

Instruction of Spanish Direct and Indirect Object Pronouns through Task-Supported Videoconferencing Instruction

Enseñanza de los pronombres de objeto directo e indirecto en español a través de un enfoque apoyado en tareas por videoconferencia

Objektu zuzena eta zehar-objektua diren gaztelaniazko izenordainen irakaskuntza bideokonferentzia bidezko atazetan oinarritutako irakaskuntza-ikuspegitik

Alexandra López Vera

PhD

lopezveraa@cusm.org

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7659-3672>

Recibido / Noiz jaso den: 03/05/2022

Aceptado / Noiz onartu den: 19/01/2023

Abstract

Task-supported videoconferencing instruction emphasizes learner centeredness and experiential learning in Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Still, relatively few studies have addressed the use of specific linguistic structures in online courses from a task-based perspective. The present study examines the effects of an online task-supported module on the acquisition of direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish. These pronouns are used very frequently by proficient Spanish speakers, but are less used by Spanish learners because of their morphological and syntactic complexity. The results of this study demonstrate the benefits of using an online task-supported module specially designed to promote the use of direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish through videoconference. Participants used the target structures on many occasions without being prompted to do so. The results suggest that the task-supported module is a promising approach to the teaching of grammar.

Keywords:

Task-Supported Language Teaching, Grammar Acquisition, Videoconferencing Education.

Sumario

1. INTRODUCTION. 2. LITERATURE REVIEW. 2.1. Focus on Form vs Focus on Forms. 2.2. Task-based Language Teaching. 2.3. TBLT and CALL. 2.4. Direct and Indirect Object Pronouns in Spanish. 3. METHOD. 3.1. Participants. 3.2. Materials. 3.3. Procedures. 3.4. Data collection. 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS. 5. DISCUSSION. 6. LIMITATIONS, PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSION. REFERENCES. APPENDIX A: Tasks. APPENDIX B: Task 2 prompt, Group B Videoconference Transcription, and Written Report.

Resumen: La enseñanza de idiomas a través de un enfoque apoyado en tareas por videoconferencia enfatiza la importancia del alumno y el aprendizaje experimental en la adquisición de un segundo idioma. Aún sabiendo esto, relativamente pocos estudios han abordado la adquisición de gramática en cursos en línea desde una perspectiva basada en tareas. El presente estudio examina los efectos de un módulo en línea diseñado para la enseñanza de pronombres de objeto directo e indirecto en español a través de videoconferencia. Estos pronombres son utilizados con mucha frecuencia por los hispanohablantes, pero son difíciles de adquirir para los estudiantes de español. Los participantes de este estudio utilizaron los pronombres de objeto directo e indirecto en muchas ocasiones sin que se les solicitara hacerlo. Los resultados sugieren que el módulo en línea utilizado en este estudio presenta un enfoque prometedor para la enseñanza de la gramática.

Palabras clave: Enfoque apoyado en tareas, Adquisición de gramática, Educación por videoconferencia.

Laburpena: Bideokonferentzia bidezko atazetan oinarritutako irakaskuntza-ikuspegiak ikasleari eta ikaskuntza esperimentalari ematen dio garrantzia bigarren hizkuntzak ikasteko. Hori jakirik ere, ikerketa nahiko gutxik landu dute online ikastaroetako gramatikaren ikaskuntza atazetan oinarritutako irakaskuntza-ikuspegitik. Ikerketa honek objektu zuzena eta zehar-objektua diren gaztelaniazko izenordainak irakasteko diseinatu den online modulu baten eraginak aztertzen ditu. Izenordain horiek oso maiz erabiltzen dituzte gaztelania-hiztunek, baina zailak dira gaztelania ikasten ari direnentzat. Ikerketa honetako parte-hartzaileek asko erabili dituzte objektu zuzena eta zehar-objektua diren izenordainak, halakorik eskatu gabe. Emaitzek iradokitzen dute ikerketa honetan erabili den online modulua irakaskuntza-ikuspegiak etorkizun oparoa izanen duela gramatikaren irakaskuntza-aren arloan.

Gako hitzak: Atazetan oinarritutako irakaskuntza-ikuspegia, Gramatikaren ikaskuntza, Bideokonferentzia bidezko hezkuntza.

1. Introduction

The importance of integrating computers and other technological tools in education is unquestionable nowadays. The online environment offers unprecedented opportunities for students who would otherwise have limited access to higher education, as well as a new teaching model for educators in which dynamic and interactive quality courses can be developed. Despite the initial intuitions of many instructors to use traditional classroom scenarios, implementing online courses is fundamentally different from the traditional classroom context. A shift to remote instruction is a potential opportunity to implement innovative ideas about teaching and learning. This change is also an opportunity to rethink traditional classroom roles and relationships. Online courses can be much more cognitively demanding on teachers than face-to-face teaching because instructors tend to find it more challenging to foster interaction among students and to keep them both engaged and motivated (Godev, 2014; Tomei, 2006; Worley & Tesdell, 2009).

Videoconferencing Language Teaching (VLT) offers a myriad of potential benefits to learners. Some of these benefits are related to a wider exposure to the target language. In addition, another positive effect of this modality is that

online oral and written texts afford L2 learners opportunities to be exposed to and produce a variety of text genres. Thus, Technology-Mediated (TM) activities offer capabilities that cannot be easily replaced by any other language teaching procedure, including the integration of the four skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening) within the same activity. The four skills integration can be achieved in a more connected and interactive way than in paper. Besides, students can have rapid access to the internet to find key facts or information (Kern & Warschauer, 2008). Furthermore, VLT encourages more active learning because the traditional student role changes. Students are more in control of their learning process and, thus, also of the outcomes of this process. In fact, through VLT, learners can have a greater level of autonomy and can decide what they want to learn and how to learn it. Traditional classes may also integrate the use of Learning Management Systems and the use of personal computers. However, through VLT, students can perform their tasks more independently, without the teacher's presence to provide direct instructions (Toyoda, 2001). All this leads to stress-reduced learning environments and higher levels of engagement in the L2 classroom (Baralt et al., 2016; Hampel & Stickler, 2005).

2. Literature Review

Language instructors have approached the teaching of grammar in the L2 classroom in different ways. In the last few decades, as globalization has increased the importance of language teaching, the underlying methodology implemented in the classroom has become a priority for L2 researchers and language instructors.

