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This study explored the effect of subtitled videos on grammar learning in an intermediate level ESL grammar classroom at a large state university in the U.S. Midwest. This classroom-based research makes use of the noticing hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) to investigate the effect of using enhanced subtitles and input flooding of a specific grammatical structure, the past perfect form, on learning. The study also looked at nine participants’ attitudes and their opinions on using videos to learn grammar. An immediate noticing activity was used to reveal if students noticed the enhanced past perfect forms from the video subtitles while a pretest and post-test was used to examine if students demonstrated a gain in knowledge of the usage of the form.

Results show that the first time the noticing activity was administered only 3 out of 9 students noticed fewer than 3 words out of the 7 subtitled words. In the second time the same activity was administered 5 students were able to notice some of the words with an average of 3 words being noticed. Pre-test and post-test results show that there was a gain in grammatical knowledge with an average of 58.3 % hence the subtitled video helped learners learn the target structure. However, the students were not just exposed to implicit instruction by watching the subtitled video during the two class periods. They also received explicit instruction on when and how to use the form through using an animated cartoon before watching the subtitled video. Overall, students interacted together as they worked within their groups to complete tasks with minimal student-teacher interaction. Findings of the questionnaire and debriefing session showed that the students had a positive attitude towards this grammar teaching approach while some
students expressed some concerns. Overall, explicit instruction and implicit instruction through watching the enhanced subtitled video helped students better understand the context that a specific grammatical structure was used.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The exponential interest and use of social media applications in today’s world may have sprung from the ease of allowing people to connect together and share ideas, photos, and videos with great ease and in an entertaining manner. Many of the people who share videos, for example, are not the original creators of those videos but have shared them from a large repository of videos found on YouTube. In fact, YouTube has allowed millions of people to create their own videos and create their own channels for other people to view and even share on other social media applications such as Facebook and Twitter. The creation and sharing of videos on YouTube have been used extensively for various purposes. They have been used by many people merely for the joy of entertainment, to other more formal uses such as learning and advertising.

The use of multimedia in language learning has gained interest in the last decade due to the potential it holds to use different modes of delivery to provide input to learners. The multimedia learning theory principles state that students acquire language better from input enhanced by text and pictures than with text alone. According to the interactionist model (Chapelle, 1997,1998; Gass, 1997; Long 1985; Pica 1994) of language learning, three functions are critical for language acquisition: comprehensible input, interaction and comprehensible output. According to Plass and Jones (2005), using the interactionist model of second language acquisition with multimedia is “the use of words and pictures designed to support the comprehensible input that the learner is exposed to and interacts with, and to elicit and negotiate comprehensible output” (p. 469).
Comprehensible input here refers to what Krashen (1982) proposes as linguistic material that is just one step above the students’ current level of competence.

Two of the fundamental aspects that the present study is based upon are providing modified and enhanced input to learners in order to harness the benefit of the input. Modified input for a learner can be created by adding an aspect of redundancy and changing the mode of input (Chapelle, 2003) while enhanced input makes input more salient to L2 learners using various techniques such as underlining, boldfacing, italicization, capitalization, color coding, or using different font sizes or types (Lee et al. 2008). The literature on input enhancement of grammatical structures shows that input has been delivered primarily via one mode of input, i.e., text-based reading passages. In those studies of input enhancement, the target grammatical structure that is embedded within the reading passage is enhanced in a way so that it becomes more salient.

According to Schmidt’s (1990) noticing hypothesis, noticing certain features in input is necessary and a prerequisite before that the input is internalized/ acquired. By increasing the perceptual saliency of certain forms, learners’ attention is drawn to the input in the hope that they notice it. Another important aspect that this study focuses on is input flooding. Input flooding is “input learners receive [that] is saturated with the form that we hope learners will notice and possibly acquire” (Wong, 2005, p.37).

The present study uses multimedia to investigate if modifying and enhancing input as well as input flooding to help learners notice and learn a specific grammatical structure: past perfect tense. The input in a video, obtained from YouTube, was modified by adding subtitles that added redundancy and changed the input mode from its oral form in the video into textual form of subtitles. In addition to modifying input, the past perfect
forms by bolding, increasing font size and changing the color of all past perfect forms to encourage noticing.

Of particular interest in this study is Long’s (1991) proposal of focus of form, where he suggests that learners’ attention should be drawn to linguistic features in input in such a way to overtly draw their attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning, or communication. Therefore what this line of thinking seems to propose is a balance between implicit and explicit instruction where communicative interaction is the main focus of instruction while not neglecting discussion of the language structure as needed. The need for explicit instruction was tested in a pilot study with a focus similar to the present study. Implicit instruction where the focus was on communication only with no explicit instruction on rule formation was found to be unsuccessful. Hence, the present study attempts to provide a balance between implicit and explicit instruction. The implicit instruction of form, which composes the main part the lessons, is provided through the use of authentic video found on YouTube called the LEGO story, and explicit instruction is provided through explanation of how the past perfect verb forms are used in the animated cartoon. The term authentic here refers to the use of material that has not been initially created for language learners.

The rationale behind using a subtitled video for grammar instruction is that first, all the research that has been done so far has investigated the use of multimodalities on reading and listening comprehension with few studies on oral communication. Hence, this research addresses this niche in literature of the effect of providing enhanced input on learning a grammatical structure through the use of multimedia. Second, since
multimodal modes of delivery have more benefits than one mode of delivery, using a video is expected to maximize the benefits of the input.

Since the goal of the present study is providing grammar instruction primarily through using an enhanced subtitled video, Chapter 2 will review the literature on explicit versus implicit grammar instruction, textual input enhancement, and multimedia and textual input enhancement. Chapter 3 will explain the procedures and materials used in the study and the design choices made to subtitle the video. Chapter 4 will present the results and analysis of this study. Chapter 5 will conclude the thesis by discussing limitations of the study as well as offering recommendations for future research on using subtitled video for grammar instruction.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter reviews a variety of relevant studies that have been conducted in three different areas: explicit versus implicit grammar instruction, textual input enhancement, multimedia and textual input enhancement. It also discusses how previous studies that have been done in those areas relate to the current study on the use of enhanced subtitled video in grammar instruction. On one hand, current research in SLA has looked at the role of grammar instruction in classrooms and whether grammar should be taught implicitly or explicitly. On the other hand, research on the use of multimedia in language learning has gained wide attention in language learning research for its potential for providing meaningful input or comprehensible input to learners using various modes of delivery. In particular, these studies have looked at the effectiveness of video subtitling on reading and listening comprehension with very few studies looking at the effect of video subtitling on oral communication. Subtitles were used in those studies as a method of enhancing input to the learners and so providing learners with comprehensible input that would lead to an increase vocabulary acquisition, listening comprehension and oral communication. In addition, to exploring the effectiveness of grammar instruction and video subtitles as a method of input enhancement, numerous research has been done on the effectiveness of textual enhancements as a method of focusing learners’ attention on grammatical forms. Yet, no research so far has investigated the intersection of using multimedia (subtitled videos) for grammar instruction. This chapter reviews research on the effectiveness of grammar instruction, textual enhancement, as well as the
effectiveness of multimedia in teaching reading and listening comprehension. Finally, it addresses the niche in literature of using subtitled videos to teach grammar.

