THE AFFECTIVE AND PARTICIPATORY RESPONSES OF STUDENTS PAIRED ACCORDING TO PROFICIENCY LEVELS IN DYADIC EXCHANGES

TAMMY GREGERSEN
Universidad de Atacama

Interaction and the affective response that this generates in the language learner affects the acquisition process. The purpose of this study was to discover whether a student's language proficiency level was a contributing factor to the variability found in the frequency of participation in dyadic exchanges and whether students experience different affective reactions when paired with a partner at a higher, lower, or similar language level. Sixteen university students of high, intermediate and low proficiency levels were paired homogeneously and heterogenously and were asked to participate in information exchange activities. The frequency of their interaction and their affective responses were measured. The results of this study confirm that affective responses in language learners change depending on the proficiency level of the person they are partnered with in dyadic exchanges. Furthermore, the proficiency level of a student is a contributing factor in the variability of the frequency of participation in dyadic exchanges between foreign language students.

INTRODUCTION

Interaction in the target language is a vital component in the process of becoming a proficient foreign language communicator. At the same time, the affective climate that is generated in the process of interaction will influence its effectiveness. Because of the important role that interaction and affectivity play in the acquisition of a foreign language, both of these issues have become the focus of much attention in the research arena.

When students are given the opportunity to interact, they are given more opportunities to practice the target language. This increment in output aids students in becoming more proficient communicators. However, various factors come into play that may affect the frequency and quality of participation when students dialogue together. Gregersen (1998) demonstrated that a large degree of variability occurs in terms of the frequency of participation when students work together in small groups on information exchange tasks. One of the factors, among others, that she speculated as being influential was

Para correspondencia y solicitud de separatas, dirigirse a: Tammy Gregersen, Universidad de Atacama, Copayapu 485, Copiapó, Chile.

the level of language proficiency of the students involved in the communica-
tion exchange. Does a student's level of language proficiency affect the
frequency of his participation in the interaction process?

The potential effects of the level of language proficiency are not only
seen on the frequency of output that students obtain but also on how they feel
about the interaction itself. This affective response may be manifested in the
diminution or intensification of feelings such as anxiety, motivation and
self-esteem. Is a student's affective response altered by the dynamics that come
into play because of the proficiency levels of the interlocutors involved? For
example, does a student feel more anxious talking to someone whose profi-
ciency level is higher than his own? or does a student feel unmotivated when
his partner cannot keep up a high level of conversation?

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to discover whether the level of a
student's language proficiency is a factor contributing to the variability found
in the frequency of students' participation in dyadic exchanges and whether
students experience different affective reactions when paired with a partner
at a higher, lower, or similar language level.

THE ROLE OF OUTPUT IN INTERACTION

Because the main focus of this study is to discover whether the variability
present in the frequency of participation of language students could be
credited to differences in the language proficiency of the students involved in
the interaction, it is necessary to investigate the importance of output in the
process of L2 acquisition. It is widely assumed that the use of the target
language is one of the crucial variables in the successful acquisition of the
target language—the more often students use or practice the second or
foreign language, the more likely they are to learn it (Day 1985).

Swain (1985) takes a strong stand on the important role of output in
the acquisition process. In fact, in her "comprehensible output hypothe-
sis," she argues that, among other functions, output is a significant way to
test out hypotheses about the target language. She concludes, on the basis
of her study of English-speaking children in a French immersion program,
that:

> Comprehensible output...is a necessary mechanism of acquisition independent of the role
> of comprehensible input. Its role is, at minimum, to provide opportunities for contextual-
> ized, meaningful use, to test out hypotheses about the target language, and to move the
> learner from a purely semantic analysis of language to a syntactic analysis of it. (p. 252)

She discovered that although the students, focussing on meaning, under-
stood what their teacher said, they were still not able to implement the
syntactic system of the second language. Building on input, Swain (1985)
believes that interaction where meaning is negotiated is also important, and
that knowing that one will eventually be expected to produce may be the
"trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expressions
needed in order to successfully convey his own intended meaning" (p. 249).