2.1. Focus on Form vs Focus on Forms

The Focus on Form (FonF) approach to grammar teaching is preferred by many SLA scholars and language teachers. The FonF approach aims at developing the use of accurate grammar by providing the rules embedded in communicative contexts. The term, along with its counterpart 'Focus on Forms' (FonFs), was coined by Long (1988, 1991), who stated that grammar instruction may be of two types: 'focus on form' and 'focus on forms'. The former refers to drawing '... students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication' (Long, 1991, p. 45). FonFs, which emphasizes accuracy, seems counterproductive in immersion contexts, where fast acquisition of fluency is necessary, as well as lower levels of

proficiency, where it may inhibit or demoralize learners. The FonF approach to grammar teaching, however, may not yield satisfactory results regarding accuracy in some cases. Williams (1994), for instance, observes that, despite exposure to a large amount of input and many opportunities for various kinds of interaction, the output of students in some French immersion programs was surprisingly inaccurate. For this author, communication with inaccurate grammar is not 'real communication', and he adds that these students' failure to achieve accuracy could have been avoided by paying more attention to forms. The author adds that the exclusive focus on meaning leads learners to fail. Thus, some researchers now recognize the necessity of explicit FonFs for advanced language learners and claim that grammar instruction is essential if learners are to achieve their educational and professional goals (Celce-Murcia, 1991; Schmidt, 1994; Shaw & Liu, 1998). Chen and Li (2022) investigated the effects of FonFs and FonF on L2 Chinese oral production. The results of their study showed that, for high-proficiency learners, it is not sufficient to pay attention only to meaning (FonF); the linguistic forms should also be given continuous attention (FonFs). In this way, the authors state that 'learners can carry out in-depth learning from their personal learning experiences with the linguistic forms and can further internalize the connection between linguistic meaning and linguistic form' (p. 13).

The tide, therefore, seems to have turned, nowadays, and a lot of attention is being paid to the teaching of grammar in the L2 classroom. While it has been difficult in the past to find a balance between FonF and FonFs, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Task-Supported Language Teaching (TSLT) may prove to be a useful model to teach L2 grammar. TBLT implementation relies on students' being involved in real communication where the target language is used in a meaningful and communicative way while focusing on accuracy at the end of each task.

2.2. Task-based Language Teaching

TBLT, an L2 teaching approach developed by Prabhu (1987), is based on the idea that the four language skills should never be targeted in isolation. Instead, teachers, as mediators between the L2 and the students, must integrate all of them in their instruction. TBLT is currently one of the most widely researched L2 teaching approaches. In the vast majority of TBLT implementations, including the most recent ones, assessment is primarily based on the task outcome (task completion) rather than on accuracy (Long, 2016). Prabhu (1987) defined 'task' as a type of activity that requires learners to reach an outcome through some process of thought. The task also allows teachers to control and regulate the learning process by preparing the students to engage in it.

There is also a TBLT implementation that focuses on forms. This FonFs version operates on the premise that tasks should be designed to constrain language use in such a way that specific target structures will be used (Ellis, 1997). In fact, when students need to communicate through the target language, they must search consciously for specific words and expressions that are needed in that context. Another TBLT implementation focuses solely on meaning and puts more emphasis on communicating without paying attention to grammatical structures (Ellis, 1997). Skehan (1998) argues that the optimal TBLT implementation is the one which draws learners' attention to linguistic structures naturally rather than artificially. By 'natural' Skehan means 'without being directed to do so' (p. 214). Thus, teachers can develop tasks that maximize the chances of using a particular structure (Skehan, 1998). Furthermore, Ellis (2003) makes a distinction between TBLT and TSLT. TBLT uses tasks as the organizational unit for syllabus design. TSLT, however, uses task and another unit, such as linguistic structures, functions of language, lexicon or concepts.

Willis (1996) reversed the traditional presentation, practice, and production (PPP) framework. He designed a TBLT sequence which has three stages: 1) the pre-task, 2) the task cycle, and 3) the post-task or language focus.

The pre-task gives a quick introduction to the topic, which is to be explored by students. It usually includes a short task-based warm-up activity. The teacher should help the students to understand the theme and objectives of the task and help focus on meaning. Some vocabulary may also be presented through schemata activation. For example, if the task involves having an appointment at the doctor's office, the schemata activation may include some reading about the causes that lead a person to go to the doctor's office. The pre-task is followed by the task itself, also known as the task cycle.

The task cycle can be seen as the main task and consists of the execution phase, which entails planning, and the actual report phase. During the task cycle phase, the teacher should make sure that there is some sort of gap that students need to address, and most importantly, it should involve planning, drafting, and rehearsing. During the planning phase, each participant in the task should discuss in the target language and work together to prepare their presentation. During the report phase, students present their findings, exchange written reports, or discuss reports verbally, and compare their results. Students should also rely on their own means and resources to 'fill that gap'.

After students present their outcome, in the post-task phase, some feedback should be given by the instructor, whose role is that of a facilitator or a mediator between the content in the target language and the student. This part of the task can be used to focus on language use (Willis, 1996). Students will have the opportunity to analyze what they said, and practice their skills. By analyzing their use of language, students will be able to repeat their performance, reflect on it,

and pay attention to form (Ellis, 2003). In addition, Norris (2009), Samuda and Bygate (2008), and Van den Branden (2006) established that a good task should have the following characteristics:

1. The focus is always on meaning.
2. A clear goal is included.
3. The learner must be placed at the center of the learning process.
4. A holistic approach should be adopted.
5. The learner must engage in reflective learning.

Tasks that meet the characteristics mentioned above will lead to students paying attention to both form and function and, consequently, achieving further development of their L2 (Schmidt, 1994).

The teacher role in TBLT (and also in TSLT), Ellis (2003) suggests that teachers should favor high level of creativity and dynamism in every lesson, apart from selecting and sequencing of tasks, preparing learners for tasks, and helping students reflect on their own learning. In addition, Hattie and Yates (2014) referred to teachers as «the major source of controllable variance» in an education system and as «the major players in the educational process» (p. 25). Hence, the teacher should start by giving clear instructions to the students about the steps involved in completing the task. Subsequently, the teacher also helps students with words, phrases, and sentences that are relevant to the task and can be difficult or confusing. When the students start to work in their groups, the teacher is available as a facilitator between the content and the students to assist with any questions or issues that may come up in the groups. Finally, when the task is over, the instructor provides appropriate feedback to the students about their performance. In addition to active participation, students are expected to help and monitor each other's work during the task completion phase.

2.3. TBLT and CALL

González-Lloret and Ortega (2014) addressed the need for a new conceptualization of TBLT in computer-assisted environments, where technology is integrated into tasks as an opportunity for learning the L2 'by doing'. In their technology-mediated TBLT framework, technology is necessarily integrated within tasks. There are three requirements that need to be met. First, there must be a clear task. Second, teaching an L2 with the aid of technology requires both teachers and students to be able to learn in different ways. Finally, the third requirement, according to González-Lloret (2016), deals with the relationships between technology and the tasks included in the teaching curriculum, because, having a conference, for example would directly affect the design of the task, implementation,

teacher's role, and assessment of the curriculum itself. Hence, it is necessary to consider what every task would entail in terms of technological aids and make sure everything is determined.

