Students shared their responses to the different communicative activities. The feedback provided to students directed their attention to the correct use of the preterit and imperfect in the context of past narration.
6. As with the experimental group, students completed a written assignment based on one of the communicative activities (see Appendix D). The written assignment for the control group was different from the written assignment for the experimental group in that students' attention (control group) was directed to the preterit and imperfect. Students were also asked to underline these verb forms before submitting the assignment to the instructor. Again, there was no explicit mention of discourse markers.
7. Students received corrective feedback on the written assignment. The focus of the feedback was on students' correct use of the preterit and imperfect. There was no mention of discourse markers. As with the experimental group, the instructor then provided the students with a handout of a sample response (see Appendix C). Students were asked to underline the preterit and imperfect verb forms in the handout.

*Pretest/Posttest Assessment Instrument:* To assess students' use of discourse markers prior to instruction, an Advanced-Level speaking task<sup>8</sup> from the SOPI was administered as a pretest during the second week of the semester. The treatment sessions began in the third week after the administration of the pretest speaking task. Students in both the experimental and control groups received four hours of instruction in the third and fourth weeks of the semester on how to narrate in the past time frame. Instruction in the fifth and sixth weeks consisted of student work with textbook activities and reading assignments. Students did not complete activities focusing on past narration during this time period. During the seventh week of the semester, the same Advanced-Level speaking task was administered as a posttest to determine the effect of instruction on students' use of discourse markers.

*Data Analysis:* The data for this study consisted of students' performances on the pre- and posttest SOPI speaking task. Student performances were transcribed and examined for frequency, range, and accurate use of discourse markers.<sup>9</sup>

## Results

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on the data from the pretest in order to determine if there were significant differences between the control and experimental groups with regard to their use of discourse markers prior to the treatment. The results of the ANOVA indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups before

treatment ( $F = 1.117, df = 1, p = 0.305$ ). The groups were therefore considered comparable prior to instruction.

*Frequency of Discourse Markers:*

Students' use of discourse markers on the pre- and posttest SOPI speaking task was calculated. Table 2 shows that the participants in the control group used an average of 2.70 discourse markers ( $M = 2.70, SD = 0.945$ ) on the pretest and an average of 3.20 discourse markers ( $M = 3.20, SD = 1.32$ ) on the posttest.

Number of Discourse Markers			
Student	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
1	3	4	1
2	4	4	-
3	3	2	-1
4	1	1	-
5	3	4	1
6	2	2	-
7	3	5	2
8	2	2	-
9	4	4	-
10	2	4	2
Mean =	2.70	3.20	0.50
SD =	0.945	1.32	

**Table 2**  
Total Number of Discourse Markers Used on the SOPI Task for the Control Group

Table 3 demonstrates that the participants in the experimental group used an average of 3.22 discourse markers ( $M = 3.22, SD = 1.20$ ) on the pretest and an average of 6.89 discourse markers ( $M = 6.89, SD = 2.67$ ) on the posttest.

Number of Discourse Markers			
Student	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
1	3	5	2
2	3	10	7
3	3	6	3
4	2	4	2
5	2	7	5
6	4	8	4
7	6	12	6
8	3	5	2
9	3	5	2
Mean =	3.22	6.89	3.67
SD =	1.20	2.67	

**Table 3**  
Total Number of Discourse Markers Used on the SOPI Task for the Experimental Group

A two-way ANOVA was then conducted on students' scores on the pretest and posttest SOPI speaking task to determine if these differences were significant. The independent variables were treatment group (experimental and control) and time (pre- and posttest). The dependent variable was score (number of discourse markers) on the SOPI. The results of the two-way ANOVA indicated that there was a significant interaction between group and time ( $F = 8.763, df = 1, p = .006$ ). The experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on the

posttest. These findings suggest that explicit instruction combined with input flood was more effective than input flood alone in promoting students' production of discourse markers on the SOPI task.

Source of Variation	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Corrected Model	3	103.750	34.583	12.761	0.000
Intercept	1	607.158	607.158	224.033	0.000
Group	1	42.000	42.000	15.498	0.000
Time	2	41.118	41.118	15.172	0.000
Group x Time	1	23.750	23.750	8.763	0.006
Error	34	92.144	2.710		
Total	38	788.000			
Corrected Total	37	195.895			

**Table 4**  
Summary of Two-Way ANOVA for Use of Discourse Markers

#### *Distribution of Discourse Markers*

The distribution of discourse markers on the pre- and posttest speaking task is shown in Tables 5 and 6. The results demonstrated that the students in the control group did not incorporate a significant number of different discourse markers on the posttest SOPI. In contrast, students in the experimental group used a broad range of different discourse markers to sequence and organize their responses on the SOPI task. This is further evidence that explicit instruction combined with input flood was more effective than input flood alone in promoting students' use of discourse markers on the SOPI task.

