교육학석사학위논문

The Use of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Korean High School Classrooms

한국 고등학교 영어 수업에서 학습자들의 구두 발화를 위한 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통의 활용

2013년 2월

서울대학교 대학원

외국어교육과 영어전공

안 수 진

The Use of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Korean High School Classrooms

by

Soojin Ahn

A Thesis Submitted to

the Department of Foreign Language Education

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts

in English Language Education

At the

Graduate School of Seoul National University

February 2013

The Use of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Korean High School Classrooms

한국 고등학교 영어 수업에서 학습자들의 구두 발화를 위한 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통의 활용

지도교수   김 진 완

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함
2012년 12월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
안 수 진

안수진의 석사학위논문을 인준함
2013년 1월

위 원 장 _____

부위원장 _____

위   원 _____

The Use of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Korean High School Classrooms

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

_____

ORYANG KWON, COMMITTEE CHAIR

_____

BYUNGMIN LEE

_____

JIN-WAN KIM

ABSTRACT

The present study explores the use of computer-mediated communication (CMC) for Korean high school students' oral production in English classrooms. More specifically, the study examines the features of oral production from synchronous CMC instruction in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects. Online chats and interviews with participants in this study are analyzed qualitatively in order to determine which features are helpful for L2 Korean learners of English and ultimately applicable to future L2 education.

For the purpose of this study, sixteen female high school students participated in the instruction sessions. The students engaged in conversations in pairs with two main activities for each instruction session. In the classroom, students used the computers equipped with instant chatware to communicate with each other. In order to find the major features of their CMC production in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects, the recordings of online chatting and interviews were analyzed according to the qualitative analytic principles.

Regarding the students' synchronous CMC production in terms of fluency, it was found that the students had fluent conversation flows

despite some spelling and grammatical errors as well as limited vocabularies in their online conversations. In addition, the students took advantage of short but more frequent turns, which is a unique feature of online chatting.

Second, regarding the students' synchronous CMC production in terms of accuracy, the students were found to have more opportunities to reflect on their comments in online chats. A sense of control over the conversation also enabled the students to correct their errors at their own pace during online chats.

Finally, regarding the students' synchronous CMC production in terms of affective aspects, students developed a willingness to communicate in English through their online written conversations in English, which represents a potential application of synchronous CMC in language education. Furthermore, it was found that a sense of close social relationships with online conversation partners is one of the key factors in the successful use of synchronous CMC in the language classrooms.

The findings of this study suggest that synchronous CMC can be used as a supportive tool for oral production of L2 learners. Synchronous CMC provides learners with opportunities to practice their productive language skills by taking advantage of unique features in terms of fluency,

accuracy, and affective aspects. As various network-based media are now available in everyday life, both synchronous and asynchronous CMC can be effective tools for L2 learning within and outside the classroom setting.

Key Words: synchronous computer-mediated communication (SCMC), English learners, oral production, fluency, accuracy, affective aspects
Student Number: 2009-21461

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Since English language education began in Korea in the early 1900s, English learners have called for more opportunities to practice their productive language skills in classrooms. Communicative language teaching (CLT) approaches have shed light on the importance of oral production through learners' interactions. Recently, computer-mediated communication (CMC) has received attention as an alternative tool for productive language learning with the technological advances stemming from computer networking. The current study explores the features of synchronous CMC that affect Korean high school students' oral production in English. In this chapter, the problem and purpose of the study are stated in section 1.1. The research questions are presented in section 1.2, and the organization of the thesis is outlined in section 1.3.

1.1 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

In the history of English language education in Korea, speaking and writing (i.e., productive language skills) have received scant attention. Yet this does not mean that speaking and writing were never considered important; in fact, initially they were considered important, but not later on. When Koreans first learned English in the educational institutions in the late 19th, and early 20th centuries, English was taught by native English teachers using the direct method and the audiolingual method. In such an English-speaking environment, students were naturally engaged in English learning for communication. Students—particularly those in boarding schools, such as Ewha Girls' School and Chungshin Girls' School, founded by missionary educators—used English to communicate with their teachers and with each other in their dormitories (Kim, 2006).

However, from the 1910s to the 1940s, during the Japanese colonial period, English education in Korean schools underwent a number of changes. For example, the lesson time allotted for learning English was reduced, and Japanese teachers taught English lessons to Korean students in

Japanese. The direct method that had previously been used was replaced by the grammar translation method (GTM), which was based on the assumption that the primary purpose for learning foreign languages was to be able to translate well. In addition, as English knowledge was included as a component of the university entrance exams starting in this period, English education focused on reading comprehension and grammar skills essential to the exam questions (Kwon & Kim, 2010). For many years, such test-oriented teaching methods were part of the English education tradition in Korea and were incorporated with the unique education fever of Korean parents and students.

In the early 1990s, in response to a growing interest in teaching English as a means to communicate and a growing awareness among Korean English teachers that not enough emphasis was being placed on the practical aspects of English (M. Park, 1999), the 6th National Curriculum adopted communicative language teaching (CLT) approaches, focusing on communicative competence and productive skills. Moreover, various types of task-based learning, in which students engage in authentic tasks and projects, were introduced into the classrooms at all levels in order to renovate the traditional English classroom environment.

However, many previous studies have indicated that Korean

students in the 2000s still speak far less English than teachers in English classrooms. Previous studies on interaction patterns in English classrooms in Korea have reported that many classes still show the traditional I-R-F interaction pattern: teacher's initiation, students' response, and teacher's feedback (S. H. Kim, 2007; Lee, 2003; J. Park, 1999). In fact, the biggest problem highlighted in these studies is that students feel uncomfortable speaking English in class. As they generally have little opportunity to practice English outside the classroom, they often fail to recognize the need for English communication inside the classroom.

In this respect, various tools and techniques need to be introduced to English classes to provide students with more opportunities to communicate in English in their classrooms. Moreover, students today live in the digital age, surrounded by personal computers, "smart" cellular phones, and a variety of digital devices that enable them to access the Internet. Such devices play an important role not only in quickly gathering information and data, but also in giving students access to other people through e-mail, chats, online forums, and social networks. Therefore, research on second language learning has suggested that computer-mediated communication (CMC) provides an ideal medium from which language learners can benefit through interaction as the written nature of the discussion gives them the opportunity

to attend to and reflect on the form and content of the communication (Warschauer & Kern, 2000).

In particular, previous studies on L2 teaching and learning have shown that CMC benefits students by (1) fostering students' participation and interaction (Berge & Collins, 1995; Blake, 2000; Chun, 1994; Holden & Wedman, 1993; Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995; Kitade, 2000); (2) helping students reduce anxiety and enhance motivation (Beauvois, 1992, 1997; Harasim, 1990; Jung, 2000; Warschauer, 1995a, 1995b); (3) increasing the authenticity of the communication in which the target language is used (Cohen & Miyake, 1986; Paramskas, 1993); (4) facilitating collaborative learning (Kroonenberg, 1994, 1995); (5) helping students develop their writing skills (Berge & Collins, 1995; Goodwin, Hamrick & Stewart, 1993; Oakes, 1996); and (6) gradually helping students develop their oral skills (Chun, 1998; Daiute, 1985; Lamy & Goodfellow, 1999; Motteram, 2000). Accordingly, CMC can be considered an alternative approach to traditional face-to-face communication (FFC) classrooms for improving Korean students' communication in English.

Although CMC has been recognized as one of the most facilitative means of learning and teaching foreign languages today, few educators have attempted to apply this method to the actual Korean English classroom (Han,

2006; Na & Park, 2003). Leem (1998) reported that, although they are interested in applying CMC to English classrooms, many Korean teachers have placed more emphasis on technical concerns (e.g., the formats of online forums and discussion forums) than on curricula. Therefore, several questions still remain far from fully answered: How can we use CMC to improve learners' English proficiency? How can we use CMC in light of the learners' affective aspects when they communicate in English? How can we organize CMC as a part of activities both within and outside the classroom setting?

Accordingly, the purpose of the present study is to gauge the applicability of synchronous CMC to Korean English classes and to explore the significant features of synchronous CMC for English learners' oral production in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects. Importantly, to reduce the research gap in qualitative analysis, which was rarely acknowledged as having the same importance as quantitative analysis in analyzing learners' experiential knowledge and linguistic data, the present study will analyze the recordings of online chats and students' interviews in a qualitative way. Specifically, the recordings of online conversations and responses after chatting will show how students use the unique features of synchronous CMC in the process of their language production rather than

the production itself.

1.2 Research Questions

     The present study aims to investigate how CMC applies to Korean English classes and to explore important features of CMC that affect not only learners' oral production in terms of language fluency and accuracy, but also affective aspects such as anxiety and motivation. The research questions that will be addressed are as follows:

1. What are the features of synchronous CMC for Korean English learners' oral production in terms of fluency?
2. What are the features of synchronous CMC for Korean English learners' oral production in terms of accuracy?
3. What are the features of synchronous CMC for Korean English learners' oral production in terms of affective aspects?

1.3 Organization of the Thesis

This thesis is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 states the problem and purpose of the present study and outlines the research questions. Chapter 2 reviews the previous studies that are relevant to the present study. Chapter 3 illustrates the methodology employed in this study, and Chapter 4 reports and discusses the results found in the data. Finally, Chapter 5 summarizes the major findings of the study and concludes by offering some pedagogical implications and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Computers have been growing as powerful tools for language learning since firstly introduced into English classrooms in the 1980s. Some researchers discovered that speech-like written communication through computer networks helps second language learners improve their oral proficiency. This chapter reviews the literature and previous studies relevant to the present study. Section 2.1 discusses the theoretical background of CMC as well as its use in language learning and teaching and its transferability to oral communication. Section 2.2 provides an overview of previous studies on features of synchronous CMC in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects as well as the application of synchronous CMC in Korean English classrooms.

2.1 Theoretical Background

In the early stage of computers in language learning, computers served as a tutor or tool kit. Ultimately, the computers became a

communication tool connecting and enabling people to interact with each other through the networking system. Due to this paradigmatic shift, CMC is now considered a powerful facilitator for interaction among language learners. In this section, the theoretical background of CMC is discussed in two subsections. Section 2.1.1 presents a definition and history of CMC as well as a review of its use in language learning and teaching; Section 2.1.2 discusses the transferability of CMC to oral communication.

2.1.1 CMC in Language Learning and Teaching

Herring (1996) defined CMC as "communication that takes place between human beings via the instrumentality of computers" (p. 1). In general, the type of CMC can be categorized based on the period of time between responses in an interaction, as synchronous CMC or asynchronous CMC (Bates, 1995). Synchronous CMC (e.g., online chatting) refers to a real-time interaction in which messages are sent instantly among people who are online at the same time, whereas asynchronous CMC (e.g., e-mail) refers to an interaction that does not require or allow for instant responses from people.