**Explicit versus implicit grammar instruction**

There is a longstanding debate about whether grammar should be explicitly taught or whether students should be expected to pick up grammatical knowledge implicitly. A meta-analysis of 49 studies on the effectiveness of L2 instruction by Norris and Ortega (2000) concluded that explicit instruction (presenting the structure, describing and exemplifying it, and giving rules for its use) is much more beneficial for learning target grammatical structures in comparison to implicit instruction alone. This renewed interest in explicit grammar instruction is seen as being essential for accurate attainment of L2 structures compared to immersion programs (e.g. Harley & Swain, 1984; Lapkin, Hart, & Swain, 1991; Swain, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1989) where explicit grammar instruction is not addressed. As Nassaji and Fotos (2004) suggest, communicative language teaching alone, where it is mostly meaning-based with no focus on form, is found to be inadequate.

Following Schmidt’s *noticing hypothesis* is that conscious attention to form is necessary for language learning for learners to notice the target grammatical structure in language input, their attention must be drawn to that target grammatical structure. Otherwise, learners process input for meaning only and do not notice the target forms in input (e.g. Skehan 1998; Tomasello 1998). Hence explicit instruction, according to Nassaji and Fotos (2004), helps direct attention to form if the purpose of grammar instruction is to help learners learn the target grammatical structure.
Textual input enhancement

Enhancing grammatical forms in input for L2 learners, as a means of drawing their attention to the forms that would eventually result in acquisition of those forms, has been researched extensively in the field of second language acquisition. This method has been used to draw the learners’ attention to form implicitly without the need of explicit instruction on form. The term *enhanced input* will be used here to refer to the methods used to make text more salient to L2 learners by using various techniques such as underlining, boldfacing, italicization, capitalization, color coding, or using different font sizes or types (Lee & Huang, 2008). According to Chapelle (2003), input in CALL can be enhanced in a number of different ways: either by salience, modification or elaboration or a combination of any of them. In grammar learning, input has been enhanced to draw the learner’s attention to a specific form which, according Sharwood’s (1991,1993) proposal of input enhancement, help the learner acquire the grammatical form. Han et al. (2008) examines 21 studies on textual enhancement and found as follows:

“A survey of the L2 literature since the 1990s yielded 21 empirical studies of [textual enhancement], most of which adopted a comparative approach whereby [textual enhancement] was pitted against another strategy, such as rule presentation (Doughty, 1991; Alanen, 1995), output production (Izumi 2002), or exclusively meaning-based communicative teaching (Leeman et al. 1995).” (Han et al., 2008, 599)

The 21 studies on textual input enhancement reviewed by Han et al. (2008) show that enhancing input was effective in that it promoted noticing and acquisition even though the degree of effectiveness of input enhancement were different in the studies reviewed. In some of these studies input enhancement was effective and in other studies it was moderately effective in that it led to noticing but not to acquisition while in others
it was not effective at all. Han et al. (2008) concluded that the different results yielded by these studies on the effectiveness of L2 input enhancement were mainly due to the methodological procedures used. Han et al. (2008) identified 10 different aspects that were the main cause of variation of results in those 21 studies:

1. Employing simple versus compound enhancement
2. Employing isolated words versus sentences versus discourse as stimuli
3. Enhancing a meaning-bearing versus a non-meaningful form
4. Teaching learners with or without prior knowledge of the target form
5. Enhancing the target form many versus one or a few times
6. Using a longer versus a shorter text
7. Employing a single versus multiple short sessions over an extended period of time
8. Enhancing one form versus multiple forms
9. Providing (or not) comprehension support prior to the treatment
10. Providing (or not) explicit instruction on what to focus on prior to the treatment.

Tables 2.1-2.3 were constructed to illustrate how each of these studies employed these parameters.
Table 2.1. Summary of studies that has shown positive effects of input enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Type of input</th>
<th>Type of discourse</th>
<th>Type of enhancement</th>
<th>Frequency of target form</th>
<th>How long vs. short text</th>
<th>How many forms</th>
<th>Comprehension support</th>
<th>Instruction on what to focus on prior treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doughty (1991)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>5-6 forms</td>
<td>3 texts; length unreported</td>
<td>Multiple; 10 sessions</td>
<td>1 Present None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shook (1994)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>6 times in each text</td>
<td>2 texts; 185 and 217 words)</td>
<td>Multiple; 2 day period</td>
<td>2 None Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jourendais et al (1995)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>18 times for one form and 10 for the other form</td>
<td>1 text; length unreported</td>
<td>Single; less than an hour</td>
<td>2 None None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeman et al (1995)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>Many; exact no. unreported</td>
<td>1 text; length unreported</td>
<td>Multiple; 2 class meetings</td>
<td>2 None Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shook (1999)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>6 times in each text</td>
<td>2 texts; 185 and 217 words)</td>
<td>Multiple; 2 day period</td>
<td>2 None Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams (1999)</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>unreported</td>
<td>40 sentences</td>
<td>Single; between 1 hour 40 min- 2 hours</td>
<td>5 Present None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berent (2007)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>Multiple; 10 weeks</td>
<td>9 None None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee (2007)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 texts; 309 and 315 words</td>
<td>Multiple; 12 sessions</td>
<td>1 None Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2.2. Summary of studies that has shown limited effects of input enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>1. Simple vs. compound enhancement</th>
<th>2. Isolated words vs. sentences vs. discourse stimuli</th>
<th>3. Meaningful vs. non-meaningful form</th>
<th>4. Learners w/o prior knowledge of target form</th>
<th>5. Frequency of target form (one, few, many)</th>
<th>6. Longer vs. short text</th>
<th>7. Single vs. multiple short sessions</th>
<th>8. Number of enhanced forms</th>
<th>9. Comprehension support</th>
<th>10. Instruction on what to focus on prior treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alanen (1995)</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Non-meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>Varied (2-8)</td>
<td>2 short texts; 87 and 98 words)</td>
<td>Multiple 2 day period- less than an hour each</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson (1997)</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Sentences</td>
<td>Non-meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>Varied 1-10</td>
<td>55 sentences</td>
<td>Single; less than an hour</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izumi (2002)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>Many; exact no. unreported</td>
<td>1 text; length unreported</td>
<td>Multiple; 6 sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (1998)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple; 50 hrs. for one group and 10 hrs. for another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcroft (2003)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>9 in one list &amp; 3 in another list</td>
<td>24 words</td>
<td>Single; 9.6 min</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park (2004)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>6 times</td>
<td>2 tasks-reconstructing a story using a comic strip</td>
<td>Single, 1 class period (80 min)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3. Summary of studies that has shown no effect of input enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mean. vs. Non-mean.</th>
<th>Prior Knowledge</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Longer vs. Short</th>
<th>Shorter vs. Longer Sessions</th>
<th>Number of Enhanced Forms</th>
<th>Comprehension Support</th>
<th>Instruction on Focus of Prior Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leow (1997)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 text; long version 631 and short version unreported length</td>
<td>Single; one session</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstreet (1998)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>18 times for one form &amp; 10 for the other form</td>
<td>2 texts; 210 words each</td>
<td>Single; less than an hour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (1998)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple; 50 hrs. for one group and 10 hrs. for another</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leow (2001)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>17 times</td>
<td>1 text; 242 words</td>
<td>Single; one session</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles (2003)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>With</td>
<td>17 times</td>
<td>1 text; 242 words</td>
<td>Single; one session</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leow (2003)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Basic knowledge</td>
<td>10 in one text &amp; 10 in another text</td>
<td>2 texts; length unreported</td>
<td>Multiple; 3 class periods with 10 minutes of exposure in each class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong (2003)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Non-meaningful</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>16 times in each text</td>
<td>3 texts; 526 vs. 511, 465 vs. 469, and 517 vs. 530 words</td>
<td>Multiple; 3 sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim (2006)</td>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Without</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 text; length unreported</td>
<td>Single; 20 min</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodological idiosyncrasies in input enhancement studies

The first variation that Han et al. (2008) observed in the studies they reviewed was how the input was enhanced: through a variety of methods versus only one method. Almost all of the studies used a combination of methods to increase the perceptual saliency of a specific form. These methods included bolding, italicizing, capitalizing, and using different font sizes and types. Only two studies (Alanen, 1995; Williams, 1999) used simple enhancement; Alanen (1995) used italics to enhance the locative suffixes of semi-artificial Finnish while Williams (1999) used highlighting to enhance different vocabulary items.