There is extensive literature that highlights the effectiveness of Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL) and TBLT. Most of that literature includes specific guidelines regarding how to proceed in technology-mediated TBLT classroom scenarios (i.e., Baralt, 2014; González-Lloret, 2016; González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014). However, there are few manuals that contain carefully developed online tasks that are ready to be implemented in the L2 online classroom and that foster grammar development. Canals and Mor (2020) aimed to describe a 'signature pedagogy' for CALL that is also closely related to TBLT. In this study, the authors identified the following set of pedagogical principles and practices as being distinctive of successful TBLT online programs. One of the most important principles entails the necessity of assigning learners distinct roles when managing group work. In fact, they recommend that there should be a leader or spokesperson in each group, who will be in charge of communicating with the teacher and monitoring communication among group members. The authors also state that instructors need to assess the entire process of carrying out a collaborative task and not only the final product.

In recent years, numerous investigations into the influence of TBLT and TSLT on L2 learning have emerged, but very few studies have examined how CALL can also be the mode of instruction for TSLT tasks with the goal of eliciting the use of targeted grammatical structures, in a similar way as face-to-face instruction does.

2.4. Direct and Indirect Object Pronouns in Spanish

Previous research in the L2 acquisition of Spanish has convincingly documented the non-native-like use of object pronouns (Liceras et al., 1997; Sanchez & Al-Kasey, 1999; VanPatten & Sanz, 1995). It is assumed that native-like variation is an essential part of communicative competence (Canale & Swain, 1980) and that grammar structures can vary in their level of learnability. According to Spada et al. (2005), direct and indirect object pronouns are grammatical elements that feature a strong link between form and meaning. Despite this fact, learners of Spanish as L2 experience many difficulties to achieve proficiency in the use of direct and indirect objects. The reason can be attributed to the fact that object clitics in Spanish normally create a structure that appears to be either (Subject) Object Verb ((S)OV) or OVS. This can be especially difficult for English native speakers since they are used to their L1 SVO order, which also occurs in Spanish. Furthermore, in sentences with two or more verbs, such as a conjugated verb and an infinitive, the pronominal direct object may precede the finite verb (le tuve que comprar leche!"I had to buy him milk", (S)OV), or be enclitic attached to

the end of the nonfinite verb (tuve que comprarle leche!"I had to buy him milk"). Additionally, the Spanish clitics must agree in gender, number, and cases in some instances, with their respective antecedent. Considering these factors, Spanish clitics present a high level of difficulty for L2 learners. Even when a student has extensive Spanish vocabulary and grammar proficiency, knowing how to use direct and indirect object pronouns can still be challenging. Additionally, there is another issue that complicates the acquisition of object pronouns: the linguistic phenomenon known as *leísmo*. This phenomenon is closely related to *loísmo*, and *laísmo*, all of them non-standard uses of the third person object pronouns. *Le* (sg.) and *les* (pl.) function both as the masculine and feminine indirect object in a sentence. In *Le di una manzana*. ("I gave him/her an apple"), the pronoun can refer either to masculine or feminine gender in Spanish. However, in some cases, you can find sentences such as: *Visité a Juan. Le visité*. ("I visited Juan. I visited him") or *A María no le he visitado nunca* ("I have never visited María"). These two examples show the use of *leísmo*, which occurs when the indirect object pronoun *le/les* is used as a direct object. From a prescriptive grammar viewpoint, the use of *le/les* as direct objects is considered incorrect by the Royal Spanish Academy (RAE), which only records the possibility of *le* as direct object if the referent of the pronoun is [+masculine, +human], never for a female.

On the other hand, *la* and *las* are the feminine direct object pronouns: *Veo a María. La veo*. ("I see Maria. I see her"). However, in some Spanish speaking regions the direct object pronouns can be used as indirect objects. Hence, we can find structures such as *las dije mi dirección* ("I told them my address"), which is grammatically incorrect in standard Spanish. Furthermore, *lo* and *los*, the masculine direct object pronouns, are sometimes incorrectly used instead of *le* and *les* respectively. Thus, a sentence such as *Lo di un regalo* ("I gave him a present") is an example of how this structure can be used "incorrectly" (from a prescriptive point of view) even by some native speakers of Spanish.

Given the difficulty that direct and indirect pronouns present for learners of Spanish and the reported effectiveness of using videoconferencing in TBLT, it seems worth exploring whether providing students with a well-designed TBLT might improve their accuracy when using those pronouns.

3. Method

The question that guided the present study is the following: «How effective is a Task-Supported videoconference module to teach direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish?». The goal was to explore the potential benefits of using an online task-supported module specially designed to promote the use of direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish through videoconference.

3.1. Participants

The study was performed with a total of 18 students enrolled in an online novice intermediate Spanish class in the department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB). The demographic information of the present study was obtained via survey. Appendix C shows the pre-questionnaire that each participant had to complete before participating in the study, thirteen of these participants were female and five were male students. The median age of the participants was twenty years old, and all of them considered English to be their native language. None of the participants indicated that they had lived in a Spanish-speaking country before, although four of them had traveled to South America or Spain. Their Spanish proficiency was at the level of either novice-mid or novice-high in the ACTFL scale, which is equivalent to the A2 level in the Common European Framework of Reference. Furthermore, none of the participants were heritage speakers of Spanish or had direct relatives whose first language was Spanish.

Seventeen participants indicated that they did not speak any other language apart from English and basic Spanish. There were two students who had basic knowledge of German and Irish respectively. Regarding the instruction of Spanish that they had received in the past, all of the students claimed that they either took two or three years of basic Spanish in High School (14 students) and/or had taken first-semester elementary Spanish at UCSB (five students). While the number of participants of this study is small, they are nevertheless a representative sample of the students that typically enroll in second-semester elementary Spanish at UCSB.

Students were informed that they were participating in a study regarding their learning of some Spanish 2 content, and no reference to direct and indirect object pronouns was made. All subjects gave their informed consent to participate in the study in accordance with the Human Subjects guidelines. The consent form explained what the project was about, its duration, and how data was to be collected by recording Zoom audio and video, and retaining Google documents.

The language used in the consent form was English since all participants in this research study were proficient English speakers. Participants were not compensated since they did not have to allocate any time outside the estimated homework time frame.

3.2. Materials

The instructional module consisted of a total of six tasks that were embedded in an online TSLT unit along with some cultural information related to the topic of each task. The study was designed incorporating the following: (i) the task-

based-language framework proposed by Willis (1996): the pre-task, the task cycle and the post-task (or language focus); (ii) the TSLT approach developed by Ellis (2003): tasks plus linguistic forms; and (iii) the TBLT framework developed by González-Lloret and Ortega (2014): a combination of CALL and TBLT.