In the early stages of computer use in language learning and teaching, computers served as a tutor—a substitute for human beings. The earliest computer programs for language learning were designed to provide basic drill practice to learners (Warschauer & Kern, 2000). As the software programs developed and became more specialized, computers began to provide learners with resources enabling them to construct new knowledge based on their existing knowledge. Since the 1980s, interaction and the socio-cognitive perspective have been increasingly emphasized in language learning and teaching, and the computer has been used as a tool of interaction among language learners. Most importantly, the development of the Internet-networking system in the 1990s enabled people to communicate with each other beyond the limitations of time and space. With the introduction of computer networking, CMC has become a more powerful tool for language learners seeking to communicate in the target language.

Regardless of the type of CMC (i.e., synchronous or asynchronous), one of the important characteristics of CMC is its textual formatting. The textual nature of CMC removes pronunciation, accent, and intonation from conversation (Kim, 2001). In addition, as discussed by Berge (1997), Harasim (1990), and Sherry (2000), the online textual format deprives conversation of the facial expressions, voice, and body language that

account for large parts of comprehension. For these reasons, the textual nature of CMC is simultaneously beneficial and problematic for language learners.

On one hand, learners can minimize concerns about having to use the correct pronunciation or accent of the target language. On the other hand, without non-verbal cues, they have to depend exclusively on the text in order to communicate; thus, it becomes crucial to appropriately choose words and organize phrases in order to deliver the intended message. Nonetheless, some researchers have claimed that the ability to take the time to reflect on, correct, and store typed messages allows learners to produce more accurate and complex sentences when communicating via CMC than in face-to-face communication (Berge & Collins, 1995; Oakes, 1990).

2.1.2 Transferability of CMC to Oral Communication

In the early research on second language acquisition, written language skills were considered secondary to the development of oral language, which was held to be the truest reflection of interlanguage (IL) competence (Krashen, 1981, 1982; Tarone, 1982). The spontaneous and

real-time conversational oral production that focuses more on meaning than form was considered the only true reflection of language competence. Thus, written language proficiency generally took a back seat to oral proficiency in second language learning and teaching (Harklau, 2002; White, 1987). Moreover, the relationship between writing ability and oral proficiency has not received extensive research attention (Williams, 2008). Most research on cross-skill influence has pointed to connections within modalities, either between reading and writing (e.g., Carson, 1993; Grabe, 2003) or between speaking and listening (e.g., Vandergrift, 2006). Although the influence of writing on the development of L2 oral proficiency has not received much historical attention, many researchers are now beginning to recognize the relationship of the two skills (Williams, 2008).

The assumption that is gaining attention regarding the effect of writing on the development of oral proficiency is that the forms produced during the output activities are already part of the mental representation of the language—that is, at least an initial form–meaning connection has been made (VanPattern, Williams, & Rott, 2004). In other words, the act of writing would indirectly affect the learner's processing of future input. Therefore, writing, like speaking, can have an indirect role in facilitating second language acquisition (Williams, 2008).

One way to cast further light on the relationship between writing and speaking proficiency would be to examine forms of language production that fall somewhere between writing and speaking (Williams, 2008), such as CMC, which has been variously described as a conversation-like form of written language exchange (Lamy & Goodfellow, 1999), "talky" writing (Daiute, 1985), written speech (Motteram, 2000), and quasi-spoken language (Chang, 2003). This strong resemblance between spoken conversation and CMC (especially synchronous CMC) lends credence to the notion that students' CMC-enhanced written competence can be gradually transferred to their oral competence. Several researchers (e.g., Abrams, 2003; Beauvois, 1997; Chun, 1994; Hirotani, 2005; Kost, 2004; Payne & Whitney, 2002) have addressed the transferability of written competence to oral competence through the means of CMC. Some Korean studies have also reported similar findings on the transferability of CMC to oral production (Chang, 2002; Han, 2004, 2006; Hwang, 2008; Jung, 2005; Kim, 2003).

As the current study examines the applicability of CMC in Korean high school English classroom in which students need more opportunities to communicate in English, the study will use the synchronous CMC (i.e., online chats), which is the closest format of oral communication. More specifically, the transferability to learners' oral production will be

investigated with respect to fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects that have been found to be beneficial features of synchronous CMC.

2.2. Previous Studies on Features of Synchronous CMC

Many researchers have tried to find the unique features of synchronous CMC and their potential benefits with regard to language learning and teaching. This section presents a review of previous studies on features of synchronous CMC in relation to linguistic benefits as well as non-linguistic benefits. Section 2.2.1 reviews previous studies on features of synchronous CMC in terms of fluency, and section 2.2.2 reviews previous studies on features of synchronous CMC in terms of accuracy. Section 2.2.3 reviews the previous studies on features of synchronous CMC in terms of affective aspects.

2.2.1 Features of Synchronous CMC in Terms of Fluency

Some researchers, exploring the written, two-way, low stakes, and conversational nature of CMC, have demonstrated potential benefits of CMC over FFC interaction in terms of fluency. Regarding the amount of language output, Beauvois (1992) and Kelm (1992) found increased student-to-student interaction and linguistic production through a synchronous CMC software program called InterChange. Kern (1995) confirmed that synchronous CMC enhanced language production in the numbers of turns, T-units, and words. Smith (2004) also reported the benefits of synchronous CMC which resulted in increased participation among learners over FFC in terms of the quantity and complexity of the language produced in chat sessions.

Regarding the lexical diversity and syntactic complexity, learners in the CMC environment have been shown to produce more language with a richer lexicon than those in the FFC environment. In the early days of research on the use of computers in language learning, Flinn (1986) and Womble (1984) found that essays written on computers had longer sentences and greater diversity of syntactical structures than essays written on paper. Berge and Collins (1995) also demonstrated that asynchronous

CMC helped students develop their writing skills with regard to lexical diversity and promoted student–student or student–teacher interactions in distance learning. Waschauer (1996) also found lexically more complex output from ESL learners in the synchronous CMC mode than in the FFC mode.

2.2.2 Features of Synchronous CMC in Terms of Accuracy

The benefits to language production of CMC over FFC interaction have also been studied in terms of accuracy. Using CMC, students benefit from the ability to take time to reflect on and correct their messages as they are typing them. They can also understand their interlocutors' comments based on a context that is permanently stored and that might be reviewed, which is not possible in transient speech in FFC (Beauvois, 1992; Harasim, 1990; Kramsch, 1998). Warschauer and Kern (2000) maintained that the visual nature of the input in CMC increases learners' ability to focus on the formal aspects of the language. Pellettieri (2000), in a study on Spanish language learners, also noted the impact of the visual representation on the learners' ability to incorporate corrective feedback during online chats.

On the other hand, as the written sentences on the computers are

likely to be incomplete without predicates or erroneous by misspelling, some researchers have warned that learners might be exposed to the incorrect forms of the target language through CMC and might become indifferent to the appropriate usage of the target language over time (Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995). Due to the fact that synchronous CMC in particular offers a greater opportunity to understand conversation from their contexts, the learners might also be less sensitive about accuracy (Beauvois, 1992; Harasim, 1990; Kramsch, 1998).

2.2.3 Features of Synchronous CMC in Terms of Affective Aspects

In addition to the linguistic benefits, the non-linguistic benefits including affective aspects of CMC have been found to be beneficial to language learners' oral production. Many researchers have suggested that various types of CMC draw out more diffident students who prefer not to speak in class and increase learners' willingness to take risks (Williams, 2008). Lam (2000) also noted that her participants preferred to work things out in writing before using newly acquired features in spoken interaction.

Some learners might simply be unwilling to try out interlanguage forms in contexts as public and vulnerable as spoken conversations, or they might find the notion to be culturally dissonant. Such learners might prefer to try out language forms about which they do not feel confident in the safer, less public form of writing, where they can acquire feedback on their usage before incorporating it in spoken conversation (Williams, 2008).

Unlike FFC, CMC also enhances the authenticity and reality of language-learning communication. Cohen and Miyake (1986) and Paramskas (1993) argued that electronic messaging in telecommunication enables language learners to feel a greater sense of authenticity than FFC because they are communicating with an authentic audience. In contrast, Lee (1999) and Jung (2000) claimed that web-based courses cause learners to feel a reduced sense of reality because they cannot see their interlocutors' faces. Cornell and Martin (1997) reported that 30 to 50 percent of learners dropped out of a distance-learning course due to the lack of social bonding among learners and teachers, and Rowmiszowski and Mason (1996) pointed out that some learners feel awkward and lack familiarity with the people with whom they are communicating online. However, these cases occurred in the early years of Internet-based networking, whereas recent years have witnessed the growing popularity of social networking services such as

Facebook and Twitter, which are easily accessed via computers and other network-based electronic devices. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that language learners today are likely to feel more familiar and comfortable with using such devices for CMC to practice their target language skills.

As the focus of this study is the features of synchronous CMC that are beneficial to the language learners' oral production, the written online chat and recorded interview data are analyzed in a qualitative method to discover detailed features of language production through synchronous CMC in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects.

2.3 Previous Studies on Synchronous CMC in Korean English Classrooms

In general, when Korean learners of English communicate in English, they depend heavily on grammatical and linguistic forms and tend to become overly conscious of word-by-word translation. As a result, they speak excessively slowly and cautiously, and the natural flow of conversation is broken. Often, expressions of awkward or incomplete

English (i.e., "Konglish") occur (Chang, 2003). Although fluency is coming to be emphasized as much as accuracy by the objectives of the national school curriculum as well as by public opinion, most Korean English learners still feel that they need sufficient time to plan what they are going to say and check grammatical mistakes when speaking in English. In addition, the current English education in Korea continues to focus more on grammatical accuracy than on other components of oral production, such as fluency, negotiation of meaning, and communication strategies. Therefore, if synchronous CMC is used in Korean English classrooms, students will benefit from its features, which help them enhance fluency as well accuracy of their oral production.

In addition, the textual, but informal, setting of synchronous CMC can help Korean students reduce their anxiety and feel less embarrassed when communicating in English. In particular, in oral communication, although pronunciation occupies a very small part of language skills, it is the most salient feature of oral performance. Some researchers have claimed that speaking is considered to be the most psychologically demanding of the four language skills (Guiora, 1972; Guiora, Beit-Hallami, Brannon, Dull & Scovel, 1972). Therefore, it is not surprising that most Korean learners of English are very sensitive to their pronunciation and intonation when they

speak English in the classroom. Moreover, middle and high school students are considered to be the most sensitive learners to peers' reactions to their pronunciation. Low-proficiency or shy learners who feel embarrassed to speak out in traditional FFC classrooms stand to benefit greatly from synchronous CMC as a stepping stone to reduce their anxiety (Harasim, 1990; Jung, 2000; Warschauer, 1995a, 1995b).

Furthermore, the benefits of authenticity and familiarity through the synchronous CMC communication setting can improve the current Korean English classroom environments. A feeling of authentic communication is often lacking in the traditional face-to-face English classroom in Korea because the oral practices in lessons require students to suppose imaginary social situations where the English language is used as a means of communication (e.g., "Suppose you have arrived in JFK airport in New York"). However, as English learners have chances to communicate with their counterparts on the internet, where English is actually used as a means of communication, a sense of authenticity can be gained outside the FFC environment. In addition, Korean English learners will have more benefits of social bonding or familiarity with online conversation partners given the recent increased use of social network services (SNS).