The studies also differed from each other in terms of the material the target form was embedded into, the meaningfulness or communicative value of that form, and learners’ prior knowledge of those target forms. Most of the studies had the target form enhanced within a reading passage i.e. within discourse, (e.g. Doughty 1991; Wong, 2003; Shook 1994, 1999; Jourdenais et.al 1995, Alanen, 1995; Kim, 2006) with few studies using sentences (Robinson 1997, Williams, 1999) and only one using word lists Barcroft (2003). It is worth noting here that none of the studies used a variety of modes of delivery such as sound, images, or a combination of both multimedia. In other words, the enhanced input was present as isolated words, or embedded within sentences or a reading passage. Thus the present study attempts to use additional dimensions with modified input, besides changing the typographical features of input such as boldfacing, capitalizing, and underling by using multiple modes other than just text. This study makes use of Chapelle’s (2003) definition of modified input as adding an aspect of redundancy and changing the mode of input (p. 40). Similar to Grgurović & Hegelheimer
(2007), subtitles add the aspect of redundancy and change the input mode from its oral form in the video into textual form of subtitles.

Most of the studies of the studies reviewed by Han et al. (2008) used meaningful target forms with varying degrees of meaningfulness. The meaningfulness of a form refers to its inherent semantic value and its contribution to the referential meaning of a sentence or utterance (Wong, 2003). For example, Shook (1994, 1999) examined the intake of the “more-meaningful” Spanish present perfect vs. the “less meaningful” Spanish relative pronoun under enhanced and unenhanced input enhancement conditions. The results of these studies show that the learners performed better on the present perfect tasks than they did on the relative pronoun indicating that the meaningfulness of the target form plays a role in the level of intake of different forms. In fact, Leow (1997) explains that the negative effect of enhanced input on the reader’s intake contradicts with the findings by Shook (1994) and Jourdenais et.al (1995) in light of the meaningfulness of the target form used in his study. He believed that the Spanish imperative form that he used as the target form in his study and the Spanish preterit and imperfect forms used in Jourdenais et.al (1995) were less meaningful than those used in Shook (1994, 1999) i.e. the present perfect and relative pronouns. Similarly, Leeman et.al (1995) who used the same forms used by Jourdenais et.al (the Spanish preterit and imperfect forms) believe that the distinction between these two forms are very subtle to the extent that the differences between these two forms posit a difficulty to advanced L2 learners of Spanish. Moreover, Wong (2003) used French as a target form (French past participle) who stated the communicative value of that form as having no inherent semantic value. Likewise, Leow (2003) used the French past participle agreement in relative clauses that
he believes has no communicative value. While the rest of the studies did not include the communicative value of the form as an independent variable, we can still assume that these studies used meaningful linguistic items in their studies when compared to other studies that used artificial language (Alanen (1995) used semi artificial Finnish and Robinson (1997) used artificial English verbs). Overall, 18 out of the 21 studies used real language with varying degrees of communicative value while 2 studies used artificial language.

With regards to the participants’ prior knowledge of the form, 6 studies (Williams, 1999; Alanen, 1995; Robinson, 1997; Leow, 1997; Barcroft, 2003; Kim 2006) had participants who had no knowledge of the target form while 14 studies had participants with at least some basic knowledge of the form (only Williams, 1999 did not provide information on the subjects’ prior knowledge of the target form.) It is worth noting here that prior knowledge of target form was used as an independent variable in 3 studies. Shook, (1994, 1999) had 2 groups of subjects; some subjects had knowledge of the target form while others did not. Bolwes (2003) replicated Leow’s (2001) study but with learners of an advanced language proficiency to examine the role of language experience on learning the Spanish formal imperative. Hence, although 14 of the studies reported that their subjects had at least some knowledge of the target form, the language proficiency of the learners across the studies are not comparable since they were not based on standardized language proficiency test scores.

Han et al. (2008) mentioned 3 other variables as the main cause of variation of results in the 21 studies; the frequency of the target form (how many times did the target form appear in the text), length of the text, and number of target forms used in the study.
The majority of the studies reported an exact number of the frequency of the target form, some just reported that the target forms appeared ‘many times’ while others did not provide information on the frequency of target form. The most common frequency of the target form were 6 times (Shook 1994; 1999; Doughty, 1991; Park 2004) followed by 10 and 18 times of two different forms in 2 studies (Jourdenais, 1995; Overstreet, 1998). Although there were studies that had a higher ratio of input flooding than other studies, it was not always a successful factor in helping learners to attend to form despite the frequency of the form (compare Leow, 2003 and Shook, 1994 in Han et al. 2008, p. 610). Wong (2005) believes that further studies should examine the optimal number of exemplars of the target form to help learners to attend to and learn the form.

The 21 studies used varying number of texts as the material through which the target forms were embedded with most studies using between 1-3 texts. Most of the studies used 1 or 2 target forms in their study where this target form, as discussed earlier, was enhanced more than once.

The last three aspects of variation mentioned by Han et al. (2008) is number of the sessions, whether comprehension support was provided to the subjects and whether the subjects were explicitly instructed before the treatment to focus on the target forms. The duration of the treatment or number of sessions were as short as less than an hour (Jourdenais et.al,1995; Overstreet 1998; Leow 2001) and as long as a 10 week period (Berent 2007) or a total of 50 hours (White 1998). Moreover, only 4 out of 21 studies provided comprehension support to the learners under the premise that it was difficult for learners to simultaneously attend to both form and meaning. According to VanPatten (1990) “[C]onscious attention to form in input competes with conscious attention to
meaning, and, by extension, that only when input is easily understood can learners attend to form as part of the intake process” (p. 296). The comprehension support that was provided to the subjects in Leow 2001 and Bolwes 2003 was in the form of a worksheet of content vocabulary words given to the learners prior to treatment. This was done in order to familiarize the learners with the words that they would encounter in the text hence minimizing the processing load of the text. In Doughty (1991) and Alanen (1995), a dictionary help option and a Finnish-English glossary with a picture was provided to the learners in each of these studies respectively to help learners understand the passages given to them. Another aspect that Han et al. (2008) talk about is whether instruction was provided before the treatment to focus on the target form. Only 5 out of the 21 studies provided explicit instructions prior treatment on what to pay attention to during the treatment i.e. while reading the enhanced text. Leow (1997) discusses the negative effect of input enhancement on readers’ intake in his study in comparison to the positive findings of Shook (1994) and Jourdenais (1995). He points to the role of instruction prior to treatment that was present in the latter two studies as playing a role in encouraging the learners to pay attention to the target form (p.163).