The six tasks included in this study were part of an online TSLT module called 'Tarea Viva' created by the author of this study. The topics of each task were related to the contents of the textbook that was used in each of the Spanish 2 course sections at UCSB (López-Burton et al., 2019). Direct object pronouns were the implicit target structure of the first three tasks, and indirect object pronouns were the implicit target structure of the last three tasks. Before each task took place, students read and studied the grammatical explanation of the underlying implicit target structure of the task and the instructor explained the dynamic of the tasks. All tasks involved in the experimental study included listening or reading material with natural use of the language (i.e., audio files, e-mails, webpages, etc.). Appendix A shows a description of each one of the six tasks and the reason why the target grammar structures were expected. Appendix B shows a complete task (Task 2), a group videoconference transcription and the written report for such task.

3.3. Procedures

All participants were divided in small groups of four or five students with a leader. There were a total of four groups. The leaders were selected at random and stayed consistent over the course of the six tasks. Zoom meetings were created by the leaders, who recorded every meeting and sent the recordings to the instructor.

Students had autonomy to schedule their meetings to complete the tasks, and notified the instructor of the times in which they would meet so that the instructor could make herself available to assist the group during the task. The post-task phase, however, always took place in the established set time for the online class.

The sequence that each task followed included a pre-task that gave a quick introduction to the topic and usually included a short warm-up activity. The teacher helped the students to understand the theme and objectives of the task by explaining the task components and providing comprehension checks. Some vocabulary was also presented through schemata activation; The pre-task was followed by the task itself (the task cycle), which consisted of the execution phase, entailing planning, drafting and rehearsing (Willis, 1996). During the planning phase, each participant in the task was to discuss and work with their group members to prepare their presentation. During the drafting and rehearsing stage, students presented their findings, exchanged written reports or discussed, and compared their outcomes. Finally, the post-task phase, which was used to draw students' attention to specific

language structures. Students had the opportunity to analyze what they had said, and practice their skills. By analyzing their use of language, students were able to repeat their performance, reflect on it, and pay attention to form (Ellis, 2009).

3.4. Data collection

Observations and analyses of each one of the Zoom recordings were used as the primary source of data within this study to identify the number of times that the target structure appeared in the students' conversations. By using observations of the students during online meetings, the data could show what students actually did, rather than relying on only what they said they did (Dörnyei, 2007).

The average duration of every videoconference was 50 minutes. There were a total of 20 hours and 37 minutes of recordings. All the recordings were transcribed and reviewed in, at least, two different occasions to make sure that all the data was correct. During the videoconferencing meetings, students were requested to use only the target language and, therefore, they used only Spanish.

4. Data Analysis and Results

Statistical calculations such as the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, percentage, ANOVA variance analysis and paired samples T-tests were used to analyze the data. «SPSS 26.0» data analysis program was used to make the calculations. While conducting statistical analyses, the cut-off value for significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

There were a total of 78 instances of the direct object pronoun in tasks 1, 2, and 3, the ones that aimed to trigger this grammatical structure. Some instances of the target structure found in the first three tasks were: *tengo que sacarlo* («I have to take it out»), *lo veo bien* («I find it correct»), *necesito visitarte* («I need to visit you»), *lo puedes hacer gratis* («you can do it for free»), *puedo enseñarla* («I can show it»), *los tienes* («you have them»), and *yo te llamo* («I will call you»). On the other hand, there were a total of 57 free uses of the indirect object pronoun structure in tasks 4, 5, and 6. Some of them were: *les gusta* («they like it»), *les pregunto eso* («I ask them about it»), *les pagamos* («we pay them for it»), *les debo dinero* («I owe them money»), *te pongo un anillo* («I put a ring on you»), and *le damos un regalo* («we give a present to her»).

The results required the use of descriptive statistics using the data analysis program SPSS 26.0 to determine which tasks were the most and least effective at triggering their use of the target structures and to find differences between groups. Additionally, only free uses of the target structure were considered in the

analysis because students likely learned formulaic expressions such as *lo siento* («I am sorry») or *me gusta* («I like it») before taking this Spanish course; therefore, the use of formulaic expressions did not actually demonstrate the effectiveness of the treatment.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the free uses of the target structures (direct objects in tasks 1, 2, and 3 and indirect objects in tasks, 5 and 6) in each task by all groups together

	A)		B)		C)		D)		E)		F)	
	Structure	Uses	Structure	Uses	Structure	Uses	Structure	Uses	Structure	Uses	Structure	Uses
Group	18	47	29	24	31	24	19	14	18	47	29	24
Task 1	18	18	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Task 2	18	29	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61	1.61
Task 3	18	31	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72	1.72
Task 4	18	24	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.33
Task 5	18	19	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06	1.06
Task 6	18	14	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82	.82
Total % (Structure)	18	137	7.61	6.44	7.61	6.44	7.61	6.44	7.61	6.44	7.61	6.44

Students produced the lowest number of the direct object pronoun in the first task and the highest number of instances of this target structure in the third one. In the other three tasks, which focused on indirect object pronouns, the results were the opposite. The highest number of occurrences of the target grammatical structures occurred in the fourth task (the first one concerned with this structure), and the lowest number of instances was found in the last task, Task 6.

Table 2: Uses of the target structures in each task by each group

Group	Task 1 Uses of I.O pronoun	Task 2 Uses of I.O pronoun	Task 3 Uses of I.O pronoun	Task 4 Uses of I.O pronoun	Task 5 Uses of I.O pronoun	Task 6 Uses of I.O pronoun
A	5	7	12	3	3	3
B	3	13	5	5	6	4
C	5	4	5	8	6	3
D	5	5	9	8	4	4
Total	18	29	31	24	19	14

The results indicated that Tasks 2 and 3 were the most effective at triggering the target structure. The means of free uses of the target structure in those tasks were 1.61 and 1.72, respectively. On the other hand, the least effective task was Task 6, with a mean of less than one use per participant (0.82). The distribution of data in all the tasks was normal since the degree of skewness and kurtosis were between -2 and $+2$ in the six tasks.

Due to the different numbers of participants in the four subgroups, the use of ANOVA was necessary to determine whether one subgroup was generally better than the others at producing the target structures.

Table 3: ANOVA t results for the six tasks

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Task1	Between Groups	.500	3	.167	.246	.863
	Within Groups	9.500	14	.679		
	Total	10.000	17			
Task2	Between Groups	15.978	3	5.326	7.239	.004
	Within Groups	10.300	14	.736		
	Total	26.278	17			
Task3	Between Groups	10.061	3	3.354	30.292	.000
	Within Groups	1.550	14	.111		
	Total	11.611	17			
Task4	Between Groups	2.100	3	.700	1.661	.221
	Within Groups	5.900	14	.421		
	Total	8.000	17			
Task5	Between Groups	1.594	3	.531	1.391	.287
	Within Groups	5.350	14	.382		
	Total	6.944	17			
Task6	Between Groups	.521	3	.174	.571	.644
	Within Groups	3.950	13	.304		
	Total	4.471	16			

Table 3 shows that there were no statistically significant differences among subgroups in Tasks 1, 4, 5, and 6, as demonstrated by the one-way ANOVA, $F(0.246, 1.661, 1.391, 0.571)$, $p = .863, .221, .287, \text{ and } .644$, respectively. However, there was a statistically significant difference among subgroups in Tasks 2 and 3, $F(7.239, 30.292)$, $p = .004 \text{ and } .000$, respectively. A Tukey post-hoc test for these specific tasks was necessary to analyze those differences.