In fact, some previous studies have confirmed that the use of

synchronous CMC in Korean English classrooms could be beneficial to improving students' oral production in various linguistic and non-linguistic aspects (Chang, 2002; Chang, 2003; Han, 2004; Han, 2006; Hwang, 2008; Jung, 2005; Kim, 2003). However, the participants in most previous studies have been college students, as the studies at the secondary level have many practical problems, such as a lack of computer labs or preparation of university entrance exams. Therefore, this study aims to explore the applicability of synchronous CMC to Korean high school English classrooms that are fully equipped with computer lab systems. Given the purpose of the current study, high school freshmen who are relatively free from the university entrance exam requirements are selected as the participants.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The present study uses primarily qualitative research methodology with a partial employment of quantitative methodology to explore the unique features of students' oral production through synchronous CMC. In this chapter, section 3.1 begins with details about the participants and setting of this study. Section 3.2 describes all the instruments applied, including instruction sessions, interviews, and procedures. Finally, section 3.3 illustrates the detailed data coding and analysis.

3.1 Participants and Setting

The participants in this study were sixteen female freshmen in an Internet high school in Gyeonggi Province, South Korea. The students participated in a special English speaking class every two weeks provided through the club activity (CA) period. The students were taught by an English teacher (the present researcher). The students' general English proficiency level ranged from intermediate to beginner according to their

placement tests which had been conducted when the students entered the high school. For the purpose of the current study, the participants are discussed using English pseudonyms.

3.2 Instruments and Procedures

The instruments for this study include three sessions of speaking instruction and interviews after the last instruction session. The entire procedure used during this study is also presented in the final section of this chapter.

3.2.1 Speaking Instruction

The speaking instruction consisted of a pre-activity, a main activity, and a post-activity during each instruction session. The means used for speaking instruction was synchronous CMC (i.e., online chatting). The contents of the instruction (including materials and activities) were based on the modified samples from the National English Ability Test (NEAT).

3.2.1.1 Communication Tool

Instructions for the participants were based on the textbooks, lesson plans, and activities; the only major difference between the traditional face-to-face classes and the classes in this study related to the communication tools used. In this study, all the activities were conducted through online textual chatting as a communicational tool. Specifically, NateOn Messenger, one of the most widely used and user-friendly real-time chatwares in Korea, was used. Figure 3.1 presents a screenshot of main window of the messenger as it appeared on the participants' computer screens.

Figure 3.1

Screenshot of NateOn Messenger Main Window

3.2.1.2 Materials and Activities

The activities used in the study were based on the themes and tasks of NEAT, the recently developed English speaking test in Korea. The NEAT was developed by the Korean government for high school students; NEAT Level 3 was designed particularly for high school practical English. Accordingly, the speaking activities in this study require learners to perform three of four tasks in the NEAT test in each session: (1) answer four questions, (2) tell a story based on a given sequence of four pictures, and (3) listen to a short story and relate what one should do next in the situation described. Table 3.1 presents the tasks adapted from the NEAT and used for each instruction session.

Table 3.1

Tasks Adapted from the NEAT

Session	Task	Description
1	Short Response	Answer four questions.
2	Storytelling	Tell a story based on a given sequence of four pictures.
3	Role-Playing	Listen to a short story and relate what one should do in the situation described.

The reference books used in this study were *It's Speaking* (Edu Chosun), *Speak for Speaking* (Gilbut Easytalk), *and HACKERS TOEFL SPEAKING* (Hackers Language Institute). The target users of these textbooks are Korean high chool or college students preparing to take a speaking test, such as the NEAT, TOEIC, and TOEFL. Generally, the textbooks include an introduction for each task, tips to organize the answers, useful expressions, sample questions, and answers. The researcher created her own Microsoft Office PowerPoint slides incorporating excerpts from the task introductions, organization tips, and useful expressions to study before the pre-activity.

The type of activity is defined by whether it was conducted in the beginning, middle, or end of a lesson. An activity conducted early in the lessons is called the pre-activity, an activity conducted near the end of the lesson is called the post-activity, and an activity in the middle stage of a lesson is called the main activity. In the pre-activity, the students were asked to engage in a small conversation in pairs. During the main activity, the students were taught key expressions by the teacher and were asked to practice them by engaging in short question-and-response activities, storytelling, descriptions of pictures and graphs, or role-playing activities in pairs. In the post-activity, the students were asked to talk in pairs about what

they learned in that lesson, focusing especially on the points they had found difficult to understand or to practice. In the post-activity, the students could also comment or give feedback on what their partners had said. Table 3.2 describes the pre-, main, and post-activities in each instruction session.

Table 3.2

Overall Descriptions of Activities

Type	Pre-activity	Main activity	Post-activity
Activity	Students have a small conversation in pairs.	Students learn key expressions. Students in pairs complete a short question and response, storytelling, description of pictures and graphs, or role-playing.	Students discuss what they had difficulty in understanding or practicing. Students give and receive feedback about what they said.
Time	5 mins.	30 mins.	5 mins.

3.2.2 Interviews

In this study, one set of interviews was conducted after all instruction was complete in order to obtain the students' experiential feedback. The researcher conducted an oral interview with six students who had participated in classes very diligently and had submitted all required assignments (e.g., chat logs and activity sheets) throughout the research. Qualitative analysis of these students' comments in the in-depth interviews was conducted to help the researcher understand the features of the instruction more thoroughly and suggest more reliable prospective applications of synchronous CMC in real English classrooms in the future.

3.2.3 Procedures

As shown in Table 3.3, the research was conducted over the course of six sessions. In the first session, the participants were informed about the research and were trained to perform activities using a synchronous CMC tool (i.e., online chatware). They performed the activities in each of the second through fourth sessions. In the last session, interviews with selected students were conducted.

Table 3.3

Speaking Instruction Procedure

Stage	Orientation	Instruction	Interviews
Session	1st	2nd-4th	5th
Agenda	Orientation to the research and use of synchronous CMC tool	Speaking instructions	Interview

3.3 Data Coding and Analysis

Qualitative analysis was conducted on two different kinds of data. First, linguistic output from online chats as a major source of qualitative analysis was saved in the form of a text file. Second, the interviews from selected participants in the final session were audio-taped and then transcribed by the researcher. The interviews were recorded and transcribed in the students' first language, Korean, and later translated into English by the researcher.

The two sets of qualitative data were then analyzed according to the generic process of qualitative data analysis, which is commonly used to analyze recorded transcripts of interviews with participants (Creswell, 2003).

The data analysis procedures using this method are outlined in the following paragraphs.

First, all the recordings of online chats and transcripts of the interviews were organized and prepared for analysis. Then the researcher read through all the data multiple times to obtain a general sense of the information and to ponder upon the overall meaning. While reading the data, the researcher wrote some notes in margins and started recording general thoughts about the data.

Second, the researcher began analyzing the data in greater detail with a coding process. The coding process involves segmenting sentences or paragraphs into categories and labeling those categories with terms. This coding process should be conducted several times to see if new categories and codes emerge (Creswell, 2003).

Finally, the researcher examined the codes to generate a smaller number of themes that would appear as major findings of the study. The researcher tried to find the key themes that appeared repeatedly across the participants' online conversations and interviews. The major findings were provided with major sub-themes, specific illustrations, and multiple excerpts. Later, the findings were discussed in comparison with the reviewed literature and the previous studies.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The change of students' oral production after the synchronous CMC instruction is compared to the one before the instruction in terms of fluency and accuracy. In addition, the remarkable features of synchronous CMC found in the records of online chatting and interviews are analyzed in terms of fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects. In this chapter, the results of the analysis are presented in three sections, corresponding to each of the three research questions. Sections 4.1 and 4.2 are each divided into two sub-sections, presenting the results of the analysis of online chats and interviews in terms of fluency and accuracy, respectively. Section 4.3 presents the results of analysis of online chats and interviews in terms of affective aspects in two sub-sections.

4.1 Features of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Terms of Fluency

The results of the qualitative analysis of online chats and interview data in terms of fluency of English language production are presented in this section. The results of the analysis are categorized into two features in terms of fluency: first, fluent flows with some spelling and grammatical errors and limited vocabulary and, second, short but more frequent turns.

4.1.1 Conversational Flows with Some Errors and Limited Vocabulary

One of the remarkable features of the CMC mode is that participants were able to maintain their conversation despite errors in spelling and grammar, as they could understand their interlocutors' comments based on the text that was permanently stored and that they could review (Beauvois, 1992; Harasim, 1990; Kramsch, 1998). Examples of conversational flows with spelling errors in online chats will be presented

and discussed in this sub-section.

First, students continued communicating even when they made some spelling errors due to troubles typing on the keyboard, as they were able to understand each other from the context. The participants found that they could scroll up and down through the text of the chat in order to obtain contextual clues more easily and continuously. Excerpts (1), (2), and (3) show the spelling errors at the word level.

(1)
Christina: yes
        sujin is very pool
Diana: why did you felling?
Christina: the bad children is send snake and spider to sujin
Diana: oh i think so too.. sujin is vert pool
Christina: if i am sujin i talk to teacher
Diana: yes me too
     Bye

                    (Christina and Diana, Chat log 1, Session 3)

For example, in excerpt (1), the two participants maintain the conversation even after both misused words, such as "pool" (poor), "felling" (feeling), and "vert" (very). In addition, in excerpt (2), Diana misspells the word "spieder" (spider), but Kyeonbin continues the flow of conversation without hesitation with the response "really." Diana also makes mistakes in

spacing and punctuation, such as "idon't" (I don't) and "under stand" (understand).

(2)
Christina: hello
         do you heard teacher's say?
Diana: spieder eat snake
Christina: really?
Diana: sorry, idon't under stand
                          (Christina and Diana, Chat log 2, Session 3)

Likewise, in excerpt (3), Ivy and Jenny discuss their recent concerns. Ivy misuses the word "teat" (test), but Jenny understands it as the correct word. When Jenny asks Ivy a related question "How level did you want," Ivy responds without hesitation. Jenny also makes mistake in spelling "realry" (really), but it is not a big problem and does not prevent the continuing of this conversation.

(3)
Ivy: i'm worried
     because middle teat
Jenny: How level did you want?
Ivy: i want to high grade.
Jenny: realry? I don't want go high level.
Ivy: why?
Jenny: I think competition is bad.

Ivy: ok. byebye

<div align="right">(Ivy and Jenny, Chat log 1, Session 3)</div>

Such examples demonstrate quite a difference from the results of the interviews with students after the instruction. When the interviewer asked the students about the biggest difference between face-to-face conversation and online chats, some participants said that making spelling errors was the most difficult thing they had to deal with while typing on the keyboard. Students said spelling errors were a big problem, but that did not actually seem to be the case based on the analysis of their chats. An example from one of the interviews is provided in excerpt (4).

(4)
Interviewer: What do you think is the biggest difference between the face-to-face conversation and online chatting?
Grace: First of all, it was spelling.
Interviewer: Was spelling the most difficult part for you?
Grace: In face-to-face conversation, the meaning is not changed if something is pronounced imperfectly, but if there is only one problem with spelling in a written message, the whole meaning can be changed. It was hard for me.