Other factors

Overall, 10 different aspects that Han et al. (2008) outline as the major differences between the studies provide a good picture of why these 21 studies on input enhancement did not reach a consensus on the effect of enhancing input on learning the target form. In addition to those 10 aspects, these studies also differed in other ways such as the noticing measure used and the variety of the target linguistic forms with regards to learner readiness to learn the form. In the 21 studies reviewed by Han et al., different studies
employed different measures to assess noticing. A number of studies used think-aloud protocols (Jourdenais 1995; Alanen, 1995; Overstreet, 1998; Leow 2001, 2003; Bowles, 2003) while other studies used multiple choice recognition test (Shook 1994, 1999; Leow 1997), a form-recognition post-test (Kim 2006), a debriefing (Wong 2003), a note-taking and production task (Izumi 2002), or a recall task (Williams 1999). Studies have shown that the learner’s developmental readiness is one of the factors that affect noticing of the target form (e.g. Bardovi-Harling, 1995; Pienemann, 1985, Sharwood Smith 1991; Williams & Evans, 1998). Hence, some of the studies that have found input enhancement to be ineffective to promote noticing or learning might have used forms that learners were not developmentally ready for. In fact, the inconclusive results of input enhancement studies reviewed by Han et al. (2008) suggest that “externally created salience of the target forms does not necessarily facilitate learner noticing, giving rise to the possibility that there may be other important learner-internal factors at work in generating learner noticing” (Park & Han, 2007, p. 149).

Another meta-analysis of 16 studies by Lee and Huang (2008) on the effects of visual input enhancement on learning of grammatical items through reading tasks have showed similar results. The findings of the meta-analysis was not surprising since 12 out of the 16 studies overlap those in Han et al. (2008) whereas the remaining 4 are unpublished doctoral dissertations. Lee and Huang’s (2008) study reveals “second language readers provided with enhancement-embedded texts barely outperform those who were exposed to unenhanced texts with the same target forms flooded in them” (p. 307). However, the researchers stress the point that their results are only tentative rather than definitive due to the methodological idiosyncrasies and evidence suggesting a
publication bias in the research domain. Some of these methodological idiosyncrasies include “learner proficiency, prior knowledge of the participants, extent of the treatment intensity in light of the number of sessions and length of reading texts, and reported degree of noticing” (p. 326).

As mentioned earlier, all of the studies that enhanced input whether for the goal of grammar learning or vocabulary acquisition mostly used reading passages as the instructional material. Now we turn our focus to research done in using multimedia for vocabulary learning, reading and listening comprehension.

**Using multimedia for input enhancement**

Research on second language acquisition with multimedia has investigated how multimedia, i.e. a combination of text, audio, and images, can enhance input by making it more meaningful thus enhancing students’ second-language development. (Plass & Jones, 2005). “Second language acquisition with multimedia is the use of words and pictures designed to support the comprehensible input that the learner is exposed to and interacts with, and to elicit and negotiate comprehensible output” (Plass & Jones, 2005, p. 469). Using multimedia for second language acquisition is based on the multimedia principle that states that students acquire language better from input enhanced by text and pictures than with text alone. The reason for that is the availability of two modes (text and pictures) helps learners to construct verbal and visual mental models of input and build connections between them (Plass & Jones, 2005). Hence, learners have the benefit of retrieving learned material from two types of cues rather than one.

One of the ways to create more enhanced input in multimedia is to use subtitled videos. Most of the foreign/second language research on the domain of video subtitling
has investigated the effectiveness of subtitles on reading and listening comprehension. Hayati and Mohmedi (2010) investigated the effect of using films with English and Persian subtitles and without subtitles on listening comprehension on EFL intermediate students. The students that received the film with English subtitles outperformed the other two groups (the groups that received the Persian and the group that did not receive subtitles respectively). In other words, they found that subtitled videos had a positive effect on listening comprehension with a highest performance in the English subtitle group.

Another study (Grgurović & Hegelheimer, 2007) investigated whether subtitles or transcripts were more effective in providing modified input to learners in cases of comprehension breakdowns. The study made use of Chapelle’s (2003) definition of modified input as adding an aspect of redundancy and changing the mode of input so that it becomes more comprehensible (p. 40). In that study the subtitles and transcripts added the aspect of redundancy and changed the input mode from its oral form in the video into textual form of subtitles and a transcript. Grgurović and Hegelheimer (2007) found that the learners in instances of comprehension breakdowns used the subtitles more often than transcripts and for longer periods of time. Therefore, this finding suggests that CALL designers are encouraged to make subtitles the help option in multimedia listening materials.

Another study by Guichon and McLornan (2008) investigated the effects of multimodality upon second language comprehension using a BBC video. Four groups were given different treatments: group 1 was exposed to sound alone, group 2 to image and sound, group 3 to image, sound and L1 (English) subtitles and group 4 to image,
sound and L2 (French) subtitles. The results were that group 3 and 4 that received English and French subtitled videos respectively outperformed group 1 and 2 that received sound and a combination of sound and images respectively. The conclusion that was drawn from these results is that “subtitles appear to be a determining factor for understanding some of the information as shown in the case of two of the semantic units” (Guichon & McLornan, 2008, p. 90). In addition, the researchers recommend L2 subtitling rather than L1 subtitling due to the lexical interference (errors in word choice made due to similarity between L1 and L2 i.e. English and French) using French words of the latter causes. Winke, Gass, and Sydorenko (2010) investigated the effects of captioning during video-based listening activities on comprehension and vocabulary recognition. Learners of Arabic, Chinese, Spanish and Russian of two different proficiency levels viewed 3 videos with and without captioning. Only the Spanish learners had two groups; those that viewed the video with captions and those who did not. Results showed that Spanish learners who viewed the video twice with captions did significantly better on the vocabulary test than the group that viewed the video without captions. As with regards to the order of caption presentation, learners of all languages who saw the captions during the first viewing outperformed on the vocabulary test than those who saw the captions on the second viewing. Overall, the researchers found that the use of input different modalities i.e. videos with captions aided vocabulary recognition and overall comprehension. Sydorenko (2010) also examined the effect of input modality on learning of written and oral word forms, vocabulary gain, noticing input, and vocabulary learning strategies. The findings reveal that the group that received input through multiple modes (images, sound, and subtitles) performed better on written
rather than oral recognition of word forms. “Pedagogical implications of this study are that captioned video tends to aid recognition of written word forms and the learning of word meaning, while non-captioned video tends to improve listening comprehension as it facilitates recognition of aural word forms.” (Sydorenko, 2010, p. 50). Overall, all these studies support the use of multimodalities (images, sound, and subtitles) for better comprehension.

Despite the large number of studies on the effect of using video captions on reading and listening comprehension, very few have been done on the effect of subtitling on speaking performance. Borras and Lafayette (1994) found results that indicate that subtitles hold “potential value in helping the learner to not only better comprehend authentic linguistic input but also to produce comprehensible communicative output.” (Borras & Lafayette, 1994, p. 69)

Throughout the literature on captioned or subtitled videos and its effect on reading, listening, and speaking performance, no research has been done on the effect of subtitling videos on grammar learning. Hence research is needed in this area to show what role subtitled videos plays in grammar learning.

Using subtitled videos for grammar learning

It has been advocated that teaching grammar in a contextualized manner is more beneficial than abstracting structures from their meaning and use.

“Since our goal is to achieve a better fit between grammar and communication, it is not helpful to think of grammar as a discrete set of meaningless, decontextualized, static structures. Nor is it helpful to think of grammar solely as prescriptive rules about linguistic form… Grammatical structures not only have (morphosyntactic) form, they are
also used to express meaning (semantics) in context-appropriate use (pragmatics)” (Larsen-Freeman, 2001, p. 252).