Table 4: Tukey test results for Tasks 2 and 3

Multiple Comparisons

Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	I-Group	J-Group	Mean	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
			Difference (I-J)			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Task 2	A	B	-1.500	.607	.108	-3.26	.26
		C	.350	.575	.384	-.72	1.62
		D	.750	.575	.576	-.92	1.43
	B	A	1.500	.607	.108	-.26	3.26
		C	2.450	.575	.004	.78	4.12
		D	2.250	.575	.008	.58	3.92
	C	A	-.350	.575	.384	-2.62	.72
		B	-2.450	.575	.004	-4.12	-.78
		D	-.200	.542	.982	-1.78	1.38
	D	A	-.750	.575	.576	-2.42	.92
		B	-2.250	.575	.008	-3.92	-.58
		C	.200	.542	.982	-1.38	1.78
Task 3	A	B	1.750	.235	.000	1.07	2.43
		C	2.000	.223	.000	1.33	2.67
		D	1.200	.223	.001	.55	1.85
	B	A	-1.750	.235	.000	-2.43	-1.07
		C	.250	.223	.684	-.40	.90
		D	-.550	.223	.110	-1.20	.10
	C	A	-2.000	.223	.000	-2.65	-1.35
		B	-.250	.223	.684	-.90	.40
		D	-.800	.210	.009	-1.41	-.19
	D	A	1.400	.223	.001	1.01	.79
		B	.550	.223	.110	-.10	1.20
		C	.800	.210	.009	.19	1.41

*. The mean difference is significant at the (.05 level).

The Tukey post-hoc test results in Table 4 show that in Task 2, Group B was able to use the target structure statistically significantly more times than Groups C and D ($p = .004$, and $.008$, respectively). Furthermore, Group A used the target structure significantly more times than the other groups in Task 3 ($p = .000$, $.000$, and $.001$, respectively). Finally, in Task 3, Group D also used Spanish direct object pronouns statistically significantly more than Group C ($p = .009$).

A qualitative approach to the analysis of the results was necessary due in part to the potential repetition of tokens of the target structure as a way of priming. It could be argued that during some tasks, participants could have mimicked or copied the use of the target structures after listening to another participant pronouncing them (e.g., *¿Lo tienes?* followed by *no lo tengo* («Do you have it?» followed by «no, I do not have it»). For instance, it seems unusual that Group

B produced direct object pronouns 13 times during Task 2, while Group C only had three occurrences of this usage during the same task. Additionally, Group A produced the target structure 12 times in Task 3, whereas Groups B and C only produced it on five occasions. After a qualitative analysis of the results, the researcher concluded that the use of the target structure during those tasks (and in every task) was not due to imitation. In fact, although some students started using direct object pronouns and other students followed, participants were able to attend to gender and number agreement differences. For example, during Task 2, the leader of Group B asked one of the students the following question: *¿La tienes?* («Do you have it?»), referring to a driving license. The student replied, *Sí, la tengo* («I have it»), and immediately asked another question that contained another instance of the direct object pronoun but, this time, in the opposite gender: *¿Eres un buen jefe?* *¿Lo eres?* («Are you a good boss? Are you?»). Hence, it can be assumed that students could encourage and elicit the use of the target structures in other participants, but the qualitative analysis of this study confirms the validity of the results. Generally, there were no instances of repeated tokens without attention to agreement. There were, however, some incorrect uses of the target structures, such as the target structures wrongly placed in the sentence or used with incorrect gender or number agreement. Those cases could have been a result of imitating the output of peers. Therefore, they were excluded from data.

The six tasks involved in the study yielded different numbers of uses the target structures. For example, as Tables 1 and 2 show, Task 3 yielded 31 free uses of the target structures, followed by Tasks 2 and 4, with 29 and 24 free uses of them, respectively. On the other end of the spectrum, the task that triggered the lowest number of uses of the target structures was Task 6, with only 14 instances of indirect object pronouns, followed by Tasks 5 and 1, with 19 and 18 occurrences, respectively.

5. Discussion

My reflection as to why I think that the results have been overall good stems from the design of the tasks. Each one of the six tasks included specific verbs that, in most cases, invited to use either the direct or the indirect object pronouns in order to avoid repetition. In particular, Task 2 and Task 3, the ones with the highest number of elicited target structures, were the only ones that aimed at eliciting the direct object pronouns by incorporating specific questions that students had to ask each other. In Task 1, there were guided instructions on how to proceed, and what information to obtain from each other, but not specific questions that had to be asked. Although guided questions were also implemented in Tasks 4 and 6 with the aim to elicit the indirect object pronouns, the results were not as good

as in Task 2 and Task 3. This can be due to the fact that indirect object pronouns are more complex structures than direct object pronouns.

As for the reason why some groups performed better than others in specific tasks, there is no a clear explanation. Groups were formed arbitrarily and some students are naturally faster than others at grasping linguistic features. In general, with the exception of Group A in Task 3 and Group B in Task 2, all the groups performed more or less similarly throughout the six tasks.

All in all, it is challenging for instructors to create conditions in the classroom to elicit the use of direct and indirect pronouns. This difficulty prompts instructors to rely on highly structured textbook activities that do not stimulate the use of these pronouns in a real or real-like communicative task. This study shows that the online TSLT module, specially designed for the production of direct and indirect pronouns in Spanish, stimulated the use of the targeted pronouns in real-like communicative tasks. In applying TSLT instruction, Ellis (2003) maintains that learning takes place more effectively when students are exposed to natural use of the language.

6. Limitations, Pedagogical Implications, and Conclusion

One limitation of this study is the fact that the tasks were designed to elicit the two target grammatical structures separately in three different tasks each. Normally, in any Spanish course, students learn direct object pronouns before indirect object pronouns and, then, both structures concurring together. However, in the Spanish 2 course, where this study was implemented, the two structures are never introduced to the students together. They were excluded because this study aimed to check the effectivity of each task in eliciting a single target structure at a time. In fact, tasks 4 through 6 called for the use of both, direct and indirect object pronouns simultaneously and this is an extremely complex structure for students who are in the Intermediate-low proficiency level. However, since students had studied the target structure right before attending the videoconferencing, they managed to either use the direct or indirect object pronouns correctly respectively, never both together correctly. The correct instances of the direct object pronouns produced in tasks 4 through 6 were not included in the results of this study.