<div align="right">(Grace, Interview)</div>

Second, students were also found to maintain conversational flow in online chats despite their limited grammatical knowledge or vocabulary, as

they were able to understand the meaning based on the context. They could understand each other even when they made grammatical errors, as long as the mistake did not interrupt the flow of communication. Similar to the implication of spelling errors, such a reflective feature of CMC can be advantageous for the participants to continue fluent communication, but it might be disadvantageous for them to let their mistakes happen repeatedly. Excerpts (5), (6), (7), and (8) show the typical grammatical errors students made in the online conversations. The grammatical errors vary and include the misuse of objectives, articles, possessive pronouns, subject–verb agreement, and word order.

(5)
Molly: yes
       It is the problem!
       Su jin was bother by other classmate.was not?
Nancy: ummm yes
Molly: umm....okay.
Nancy: she change hers' character
Molly: yes yes
Nancy: passive→positive
Molly: also, she speak teacher.
Nancy: sure
Molly: She must bother speak teache0r by classmate.
                                    (Molly and Nancy, Chat log 1, Session 3)

In excerpt (5), the two participants make several errors such as incorrect verb and possessive forms, but they process the conversation without hesitation. Furthermore, they indicate that the conversation is going well with signal words like "yes", "okay", and "sure." In excerpt (6), Heather misuses the verb forms and the articles in the sentence "I am not pen." Grace also makes a mistake using the verb's objective and articles in the sentence "lend pen~" However, it does not seem that the conversation is problematic for the participants.

(6)
Heather: i am not pen!!
Grace: ...me too
        lend pen~
Heather: me too!nn

                                (Heather and Grace, Chat log 1, Session 1)

Similarly, in excerpt (7), Bella thinks the correct form of the second-person possessive "your" is "you are." Then, she makes mistakes repeatedly in asking her partner's birthday, classroom, and middle school. However, her partner Annie continues responding to these questions without any hesitation.

(7)

Bella: when is youre birthday? you are ??

Annie: july 19th and you?

Bella: december 31th

Annie: amazing!!

Bella: oooooooohh!!! im hungry

Annie: it's so funny!! ㅋ [laugh]

Bella: very delicious!! wow!!

Annie: yes!!!

Bella: what is classroom? mistake what is you are classroom?

Annie: class 4

Bella: a~~

Annie: and you?

Bella: 1!!!!

Annie: A ㅏ ~~ [Ah ~~]

Bella: im class leader! hehe [laugh]

Annie: kikkik [laugh]

Bella: what is you are middle school?

Annie: sannam middle school. and you?

Bella: yeong bok middle school!! lady...

Annie: a-ha kik kik [laugh]

<div align="right">(Bella and Annie, Chat log 1, Session 1)</div>

As another example, in excerpt (8), Diana and Christina are not good at using verbs in their sentences. Eunjji repeatedly asks questions without any verb, such as "where your class room?" (Which class are you in?), "where your middle shcool?" (What middle school did you go to?), and "what your favorit subjet?" (What is your favorite subject?). Christina also makes an ungrammatical sentence, "i am middle school is wonchen

middle school" (I went to Wondchen Middle school). However, they understand each other enough to give and receive the desired information.

(8)
Diana: where your class room?
Christina: my class room is 10
Diana: where your middle shcool?
Christina: hey speed up!!
Diana: where you are
         what your favorit subjet?
Christina: i am middle school is wonchen middle school you are?
         are you?
         hey speed up
Diana: l 'm pogok middle school
                          (Christina and Diana, Chat log 1, Session 1)

Although they were able to maintain conversational flow despite limited grammatical knowledge and vocabulary, students were found to use some strategies to overcome these difficulties. In the interviews, they said that they avoided sentences they were unsure about or difficult vocabulary. Although they used the strategy of avoidance, they did not find it too difficult to continue their conversations. Excerpt (9) shows that two participants who were assigned as conversation partners to each other said that they successfully overcame their difficulties with grammatical

knowledge and vocabulary during the online chat using the avoidance strategy.

(9)
Interviewer: If you were not sure if your sentences were grammatically correct or not, how did you solve the problem?
Heather: When I was writing?
Interviewer: Yes, when you were writing.
Heather: I did not use such sentences.
Interviewer: Oh, you did not use them. Did you write your sentences using other words?
Heather: Yes, I did.
Grace: I made short sentences.
Interviewer: Yeah, you made short sentences, but did you understand each other anyway?
Heather and Grace: Yes.

(Grace and Heather, Interview)

As some researchers have discussed, encountering many incorrect forms of the target language through synchronous CMC might be disadvantageous for language learners' accurate production (Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995). Nonetheless, learners can certainly benefit from the opportunity afforded by synchronous CMC to practice fluent communication in the target language without being concerns about accuracy that are likely to hinder them in face-to-face communication.

4.1.2 Short but More Frequent Turns

Another feature of synchronous CMC is that it allows conversational partners to take turns more frequently. When chatting online, it is possible for participants to break down the elements of sentences to take more turns. Students can take turns with even one or two words, which is not easily done in the FFC mode. This more frequent turn-taking might seem strange to students at first. Excerpts (10), (11), (12), and (13) include the examples of short turns frequently used by the participating students. Specifically, excerpts (10) and (11) show typical examples of one-word turns to make one complete sentence, and excerpt (12) shows an example of turns which consist of two-word or three-word phrases to make one complete sentence.

(10)
Laura: O my God!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1
       jesus ㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠ [sad sad sad]
       ah
       big
       problem
       is
       i'm
Karen: dd

Laura: agly
        ugly?
        oooo
        this
        kkkkk
Karen: her!!!
Laura: ha...
Karen: your pretty girl
Laura: o my god
        um...
        you...
Karen: cute
Laura: don't pretty
        don't cute
        shut up
Karen: your dog
Laura: I'm
        ugly
        It's
        my
        problem
        opk?
Karen: yes your ugly!!

(Laura and Karen, Chat log 3, Session 3)

For example, in excerpt (10), Laura appears to be very familiar with using short but more frequent turns. She uses seven one-word turns instead of one long turn to make one sentence ("big problem is I'm, agly ugly?"). She actually makes one turn consisting of one word and uses more than one turn to make almost every sentence of her. Similarly, in excerpt (11),

Heather also seems very familiar with making short but more frequent turns. She uses five short turns instead of one long turn to make one sentence ("no I eat only 고구마 [sweet potato] cake"). In contrast, her partner Grace forms complete sentences in single turns "do you like cake?" "ahah," "me too," and "I like cake." Again, Heather tends to use more than one turn in her responses to Grace ("oh," "ah," "sleep," and "sleeping.")

(11)
Grace: do you like cake?
Heather: summer
      no
      i
      eat
      only
      고구마 [sweet potato] cake
Grace: ahah
      me too
Heather: ohl
Grace: i like cake
Heather: oh
      ah
      sleep
      sleeping
                  (Grace and Heather, Chat log 1, Session 3)

In a similar but a little different way, in excerpt (12), Ivy creates a sentence over a total of four turns. These short turns consist of two- or three-

word phrases. In the first turn, she mentions only the subject and the main verb ("수진 [Sujin] bully"), but she adds the linking verb ("was") and prepositional phrase ("at scjool") in a step-by-step manner. Finally, she completes one sentence ("sujin was bulled at school") with all sources she mentioned in the formal turns.

(12)
Ivy: 수진 [Sujin] bully
　　　sujin was bully
　　　at scjool
　　　sujin was bulled at school.
Jenny: He bullies 수진 [Sujin] into telling to her teacher
　　　　I think 수진 [Sujin] must tell her problem to her teacher.
<div align="right">(Ivy and Jenny, Chat log 3, Session 3)</div>

In line with Kern (1995) and Smith (2004), the participants in this study also showed increased language production in the number of turns in chat sessions. Although such an increase in the written form of CMC was not assessed in a quantitative way, some previous studies have suggested that the proficiency can be gradually transferred to oral production in the future (Abrams, 2003; Beauvois, 1997; Chun, 1994; Hirotani, 2005; Kost, 2004; Payne & Whitney, 2002).

4.2 Features of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Terms of Accuracy

This section presents the results of the qualitative analysis of online chats and interview data in terms of the accuracy of English language production. The results of the analysis are categorized into two features in terms of accuracy: first, the opportunity to reflect on and correct errors, and second, a sense of control over the conversation.

4.2.1 Opportunity to Reflect on and Correct Errors

Given the unique features of "talky" writing (Daiute, 1985) or written speech (Motteram, 2000), synchronous CMC provides great opportunities for language learners to reflect on the form and content of the communication (Warschauer & Kern, 2000). Through synchronous CMC, learners can reflect on their written language on the screen whenever they wish, whereas in the FFC mode they can only reflect on their spoken communication immediately after speaking. Such chances to reflect on their

communication in synchronous CMC give students the opportunity to correct their expressions by reviewing their language on the screen. These corrections can be categorized into two subtypes based on who initiates the correction. Correction initiated by a speaker can be called self-correction, whereas correction initiated by a correspondent can be called other-correction. Excerpts (13), (14), and (15) are the examples of self-correction in the online chat; excerpts (16), (17), and (18) are the examples of other-correction in the online chat. Excerpts (19) and (20) are the participating students' opinions about the chances to reflect on and correct linguistic forms during the chatting.

As an example of self-correction, in excerpt (13), Heather and Grace discuss their hobbies. Both participants initially use the word "habby" to mean "hobby." Over several turns, Heather, who first uses the word "habby," realizes that they are using the word incorrectly ("hobby // i don't know") and tries to correct the word in the middle of the conversation ("habby→hobby"). Grace agrees with the Heather's opinion with the expression "Oaha." After they reach an agreement on the use of "hobby" in the correct form, Grace tries to make a sentence using the correct form ("what your's hobby?"). In the last part of this excerpt, Heather shows her understanding of Grace's corrected form and also uses the correct word

"hobby" in her sentence.

(13)
Heather: my name is min jung!!!
        what your's habby?
Grace: my habby is computer
Heather: oh
        me too
Grace: you know 수원토막살인 [a case of torso murder in Suwon]?
Heather: yes!ㅜㅜ [sad]
        i'm sad
Grace: me too.nn [ㅜㅜ sad]
Heather: hobby
        i don't know
Grace: what?
Heather: habby→hobby
Grace: oaha!!
        how old are you?
Heather: i'm 17
Grace: oh!
        me too
Heather: wow!!!!
Grace: !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Heather: hi!
Grace: we are friend!!!!!
Heather: i am not pen!!
Grace: ...me too
        lend pen~
Heather: me too!nn [ㅜㅜ sad]
Grace: what your`s hobby?
Heather: my hobby is watching TV
                    (Grace and Heather, Chat log 1, Session 1)

As another example of self-correction, in the first part of excerpt (14), Bella and Annie ask each other about their classes in the introductory conversation in Session 1. Bella initially asks "what is classroom?" but she soon realized that she has missed something and indicates this by saying "mistake." Next, she creates an edited sentence "what is you are (your) classroom?" Later in the conversation, Bella identifies the middle school she attended. She initially says "yeong bok middle school!! lady..." referring to the fact that the school is a girls' school. In the following turn, Bella changes the word "lady" into "girls," possibly because she thinks "girls" is more suitable than "lady." Annie agrees with Bella's expression by responding "our school is girl's school too!!"