Hence, what this implies is that teaching grammar through rule presentation only and by using a set of decontextualized sentences is unhelpful. This is because this type of methodology of grammar instruction does not serve the purpose of demonstrating how these structures are used in meaningful communication i.e. through context. The review of literature on grammar instruction reveals that a balance needs to be sought between a meaning-based and form-based instruction to help learners communicatively use language without sacrificing grammatical accuracy. One way of presenting language structures in a meaningful and contextualized manner is through using subtitled videos that contain embedded enhanced grammatical structures.

The review of research in enhanced L2 input and the use of subtitled videos in SLA has revealed a number of niches that needs to be addressed. First, although the results from research on the result of enhanced input on noticing and learning grammatical forms are inconclusive due to methodological idiosyncrasies, all studies employed one mode of delivery, a typographically enhanced input only. Second, research done in the field so far has not investigated the role of subtitled videos in grammar but mainly focused on the other areas of language such as reading, listening and speaking. Given the different areas of language skills research has focused on so far, the use of subtitled videos as a means of L2 input enhancement for the purpose of grammar learning has not been investigated.

This study attempts to explore the effect of providing a contextualized grammar instruction by creating a learning environment that focuses on meaning and use of a grammatical form while promoting noticing of that form. To facilitate noticing, Larsen-
Freeman (2001) suggests enhancing a particular grammatical structure by, for instance, boldfacing in a way that it becomes more salient and have a greater chance to be noticed by the learner. Hence, the subtitles in the video are enhanced in a way that would increase the salience of the past perfect form. The past perfect form was enhanced through boldfacing, the use of a bigger font and different color to make it more salient than the surrounding text. In addition to enhancing input or a specific grammatical structure, this study makes use of input flooding to investigate the role of frequency of input plays in promoting students’ noticing of a particular structure. In other words, the past perfect form did not only appear once but appeared 7 times at various points in the video subtitles. Following the strand of literature that suggests that learners’ attention is limited in capacity (VanPatten, 2002) and cannot attend to form and meaning simultaneously; their attention was first directed to meaning and then to form. In other words, learners watched the video more than once and their focus was first directed to meaning and then form.

Conclusion

Despite the above mentioned research, studies have mainly geared to the effect of subtitling on reading, listening and oral communication while no research has been done on the role of subtitling on grammar learning. Moreover, research done on the effect of input enhancement and grammar learning has mostly been paper-based involving no use of multimedia. The current study addresses this gap in literature by focusing on the effect of subtitling a grammatical form on grammar learning, specifically the past perfect form.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research questions that guided the study, explains the research design, and describes the participants, data collection materials and data analysis. This is a classroom-based research study, which gave the researcher an opportunity to collect data in a real ESL classroom in an intensive English program where participants were expected to be motivated to learn the target grammatical forms and functions. Data were collected through pre- and post-tests, questionnaires, a debriefing session, and a video recording of the lesson that were subsequently analyzed.

Research Questions

This study intended to reveal the role that subtitled video played in a grammar classroom. In other words, it attempted to find out how subtitled videos helped students notice and learn a specific grammatical point by providing enhanced and meaningful input through multimedia. This study also looked into the way students interacted in the class, in particular, in terms of types of questions that need to be addressed in a grammar classroom that addresses both meaning and form. Finally, it aimed to explore students’ perspectives on this meaning-focused teaching method that included integrated technology through the use of subtitled videos in grammar teaching. For these purposes, an ESL lesson based on a video with input exemplifying use of the past perfect was investigated by seeking evidence pertaining to the following research questions:

1. Do students notice the enhanced form of the past perfect from the subtitled video?
2. Do students learn the form of the past perfect from the subtitled video?
3. Does noticing of the past perfect forms lead to learning of the usage of these forms?

4. How do students during class time interact with this video-based grammar lesson?

5. What are the students’ attitudes towards a video-based grammar lesson?

**Research Design**

A classroom-based research design was chosen to investigate the research questions concerning process and learning in a real ESL classroom. Gass and Mackey (2007) define classroom research as events in which “the researcher intervenes in the learning process and then measures the effect of intervention” (p. 172). In this study, students in an Intensive English program at a Mid-western University, who are in an intact class, received video-based grammar instruction for two 50-minute classes. These two classes were videotaped and transcribed and used to document classroom interaction. The course plan and objectives of the course were not sacrificed for the sake of the research since knowledge of the meaning and use of the past perfect tense is one of the learner outcomes of this grammar course.

**Participants**

Nine intermediate level students (2 females and 7 males) who were enrolled in an intact grammar class in an Intensive English program at a Mid-western university in the United States participated in this study. In this grammar class, the teacher employ a approach to teach grammar following a structured syllabus and lessons that consist of three phases as presentation, practice, and production. Such an approach, as Larsen-Freeman (2001) states, “present[s] a grammar structure in advance of its use in context” (p. 256) and teaches form and meaning separately with decontextualized practice drills.
Materials

Many of the materials used in this study involved design choices most of which were recommendations based on the pilot study that was done in a similar setting with a group of participants of similar characteristics. Since one of the major problems encountered in the pilot study was that the instruction was mainly meaning based with no explicit instruction on form, this study tried to balance between the two—meaning and form. Also, this study tried to make use of the experience gained in the pilot study by using a video that made use of authentic language while at the same time appealing to the students. Another problem that was found in the pilot study was the way the researcher measured the participants noticing of the target grammatical feature from the subtitled video. By looking at the literature on how noticing form was measured, a method for measuring noticing was found (Rozendaal, 2005), and replicated in this study.

The materials used for the study consisted of a cartoon, a PowerPoint presentation, a subtitled video, and 3 different activities for instruction, as well as a pre-test, post-test, noticing activity, questionnaire and debriefing session for data collection.

Cartoon and PowerPoint presentation

A cartoon with explicit explanations of grammatical forms (http://www.enlishtenses.com/tenses/past_perfect) was used to introduce students to the positive sentence structure of past perfect tense. Following the cartoon, students were provided with a PowerPoint presentation that elaborated on the use of past perfect tense in the cartoon (See Figure 3.1).
Furthermore, three activities were designed for instruction to check students’ understanding of the past perfect tense they learnt in the cartoon and give them opportunities to practice using the past perfect tense.

**Activity 1**

The first activity presented students a context that was related to their daily lives and asked them to construct a sentence about two things that they had done a day earlier. The students were required to use a timeline to construct a sentence using the past perfect tense. Figure 3.2 shows the activity given to the students.
Activity 2

The second activity included handouts with eight screenshots of the major events in the subtitled video (See the screenshots in Appendix A, p. 68). In this activity, students were required to work in groups of three and describe each screenshot in one sentence. Students were expected to write sentences such as the following:

1. Ole lost his wife.
2. Ole started making toys.
3. The wholesaler made a big order.
4. They worked hard so that the wholesaler could get the toys in time.
5. Ole received a letter from the wholesaler.
6. He was able to trade his toys for food instead of money.
7. Ole names the company LEGO.
8. Ole’s company was set on fire.

Activity 3

The third activity required students to use the sentences that they created in the second activity to construct eight new sentences in past perfect tense showing the relationship between the events.