The studies of Pica and Doughty (1985a) and Porter (1986) converge with their suggestions that more language, possibly more complex language, and no less grammatically correct target language can be encouraged if learners interact with peers. Pica and Doughty, in comparing teacher-fronted as opposed to small group activities, discovered that teacher-fronted activities generated a good deal of linguistic production but that more than half of this was the output of the teacher and the more proficient class members. Group work, on the other hand, stimulated less total production, but more conversational modification was detected than those of teacher-to- student activities.

Thus, output is more than just a means for receiving more comprehensible input —it is also important to the acquisition process itself. It has been demonstrated that small group interaction provides more opportunity for practicing output. This being the case, creating opportunities for producing output in the classroom, particularly in a foreign language setting where outside-the-classroom contact with the target language is limited, is fundamental.

THE EFFECTS OF PROFICIENCY ON INTERACTION

Most cooperative learning theories which stress the importance of interaction in the learning process support the use of heterogeneous groups because of the hypothesized benefits to low-achieving students of being tutored by high-achieving students or because of the goal to build trust and friendliness among members of different social groups. Cohen (1994) collected data from different research on the issue and concluded several things. First of all, if high-achieving students have the opportunity to give explanations, then heterogeneous groups will be especially beneficial for them. If the group is composed of only medium-achieving combined with low-achieving students, the expectation is that the medium-achieving students would benefit from giving explanations. This idea is based on the supposition that providing explanations is helpful for any student but that the better students in the group probably engage more in such behavior. However, a difficult, vague task with an open-ended solution may negatively affect the confidence of the more developmentally advanced student and he or she may suffer regression. The only result, according to Cohen, that seems to consistently maintain credibility is the benefit to the low achiever of being in a heterogeneous group as compared to a homogeneously low-achieving group.

In the language acquisition arena, Porter (1986), in trying to answer the question as to whether teachers should set up groups or pairs according to language ability to facilitate language acquisition, discovered that, indeed, teachers might wish to pair students of differing proficiency levels in the language classroom. Her findings suggest that learners received more, higher quality input from advanced learners than from intermediates, thus implying an advantage for practice with a higher-level partner from the perspective of quality and quantity of input. Essentially, learners talked more with advanced learners, primarily because the conversations lasted longer. In terms of level

differences, the intermediate learners benefit more from talking to advanced learners from both an input perspective and a production perspective; again, they get to talk more because the discussions go on longer. Advanced learners get more input from and production practice with other advanced learners than intermediates; however, they get only slightly less production practice with intermediates because they tend to dominate the conversations.

Although interaction in the target language is an important element in the language acquisition process, how students actually feel about that inter-action may also have an impact on how effective interaction is. For this reason, the following section will focus on affective factors, particularly those associated with anxiety, motivation, and self-confidence.

AFFECTIVE FACTORS

The term "affective" refers to emotions, attitudes, motivations, and values (Oxford 1990). According to her, it is impossible to overstate the importance of the affective factors influencing language learning. These factors often define the reasons why attempts at learning language fail (Brown 1981). Good language learners are often those who can control their emotions and attitudes about learning. Negative feelings have the potential of slowing down progress, while positive emotions and attitudes can make language learning more enjoyable (Oxford 1990).

In discussing the "Affective Filter Hypothesis," Krashen (1987) suggested that anxiety, motivation and self-confidence are all related to success in language acquisition. The affective filter is an imaginary barrier which prevents learners from using input which is available in the environment. The acquirer needs to be open to input. When the affective filter is "up" the acquirer may understand what he hears and reads, but the input will not be processed. This usually occurs when the acquirer is anxious, poorly motivated, or lacking self-confidence (Stevick 1976). Because of the crucial nature of each of these affective variables, it is important to take a closer look at each of them.