Discourse Marker	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
al mismo tiempo	3 (11.1%)	3 (9.4%)	-
al final	-	-	-
cuando	11 (40.8%)	14 (43.8%)	3
después	-	3 (9.4%)	3
entonces	3 (11.1%)	2 (6.3%)	-1
pero	3 (11.1%)	1 (3.1%)	-1
por eso	1 (3.7%)	1 (3.1%)	-
porque	-	3 (9.4%)	3
primero	-	1 (3.1%)	1
también	6 (22.2%)	4 (12.4%)	-2
Total	27	32	5

**Table 5**  
Distribution of Discourse Markers Used on the SOPI Task for the Control Group

Discourse Marker	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
al mismo tiempo	-	3 (4.8%)	3
al final	-	1 (1.6%)	1
cuando	14 (48.3%)	18 (29.0%)	4
después	1 (3.4%)	4 (6.5%)	3
entonces	4 (13.8%)	17 (27.4%)	13
pero	4 (13.8%)	5 (8.1%)	1
por eso	-	4 (6.5%)	4
porque	-	1 (1.6%)	1
primero	2 (6.9%)	1 (1.6%)	-1
también	4 (13.8%)	8 (12.9%)	4
Total	27	62	33

**Table 6**  
Distribution of Discourse Markers Used on the SOPI Task for the Experimental Group

## Discussion

This study investigated the effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of discourse markers on a SOPI. Students in the experimental group were provided with brief instruction on the function and use of discourse markers to narrate an event or experience in the past time frame. This group also received flooded input consisting of the target forms. These students were then provided with numerous opportunities for communicative practice and feedback. The researcher predicted that explicit instruction combined with communicative practice and feedback would result in an increase in students' use of discourse markers after the instructional treatment. In contrast to the experimental group, the control group did not receive explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers. Students in this group were exposed to the same flooded input as the experimental group. However, there was no mention of discourse markers during the instruction. In addition, corrective feedback on the use of discourse markers was not provided to students during the communicative activities. With regard to this group, the researcher predicted that the provision of flooded input in the absence of explicit instruction and corrective feedback might not be sufficient for students to notice the discourse markers. As a consequence, students in the control group would not demonstrate an increase in their use of discourse markers after the instructional treatment.

The results of this study demonstrated that explicit instruction combined with input flood had an overall positive effect on students' use of discourse markers to narrate a past event. As shown in Table 3, the experimental group showed a significant increase in their use of discourse markers after the instructional treatment. Students in this group used an average of 3.22 discourse markers on the pretest in comparison with an average of 6.89 discourse markers on the posttest. Students' average pretest to posttest gain was 3.67 discourse markers. The fact that all nine students in the experimental group demonstrated progress in their use of discourse markers from the pretest to the posttest is further evidence of the positive effect of explicit instruction. Support for explicit instruction is also found in an examination of the distribution of discourse markers on the posttest SOPI task (see Tables 5 and 6). Students in the experimental group, for example, attempted to incorporate a broad range of different discourse markers into their responses on the posttest assessment instrument while students in the control group used a narrow range of discourse markers. These findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating the effectiveness of explicit instruction or explicit rule presentation on students' L2 acquisition (Alanen 1995; DeKeyser 1995; Ellis 1993; Robinson 1996, 1997; VanPatten and Cadierno 1993). As in Alanen (1995), the results of this study support Schmidt's (1990, 1993, 1995, 2001) prediction regarding the importance of explicit information in directing students' attention to certain L2 forms.