Subtitled video

The main material of instruction that was used in this study is the subtitled video. The video used in this study was called The LEGO® STORY http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NdDU_BBJW9Y which was produced by the LEGO company, a Danish toy manufacturer, to celebrate their 80th anniversary. The video was not produced for educational purposes, but it was an authentic material talking about the
history of the LEGO company through authentic language. The total length of the video was 17 minutes and eight seconds, but only the first seven minutes and 38 seconds were used in this study because of time constraints. In order to enhance the noticing of past perfect tense grammatical structure, the video was subtitled using iMovie (version 9.0.8) program. As Figure 3.3 shows, the subtitles were translucent. 7 occurrences of the past perfect were enhanced through a 3-sizes bigger font and a contrasting color than the surrounding text in order to promote noticing.
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Figure 3.3. Screenshot of subtitles that has the enhanced past perfect form

In addition to the materials used for instructional purposes, this study made use of a pre-test, post-test, and a noticing activity.

**Pre-test**

A pre-test was used to check students’ knowledge of the past perfect tense before instruction (See Appendix A, p. 66 for the pre-test). The pre-test asked students to fill in blanks in four sentences about a timeline presented with past perfect tense verb forms.
The timeline contained points from Ang Lee’s career, a famous Chinese movie director. For each correct answer, students received one point.

**Post-test**

Like the pre-test, the post-test had a timeline but of the main character of the video that students watched, Ole, the owner of the LEGO company (See Appendix A, p. 67 for the post-test). Following the timeline were five sentences with blanks that students were asked to fill with the correct tense. For each correct answer, the student was awarded one point. The post-test was given at the end of the second class session.

**Noticing activity**

Based on Rozendaal’s (2005) study on the effect of subtitling keywords to help students notice selected vocabulary items, a noticing activity was designed. The activity required students to write down the past perfect forms that they noticed in the video. The results of that study showed that participants were able to recall five words on average, which was less than the number the researcher had expected in the study. The researcher did not explicitly tell the participants that they would be asked to recall the subtitled keywords. According to the researcher, this might have been one of the reasons why the participants did not recall many of the words. Therefore, this study made use of the design method employed in Rozendaal’s study as well as his recommendations by explicitly telling students before the video was played to pay attention to that past perfect form.
Questionnaire and debriefing session

In the last stage of the study, data were collected about students’ perceptions and attitudes towards the video-based grammar lesson through a questionnaire. Nine participants completed the questionnaire and two joined a debriefing session. The questionnaire contained the following 4 questions:

1. What **did** you like about yesterday’s lesson?
2. What **didn’t** you like about yesterday’s lesson?
3. Did you like the video?
4. Did you like the idea of using a video to teach grammar?

Two of the students that volunteered to participate in the debriefing session were asked the following questions:

1. Do you have past learning experiences of using a video in a grammar class?
2. What is your impression of using the video in the class?
3. Did you find anything negative about the class?
4. Was there anything that you wanted that was not there?
5. What did you think about the exercise where you had to write the forms of the past perfect that you’ve noticed from the video?
6. What did you think about the exercise were you formed sentences using the pictures given to you?
7. Did you prefer the fill in the blanks exercises or the constructing full sentences exercises?
Procedure

This study was conducted as part of a grammar course that took place over two 50-minute class sessions. The class sessions were held during their normal hours on two consecutive days while the debriefing session was scheduled outside of class time.

Pre-test

For this study, students first received a pre-test a day before the data collection day because of time restrictions as the data collection took place during a normal class period, which was 50 minutes only, and there would not have been enough time for the pre-test. Administrating the pre-test on a separate day would also help students feel less threatened by what is perceived as a test.

Cartoon

The next day, students were first shown the cartoon that explained the meaning and use of the past perfect form via a short dialogue between a father and a son. By using this cartoon, students were shown the context where the past perfect was used. To further explain the usage of the past perfect in the context that they had just seen, screenshots of the cartoon were shown on a timeline to express a past event that happened prior to another past event. The past perfect was used for the first past event while the simple past was used for the second past event. This was regarded as an explicit explanation of the past perfect form which would prepare them for noticing the same form in the subtitled video. After the meaning and form of the past perfect were explained students were given their first activity.
Activity 1

Students were shown their first activity on the PowerPoint slide and were told to construct their own sentence using the past perfect in 2 minutes. The elicited student examples were then shared with the rest of the class as a check for understanding.

Subtitled Video

The remaining part of the lesson focused on the subtitled video. Students were first shown a picture of LEGO bricks. Then students watched the video. This was done in order to prepare the students and give them the context of what they were about to see. After the video was played, students were divided into groups of three and given the second activity; handouts that contained screenshots of the video.

Activity 2

After students were put into their groups, they were asked to form at least one sentence related to the picture. The researcher used the first picture as an example to explain to the students what was required of them. The researcher then allowed each group to share their examples in order to check if the students understood the events that they had just seen in the video. This would also give the students a chance to use the past simple tense because their next activity would involve constructing sentences in two tenses; the simple past and the past perfect. By this time, the students had understood the context of the video and were able to construct sentences talking about it. Therefore, after they had focused on the meaning of the video, the next step was focusing on the form which was the enhanced past perfect form in the video.
Noticing activity

After students were introduced to the video and were given a chance to briefly describe the events in the video using screenshots of the video, the next focus of the lesson was noticing the past perfect forms. As previously described, the past perfect forms were enhanced in the subtitled video so that they contrasted in size and color from the surrounding text. During this part of the lesson, students were given handouts and were asked to write down the past perfect forms that they had noticed from the video. Before the video was played, they were told to pay attention to the past perfect forms. After the video, they were given the noticing handouts and were asked to write down the past perfect forms that they had noticed from the video. Because this task was done in the remaining two minutes of the lesson, it was repeated again the next day using the first 5 minutes of the class. The second time this activity was done, students were already familiar with the activity and so they were explicitly told before the video was played that they would write down the words that they noticed after the video had finished. They were strictly given instructions not to write down the words that they noticed so that they could pay attention to the form. Hence, the goal of this activity was to allow students to focus on the form of the past perfect that was enhanced in the subtitled video.

Activity 3

Following this activity, students were returned to their groups with the past perfect forms that they had noticed as well as with the screenshots of the video and the sentences that they had constructed related to the pictures. It was expected that not all students would notice the same forms. Hence, at this point, they were given a chance to collaborate together and form their own sentences. They were told to use their collective
past perfect forms that they had noticed along with the sentences they had constructed in the second activity to form new sentences containing the past perfect. The researcher then gave students an example based on the first screenshot in order to exemplify what was required of them. Afterwards, each group shared their answers with the rest of the class so that the researcher could check for understanding.

**Post-test**

Students were then given a post-test at the end of the second class session which would, in reference to the pre-test, could help with the evaluation of students’ learning of the past perfect form.

**Questionnaire and Debriefing**

At the end of the second class session, students were given a questionnaire. An hour and a half later after the second class ended, a debriefing session was held in a quiet room with two participants. They were asked to elaborate further on their perceptions and attitudes towards the two lessons that they had taken with the researcher.

**Data Analysis**

Data were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Data for the first three research questions were analyzed quantitatively while the data of the last two research questions were analyzed qualitatively.

To answer the first research question that was concerned with whether or not students noticed the enhanced past perfect form from the subtitled video, the number of correct forms and the exact form that the students noted down on the noticing handout were counted and tabulated. To answer the second research question that was concerned
with whether or not students learn the past perfect form, students’ answers from the pretest and post-test were analyzed. A percentage of the correct answers on the pre-test and post-test was calculated to assess whether or not there was a gain of knowledge, which would mean that the students learned about the usage of the past perfect, the percentage of correct responses on the pre-test was subtracted from the percentage of responses on the post-test. Ideally to ensure that students learned the past perfect, a delayed post-test would have been more appropriate but for the purposes and constraints of the current study, learning is defined as immediate intake of knowledge. In order to answer the third research question which was concerned with the relationship between noticing the past perfect and learning the past perfect and if the former led to the latter, the percentage of the number of noticed forms was compared to the gain in knowledge percentage. If one of the participants scored 0% on any of the noticing activities but showed a gain in knowledge, then the notion of noticing of the past perfect form led to learning that form is not supported.