(14)
Bella: what is classroom? mistake what is you are classroom?
Annie: class 4
Bella: a~~
Annie: and you?
Bella: 1!!!!
Annie: A ㅏ ~~ [Ah ~~]
Bella: im class leader! 🧑‍💻hehe
Annie: 😲kikkik
Bella: what is you are middle school?
Annie: sannam middle school. and you?
Bella: yeong bok middle school!! lady... 😣
Annie: a-ha kik kik

Bella: girls ....
Annie: our school is girl's school too!!

<div style="text-align: right;">(Bella and Annie, Chat log 2, Session 1)</div>

Moreover, students were found to ask themselves or each other whether their language use was grammatically correct through explicit expressions such as "Is it correct?" For example, in excerpt (15), Nancy and Molly talk about the weather. Nancy is not sure about the grammaticality of her sentence "how's the weather," so she adds "이거 맞나 [Is it correct?]" in her native language. Her partner Molly responds "mol la [I don't know]," typing her answer in her native language but using the English alphabet. Molly also uses questions marks ("???????????????" and "tomorow(?) too") to express her uncertainty about the grammaticality of her sentence in later turns. When Molly finds the correct form, she makes a correction by saying "also 구나 [It should be 'also']" in her next turn.

(15)
Nancy : how's the weather 이거 맞나 [Is it correct?]
Molly: mol la
Nancy : kkkkk
Molly: today weather rain... ???????????????
Nancy : rain very 콸콸콸 [glub-glub-glub]
Molly: tomorow(?) too
Nancy : ??

Molly: also구나 [It should be 'also']

Meanwhile, correction initiated by a correspondent, which is called other-correction, is also found in the linguistic output of the CMC group. Other-correction can be subdivided into two categories, depending on whether or not the correction is ultimately accepted by the counterparts being corrected. Examples of these two categories will be discussed in order.

Excerpt (16) is an example of other-correction that is accepted by the counterpart being corrected. Christina and Diana talk about their favorite singers. Diana initiates the conversation by asking "what you are favorit singer?" Christina finds the mistake in her question immediately and interrupts with "hey." Diana proceeds to repeat the question with a small word change from "singer" to "music," possibly thinking that Christina does not understand her previous phrasing. Christina then offers corrective feedback on her expression as "what you are is not!" When Diana does not understand this, Christina repeats the corrective expression and checks her understanding in the sentence, "what are you is right ok?" Although Christina's corrective form is not grammatically perfect (because she misuses the aspect of the linking verb and the possessive form of the second-person pronoun), Diana expresses her thanks ("ok!!thank you") to

Christina for the correction. In this example, we can conclude that the participant in the synchronous CMC mode is willing to provide corrective feedback regarding her partner's ungrammatical sentences when she notices them, and the counterpart also has a positive attitude toward such feedback.

(16)
Diana: what you are favorit singer?
Christina: hey
Diana: what you are favorit music?
Christina: what you are is not!
Diana: umm...what is it?
Christina: what are you is right ok?
Diana: ok!!thank you

(Christina and Diana, Chat log 2, Session 1)

Excerpt (17) is a different example of other-correction that is not accepted by the counterpart being corrected. In this excerpt, Jenny and Ivy discuss their free time. In the first phase, both Jenny and Ivy use the same expression; "what are you doing when your rest time?" After several exchanges of turns, Jenny tries to correct the expression as "whajt (what) do you do when your free time." Of course, this expression is not perfectly grammatical, but she tries to express a more habitual action by omitting the auxiliary verb. However, Ivy does not agree with this correction. When Jenny asks whether Ivy understands, Ivy responds "you are wrong." More

interestingly, Jenny responds "I don't cajre (care)" to Ivy's response. Hence, from this example, we can infer that the participants do not always reach a common ground on some corrective feedback initiated by their partners.

(17)
Jenny: WHat are you doing when your rest time?
Ivy: I WATCHING DRAMA
      where are you from?
Jenny: I'm from Korea
Ivy: what's your namew?
Jenny: My name is 김민지 [Jenny Kim]
Ivy: what's your hobby?
Jenny: My hobby is listening musics.
Ivy: WHat are you doing when your rest time?
Jenny: I'm listen to music
        (Ellipsis)
Jenny: Waht are you doing when your rest time->
       whajt do you do when your free time?
       ok?
Ivy: i watching tv
Jenny: Don't you under stand?_
Ivy: you are wrong>>
Jenny: I don"t cajre
       care
Ivy: wrong

                        (Ivy and Jenny, Chat log 1, Session 1)

        During the interviews, the participants mentioned one advantage of online chat is that it enables them to speak more correctly. Although

evidence is not displayed in the final linguistic output, the online chat enabled students to delete and change their language more freely while typing because they were able to check their language explicitly and immediately on the screen. Excerpts (18) and (19) are examples of this point discussed in the interviews with the participating students.

(18)
Interviewer: Between the FFC mode and CMC mode, which do you think helped you to speak more correctly?
Annie: In the chatting mode, I was able to delete and change the sentences if I could find the errors on the screen.

(Annie, Interview)

(19)
Grace: By using my grammatical knowledge or vocabulary in chatting, I myself could check 'Is it grammatically correct?'

(Grace, Interview)

We can infer from these examples that the students were actively engaged in the exchange of correction and feedback on their language use in the online chat sessions regardless of the types of correction. This is a very unique feature of CMC that is hardly possible in FFC (Beauvois, 1992; Harasim, 1990; Kramsch, 1998). Although the results of the oral production of the CMC group did not show much improvement in terms of accuracy,

they are meaningful in that such corrective activities were often found in the chat sessions. It is likely that the students' awareness of their use of forms as well as contents will gradually help them produce more accurate sentences in the future.

4.2.2 Sense of Control over Conversation

Another characteristic of the synchronous CMC mode is that it allows students to control the speed at which they speak more freely than they can during normal face-to-face conversation. This characteristic is closely related to the reflective nature of CMC that allows students to reflect on the form and content of their communication whenever they want, whereas they can only reflect on their language use immediately after speaking in FFC mode (Warschauer & Kern, 2000).

Moreover, the online chat system can also provide students with the function of control over the conversation. For example, many instant chatwares, including the one used in this study, indicate whether the participants are involved in the conversation in real time by showing a phrase such as "User's partner is now typing" when a participant is typing a comment on the screen (see Figure 4.1). This might give the participants a

sense of control over the conversation during the chat sessions because it enables them to anticipate their partner's turns as well as their own.

Figure 4.1
Screenshot of NateOn Messenger Chat Window

In the interviews, some participants said that they felt more comfortable with CMC as it allowed them to control their own speaking speed. Excerpts (20) and (21) provide examples of the participants' opinions regarding their sense of control over conversation in online chats. Elizabeth

explained that it would be more difficult to maintain the conversation in face-to-face mode than in synchronous CMC mode, because FFC would require her to focus on the speed of conversation. In addition, Annie expressed her feeling that it was acceptable to wait for her partner to type during online chats.

(20)
Elizabeth: If I had to have a conversation in face-to-face mode, it would be more difficult for me to do it because the conversation should be kept going regardless of my speed, whereas I can take time to think and speak while chatting online.

(Elizabeth, Interview)

(21)
Interviewer: Did you mind having to wait for your partner taking time to type online?
Annie: I felt it did not take too much time, so it was okay.

(Annie, Interview)

On the other hand, it is interesting to note that students used signal expressions when they wanted to control the speed of conversation during online chats. Examples of signal expressions include "wait," you are slow," "speed up," and "where?" Specifically, "wait" is a kind of self-control used by the speaker to slow down her own production. In contrast, "you are slow," "speed up," and "where?" are a kind of other-control used by the listeners to

encourage the speaker's production. Excerpts (22) and (23) show examples of self-control, and excerpts (24) and (25) show examples of other-control found in the records of participants' online chat.

Excerpts (22) and (23) show the use of "wait" by the speakers to control the speed of the conversation. In excerpt (22), Elizabeth and Florence talk about their names, favorite subjects, and hobbies in their introductory conversation. When Florence wants to take some time to think about making sentences, she uses the expression "wait" Elizabeth then signals that she will wait for her, saying "yeah" or using the "smiley" emoticon "^p^" Similar signals were found in excerpt (23), when Laura and Karen discuss their recent worries. When Karen feels burdened in answering Laura's question, she signals that she needs some time to think about by saying "im..um..wait!"

(22)
Elizabeth: HI
Florence: Hello
Elizabeth: WHAT YOUR NAME
Florence: my name is Kim So Ryeon
Elizabeth: THAT'S A PRETTY
              that's a pretty
Florence: Ha Ha thank you!
Elizabeth: umm..
Florence: wait!

Elizabeth: yeah

hey

what your favorit subject

Florence: uh.....

Elizabeth: :)

:l

Florence: nothing

Elizabeth: what?

are you kidding? ww

;)

hey

Florence: why

(Ellipsis)

Elizabeth: thank you

you have any questions to me?

Florence: wait..

Elizabeth: ^p^ [smiley]

Florence: what's your hobby?

Elizabeth: umm

my hobby is read the books And you?

(Elizabeth and Florence, Chat log 1, Session 1)

(23)

Laura: Wha's the problem

t

Karen: what your matter??

Laura: shut up

Karen: im..um..wait!

tommrow test..

(Laura and Karen, Chat log 1, Session 3)

Sometimes, the participants showed impatience in waiting for their

conversation partners' responses, so they tried to control the conversation by commenting explicitly about their partners' speed of talking. When the listeners want to speed up the conversation, they used explicit expressions such as "you are slow" and "speed up." For example, in excerpts (24) and (25), Bella evaluates her partner Annie's speed and encourages Annie to speak faster by saying "you very slow [you are very slow]" while Christina evaluates her partner Diana's speed repeatedly and forces Diana to speak fast by saying "hey speed up." In fact, Christina seems to focus more on the speed than the topic of the conversation, because she mentions the speed ("it's so slowly") but fails to answer Diana's question about her favorite subject.

(24)
Bella: hello
Annie: hi
Bella: my name is Bella ha nice meet you to
Annie: my name is Annie park
Bella: you very slow
Annie: nice to meet you too
Bella: yes!

(Bella and Annie, Chat log 4, Session 1)

(25)
Diana: where your middle shcool?
Christina: hey speed up!!

Diana: where you are
        what your favorit subjet?
Christina: i am middle school is wonchen middle school you are?
        are you?
        hey speed up
Diana: l 'm pogok middle school
Christina: it's so slowly

                            (Christina and Diana, Chat log 3, Session 1)

Another signal expression used to force the conversation partner to speak is "where? [where are you?]." The participants were communicating in cyberspace, so they used the expression "where are you" to initiate the talks with their partners. In excerpt (26), Olivia uses "where??" when Pamela does not answer her question. Soon after Olivia's signal, Pamela answers the question.

(26)
Pamela : ㅗ됴 햐긴 [hey girls]
        Hey!!!!!!
        How aboput you?
        about
Olivia: soso and you
        ?
        where??
Pamela : I'm soso,to.o
        too.