Anxiety

Anxiety in general is defined as "the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the autonomic nervous system" (Horwitz et al. 1986:127). However, due to the specific nature of language anxiety, it must be defined more precisely as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings and behaviors related to classroom language learning that arise from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (p. 128).

The importance of this affective factor in language acquisition lies in the negative effects that debilitating (as opposed to facilitating) anxiety has in the language learning process. According to Oxford (1990), the anxious language learner will probably be inhibited, with even moderate risks posing

problems. This is preoccupying because overcoming inhibitions and learning to take reasonable risks are important factors in successful language learning. Actual or anticipated criticism from others and from themselves paralyze the inhibited learner.

A reduction in social interaction is one of the most negative behaviors brought on by anxiety. This is seen in behaviors such as not initiating conversation or less participation in them as well as allowing longer silent periods. Anxious language students also tend to speak for shorter periods in front of the group (Young, 1991). Many experts have concurred that students withdraw from voluntary participation in class when in an anxious state (Ely 1984, Horwitz et al. 1986, MacIntyre and Gardner 1991, Young 1991).

Because this study has integrated as one of its principal foundations that interaction in the target language is necessary for acquisition to occur, this reduction in participation that anxiety creates becomes an even graver issue.

Motivation

Like anxiety, motivation is a factor in the successful acquisition of a foreign language. "Motivation is commonly thought of as an inner drive, impulse, emotion, or desire that moves one to a particular action" (Brown 1981:121). Motivation decides the extent of active, personal engagement in learning. Oxford and Nyikos (1989) discovered that the degree of motivation is the most powerful influence on how and when students use language learning strategies, the techniques learners employ to take charge of and improve their own progress. High motivation incites learners to interact more in the language, which in turn increases the amount of input that a learner receives (Oxford 1990).

Furthermore, various researchers have demonstrated that motivation encourages greater overall effort on the part of language learners and typically results in greater success in terms of global language proficiency and competence in specific language skills such as listening, reading and speaking. Strong motivation and positive attitudes also help learners maintain their language skills after classroom instruction has been completed (Oxford 1990).

Two elements which Ellis (1994) suggests as aiding in the generation of students' intrinsic motivation are: a) providing opportunities for communication, and b) engendering students with self-direction. Allowing students to communicate satisfies the need to get meanings across and helps to stimulate the pleasure experienced when this is achieved. Through this communicative process, motivation to learn a foreign language is enhanced. Self-direction is accomplished when students talk to other students, as well as by the determination and evaluation of their own objectives.

Again, one can appreciate the cyclical role that affective factors and interaction have on each other. Interaction is enhanced by positive motivation, while positive motivation stimulates interaction.

Self-esteem

"The worth that persons place upon themselves is commonly referred to as self-esteem. People derive a sense of self-esteem from the accumulation of experiences with themselves and with others, and from assessments of the external world around them" (Brown, 1981:114).

Krashen (1987) states that the acquirer with more self-esteem and self-confidence tends to do better in second language acquisition. Dulay et al. (1982:75) concur, postulating that, "all things being equal, the self-confident, secure person is a more successful language learner." They credit this to the fact that self-confident people are usually more eager to try new and unpredictable experiences, and are probably more likely to be willing to guess before knowing something for sure. Furthermore, they are more apt to seek out situations that require real communication in the new language.

Although anxiety, motivation, and self-esteem were divided here for the sake of more precise definition, it must be noted that oftentimes these affective variables overlap to the degree that they are not able to be differentiated one from the other. Separating affective variables from other variables present in human behavior, such as the cognitive one, is in itself a difficult feat. Separating out anxiety, motivation and self-esteem from other affective variables as well as from each other is an even greater task.

CONCLUSION

Affective factors in language acquisition have the potential to define the success or failure that a student experiences when confronting a new language. These factors also will influence the way a student approaches the interaction process. Interaction is an important element in the acquisition of a new language because it affords the opportunity for students to negotiate interaction and test language hypotheses through the production of output.