In contrast to the experimental group, the control group did not demonstrate a significant increase in their use of discourse markers on the SOPI task. As shown in Table 2, students in the control group used an average of 2.70 discourse markers on the pretest compared to an average of 3.20 discourse markers on the posttest. Students' average pretest to posttest gain was 0.50 discourse markers. A total of four students in the control group demonstrated moderate progress in their use of discourse markers from the pretest to the posttest. These results seem to suggest that flooded input without explicit instruction was not effective in directing students' attention to the discourse markers contained in the input. It appears that students in the control group did not notice the discourse markers in the input and, as a result, did not incorporate them into subsequent communicative activities. This finding supports previous studies suggesting that explicit instruction might be more effective than exposure to input flood alone in drawing students' attention to the formal properties of the L2 (White 1998; Williams and Evans 1998). With regard to the present investigation, it is possible that students in the control group would have benefited from more frequent exposure to the L2 forms. Indeed, Schmidt (1990, 1993, 1995, 2001) and Wong (2005) both identified amount of exposure to an L2 feature as one of several factors affecting the noticing process. It is still reasonable, however, to believe that these students would not have

noticed the discourse markers despite increased exposure to them in the input. Without explicit information about the function and use of Spanish discourse markers, students in the control group might have perceived these L2 forms as unimportant for the purpose of communication. As Schmidt (1995) and Doughty and Williams (1998) state, students' perception of the relative importance of an L2 form can impact their ability to notice the form. It is important in such instances that instructors provide students with explicit information about the L2 form in order to facilitate advanced levels of L2 acquisition.

### Conclusion

The aim of this investigation was to examine the effects of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of Spanish discourse markers on an Advanced-Level SOPI task. The results of the experiment demonstrated that explicit instruction combined with input flood was more effective than input flood alone in promoting students' use of discourse markers. This study also attempted to raise awareness about the importance of teaching discourse markers as a critical component for the development of Advanced-Level language performance. The study suggests the need for instructors to examine how explicit instruction in the use of discourse markers can assist students in their progress toward Advanced-Level oral proficiency. Future research should continue to investigate the effect of different approaches to form-focused instruction on the acquisition of different L2 structures. Research should also further examine the role of both explicit and implicit feedback techniques on L2 accuracy.

The results of the present study support the use of explicit instruction in the communicative L2 classroom. It is critical, however, that such an approach integrate attention to form, meaning, and function (Doughty and Williams 1998) through sustained comprehension- and production-oriented activities. The students in the experimental group benefited from brief explicit instruction on the function and use of discourse markers. The explicit information provided to these students allowed them to notice the discourse markers in input-based activities. The explicit instruction also assisted students in understanding how to use the discourse markers in subsequent communicative activities. The extensive communicative practice combined with corrective feedback further provided students in the experimental group with meaningful opportunities to notice the discourse markers, test their hypotheses, and reflect on the role of discourse markers in narrating an event or experience in the past time frame (Swain 1995).

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Learners do not produce the L2 structure as part of this teaching sequence. Nevertheless, Lee and VanPatten argue for the importance of output for the development of fluency and accuracy.

<sup>2</sup>Sanz and Morgan-Short (2004) found that explicit information did not contribute to students' acquisition of Spanish word order. The authors argued that providing students with activities that required them to use the L2 structure to complete the task (task-essential practice) was sufficient to promote L2 acquisition.

<sup>3</sup>In VanPatten and Oikennon (1996), students were assigned to one of three groups. Group One received both explicit rule presentation and structured input. Group Two received explicit rule presentation, and Group Three received structured input. The results of the experiment indicated that the students who received structured input without explicit rule presentation (Group Three) performed as well as the students who received both explicit rule presentation and structured input (Group One). The authors concluded that the nature of the structured input activities required students to attend to the L2 form to comprehend the content of the input.

<sup>4</sup>Input flood is a form of input enhancement. Sharwood Smith (1981, 1991, 1993) first introduced the concept of input enhancement in order to redefine the role of grammar instruction in the L2 classroom. He defined input enhancement as language instruction that attempted to make specific features of L2 input more salient in order to draw students' attention to these features with the objective of facilitating L2 acquisition. Input enhancement techniques discussed in Sharwood Smith (1991) and in Wong (2005) included explicit rule explanation, input flood, textual enhancement, structured input activities, and grammar consciousness-raising activities.

<sup>5</sup>The SOPI was developed by the Center for Applied Linguistics. The SOPI is a tape-mediated test of speaking proficiency. As with the ACTFL OPI, the SOPI is designed to elicit speech samples that are rated according to the ACTFL proficiency scale. As a tape-mediated test, the SOPI uses an audio tape and test booklet

to obtain a speech sample from the examinee rather than the face-to-face procedure of the OPI. In a SOPI, the examinee listens to a series of speaking tasks on a master tape and records his or her responses on a second blank cassette. A global rating is then assigned by comparing the examinee's responses with the criteria in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*.