To answer the fourth research question, the transcription of the data collection process was analyzed. Instances such as when students answered the researcher’s questions, volunteered to share their answers, or asked questions were regarded as student interaction. To find evidence for the fifth research question, which was about the students’ attitudes towards the video-based grammar lesson, students’ answers on the questionnaire as well as the transcriptions of the debriefing session were analyzed. Students’ opinions, concerns, suggestions were gathered and tabulated and similarities were used to make inferences about students’ attitude about the video-based grammar lesson.
Conclusion

This chapter explained how the data were gathered and analyzed to answer the five research questions this study attempted to answer. The materials that were used for instruction as well as for data collection were described in this chapter. Moreover, the rationale behind why these materials were suitable for the purposes of this study was explained.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This study investigated the role of subtitled video in noticing and learning the meaning and use of the English past perfect. Unlike previous studies that studied the role of subtitled videos in improving learner comprehension, this study addressed the role of subtitled videos in development of students’ grammatical accuracy. Following Schmidt’s noticing hypothesis that emphasizes the necessity of awareness or consciousness for learning to take place, the video had another dimension of modification besides subtitling: instances of the target grammatical structure in the subtitles were enhanced. In other words, the color and font size of the past perfect form in the subtitles were altered in order to encourage the learners to notice the form. Another main aim of this study was to find evidence suggesting whether or not noticing of the past perfect form would lead to learning. Moreover, this classroom-based study is also interested in students’ perspective of a video-based grammar lesson and how they interact during the lessons. Results obtained from this study helped the researcher answer the research questions through quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Research question 1: Noticing the past perfect form

The first research question was concerned with finding evidence about whether or not students noticed the enhanced form of the past perfect from the subtitled video. An enhanced form was counted as noticed if the learner in his/her noticing handout noted one of the 7 forms that were in the video subtitles regardless of spelling mistakes and missing prepositions. Table 4.1 shows the number of words each of the 9 learners indicated that they had noticed in the first and second noticing activity. The results displayed in the
table show that the first time the noticing activity was administered only 3 students noticed fewer than 3 words out of the 7 subtitled words. The rest noticed none of the forms. On the other hand, the second time the same activity was administered more students were able to notice more words. Out of the 9 participants in this study, 5 of them were able to notice some of the words with an average of 3 words being noticed. Hence, some students were able to notice the past perfect form with better results the second time.

Table 4.1. Students’ scores on the 1st and 2nd noticing activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Number of forms noticed-1st time (out of 7)</th>
<th>Number of forms noticed- 2nd time (out of 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abb</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jac</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>2 (29%)</td>
<td>5* (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kev</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sev</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unexpected results for the number of noticed words made the researcher question the validity of the design of the noticing activity especially after considering the students’ reflections in the debriefing session. In the debriefing session, Lin and Sar mentioned that they were not able to recall all the words that they had noticed when they were asked to write down all the words they had noticed. Therefore, these two students noticed the past perfect forms during the activity but were not able to remember what they had noticed. In other words, writing down the noticed words immediately after the video had been played might not have been a successful assessment method due to the cognitive load of recalling the noticed words. Another point that was brought up in the
debriefing session was the unequal time intervals between the enhanced forms. Table 4.2 shows the differences in time intervals between the 7 different past perfect forms.

Table 4.2. Difference of time intervals between the 7 forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtitle that appeared</th>
<th>Time it appeared</th>
<th>Difference in time between the first and second form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ole <strong>had gotten</strong> an idea and for him it never took long to put an idea into action.</td>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>20 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckily, he <strong>had saved up</strong> a lot of wood from the carpentry production.</td>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>1:41 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole received a letter saying that the wholesaler <strong>had filed</strong> for bankruptcy</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>5 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and couldn’t buy the toys that he <strong>had ordered</strong></td>
<td>3:39</td>
<td>1:02 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He didn't receive as much money as he <strong>had hoped</strong></td>
<td>4:41</td>
<td>7 sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time passed by but the toys didn’t sell as quickly as they <strong>had expected</strong>.</td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td>2:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All that he <strong>had worked</strong> for was gone and he almost lost his company.</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.2 we can see that the differences in time intervals between the 7 different past perfect forms are not constant. But in order to assess the effect of the irregularity in time intervals between the different forms on the number of noticed words, I had to examine the pattern of the forms noticed. Table 4.3 shows what forms were noticed by each of the 9 students.
Table 4.3. Forms noticed by the students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Forms noticed 1\textsuperscript{st} time</th>
<th>Forms noticed 2\textsuperscript{nd} time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abb</td>
<td>had expected</td>
<td>had expected had saved up had filled*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jac</td>
<td>had filed</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>had filed had ordered</td>
<td>had worked had filed had saved up had hoped had expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kev</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>had worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>had gotten had expected had worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>had gotten had saved* had worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sev</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The spelling mistakes and missing preposition were ignored and were considered one of the correct words that were noticed.

As Table 4.3 shows, some forms were noticed both the first and second time the noticing activity was administered. Those forms were *had expected* and *had filed*. Given the big difference in time interval between these two forms, it is most likely that the time interval was not a factor affecting the likelihood of forms being noticed. To better demonstrate that the time interval was most probably not a factor affecting certain forms being noticed, Table 4.4 shows what each student noticed and at what time interval this form appear. It is important to note here that unlike Table 4.3, Table 4.4 does not show the order of forms listed by the student on the noticing activity. For example, Abb noted on her noticing activity *had expected*, *had saved up*, and *had filled* in that order as Table 4.3 shows. On the other hand, the first form that she had noted *had expected* actually appears at 4:48 minutes while the second form that she noted *had saved up* appeared at 1:53 (i.e. 2:55 minutes earlier).
Table 4.4. Forms noticed by students with time intervals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtitle that appeared</th>
<th>Time it appeared</th>
<th>Difference in time between the first &amp; second form</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ole had gotten an idea and for him it never took long to put an idea into action.</td>
<td>1:33</td>
<td>20 sec</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckily, he had saved up a lot of wood from the carpentry production.</td>
<td>1:53</td>
<td>1:41 min</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ole received a letter saying that the wholesaler had filed for bankruptcy.</td>
<td>3:34</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and couldn’t buy the toys that he had ordered</td>
<td>3:39</td>
<td>5 sec</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He didn’t receive as much money as he had hoped</td>
<td>4:41</td>
<td>1:02 min</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time passed by but the toys didn’t sell as quickly as they had expected.</td>
<td>4:48</td>
<td>7 sec</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All that he had worked for was gone and he almost lost his company.</td>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>2:42</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since more time was given to the students to write down the noticed words in the second session, the number of the noticed forms in the second time was higher and therefore there was a more observable pattern. Another reason that the students noticed/remembered more the second time the noticing activity was administered is due to the repetition of seeing the video more than once. Besides the two forms mentioned earlier that students noticed the first and second time, 3 students noticed the forms had saved up and had worked while 2 students noticed the forms had gotten the second time. The question here is why was there a pattern in the words noticed. In other words, why were those words (had expected, had filed, had saved up, had worked, had gotten) more salient than the others (had ordered and had hoped) when all the forms were enhanced in the same way. There are many possible different explanations to this. First, the forms that appeared at the end of the video might have had a better chance to be noticed and
remembered than those that appeared at the beginning and so that might be the reason why the forms *had expected* and *had worked* were noticed by most students. This explanation is based on the assumption that memory might have played a role in which words were noted down by the students as words that had been noticed. Second, new vocabulary words might have been more noticeable by the students than more familiar words and so it had a better chance to be remembered and noted down by the students as words that had been noticed.