Because interaction plays such an important role in the language acquisition process, it is important to understand what factors influence the variability in participation frequency that occurs when students talk together. One of the possible reasons that this variability exists is the level of language proficiency that each interlocutor exhibits. However, it is not enough to just understand the interactive process from a hard number frequency perspective, but also to look into how the different proficiency levels affect the participants on the affective plane. Insight into the affective nature of interaction could also provide some important information on students' behavior in the communicative process.

HYPOTHESES

H1: Students with differing levels of proficiency, as measured by the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), will demonstrate variation in the frequency of participation in dyadic exchanges as measured by classroom observation and audio taped dyadic interaction between foreign language students.

H2: Affective responses as measured by the Measure of Affective Response Toward Interaction (MARTI) will differ between low, intermediate and high proficiency students when confronted with the task of communicating in dyadic exchanges.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. *Subjects*

The subjects of this experiment were extracted from students in the second semester of their third year in the Programa de Pedagogía y Licenciatura en Inglés of the Universidad de Atacama in Copiapó, Chile. Eighteen students were chosen as the sample population for this study based upon their proficiency level as measured by the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). Three categories were defined —high, intermediate, and low— that corresponded to categories fixed by the guidelines created by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

2. *Instruments*

Three means of measurement were necessary to comply with the objectives of this study: 1) the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), which categorized the sample population into proficiency levels; 2) an observation sheet, which facilitated the recollection of frequency of participation data; and 3) the Measure of Affective Responses Toward Interaction (MARTI), which surveyed the attitudes of the members of the sample population concerning their affective responses toward interaction.

2.a. The Oral Proficiency Interview

The Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) was administered to measure the level of language proficiency of each student coming into the experimental process in order to correctly categorize their language proficiency level.

The OPI was developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in conjunction with the Educational Testing Service and several government agencies, and was designed to assess an individual's oral proficiency on the basis of a face-to-face structured conversation. The goal of the OPI is to obtain a sample of speech that can be rated using the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines as the measure. These Guidelines comprise level-by-level (from Novice to Superior) descriptions of learner performance specifying the content that a learner at a particular level might dominate (such as greetings, health matters, family, etc.), the functions the learner dominates (such as expressing agreement/disagreement, narrating in the past, present and future, supporting opinions, etc.) and the accuracy present in the learner's speech (such as systematic errors that interfere with communication and sporadic errors that do not interfere with communication) (Lee and Van Patten 1995).

2.b. The Observation Sheet for Participation Frequency

Participation was measured quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, the frequency of participation was measured. Qualitatively, the length of the utterance was the unit of measure. The units of measure were word, phrase, and extended discourse. At the beginning of both classes, the nine dyads were given a tape recorder to record their sessions. The students submitted their tapes to the research team at the end of each class period to be evaluated. The researcher listened to the tapes and ticked the box on the observation sheet representing the length of the utterance made by each student. After every class, each observer tallied up the number of times each student participated in each column, and then registered the total. At the end of the experimental process, the researcher calculated the total frequency of participation as well as the total number of utterances under each heading of the Observation Sheet.

2.c. The Measure of Affective Response Toward Interaction (MARTI)

The Measure of Affective Response Toward Interaction (MARTI) is a four-teen item, self-report, Likert Scale attitude assessment created by the research team that measures the subject's attitudes toward dyadic interaction, focuss-ing on the proficiency level of the person with whom they were partnered. The questions centered on the anxiety (for example, "I felt uncomfortable when my partner corrected my errors."), motivation (for example, "My part-ner's level of English did not motivate me to speak with him/her.") and self-esteem (for example, "My insecurity made me commit many errors in the conversation.") that was stimulated in each subject by their co-interlocutor during the interaction. The responses ranged from "Completely agree" (1) to "Completely disagree" (5). (See Appendix A)

3. *Procedures*

3.a. Selection of the sample

The first phase of this study involved diagnosing the language proficiency levels of the sample population. Using the OPI, the researchers evaluated the students using the scale provided by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. With these guidelines, the students ranged in ability levels from low novice to high intermediate. For the purposes of this experi-ment, students who scored "low" to "mid novice" were considered Low; students who fell within the range of "high novice" to "low intermediate" were categorized as Intermediate; and those who achieved "mid" to "high interme-diate" were defined as High.