Furthermore, this study was designed to be implemented in an online platform and we do not have data of the differences between implementing the TSLT module through Videoconferencing vs a face-to-face classroom. Another limitation of this study is that it cannot prove the benefits of implementing videoconferencing tasks that require synchronous communication over tasks with the

same goal but in a face-to-face environment. The results suggest that the production of Spanish direct and indirect object pronouns is present in videoconferences where students work in groups under a TSLT approach. Thus, this model can replicate the face-to-face experience.

One of the pedagogical implications of the current study is related to the benefits of developing videoconferencing tasks that require synchronous group work since they foster real use of the TL and elicit the use of problematic grammatical structures that would not be elicited while working individually. However, more research is needed as stated in the limitations section.

Moreover, another pedagogical implication is that tasks should have a clear goal that students must fulfill through filling gaps in information, through reasoning, or through personal opinion. Additionally, the task must involve opportunities for reflecting, ordering ideas, or reaching a consensus. Furthermore, a holistic approach should be used when creating tasks since each task should reflect real-world processes of language use, which are characterized by a holistic focus on meaning. Students should see the task as a whole and not as small chunks that are evaluated independently.

The goal of this study was to explore the potential benefits of using an online task-supported module specially designed to promote the use of direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish through videoconference. This study attempted to address this gap by examining the effects of an online TSLT module on eliciting direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish.

The results presented in this chapter demonstrate the benefits of implementing Videoconferencing TSLT tasks that focus on meaning, are interesting for students, include a clear goal, and engage students in reflective learning. Overall, online TSLT modules seem to be a positive tool to promote the elicitation of problematic L2 grammatical structures such as direct and indirect object pronouns in Spanish.

References

- Baralt, M. (2014). Task sequencing and task complexity in traditional versus online classes. In M. Baralt, R. Gilabert, & P. Robinson (Eds.), *Task sequencing and instructed second language learning* (pp. 95–122). Bloomsbury.
- Baralt, M., Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Kim, Y. (2016). Engagement with language: How examining learners' affective and social engagement explains successful learner-generated attention to form. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning. Pedagogical potential and research agenda* (pp. 209-240). John Benjamins.

- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- Canals, L., & Mor, Y. (2020). Towards a Signature Pedagogy for Task-Based Technology-Enhanced Language Learning: Design Patterns. *Proceedings of the European Conference on Pattern Languages of Programs 2020 (EuroPLoP '20)* (pp. 1–11). NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3424771.3424787>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 459–480. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3586980>
- Chen, M. & Li, W. (2022) The Influence of Form-Focused Instruction on the L2 Chinese Oral Production of Korean Native Speakers. *Front. Psychol.* <https://doi.org/10.3389>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 30, 474–509.
- Kern, R., & Warschauer, M. (2008). Network-Based Language Teaching. In: Hornberger, N.H. (Eds). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_105
- Godev, C. B. (2014). First-year hybrid Spanish courses: How instructors manage their time. *Hispania*, 97, 21–31.
- González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Videoconferencing TBLT: Researching technology and tasks* (Vol. 6). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- González-Lloret, M. (2016). *A practical guide to integrating technology into task-based language teaching*. Georgetown University Press.
- Hattie, J., & Yates, G. C.R., (2014). *Visible learning and the science of how we learn*. Routledge.
- Liceras, Juana M., Denyse Maxwell, Biana Laguardia, Zara Fernández, Raquel Fernández, & Lourdes Díaz. (1997). A longitudinal study of Spanish non-native grammars: Beyond parameters. In William R. Glass and Ana Teresa Pérez-Leroux, (Ed.). *Contemporary perspectives on the acquisition of Spanish, vol. 1, Developing grammars* (p. 99- 132). Cascadilla Press.
- López-Burton, N., Marques, P. L., & Pardo, B. C. (2019). *Pura vida: Beginning Spanish*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Long, M.H. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (Ed.). *Issues in Second Language Acquisition: Multiple Perspectives* (pp 115-141). Newbury House.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, and C. Kramsch (Eds.). *Foreign Language Research in Cross-cultural*. John Benjamins.
- Norris, J.M. (2009). Task-based teaching and testing. In M. H. & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *Handbook of language teaching* (pp. 578–594). Wiley/Blackwell.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.
- Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Sanchez, L., & Tamara Al-Kasey. (1999). L2 acquisition of Spanish direct objects. *Spanish Applied Linguistics* 3:1-32.
- Schmidt, R. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages*. (pp. 165-209). Academic Press.
- Shaw, P., & Liu, E. (1998). What develops in the development of second-language writing? *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 225-254.
- Skehan, P. A (1998). *Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Spada, N., Lightbown, P., & White, J. (2005). The importance of form/meaning mappings in explicit form-focused instruction. In A. Housen, & M. Pierrard (Eds.), *Investigations in instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 199-234). Mouton de Gruyter. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110197372.2.199>
- Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the Communicative Approach (1), *ELT Journal*. 39, (1), pp. 2-12.
- Tomei, L. A. (2006). The impact of online teaching on faculty load: Computing the ideal class size for online courses. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 14, 531-541.
- Toyoda, E. (2001). Exercise of learner autonomy in project-oriented CALL. *CALL-EJ Online*, 2 (2), <http://callej.org/journal/2-2/toyoda.html>
- Van den Branden, K. (Ed.). (2006). *Task-based language education: from theory to practice*. Cambridge.
- VanPatten, B. & Sanz, C. (1995). From input to output: Processing instructional and communicative tasks. In Fred R. Eckman, Diane Highland, Peter W. Lee, Jean Mileham, and Rita Rutkowski Weber, (Eds.). *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp. 169-185). Routledge.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.
- Williams, M. (1994) Motivation in foreign and second language learning: an interactive perspective. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 11, 77-84.
- Worley, W., & Tesdell, L. (2009). Instructor time and effort in online and face-to-face teaching: Lessons learned. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 52, 138-151.

Appendix A: Tasks

- **Task 1:** En el dentista (*At the dentist's office*)
Type of Task: Information-gap and opinion task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life-like task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third direct object pronouns.
Objective: To recreate a real-world dentist appointment in Spanish.
Type of target language product: Conversation and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: individual and in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups.
Post-task: the whole class.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min Task cycle; 15 min post-task).
- **Task 2:** Entrevista de trabajo (*Job interview*)
Type of Task: Reasoning task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life-like task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third direct object pronouns.
Objective: To find an ideal boss or job candidate in Spanish.
Type of target language product: Conversation and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: first individual, then in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups. *Post-task*: in groups.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min task cycle; 15 min post-task).
- **Task 3:** Un familiar lejano (*An extended family member*)
Type of Task: Opinion task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life-like task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third direct object pronouns.
Objective: To be able to write an email to a family member in Spanish, and to decide which one of their families is the closest one.
Type of target language product: Conversation, notes and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups. *Post-task*: in groups.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min task cycle; 15 min post-task).
- **Task 4:** La boda perfecta (*The perfect wedding*)
Type of Task: Reasoning and opinion task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life-like task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third indirect object pronouns.
Objective: To try to design the best wedding of the class in Spanish.
Type of target language product: Conversation and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: individual and in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups.
Post-task: the whole class.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min task cycle; 15 min post-task).