\*Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds (1995) advocated the use of focused-noticing activities as an important component of flooded input. This approach requires students to respond to the target L2 features to further encourage them to notice and thus acquire these forms.

<sup>7</sup>This assignment was adapted from Caycedo Garner, Rusch, and Dominguez (1991).

\*The Advanced-Level SOPI speaking task required students to narrate a sequence of events in past time. Students had to speak in paragraph-length connected discourse in order to receive an advanced-level rating on this task. Students were therefore required to use discourse markers to structure and organize their narrations.

<sup>9</sup>When a speaker self-corrected or repeated a discourse marker, the second discourse marker was counted. The first discourse marker was not included in the count.

## WORKS CITED

- ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines—Speaking, Revised 1999*. (1999). Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Alanen, Riikka. (1995). "Input Enhancement and Rule Presentation in Second Language Acquisition." *Attention and Awareness in Foreign-Language Acquisition*. Ed. Richard Schmidt. Honolulu: U of Hawaii. 259–302.
- Bardovi-Harlig, Kathleen, and Dudley Reynolds. (1995). "The Role of Lexical Aspect in the Acquisition of Tense and Aspect." *TESOL Quarterly* 29: 107–31.
- Benati, Alessandro. (2004). "The Effects of Structured Input Activities and Explicit Information on the Acquisition of the Italian Future Tense." *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research, and Commentary*. Ed. Bill VanPatten. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 207–25.
- Caycedo Garner, Lucia, Debbie Rusch, and Marcela Dominguez. (1991). *En parejas 2: A Four-Book Series of Communicative Activities*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- DeKeyser, Robert. (1995). "Learning Second-Language Grammar Rules: An Experiment with a Miniature Linguistic System." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 17: 379–410.
- . (1998). "Cognitive Perspectives on Learning and Practicing L2 Grammar." *Focus on Form in Second-Language Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP. 42–63.
- Doughty, Catherine, and Jessica Williams. (1998). "Pedagogical Choices in Focus on Form." *Focus on Form in Second-Language Classroom Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP. 197–261.
- Ellis, Nick. (1993). "Rules and Instances in Foreign-Language Learning: Interactions of Implicit and Explicit Knowledge." *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 5: 289–319.
- Farley, Andrew. (2004). "Processing Instruction and the Spanish Subjunctive: Is Explicit Information Needed?" *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research, and Commentary*. Ed. Bill VanPatten. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 227–39.
- Krashen, Stephen. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. London: Longman.
- . (1994). "The Input Hypothesis and Its Rivals." *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. Ed. Nick Ellis. London: Academic P. 45–77.
- Lec, James, and Bill VanPatten. (2003). *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Robinson, Peter. (1996). "Learning Simple and Complex Second-Language Rules under Implicit, Incidental, Rule-Search, and Instructed Conditions." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 18: 27–68.
- . (1997). "Automaticity and Generalizability of Second-Language Learning under Implicit, Incidental, Enhanced, and Instructed Conditions." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 19: 233–47.
- Sanz, Cristina, and Kara Morgan-Short. (2004). "Positive Evidence versus Explicit Rule Presentation and Explicit Negative Feedback: A Computer-Assisted Study." *Language Learning* 54: 35–78.
- Schmidt, Richard. (1990). "The Role of Consciousness in L2 Learning." *Applied Linguistics* 11: 129–58.
- . (1993). "Awareness and Second-Language Acquisition." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 13: 205–25.
- . (1995). "Consciousness and Foreign-Language Learning: A Tutorial on the Role of Attention and Awareness in Learning." *Attention and Awareness in Foreign-Language Acquisition*. Ed. Richard Schmidt. Honolulu: U of Hawaii. 1–63.
- . (2001). "Attention." *Cognition and Second-Language Instruction*. Ed. Peter Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 3–32.
- Sharwood Smith, Michael. (1981). "Consciousness Raising and the Second-Language Learner." *Applied Linguistics* 2: 159–68.
- . (1991). "Speaking to Many Minds: On the Relevance of Different Types of Language Information." *Second Language Research* 7: 118–32.
- . (1993). "Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical Bases." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 15: 165–79.