                            (Olivia and Pamela, Chat log 1, Session 3)

Based on these examples, we can infer that participants in the synchronous CMC mode needed to use explicit written expressions to signal their turns to each other as they were unable to use the nonverbal cues they would have used in the face-to-face conversation mode. These signal words represent a new set of turn-taking skills in synchronous online communication, as Salaberry (1997) claimed for its necessity. Accordingly, by learning how to use such signal words and phrases, initiated by either speaker or listener, the participants can ultimately develop a sense of control over the real-time online conversation.

4.3 Features of Synchronous CMC for English Learners' Oral Production in Terms of Affective Aspects

This section presents the results of the qualitative analysis of linguistic output from the CMC group and interview data in terms of various affective aspects of English language production. The features of the

linguistic output from the online chat are categorized into two features in terms of affective aspects: the willingness to communicate in English and a sense of closeness with conversation partners.

4.3.1 Willingness to Communicate in English

Williams (2008) summarized previous researchers' findings that CMC can help diffident students who prefer not to speak in English classes to increase their willingness to take risks. In this study, the participants demonstrated a willingness to communicate in English regardless of whether they were confident in speaking English. This sub-section presents the examples of the participants' awareness of speaking in English in online chats in excerpts (27), (28), (29), and (30), as well as examples of their strategies to avoid speaking in English in the chat in excerpts (31), (32), and (33).

The participants seemed to be more aware of their communication in English while chatting online. In fact, although communication in English *per se* was not a topic of conversation suggested by the instructor in any session, they were found on many occasions to talk to each other about their English-speaking abilities. For instance, excerpt (27) demonstrates Grace

and Heather expressing their wishes to speak better English.

(27)
Grace: do you speaking english very well?
Heather: no┬┬ [sad]
          i want to speak english very well
          you?
Grace: Soso..

                              (Grace and Heather, Chat log 2, Session 1)

More interestingly, in excerpts (28) and (29), the participants expressed encouragement to speak in English as well as their concerns about English communication. In excerpt (28), Florence does not have confidence in her English-speaking ability, but her partner Elizabeth gives her some cheerful advice and positive feedback. Similarly, in excerpt (29), Christina expresses her anxiety about speaking in English. Christina's partner Diana agrees with her opinion but advises her to cheer up, and Christina responds with appreciation, saying "thank you." Therefore, the conversation is finalized in the positive mode. From these talks, Florence and Christina seem to gain a little more confidence to communicate in English.

(28)

Elizabeth: can you speak english

Florence: No I can't

Elizabeth: why

       i think you can

Florence: I don't like English

     힘들어 [It's hard]

Elizabeth: you may hate english but you can it, alright?

Florence: no........

     영어는 내 체질 아니얔ㅋㅋ [I don't like to speak in English (Laugh)]

Elizabeth: you said "I don't like English"

     but you can type english

     than you know english

     right?

Florence: ah..........

Elizabeth: ah

     your english is not bad

Florence: ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha ha

Elizabeth: do your best

Florence: 너 영어 잘한다 [You speak English very well.]

Elizabeth: no

     I jcan standard english

     sorry i have miss spelling

     i can standard english

     you know?

     what the..

            (Elizabeth and Florence, Chat log 2, Session 1)

(29)

Christina: ok!speak in english is very hard...

Diana: yes.your are right..very very hard

Christina: i'm so sad...

Diana: cheer up!!
Christina: thank you..!!
Diana: you are welcome!!

(Christina and Diana, Chat log 4, Session 1)

In addition, in excerpt (30), one of the interviewed participants indicates that she becomes very motivated when her partner understands what she is saying even though it seems to be grammatically problematic. She also mentions that starting the online chat in English is a simple way to motivate her partner to speak in English.

(30)
Interviewer: Was the online chatting exciting?
Elizabeth: Yes, it was. More than that, speaking English was very interesting. Even though it seemed that my English did not make sense, my partner could understand the meanings.
By the way, when I started the chat with "hey you" just for fun, my partner also responded to that in English.

(Elizabeth, Interview)

On the other hand, when students felt burdened to speak in English during an online chat, they were found to use a kind of avoidance strategy; They used the English alphabet to indicate sounds phonetically similar to their first language (Korean) words. Excerpts (31), (32), and (33) provide examples of students' use of a combination of L2 (English) sounds with L1

(Korean) meaning.

Excerpt (31) provides an example of the English-typed Korean language. Here, "*o gle girl a*" has nothing to do with the English word "girl", but rather means "I feel nervous" in the Korean language. Similarly, the phrase "*him dl a*" is unrelated to the English word "him"; instead, it means "it is hard" in Korean. Finally, "*I girl ro han gle chi nya*" means "Are you typing Korean on the English keyboard?" Once Ivy uses English again by saying "stop" in the next turn, the conversation returns to English mode.

(31)
Ivy: o gle girl a
    him dl a
Jenny: i girl ro han gle chi nya
Ivy: stop
Jenny: byr
     bye
 Ivy:
 Jenny: bye
     bye

(Ivy and Jenny, Chat log 4, Session 3)

A similar example is shown in excerpt (32). Nancy spells out the Korean words in English when she says "*a o gle to gle* 오글토글 *myut ban e ya?*" ("I feel nervous, I feel nervous, what class are you in?") To this question, her partner Molly responds in English by saying "my class 2."

Due to this response in English, Nancy returns to English mode and says "I'm 6 kkk." The following turns are also written in English.

    (32)
    Molly: Hello!!!!!!!!!!!1
    Nancy: 뭐하지 [What we should do?]
    Molly: zzzzzzzzzzz What your name..?
    Nancy: hyun jeong hwang!
    Molly: Me too!!!!!!!!
    Nancy: a o gle to gle 오글토글 myut ban e ya? [I feel nervous, I feel
          nervous, what class are you in?]
    Molly: my class 2
    Nancy: i'm 6 kkk
    Molly: what numble ?
    Nancy: 10635 umm.. hungry very very
    Molly: Me too. always...
    Nancy: me too kkk
                         (Molly and Nancy, Chat log, Session 3)

    In another example, shown in excerpt (33), Olivia uses Korean and English at the same time. The sound of the translated meaning of "king (wang)" is used to complete a Korean word that sounds like "*wangdda* [an outcast]" Pamela understands Olivia's word meaning and translates the word to the English phrase "a black sheep."

    (33)
    Olivia: king따 [an outcast]

Pamela : Sujin is a black sheep
Olivia: oh
Pamela : I'm sad
Olivia: me too
 bb [ㅜㅜ sad]
 ㅠㅠ [sad]
 cheer up
 ~!!
 ㅗㅐㅕ [you] dksldi [not (a black sheep)]
Pamela : I haven't been a black sheep
Olivia: me. too
Pamela : I'm sad.................
 O.K
 Bye
Olivia: ㅠㅗㄷ [bye]
 bye

(Olivia and Pamela, Chat log 3, Session 3)

In some of the previous research, second language learners are found to use their first language as a strategy to overcome difficulties in unknown words or unclear meanings of the second language (Darhower, 2002). In this study, the participating Korean students also used this strategy to overcome their difficulties in expressing words and phrases in English. However, it is interesting that they did not choose the written form of Korean language but borrowed the English letters that sound like Korean words. If the participants had had access to no other languages but English on their keyboards, spelling out the Korean words in the English language

would have not been a remarkable phenomenon as they had had no choice. However, the participants in this study actually had a choice to change the language of their keyboards from English to Korean, yet they tried to maintain their typing systems in English when they spoke Korean. Therefore, this finding can be interpreted as at least a partial willingness on the part of the students to communicate in English.

4.3.2 Sense of Closeness with Conversation Partners

According to the linguistic output and interviews with the participating students, the students were more likely to be actively involved in the online chat when they felt closer to their conversation partners. As early studies on CMC in language learning have shown, some learners feel awkward or uncomfortable communicating with online strangers (Rowmiszowski & Mason, 1996). Even in the actual classrooms, students can feel uncomfortable when talking with classmates to whom they are not close. In this study, excerpts (34) and (35) show such concerns about communication with unfamiliar partners in online chatting. Moreover, excerpts (36) and (37) show some interesting patterns of online conversation between close partners. The patterns are characterized by informal talk

using many question marks "?", exclamation marks "!", impolite expressions, and expressions of laughter.

Excerpt (34), Florence confesses that she could not have a comfortable conversation with a new or random online conversation partner. Similarly, in excerpt (35), Grace points out that she would be worried about taking too much time typing in English if she were given an unfamiliar online conversation partner.

(34)
Interviewer: I found you enjoyed chatting online with your partner Elizabeth, in this class. Do you think you can keep practicing it with other friends?
Florence: For other friends… If I get closer to other friends, I can do it.
Elizabeth: If I tried to do it with new friends, I would feel uncomfortable talking with them.

(Florence and Elizabeth, Interview)

(35)
Grace: If I have a conversation with a new partner, I would feel sorry for her since I take much time to think and speak English. For that reason, I think it would be better for me to chat with a close friend.

(Grace, Interview)

In fact, to mitigate this issue, the participants in this study were

allowed to choose their own conversation partners in the first session; thus, relatively close friends were arranged in pairs in all sessions. If the participants had been arranged randomly, different features or patterns would have been identified in the linguistic output from the online chat. Thus, it is inferred that this issue should be considered seriously in the online conversation in any situation.

Furthermore, conversation partners who are closer to each other were found to have more informal conversations, using more question marks "?", exclamation marks "!", impolite expressions, and expressions of laughter than pairs who were not as close to each other. Excerpts (36) and (37) include examples of such informal talk between close online conversation partners.

For example, in excerpt (36), Karen calls her partner, Laura, by her nickname in Korean (보깅 [Bokying]) to start their conversation, and Laura's response contains many exclamation marks ("busy!!!!!!!!!!!!!!111"). Karen also uses many exclamation marks and questions marks ("why?!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!?????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!") when Laura does not answer her question immediately. When Laura and Karen ask each other a similar question at almost the same time, Laura forces Karen to answer her question first by saying "shut up" in an impolite way. Although Karen

seems a little embarrassed ("im..um..wait!"), she soon answers the question, showing that she understands the situation and wants to maintain the conversation. However, Laura continues to use impolite expressions ("shut up!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!111," "O my God!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1") and laughter ("kkkkkk") in the rest of conversation.

(36)
Karen: hello 보깅 [Bokying]
Laura: i'm very busy
      busybusy
      busy!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!111
Karen: why??
Laura: um...
Karen: why?!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!?????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Laura: I don't know
Laura: ah
      Wha's the problem
      t
Karen: what your matter??
Laura: shut up
Karen: im..um..wait!
      tommrow test..
Laura: oh my god
      shut
Karen: bb
Laura: up!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!111
Karen: ㅠㅠ [sad]
Karen: your???
Laura: O my God!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1

jesus ㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠㅠ
                    ah
                    big
                    problem
                    is
                    i'm
Karen: dd
Laura: agly
                    ugly?
                    oooo
                    this
                    kkkkkk [laugh]
Karen: her!!!
                    [really?]
Laura: ha...
Karen: your pretty girl
Laura: o my god
                    um...
                    you...
Karen: cute
Laura: don't pretty
                    don't cute
                    shut up
Karen: your dog

                                     (Laura and Karen, Chat log 2, Session 3)

        A similar example is illustrated in excerpt (37). Heather and Grace

begin their conversation by exchanging their names, although they already

know each other's names. When Grace asks Heather her name while

laughing ("hahahahahhahaha"), Heather responds with "secreat (secret)"

instead of giving her name in order to make the conversation more informal and humorous. Grace responds with more laughter and an emoticon (^^) that means the same as the "smiley" emoticon—:)—in Western culture. In addition, when Heather says that she is sick, she asks if Grace is sad at the end of her turn. Grace says "no" in a very informal way: "No. Nonononononononononononono." Continuing the conversation in a humorous way, Heather responds that she must be sad, using many exclamation marks ("you must sad!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!").