3.b. Creation of the classroom materials

The next step was to create the material for the subjects to use during the class to stimulate interaction. Pica (1987), Pica and Doughty (1985b) and Pica et al. (1989) found information-exchange activities to be more interactionally

fruitful than the decision-making tasks that tend to presently be in vogue. With this in mind, the researchers of the present study, while trying to maintain the variable of classroom material under control, created two types of information tasks to be used in each class period. The first was the assignment of a controversial issue in which each student took a side of the argument and debated in favor of his position. During the first class period, the dyads debated the issue as to whether or not there should be tighter government controls on alcohol consumption. The dyads during the second class period argued for or against the idea of living together before marriage. The second assignment for students to complete during the class period was a structured interview with a chart to fill with the partner's answers. The dyads in the first class period interviewed each other on likes and dislikes, while during the second class period, the students exchanged information on childhood memories. (See Appendix B for copies of the assignments)

3.c. Pairing partners

After the subjects had been assessed for their proficiency levels and the information exchange activities had been developed, the next phase involved pairing the students to work together. As mentioned earlier, a total of eighteen students were involved in the study, six students in each of the three categories (Low, Medium, and High). In the first round, high students were paired with high, medium students with medium, and low students with low, making three pairs at each level. This was done to discover how homogeneous pairs responded to interaction in terms of their frequency of participation and their affective responses to that interaction. In the second round, three high students were paired with three medium students; another three high students with three low students; and finally, three medium students were paired with three low students. Again, the purpose for this grouping procedure was to see how heterogeneous pairs responded participatively and affectively, and to see to what extent language proficiency had an effect on the interaction.

RESULTS

After each class where the students were paired according to proficiency levels, they were given a copy of the Measure of Affective Response Toward Interaction (MARTI) with the purpose of discovering how they felt about the interaction that had transpired during that class period. The average score on the table corresponds to the student whose proficiency level is written first, and paired with a student whose proficiency level is written in parentheses. For example, "High (High)" is the score of a high proficiency student paired with another high proficiency student.

Using an observation sheet, the research team evaluated the cassettes of the recordings of the group sessions and tallied up the frequency and quality of participation. Table 2 shows the results of student participation in homogeneous pairs, while Table 3 shows the results of student participation in heterogeneous pairs.

TABLE 1: AVERAGE SCORES ON THE MEASURE OF AFFECTIVE RESPONSE TOWARD INTERACTION (MARTI)
(According to Proficiency Grouping)

COMBINATION	AVERAGE SCORE
High (High)	60.74
High (Intermediate)	58.0
High (Low)	57.0
Intermediate (High)	56.0
Intermediate (Intermediate)	50.07
Intermediate (Low)	55.55
Low (High)	57.0
Low (Intermediate)	51.33
Low (Low)	50.73

TABLE 2: AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION (HOMOGENEOUS GROUPS)

	WORD	PHRASE	EXTENDED DISCOURSE	TOTAL FREQUENCY
High (High)	40.67	113.5	37.17	191.03
Intermediate (Intermediate)	56.67	57.5	26.67	142.5
Low (Low)	35.83	55.67	4.33	94.83

TABLE 3: AVERAGE FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION (HETEROGENEOUS GROUPS)