- Swain, Merrill. (1995). "Three Functions of Output in Second-Language Learning." *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*. Ed. Guy Cook and Barbara Seidlhofer. Oxford: Oxford UP. 125–44.
- VanPatten, Bill. (1996). *Input Processing and Grammar Instruction: Theory and Research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- . (2000). "Processing Instruction as Form-Meaning Connections: Issues in Theory and Research." *Focus on Form in Second-Language Classroom Acquisition*. Ed. James Lee and Albert Valdman. Boston: Heinle and Heinle. 43–68.
- . (2004). "Input Processing in Second-Language Acquisition." *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research, and Commentary*. Ed. Bill VanPatten. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 5–32.
- VanPatten, Bill, and Teresa Cadierno. (1993). "Explicit Instruction and Input Processing." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 15: 225–43.
- VanPatten, Bill, and Soile Oikkenon. (1996). "Explanation versus Structured Input in Processing Instruction." *Studies in Second-Language Acquisition* 18: 495–510.
- White, Joanna. (1998). "Getting the Learners' Attention: A Typographical Input Enhancement Study." *Focus on Form in Second-Language Classroom Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP. 91–128.
- Williams, Jessica, and Jacqueline Evans. (1998). "What Kind of Focus and on Which Forms?" *Focus on Form in Second-Language Classroom Acquisition*. Ed. Catherine Doughty and Jessica Williams. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge UP. 139–55.
- Wong, Wynne. (2004). "Processing Instruction in French: The Roles of Explicit Information and Structured Input." *Processing Instruction: Theory, Research, and Commentary*. Ed. Bill VanPatten. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 187–205.
- . (2005). *Input Enhancement: From Theory and Research to the Classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

## APPENDIX A

Discourse markers are expressions used to sequence and organize ideas and information in a narration. Use these discourse markers to assist you in narrating a past experience or event.

<b>al principio</b>	at first
<b>al mismo tiempo</b>	at the same time
<b>al final</b>	finally
<b>también</b>	also
<b>entonces</b>	then
<b>cuando</b>	when
<b>más tarde</b>	later
<b>mientras</b>	while
<b>en cuanto</b>	as soon as
<b>porque</b>	because
<b>antes</b>	before
<b>después</b>	afterwards
<b>pero</b>	but
<b>por eso</b>	therefore

## APPENDIX B

### ¿Qué le pasó a Juan?

**¿Qué le pasó a Juan?** Your friend Alicia has just sent you an e-mail in which she describes an experience she had at the gym. This reminds you of an incident that happened to your friend Juan last week. Based on the story shown in the pictures, write an e-mail to Alicia in which you recount for her what happened to Juan. **Be sure to underline: (1) verbs in the preterit and imperfect and (2) discourse markers.** You should write about 10 sentences.

## APPENDIX C

## Sample response for written assignment

**¿Qué le pasó a Juan?** Your friend Alicia has just sent you an e-mail in which she describes an experience she had at the gym. This reminds you of an incident that happened to your friend Juan last week. Based on the story shown in pictures, write an e-mail to Alicia in which you recount for her what happened to Juan.

¡No te preocupes! Esas cosas pasan. Mi amigo Juan tuvo una experiencia similar. Un día estaba leyendo un libro en el cuarto de baño. El libro se llamaba "Pierda Peso." Entonces subió la balanza en su baño para ver cuánto pesaba. ¡Pesaba 100 kilos! Por eso decidió salir a correr. Al principio todo estaba bien. Más tarde Juan estaba corriendo por la calle cuando de repente vio a una amiga. Estaba hablando con su amiga mientras corría cuando se cayó en un pozo. ¡Qué mala suerte! Juan era muy dedicado todavía. Por eso decidió seguir corriendo. Estaba corriendo por la calle otra vez cuando un carro pasó. El carro tiró agua encima de Juan. El dijo "¡basta!" Entonces, decidió volver a casa. Antes de llegar a casa un perro lo atacó. Al final, después de un día difícil, Juan llegó a casa. Estaba enfermo. El tiró el libro en la basura en cuanto entró en casa porque no había perdido nada de peso. ¡Pobre Juan!

## APPENDIX D

## ¿Qué le pasó a Juan?

**¿Qué le pasó a Juan?** Your friend Alicia has just sent you an e-mail in which she describes an experience she had at the gym. This reminds you of an incident that happened to your friend Juan last week. Based on the story shown in the pictures, write an e-mail to Alicia in which you recount for her what happened to Juan. **Be sure to underline verbs in the preterit and imperfect.** You should write about 10 sentences.