(37)
Heather: hi
Grace: hello
Heather: what your's name?
Grace: my name is 헤리 [Grace]
Heather: oh
     hi
Grace: hahahahahhahaha [laugh]
    what your`s name?
Heather: secreat
Grace: AH?
    hahahahahahaha [laugh]
    ^^ [smiley]
Heather: i am sick
    nose water
    nn [ㅜㅜ sad]
Grace: oh?
    you look healthy

Heather: no
        i am sick
        very
        very
        tou sad?
Grace: No.
        Nononononononononononononono
Heather: you must sad!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!1nn [ㅜㅜ sad]
        xzzxzz [laugh]

<div align="right">(Heather and Grace, Chat log 1, Session 3)</div>

Based on these examples, we can infer that a sense of closeness with conversation partners makes the online conversation both more active and more informal. Thus, educators should consider this factor very carefully when they apply synchronous CMC tools to their language classrooms. In fact, social cohesiveness has already been considered as an important part of the online discourse in Sociocultural Theory. Chun (1994) said that interactional speech such as greetings, leave takings, and the use of polite formulas allows learners to share their feelings with each other and to demonstrate a sense of sociability (cited in Darhower, 2002). In addition, Meskill (1999) referred to a sense of sociability as "a community of learners," and Wenger (1998) referred to it as "a community of practice."

However, too much informal talk can lead to impolite or off-topic communication. Darhower (2002) demonstrated that the use of humor

contributed to the social cohesiveness of the chat room environment and that even the use of sarcasm or insults should be interpreted as a way of learners' development of sociolinguistic competence in the target language. In the present study, the participants also seemed to use many question marks, exclamations marks, impolite expressions, and expressions of laughter in the purpose of having fun with each other not making fun of each other. Nevertheless, teenagers are generally considered very sensitive to their relationships with their peers as well as the languages they exchange, so it should be considered more seriously when the synchronous online communication becomes too informal in conversations. Moreover, the participants in this study are only females; further research involving male participants is needed to discover the different or similar features in terms of sense of closeness in online chats. Generally speaking, boys are more likely to have informal talks with their peers than girls are; thus, male teenagers are expected to show different language uses in the same online chat environment.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

The present study attempted to explore which features of synchronous CMC affect Korean high school English learners' oral production in regard to fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects by examining the linguistic output from online chats and interviews. This chapter presents conclusions drawn from the results of the data analysis for the present study. Section 5.1 summarizes the major findings of the present study. Section 5.2 proposes pedagogical implications, and section 5.3 discusses the limitations of this study and provides suggestions for future research.

5.1 Major Findings

Major findings of the present study for all three research questions are summarized as follows. First, regarding the students' synchronous CMC production in terms of fluency, the linguistic data from the online chat

showed fluent conversational flows despite some spelling or grammatical errors as well as limited vocabulary (Kelm, 1992; Kern, 1995). In addition, the students were found to take advantage of short but more frequent turns, which is a unique feature of online chats (Kern, 1995; Smith, 2004). Therefore, instruction utilizing the unique features of synchronous CMC facilitates the Korean English learners' fluent oral production.

Second, regarding the students' synchronous CMC production in terms of accuracy, the students had more opportunity to reflect on their language use and correct errors thanks to the visual nature of synchronous CMC (Beauvois, 1992; Harasim, 1990; Kramsch, 1998; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). They also had a sense of control over the conversation as they were able to control the speed of their communication in online chats. The signal words found in this study readdress the need for a new set of turn-taking skills in synchronous online communication, where nonverbal cues are missing (Salaberry, 1997). Thus, synchronous CMC enables Korean English learners to produce language more accurately by reflecting on and controlling their conversation.

Finally, regarding students' synchronous CMC production in terms of affective aspects, the linguistic output from online chats and interviews showed remarkable features related to the students' willingness to

communicate in English. During the real-time online chat, the students showed explicit consideration about communication in English and avoidance strategy to overcome their difficulties in the limited competence of English forms and meaning (Darhower, 2002). The interesting fact newly found in this study is that the students also used this strategy by speaking their L1 (Korean) with L2 (English) alphabets and sounds, which can be interpreted as at least a willingness to communication in English. Moreover, the fact that students tended to be more actively engaged in online conversation when they felt a sense of closeness with their partners supports the previous studies on affective aspects of synchronous CMC (Chun, 1994; Darhower, 2002; Meskill, 1999; Wenger, 1998). Therefore, synchronous CMC promotes Korean English learners' willingness to communicate in English, and the social bonds among the conversation group members should be considered as important for maximizeing the benefits of synchronous CMC in affective aspects.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

Although synchronous CMC might not be a panacea for the shortcomings of the traditional mode of oral communication in English classrooms in Korea, it does provide a useful alternative tool for teaching and learning English in Korea. Synchronous CMC can be particularly powerful and effective when utilizing network-based devices (computers, smart phones, etc.) that are widely used both within and outside the classroom setting.

By using the unique features of synchronous CMC, students can practice more fluent communication in their target language despite some spelling or grammatical errors as well as their limited vocabulary. In addition, students can practice making sentences by taking short turns consisting of a couple of words when reviewing their written speaking on the screen.

In addition, students can use the reflective features of synchronous CMC to correct their language use and improve accuracy in their online conversation. Through synchronous CMC, students can also practice more accurate language use by controlling their conversation speed and turns with

each other. Considering these features, educators can create lesson plans and activities focusing on either fluency or accuracy of learners' oral production.

Regarding the affective aspects, synchronous CMC can be adopted to either the first phase of the course or the pre-activity of each lesson to enhance students' willingness to communicate in English. Through such adoption, an integrated instruction model of synchronous CMC in cooperation with FFC (e.g., CMC then FFC, or CMC then FFC then CMC) could be designed.

Meanwhile, as discussed by the participating students, the social relationship between conversation partners is also a very important part of the students' affective aspects in the synchronous CMC mode. In physical classrooms, the social relationships among students are largely ignored while the educators focus more on the lesson objective, but teachers using synchronous CMC in their classrooms should consider students' closeness and how to create such social bonds in order to maximize the benefits of using online communication. When students are assigned based on the strong social bonds or community, more productive language practice conversations will likely result.

However, English educators should also consider the difficulties or challenges that students might face when they use synchronous CMC as a

tool for language learning. In order to maximize the beneficial features of synchronous CMC in fluency, accuracy, and affective aspects, educators and students must be technically trained in controlling the functions of various types of synchronous CMC tools before using them in their classes.

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

This study has some limitations that present suggestions for further research. First, this study relied on the linguistic output and interviews from participants only using synchronous CMC in the English classrooms. In order to explore the comparative features of synchronous CMC, future studies should analyze the linguistic output and interviews from participants in the traditional oral communication (FFC) mode. In fact, the quantitative comparison between the synchronous CMC and FFC groups using measurements such as the number of words, clauses, and errors is sufficiently covered in the body of previous research. Thus, it will be more valuable for future studies to analyze the similarities and differences of

learners' oral production in the two communication modes in a qualitative way.

Second, to compare different integrated modes of communication and feasible application to particular settings in more detail, a mixed model (e.g., synchronous CMC then FFC, or FFC then synchronous CMC) can be developed and tested in future research. If such models gain reliability in actual classroom environments, this would contribute to the development of the ideal instruction model for network-based language learning in the Korean English classroom setting. Moreover, such a model could be applied to other settings beyond school classrooms.

Finally, future researchers can further examine the integration of online communication for English learners' writing and speaking skills. As the linguistic output from either synchronous CMC or asynchronous CMC falls somewhere on the spectrum between spoken and written forms of language, the focus can be varied according to the purpose of the research. For example, if a researcher uses asynchronous CMC tools such as electronic mail or online forums to analyze students' linguistic production, the research focus should be more related to students' writing skills than their speaking skills. Yet even in online forums or e-mails, when certain topics have already been introduced and many responses have been

exchanged among participants, their language production would be more likely to be spoken than written. Therefore, various integrated or blended learning models that connect speaking and writing should be explored in further research.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. I. (2003). The effect of synchronous and asynchronous CMC on oral performance in German. *The Modern Language Journal, 87*(2), 157-167.

Bates, T. (1995). *Technology, open learning and distance education.* London: Routledge.

Beauvois, M. H. (1992). Computer-assisted classroom discussion in the foreign language classroom: Conversation in slow motion. *Foreign Language Annals, 25*, 455-464.

Beauvois, M. H. (1997). Write to speak: The effects of electronic communication on the oral achievement of fourth semester French students. In J. Muyskens (Ed.), *New ways of learning and teaching: Focus on technology and foreign language education* (pp. 93-115). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers**.**

Berge, Z. (1997). Computer conferencing and the on-line classroom. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications, 3*, 3-21.

Berge, Z., & M. Collins. (1995). *Computer-mediated communication and the online classroom(Ⅲ): Distance learning*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Blake, R. (2000). Computer-mediated communication: A window on FL

Spanish interlanguage. *Language Learning & Technology, 4*, 120-136.

Carson, J. (1993). Reading for writing: Cognitive perspectives. In J. Carson, & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the composition classroom* (pp. 85-104). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Chang, J. T. (2002). *The mask mechanism: A study of anxiety, motivation and communicative competence of Korean learners of English in computer-mediated communication environments.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Manchester.

Chang, J. T. (2003). Quasi-spoken interactions in CMC: E-mail and chatting content analysis. *English Teaching, 58*(3), 95-122.

Chun, D. M. (1994). Using computer networking to facilitate the acquisition of interactive competence. *System, 22*(1), 17-31.

Chun, D. (1998). Using computer-assisted class discussion to facilitate the acquisition of interactive competence. In J. Swaffar, S. Romano, P. Markley, & A. Kaye (Eds.), *Language learning online: Theory and practice in the ESL and L2 computer classroom* (pp. 57-80). Austin, TX: Labyrinth Publications.

Cohen, M., & Miyakes, N. (1986). A Worldwide intercultural networks: Exploring electronic messaging for instruction. *Instructional Science,*

15, 257-273.

Cornell, R., & Martin, B.L. (1997). The role of motivation in web-based instruction. In B. Khan (Ed.), *Web-Based Instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Daiute, C. (1985). *Writing and computers.* London: Addison Wesley.

Darhower, M. (2002). Interactional Features of Synchronous Computer-Mediated Communication in the Intermediate L2 Class: A Sociocultural Case Study. *CALICO Journal, 19*(2), 249-277.