- **Task 5:** Universidad en España (*University in Spain*)
Type of Task: Reasoning and opinion task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life-like task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third indirect object pronouns.
Objective: To be able to write a statement of purpose and cover letter in Spanish.
Type of target language product: Conversation, notes and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: individual and in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups.
Post-task: the whole class.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min Task cycle; 15 min post-task).
- **Task 6:** Fiesta para la clase (*Class party*)
Type of Task: Information-gap and opinion task.
Focus: FonF. The focus is on meaning, communicating in a real-life task.
Implicit target structure: First, second, and third indirect object pronouns.
Objective: To design the best class party in Spanish.
Type of target language product: Conversation and oral report.
Interaction Pattern: *Pre-task*: individual and in groups. *Task cycle*: in groups.
Post-task: the whole class.
Duration: 75 min total (15 min pre-task; 45 min Task cycle; 15 min post-task).

Appendix B: Task 2 prompt, Group B Videoconference Transcription, and Written Report

Pre-Task prompt:

Pre-Tarea
La mitad del grupo son jefes y la otra mitad buscan trabajo. Deben trabajar en los siguientes momentos en su cátedra desarrollando un rol para jefes o buscadores de trabajo.

Cultura Viva:
Errores comunes en las entrevistas de trabajo en el mundo hispano:
Inquietud en la silla: muestra la calma, sin moverte.
Sonrisa: es bueno sonreír en la situación lo requiere.
Contacto visual: Míra a la entrevistador.
Mirar el móvil: no mirar tu teléfono.

JEFES
1. Inventa un negocio
2. Piensa que tipo de candidato necesitas para tu negocio
3. Qué estilo quieres
4. Inicio del trabajo
5. Responsabilidades del trabajo
6. Experiencia necesaria

HUSCADOR DE TRABAJO
1. Tu trabajo ideal
2. Tus razones características
3. Tu experiencia
4. Tus estudios
5. Por qué quieres (describir) el trabajo.

You will need to work with your group over Zoom. There will be 2 jefes and 2 buscadores de trabajo in each group. Each jefe needs to find their ideal candidate. There will be a leader. The leader of each group should create a Zoom/Google with ALL the members of the group and complete this activity. The Zoom must be initiated maximum 20 min meeting.

Task cycle prompt:

Tarca Paso 1

Die jefas y die buscadores de trabajo debien tener entrevistas. En el Zoom, debien preguntarse las siguientes preguntas. Ejemplo: ¿Tienen permisos (vacante) de trabajo?

JEFES should ask...

1. ¿Tienen permisos de trabajo en sus Estados Unidos?
2. ¿Tienen permiso de conducir?
3. ¿Qué escuela fueron?
4. ¿Qué experiencia laboral tienen?
5. ¿Alguna vez fue jefe de familia?
6. ¿Alimentará la familia cuando han un problema?
7. ¿Conducirá con todo experiencia?
8. ¿Viaja en automóvil de trabajo?
9. ¿Vivirá sola siempre?
10. ¿Por qué quieren el trabajo?

Buscadores should ask...

1. ¿Qué se debe preguntar?
2. ¿Hay un líder laboral?
3. ¿Cómo fue la experiencia laboral?
4. ¿Habrán alguna experiencia laboral?
5. ¿Permiten que sean jefe jefe?
6. ¿Permiten trabajar más de tiempo largo?
7. ¿Permiten las citas laborales?
8. ¿Puedo vivir a tiempo?
9. ¿Tienen experiencia laboral en jefe?
10. ¿Alimentar a familia de trabajo?

Paso 2: En el Google doc, escribe un breve reporte explicando quien es tu jefe o buscador ideal de los dos de tu grupo y por que lo es.

Paso 1: Videoconference Transcription

Estudiante 1: Tenemos que hacer entrevista. Yo puedo ser jefa, estudiante 2.

Estudiante 2: Pero yo quiero jefa.

Estudiante 1: Está bien, tú eres la jefa y estudiante 3, ¿quieres buscar trabajo?

Estudiante 3: Está bien.

Estudiante 1: Ok. So, estudiante 4 es jefa y estudiante 2 es jefa. Primer, yo con estudiante 2 y

más tarde estudiante 4 con estudiante 3.

Estudiante 2: Ok.

Estudiante 4: Está bien.

Estudiante 1: Hola.

Estudiante 2: Hola.

Estudiante 1: ¿Eres una jefa?

Estudiante 2: Sí soy la jefa de este trabajo.

Estudiante 1: ¿Eres una jefa razonable?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Soy razonable. ¿Tienes un permiso de trabajo?

Estudiante 1: Sí, lo tengo y también para preparar la comida.

Estudiante 2: ¿Tú estudias?

Estudiante 1: Sí. Yo estudio las matemáticas y las comunicaciones y tengo mucha experiencia en trabajar las matemáticas siempre.

Estudiante 2: ¿Quieres hablarme de ti?

Estudiante 1: ¿Qué es el trabajo?

Estudiante 2: Es un restaurante de tacos.

Estudiante 1: ¿Cuántos trabajadores tienes?

Estudiante 2: Tengo cuatro trabajadores.

Estudiante 1: ¿Eres una jefa buena?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Yo soy muy buena y responsable.

Estudiante 1: ¿Qué experiencia necesitas para el trabajo?

Estudiante 2: Necesitas poca experiencia con la cocina, pero mucha experiencia con hablar con mucha gente. El candidato ideal es de Mexico o sabe mucho de tacos.

Estudiante 1: Yo sé preparar tacos. Quiero mucho el trabajo. ¿Pagas un buen sueldo?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Yo lo pago. Son treinta dólares por hora.

Estudiante 1: ¿Paegas por entrenar?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Entreno a todos y yo entreno para hacer tacos.

Estudiante 1: ¿Das días libres?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Los doy, tienes 3 días libres los viernes, sábados y domingos.

Estudiante 1: ¿Puedo trabajar los fines de semana?

Estudiante 2: Sí, tengo muchas personas comprando los tacos. ¿Tienes una licencia de conducir?

Estudiante 1: La tengo y tengo la licencia para preparar la comida y tengo una licencia para entregar los órdenes.

Estudiante 2: ¿Tienes un coche?

Estudiante 1: Sí, lo tengo.

Estudiante 2: Es para entregar los tacos.

Estudiante 1: ¿Puedo vestir ropa informal?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Puedes llevar ropa negra informal o mitad formal.

Estudiante 1: Yo llevo la ropa cara y negra.

Estudiante 2: ¿Quieres el trabajo?