	WORD	PHRASE	EXTENDED DISCOURSE	TOTAL FREQUENCY
High (Intermediate)	28	56.33	35	119.33
High (Low)	25.66	73.66	16.66	137
Intermediate (High)	37.33	46.33	29.66	116.66
Intermediate (Low)	13.66	28	29.33	71
Low (High)	33.33	66	13	112.33
Low (Intermediate)	14.66	22	27.33	63.66

DISCUSSION

1. Interpretation of MARTI results

In terms of the students' affective response to different proficiency grouping (Table 1), various conclusions can be reached. First of all, concerning homogenous groups, the high levels of affectivity were found in those pairs composed of high level proficiency students, scoring an average of 60.74, while the students at an intermediate or low level of proficiency, when paired with students at the same level, scored 50.07 and 50.73, respectively. Thus, homogeneous grouping is most affectively advantageous to high proficiency students. Intermediate and low level students do not seem to have the same positive response to being paired with students at similar levels of proficiency. Indeed, the scores corresponding to homogeneous pairing for intermediate students and low students are even lower than any of the other scores for heterogeneous grouping.

The tendency for positive affectivity involving high level students was also carried over into heterogenous grouping. Table 2 demonstrates that the affective scores are highest with both intermediate and low proficiency students when they are paired with high proficiency students. For example, when an intermediate student was paired with a high proficiency student, the average score on the MARTI was 56.0, while the same students paired with another medium or low student scored 50.07 and 55.55, respectively. This tendency was even more exaggerated with low level students whose average score was 57.0 when paired with a high proficiency student, but whose score dropped substantially to 51.33 when paired with an intermediate student, and 50.73 when paired with another low student.

These results are congruent with the theories of Vygotsky (1978) and his idea of the social nature of learning. He identified two developmental levels in the individual that interact with learning from birth. Using interaction, the individual advances from an "actual developmental level" to a "potential developmental level." The "Zone of Proximal Development," which he defined as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance of and in collaboration with more capable peers," is between the two levels (p. 86). Through learning which "presupposes a specific social nature and a process by which children grow into the intellectual life of those around them," the potential developmental level becomes the next actual developmental level (p. 89). The fact that Vygotsky includes the idea of more capable peers confirms the results found in this study.

2. Interpretations of the participation results

Not only does the presence of a high proficiency student working in a dyad produce higher results on the MARTI, but it also stimulates more interaction between students, as can be seen in Tables 2 and 3. Focussing on the "total frequency" of student participation in homogeneous groups (Table 2), it

probably comes as no surprise that high proficiency students participate more frequently than intermediate students and that intermediate students participate more actively than their lower counterparts. High proficiency students participated an average of 191.03 times in the class period, while the intermediate students participated 142.5 times, and the low students, 94.83 times. In terms of the quality of participation in homogeneous groups (Table 2), as measured by the length of the utterance, again it is not surprising that high proficiency students participate with more extended discourse (37.17 times per class) than students at lower levels, as they not only have the language capacity to do it, but they are also involved in giving more explanations. Intermediate students use less extended discourse than high students (26.67 times per class), but more than the lower ones (a mere 4.33 times per class). The most commonly used length of utterance by all three proficiency groupings was the "phrase" —high level students used it 113.5 times per class; the intermediate students, 57.5 times per class; and the low students, 55.67 times per class. This should not be surprising, either, as most daily conversation takes place at this level.

Just as the presence of a high proficiency student in a dyad stimulated more positive affective responses on the part of intermediate and low proficiency students, so too did it encourage more active participation. Table 3 shows the results of the frequency of participation in heterogenous groups. Whenever the group was integrated with a high proficiency student, the level of participation increased. For example, an intermediate student when paired with a low student, participated an average of 71 times per class, but when paired with a high student, his average total frequency increased to 116.66 times per class. The same tendency was evidenced with the participation of a low proficiency student: when paired with a medium student, his average participation was calculated at 63.66 times per class, but in combination with a high proficiency student, his participation increased to 112.33 times per class.