Flinn, J. Z. (1986). *The role of instruction in revising with computers: Forming a construct for 'Good Writing.'* St. Louis, MO: University of Missouri.

Goodwin, A., Hamrick, J., & Stewart, T. C. (1993). Instructional delivery via electronic mail. *TESOL Journal, 3*, 24-27.

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242-262). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Guiora, A. Z. (1972). Construct validity and transpositional research:

Toward an empirical study of psychoanalytic concepts. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 13*(2), 139-150.

Guiora, A. Z., Beit-Hallami, B., Brannon, R. C. L., Dull, C. Y., & Scovel, T. (1972). The effects of experimentally induced changes in ego states and pronunciation ability in a second language: An exploratory study. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 13*(5), 421-428.

Han, J. I. (2004). The effective use of real-time computer-mediated communication tools for the development of Korean EFL learners' oral communicative competence. *Foreign Language Education, 11*(2), 195-226.

Han, J. I. (2006). A study on the effective use of ICT in developing the fluency and accuracy of Korean college students' English speaking skills. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 9*(1), 211-242.

Harasim, L. (1990). On line education. In N. Harasim (Ed.), *Online education* (pp.137-183). N.Y. Praeger.

Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11,* 329-350.

Hayamizu, T., & Yoshizaki, K. (1989). Cognitive motivational processes mediated by achievement goal tendencies. *Japanese Psychological Research, 31*, 179-189.

Herring, S. C. (1996). *Computer-mediated communication: Linguistic, social, and cross cultural perspectives.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hirotani, M. (2005). *The effects of synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) on the development of oral proficiency among novice learners of Japanese.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Purdue University.

Holden, M., & Wedman, J. (1993). Future issues of computer-edited communication: The results of a Delphi study. *Educational Research and Development, 41*(4), 5-24.

Horwitz, E., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70,* 125-132.

Hwang, P. (2008). *Characteristics of the SCMC, ASCMC, and FFC modes and their effects on oral performance and pshychological aspects of Korean English learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seoul National University.

Jung, Y. (2000). Reexamination of the theoretical background of WBI based English education. *Journal of The English Language and Literature, 44*(2), 239-262.

Jung, Y. (2005). A study on the impacts of CMC based written communication on students' speaking ability. *The Journal of Studies*

in Language, 21(2), 113-132.

Mehnert, U. (1998). Length of planning time and L2 performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 109-122.

Kelm, O. R. (1992). The use of synchronous computer networks in second language instruction: A preliminary report. *Foreign Language Annals*, *25*, 441-454.

Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects on fluency and characteristics of language production. *The Modern Language Journal*, *79*, 457-476.

Kim, M. (2006). *Gaehwagieui youngeo yiyaki [The story of English in the period of modernization in Korea]*. Seoul: International Graduate School of English Press.

Kim, S. H. (2007). Classroom discourse and interaction patterns in seventh grade TETE classes in Korea. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Seoul National University.

Kim, S. Y. (2001). Ways to develop communicative comptetence through virtual learning environments. *Journal of the Applied Linguistics Association of Korea, 17*(1), 139-158.

Kim, S. Y. (2003). A combination of CMC and FFC: Its effects on Korean students' oral proficiency and attitudes. *English Teaching, 58*(1), 61-

80.

Kitade, K. (2000). L2 learners' discourse and SLA theories in CMC: Collaborative interaction in internet chat. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 2*, 143-166.

Kost, R. C. (2004). *An investigation of the effects of synchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) on interlanguage development in beginning learners of German: Accuracy, proficiency, and communication strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona.

Kramsch, C. J. (1998). Language and culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kroonenberg, N. (1994/1995). Developing communicative and thinking skills via electronic mail. *TESOL Journal, 4*, 24-27.

Kwon, O., & Kim. J. (2010). *History of English education in Korea*. Seoul:

HanKukMunHwaSa.

Lam, W. (2000). L2 Literacy and the design of the self: A case study of a teenager writing on the Internet. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 457-482.

Lamy, M., & Goodfellow, R. (1999). Reflective conversation in the virtual language classroom. *Language Learning and Technology, 2*(2), 43-61.

Lee, H. (2003). An Interaction analysis of Korean EFL classrooms: A case study of teaching English through English. M.A. Thesis, Seoul National University.

Lee, J. (1999). How to use multimedia in web-based teaching. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning, 2*(1), 143-159.

Leem, J. (1998). The effects of learning and teaching in the internet-based instruction. Studies of Educational Technology, *4*(2), 103-136.

Meskill, C. (1999). Computers as tools for sociocollaborative language learning. In K. Cameron (Ed.), *Computer-assisted language learning (CALL): Media, design and applications* (pp. 144-152). Exton, PA: Swets and Zeitlinger Publishers.

Motteram, G. (2000). Communicating with computers. In P. Brett, & G. Motteram (Eds.), *A special interest in computers* (pp. 73-91). Whitstable: IATEFL.

Na, Y., & Park, M. (2003). A suggestion for enhancing richness of CMC in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Education, 10*(3), 23-50.

Oakes, C. (1996). First grade online. *Learning and Learning with Technology, 24*, 37-39.

Paramskas, D. (1993). Computer-assisted language learning (CALL): Increasingly into an ever more electronic world. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*, 124-143.

Park, J. K. (1999). Teaching English: Korean culture and context. *English Teaching, 54*(3), 3-21.

Park, M. (1999). Task-based interaction in Korean EFL classrooms. *The Journal of English Language Teaching, 10,* 71-101.

Payne, J., & Whitney, P. J. (2002). Developing L2 proficiency through synchronous CMC output, working memory, and interchange development. *CALICO Journal, 20*(1), 50-64.

Pellettieri, J. (2000). Negotiation in cyberspace. In M. Warschauer & R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and Practice* (pp. 59-86). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rowmiszowski, A., & R. Mason. (1996). Computer-mediated communication. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for*

*educational communications and technology (*pp. 438-456). NY: Prentice Hall.

Salaberry, R. (1997). A theoretical foundation for the development of pedagogical tasks in computer-mediated communication. *CALICO Journal, 14*(1), 15-33.

Sherry, L. (2000). The nature and purpose of online discourse: A brief synthesis of current research as related to the WEB project. *International Journal of Telecommunications, 7*, 19-51.

Smith, B. (2004). Computer-mediated negotiated interaction and lexical acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*, 365-398.

Tarone, E. (1982). Systematicity and attention in interlanguage. *Language Learning, 32*, 69-82.

Vandergrift, L. (2006). Second language listening: Ability or language proficiency? *Modern Language Journal, 90*, 6-18.

VanPattern, B., Williams, J., & Rott, S. (2004). Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition. In B. VanPattern, J. Williams, S. Rott, & M. Overstreet (Eds.), *Form-meaning connections in second language acquisition* (pp. 1-26). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Warschauer, M. (1995a). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal, 13*, 7-25.

Warschauer, M. (1995b). *E-mail for English teaching: Bringing the Internet and computer learning networks into the language classroom.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL Publication.

Warschauer, M. (1996). Comparing face-to-face and electronic discussion in the second language classroom. *CALICO Journal, 13*, 7-26.

Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (2000). Introduction: Theory and practice on network-based language teaching. In M. Warschauer, & R. Kern (Eds.), *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice* (pp. 1-19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wengner, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learninig, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

White, R. (1987). Approaches to writing. In M. Long, & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 259-266). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Williams. J. (2008). The speaking-writing connection in second language and academic literacy development. In D. Belcher, & A. Hirvela (Ed.), *The oral-literate connection* (pp. 10-25). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Womble, G. G. (1984). Process and Professor: Is there a machine in the English classroom? *English Journal, 73*(1), 34-37.

국 문 초 록

　　본 연구는 한국 고등학교 영어수업에서 학습자들의 구두 발화를 위한 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통(SCMC)의 활용을 알아보기 위하여 수행되었다. 이를 위해 본 연구에서는 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통을 활용한 수업에서 학생들의 영어 구두 발화의 특성을 유창성, 정확성, 정의적 측면에서 살펴보았다. 구체적으로, 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통을 활용한 수업 중 학생들의 온라인 대화 기록과 사후 인터뷰 기록을 질적 연구방법으로 분석함으로써 한국의 영어학습자들에게 도움을 줄 수 있는 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통의 주요 특성을 알아보고자 하였다.

　　본 실험은 한국인 고등학교 여학생 16명을 대상으로 진행되었다. 학생들은 한 수업당 주어진 두 개의 목표 활동을 짝활동으로 수행하였으며, 교실에 온라인 메신저가 장착된 컴퓨터를 통해 대화를 진행하였다. 학생들의 구두 발화를 유창성과 정확성, 그리고 정의적 측면에서 살펴보고자 수업 중 학생들의 온라인 대화 기록과 수업 후 인터뷰가 질적 분석대상에 포함되었다.

　　분석 결과, 학생들의 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통을 활용한 구두 발화에서 다음과 같은 특성이 발견되었다. 첫째, 학생들의 구두 발화 능력의 유창성 측면에서는 철자 오류와 문법적 오류 및 부족한 어휘 실력에도 불구하고 유창한 대화 흐름을 확인할 수 있었다. 뿐만 아니라, 학생들은 온라인 대화 특유의 짧지만 여러 차례에 걸쳐 말하기 차례를 이어나가는 특징을 활용하여 유창한 대화를 이어가는 모습을 보였다.

둘째, 학생들의 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통을 활용한 구두 발화 능력의 정확성 측면에서는 학생들이 화면에 적혀진 문자를 통해 지나간 대화를 되돌아봄으로써 학생들이 자신 뿐 아니라 상대방의 발화를 수정하는 모습을 보였다. 또한, 학생들이 온라인 대화의 속도를 자율적으로 조절하게 됨으로써 대화의 정확성의 향상을 도모하는 모습 또한 관찰되었다.

셋째, 학생들의 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통을 활용한 구두 발화 능력의 정의적 특성을 살펴본 결과, 학생들은 온라인으로 대화를 하는 동안 영어 말하기에 대한 높아진 관심 및 의지를 보였으며, 이는 향후 언어교육에 긍정적인 요소로 작용할 것으로 생각된다. 더욱이, 온라인 대화 상대와의 친밀감의 정도는 영어 수업에서 동시적 혹은 비동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통의 성공적인 활용을 결정하는 데에 중요한 요소 중 하나로 파악되었다.

본 연구의 결과는 외국어 수업에서 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통이 학습자들에게 언어 유창성, 정확성, 정의적 특성 면에서 구두 발화를 연습할 수 있는 기회를 제공한다는 점에서 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통이 제2 언어 학습에서 유용한 보조 도구로서 활용될 수 있음을 시사한다. 오늘날 다양한 네트워크 기반 매체의 일상생활에서의 높은 활용도에 비추어 볼 때, 이러한 동시적, 비동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통은 제2 언어 교실 안팎에서 보다 더 다양한 방식으로 외국어 교수 및 학습에 기여할 것으로 예상된다.

주요어: 동시적 컴퓨터 매개 의사소통(SCMC), 영어 학습자, 구두 발화, 유창성, 정확성, 정의적 특성

학 번: 2009－21461