Estudiante 1: ¿Tengo que entregarlos a todas las casas?

Estudiante 2: Mmmm. ¿Puede repetir eso?

Estudiante 1: Los tacos. ¿Tengo llevar los tacos a todas las casas?

Estudiante 2: Sí. Tienes que entregarlos a todas las casas. ¿Quieres tu trabajo?

Estudiante 1: Sí lo quiero, porque es fácil, me gusta, y tengo la experiencia.

Estudiante 2: ¡Lo tienes! Puedes empezar el lunes!

Estudiante 1: Dulce.

Estudiante 3: Mi turno.

Estudiante 1: Sí.

Estudiante 3: Hola busco por un trabajo.

Estudiante 4: Yo tengo un café. Necesito una barista.

Estudiante 3: Muy bien, yo tengo experiencia.

Estudiante 4: Sí, no hay problema. Yo preparo hamburguesas, pizza, y muchas otras comidas

Estudiante 3: ¿Permites días libres?

Estudiante 4: Sí. Los días libres están en el fin de semana: los sábados y domingos.

Estudiante 3: ¿Pagas un buen sueldo?

Estudiante 4: Pago \$20 por hora. ¿Tienes licencia para conducir?

Estudiante 3: Sí. La tengo.

Estudiante 4: ¿Quieres trabajar en la mañana o en la noche?

Estudiante 3: Puedo trabajo en la noche porque soy una estudiante.

Estudiante 4: En la noche, el trabajo empieza a las dos y termina a las diez.

Estudiante 3: Es muy largo.

Estudiante 4: Sí. Es ocho horas pero tú tienes dos.

Estudiante 3: Está bien. El café tiene buenas reseñas en Yelp.

Estudiante 4: Sí. las tiene. Reseñas son muy bien. Muchas clientes visitan el café y encanta.

Estudiante 3: ¿Puedo vestir informal o un uniforme?

Estudiante 4: Necesita un uniforme gris, es muy formal. ¿Consideras que eres responsable?

Estudiante 3: Sí lo considero y luego al tiempo y yo sigo la dirección.

Estudiante 4: ¿Y abandonas tu trabajo por una problema?

Estudiante 3: No lo abandono, y busco ayuda. ¿Festejas los días religiosos o no?

Estudiante 4: No tienes trabajo en los días de festivales. ¿Por qué quieres el trabajo?

Estudiante 3: Yo lo merezco porque yo responsable y trabajadora luego al tiempo y trabajar rápido.

Estudiante 4: ¿Puedes empieza?

Estudiante 3: ¿Cuándo?

Estudiante 4: Sí

Estudiante 3: Yo puedo empezar los lunes. ¿Tú piensas que merezco el trabajo?

Estudiante 4: Si, tú mereces y tienes el trabajo.

Estudiante 3: Muchas gracias

Estudiante 4: Muchas gracias, estudiante 3. Adiós.

Estudiante 3: Hasta luego

Estudiante 1: Muy bueno. Gracias.

Estudiante 3: ¿Hacemos paso 2?

Estudiante 1: Yo escribo el reporte de mi grupo. ¿Estudiante 4, tú escribes reporte de tu grupo?

Estudiante 4: Sí. Send me de link of the Googledoc.

Estudiante 1: Es en el chat. Tenemos que... no sé la palabra... choose la mejor jefe.

Estudiante 4: Sí.

Estudiante 3: Yo creo que estudiante 4 es buen jefe porque prepara las hamburguesas.

Estudiante 1: Sí, pero estudiante 2 paga más alto.

Estudiante 2: Yo soy más cara.

Estudiante 4: Estudiante 2 es tacos y están delicioso. Mi empresa es americano. Yo prefiero comida de México.

Estudiante 3: Sí. Yo también.

Estudiante 2: Gracias. Yo soy una jefe bien.

Estudiante 1: So... ¿estudiante 2 es el jefe ideal?

Estudiante 3: Para mí sí.

Estudiante 4: Está bien.

Estudiante 2: Gracias team.

Estudiante 1: Yo escribo reporte de la jefe ideal y así estamos terminando.

Estudiante 3: Gracias.

Estudiante 2: Gracias.

Estudiante 4: Gracias.

Estudiante 1: Adios.

Total number of uses of the direct object pronoun in the videoconferencing meeting: 13

Paso 2: Written report

El resumen del primer sub-grupo: Estudiante 1 tiene un permiso para trabajar para la cocina. Estudiante 1 quiere estudiar matemáticas y comunicaciones. Estudiante 1 tiene mucha experiencia en matemáticas y es una buscadora de trabajo muy trabajadora. Estudiante 2 es una jefe responsable y es muy buena. Estudiante 2 tiene una empresa de tacos. Pienso que estudiante 1 es una trabajadora perfecta para la empresa de tacos. Ella es muy inteligente y tiene mucha experiencia con comunicaciones, y este es muy importante porque ella necesita hablar mucha con la gente si quiere trabajar en una empresa de tacos. Es verdad que ella no tiene mucha experiencia en la cocina, pero pienso que puede enseñarla. Ella puede trabajar en los fines de semana cuando tiene muchos clientes y me gusta eso mucho porque no hay muchas personas que pueden hacerlo. La ropa necesita ser informal pero es más o menos. Los trabajadores necesitan trabajar seis horas. Estudiante 1 viste ropa formal y la viste cara.

El resumen del segundo sub-grupo: Estudiante 3 tiene un permiso para trabajar, y es muy responsable. Estudiante 4 tiene un café. Ella prepara hamburguesas y muchas comidas. Estudiante 3 puede tener días libres (todos son pagadas), pero debe pedirlos. Estudiante 3 tiene que trabajar los sábados y domingos unos o dos tiempos y también puede vestir ropa gris y la lleva elegante. Más o menos son 2 horas cada semana. Estudiante 3 es una trabajadora muy buena y tiene la experiencia necesaria para ser una gran trabajadora. Ella es muy simpática y parece una buena persona. En la empresa de café, Estudiante 3 es una trabajadora perfecta pero necesita aprender más sobre el café. La experiencia la necesita para hablar con los clientes y con otras empresas también. Para concluir, es una trabajadora buena.

El resumen del grupo entero: Estudiante 2 y estudiante 4 son jefas muy simpáticas y responsables. Nosotras necesitan seleccionar la más mejor. La empresa de estudiante 2 es muy interesante porque me gustan los tacos y es muy divertida para cocinar, pero no es sencillo la experiencia necesitada. También necesito vestir formal si quiero trabajar en la empresa de estudiante 4 y esa idea no la quiero. Yo prefiero vestir en ropa un poco informal y por eso me gusta el atuendo de ropa negra en la empresa de estudiante 2. Me gusta la empresa de estudiante 2 porque puedo aprender más sobre tacos y ella me paga bien. Para concluir, yo quiero trabajar con la empresa de estudiante 2.