Thus, this study has demonstrated that, in concordance with the hypothesis stated at the outset of the experimental process, affective responses change in low, intermediate and high proficiency students when confronted with the task of communicating in dyadic exchanges depending on the proficiency level of the person they are partnered with. Furthermore, this study has shown that the proficiency level of a student is a contributing factor in the variability in the frequency of participation in dyadic exchanges between foreign language students.

CONCLUSIONS

Generalizing on this information, the results of this study confirm that pairing students heterogeneously according to proficiency levels for dyadic interaction is advantageous from both an affective perspective as well as for stimulating higher frequency of participation. The only students who benefit from homogenous grouping are the high level students. Both intermediate and low level students are at a disadvantage both affectively and interactively when

paired with students at their same proficiency level. The presence of a high proficiency student in dyadic exchanges positively increases the emotional reaction to the communicative act as well as their performance in it.

Thus, language teachers must be aware that pairing students at the same level of language proficiency may not be as beneficial as making sure that the higher level students are evenly dispersed throughout the class when dyadic exchanges are used. This study has demonstrated that the idea of "tracking" students according to ability levels is only advantageous to the better students, leaving the others affectively weaker and participating less.

REFERENCES

BROWN, H.D. (1981). Affective factors in second language learning. In J. Alatis, H. Altman, and P. Alatis (Eds.), *The second language classroom: Directions for the 1980's*. New York: Oxford University Press.

COHEN, E. (1994). Restructuring the classroom: Conditions for productive small groups. *Review of Educational Research* 64: 1-35.

DAY, R. (1985). The use of the target language in context and second language proficiency. In M.S. Gass and C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Pp. 257-277. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

DULAY, H., M. BURT, and S. KRASHEN. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ELLIS, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ELY, C. (1984). An analysis of discomfort, risktaking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning* 36: 1-24.

GREGERSEN, T. (1998). Improving teaching methodologies for communicatively apprehensive foreign language students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Universidad Católica de Valparaíso.

HORWITZ, E., M. HORWITZ, and J. COPE. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal* 70: 127-132.

KRASHEN, S. (1987). Applications of psycholinguistic research. In M. Long and J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL*. Pp. 33-44. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

LEE, J. F. and B. VAN PATTEN. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw Hill Publishers.

MAC INTYRE, P. D. and R.C. GARDNER. (1991). Methods and results in the study of anxiety and language literature: A review of the literature. *Language Learning* 41: 85-117.

OXFORD, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

OXFORD, R. and M. NYIKOS. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern Language Journal* 73: 291-300.

PICA, T. (1987). Second language acquisition, social interaction and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics* 8: 3-21.

PICA, T. and C. DOUGHTY. (1985a). Input and interaction in the communicative language classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass and C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Pp. 115-463. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

PICA, T. and C. DOUGHTY. (1985b). The role of group work in classroom second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 7: 233-248.

PICA, T., L. HOLLIDAY, N. LEWIS, and L. MORGENTHALER. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11: 63-90.

PORTER, P. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn*. Pp. 200-224. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

STANSFIELD, C. (1996). *Test development handbook: Simulated oral proficiency interview*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

STEVICK, E. (1976). *Memory, meaning and method: Some psychological perspectives on language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

SWAIN, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass and C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition*. Pp. 235-253. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

VYGOTSKY, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Cole, S. Scribner, V. John-Steiner, and E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Pp. 79-91. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

YOUNG, D. (1991). Creating a low-anxiety classroom environment: What does language anxiety research suggest?. *The Modern Language Journal* 75: 426-437.

APPENDIX A

POR FAVOR, CONTESTE LAS SIGUIENTES PREGUNTAS USANDO LA ESCALA QUE SE DA A CONTINUACIÓN:

CA   = En Completo Acuerdo
DE   = De Acuerdo
NAD   = Ni en Acuerdo ni en Desacuerdo
ED   = En Desacuerdo
CD   = En Completo Desacuerdo

1.   El nivel de inglés de mi compañero no me motivó a hablar con él/ella.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

2.   No me sentí capaz de interactuar con mi compañero porque las diferencias en los niveles de inglés eran notables.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

3.   Mi inseguridad me llevó a cometer errores en la conversación.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

4.   Me sentí incómodo de que mi compañero me corrigiera los errores.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

5.   Sentí temor de que mi compañero se burlara de mi nivel de inglés.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

6.   Mi compañero no parecía comprender la mayor parte de mi mensaje y esto me hizo sentir mal.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

7.   Sentí que mi nivel de inglés era inferior al de mi compañero.
       CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

8. Me esforcé demasiado para mantener el nivel de la conversación.
   CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

9. Sentí que el bajo nivel de inglés de mi compañero hizo de esta actividad una pérdida de tiempo.
   CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

10. No me entretuve mucho durante la conversación con mi compañero por los niveles de habilidad idiomática que se mantuvieron.
    CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

11. Sentí que con mi nivel de inglés no pude ayudar a mi compañero a mejorar el suyo.
    CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

12. Sentí que el diálogo con mi compañero no me llevó a mejorar mi nivel de inglés.
    CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

13. Cuando encontramos una barrera de comunicación, fue difícil superarla.
    CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

14. Sentí que tenía que bajar mi nivel de inglés para asegurar que mi compañero pudiera seguir la conversación.
    CA   DE   NAD   ED   CD

APPENDIX B

SHOULD THERE BE LAWS REGULATING ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION IN CHILE?

The absence of laws regulating alcohol consumption allows people to freely decide whether or not they want to enjoy drinking. The government, under a democratic system, should not interfere with such tradition. Individuals should have the ability to consume as they want. It was demonstrated that when alcohol is made illegal, many other illegal activities grow around it —like the black market, contraband, robbery, and maybe even murder.

Alcohol distorts a person's actions, and in fact can stimulate abusive behavior. It has been shown to increase psychological and physical violence. Drunkenness and alcohol abuse are some of the main causes of the delinquency that we see on the television every day. The regulation of alcohol would diminish many crimes and help to maintain a peaceful society.

IS IT A GOOD IDEA TO LIVE TOGETHER BEFORE MARRIAGE?

Living together before marriage is an excellent way to know the other person's habits at home, which would be impossible to know in an ordinary affair. It is a good learning experience before going through marriage; in fact, both the man and the woman will learn a great deal about themselves. Living together before marriage limits the possibility of encountering disgusting surprises once the couple marries. It also lessens the probability of going through a painful divorce later on.

Living together before marriage is still not socially acceptable, creating a stigma that the couple must live with. Trying to create stability with another person is hard enough without the problems posed by having to deal with societal disapproval. The moral value of the family as the building block of society would be compromised. Living together implies informality and instability because there is no legal basis for it. Either of the cohabitants could decide to leave when the mood hits, creating feelings of insecurity in the couple. The greatest tragedy would be the presence of a child who would not be able to feel the security of family that marriage brings to his mother and father.

INTERVIEW 1 (Love)

	I really like (perhaps love)...	I am not very fond of...	My partner really likes...	My partner isn't very fond of...
a country				
a town				
a type of music, a singer				
a type of film				
something to eat				
something to drink				
a person of the opposite sex				
a person of the same sex				
a child				
an animal				

INTERVIEW 2 (Childhood)

	ME	MY PARTNER
What was your position in the family (e.g. only child, oldest, youngest, second, etc.)?		
How did you feel about school?		
Who was your favorite relative when you were a child?		
Which toy did you like most?		
Who did you play with?		
What did you hate eating?		
What is your most vivid memory of the house where you grew up?		
What smells or sounds can you recall from your childhood?		
What is your earliest memory of your life?		
Describe your favorite photo from your childhood.		