The first research question addresses the question of whether the learners were able to notice the enhanced past perfect forms. Hence, although the aim is to find if enhanced forms were noticed from the video subtitles, it was also interesting to look at what other forms the students cited as being noticed which did not exist in the video subtitles. Some students noted forms such as *had not bought*, *had lost*, and *had made*. It is possible that when students were not able to remember the exact form they noticed in the subtitles, they sometimes resorted to writing down a form of similar meaning. For example, Sar noted *had not bought* which had a similar meaning to the phrase *and couldn’t buy the toys that he had ordered*. Hence, and as he had explained in the debriefing session, it was difficult to remember the exact form when he was asked to write down the noticed forms after he had watched the video. On the other hand, there were also many other examples of correctly constructed past perfect forms that were not similar in meaning to any of the enhanced target forms. Those were *had lost* and *had made*, which were more frequent in the first noticing activity than it was in the second. Although those two forms did not exist in the video, they related to two major events that happened in the video; that Ole lost his wife and that he started making toys after his
wife’s death. Therefore, students’ comprehension of the main events in the video might have caused them to create past perfect forms related to what could be easily retrieved, their comprehension of the main events, without those forms being actually presented in the video subtitles. Another observation was that two students (Jac and Ray) noted *had got* on their second noticing handout which might have referred to *had gotten* but did not remember the exact past participle form that had been used in the video. Therefore, students noted forms that were not actually present in the subtitles but were related to meaning to the events happening in the video.

The debriefing session provided good insights on why the noticing results were not higher than the present results as it had been expected. An explanation for the low noticing results is a concern mentioned by Sar in the debriefing session that it was difficult to “catch” all of the past perfect forms (Appendix B, p.79) in a stream of continuous speech. What this implies is that it might have been challenging for the student to concentrate on form and meaning at the same time. This in return might have increased the cognitive load on the student to try to focus on two different things at the same time, focusing on meaning and form. The suggestion that Sar and Lin mentioned in the debriefing session is to pause the video at points were the past perfect form appears. This would probably give them more time to process meaning and form that might result in better noticing of the target form. In fact, their concerns and suggestions are supported in the literature where researchers like Skehan (1998) and Tomasello (1998) have found that language leaners cannot process input on form and meaning at the same time. This suggests that even though leaners’ attention was directed to form in the enhanced subtitles, their focus on meaning somewhat obstructed their attention to form. It appears
that although subtitling enabled learners to check areas of semantic and lexical ambiguity, reading subtitles to focus on the past perfect form adds an extra operation to the comprehension task and creates potential interference due to the constraints upon the learner’s information processing capacity (Tardieu and Gyselinck, 2003).

There was a very interesting observation when the noticing activity was repeated the next day in the second class. Since the students already knew that they were going to write down the past perfect forms that they had noticed after the video finished (as they had done the same activity in the previous class), one of the students, Jer, was writing the past perfect forms along as the video was being played although they were told not to do so. After the video had finished and they were given a new noticing handout to write the forms that they had noticed, he put aside the list that he had written and started writing the forms that he noticed on the noticing handout given to him as instructed by the researcher. By looking at the results, this student scored the highest on the number of forms noticed; he noticed 5 forms compared to others who noticed 3 and 1 word out of 7. I believe that this demonstrates how the assessment method of noticing failed to reflect the target forms that the participants did actually notice. Although the noticing activity was immediately administered after exposure to the enhanced video subtitles, it still required students to recall what they had noticed. If a student did notice all of the 7 forms during exposure of the subtitled video but only wrote some of these forms in the noticing activity, it means that he/she failed to recall all of the noticed forms and does not mean that he/she failed to notice the forms. Hence, the results of the noticing activity were not only dependent on the noticing factor but also on memory (i.e. recalling from memory.
what has been noticed). Therefore, the cognitive load of recalling all the forms that were present throughout the 7-minute and 38 seconds video affected the noticing results.

**Research question 2: Effect of noticing lead on learning**

The second research question addressed whether noticing of the past perfect form led to learning how to use these forms. To answer this question, the results of the pre- and post-test were compared to check for any gain in knowledge. Table 4.4 shows the students’ scores of the pre and post-test and the gain in knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest score (%)</th>
<th>Post test score (%)</th>
<th>Gain in knowledge (%) (Post test – Pretest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abb</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kev</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sev</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td><strong>19.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>77.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td><strong>30.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.06</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is directly observable from table 4.4 is all students have shown a gain in knowledge with an average of 58.3 %. In the debriefing session, Lin mentioned that there were not enough past perfect forms in the video (Appendix B, p. 78). This might mean that 7 similar target grammatical structures might not be regarded as input flooding according to one of the participants. Therefore, if there had been more target grammatical structures, the gain in knowledge results might have been better. Although previous studies on input enhancement and input flooding did not come to a consensus on what is the ideal number of target forms in input for it to be considered input flooding, many studies used a frequency of target forms between 6 to 10 in reading texts of length.
between 87-217 words. Therefore, the 7 exemplars of the past perfect in this study might not have been enough for just one of the participants.

On the other hand, three students (Ray, Ric, Sev) did not show that they had noticed the past perfect form neither in the first nor the second noticing activity as shown in Table 4.1 but showed a gain in knowledge of the past perfect form as shown in Table 4.4. In other words, these 3 students did not show evidence that they had noticed the past perfect forms in the video but did show evidence that they had learned the past perfect forms. Hence, although results showed that all learners demonstrated a gain in knowledge not all learners showed that they had noticed the past perfect form from the video subtitles. This could be directly attributed to the issue addressed in the first research question, the validity of the noticing activity as a measure for noticing. In other words, students might have noticed the past perfect form that might have lead them to learn it but their noticing was not accurately assessed in the noticing activity. The reason is that although the noticing activity was immediately administered after exposure to the enhanced video subtitles, it still required students to recall what they had noticed. If a student noticed all of the 7 forms during exposure but only wrote some of these forms in the noticing activity, it meant that he/she failed to recall all of the noticed forms. Hence, the results of the noticing activity were not only dependent on the noticing factor but also on memory (i.e. recalling from memory what has been noticed). This reasoning of why some students scored 0 on their noticing activity but showed at least some gain in knowledge of the past perfect is echoed in Sar’s complaint in the debriefing session, “You can’t remember because we got the rule and we got the idea but we didn’t remember the exact word” (Appendix B, p. 79).
Upon the assumption that the noticing activity was not a very accurate measure of noticing, as 3 out of the 9 students that showed evidence of gain in knowledge but no evidence of noticing might in fact have noticed the forms (that lead to learning) but the design of the noticing activity failed to show so.

**Research question 3: Learning the past perfect from the video subtitles**

The third research question addresses whether or not the video subtitles helped learners learn the past perfect form. Since all learners showed a gain in knowledge after they had been exposed to the subtitled video, we can assume that the subtitled video helped learners learn the past perfect form. However, the students were not just exposed to implicit instruction by watching the subtitled video during the two class periods. They also received explicit instruction on when and how to use the form through using a cartoon before watching the subtitled video. In fact, the explicit instruction part of the treatment was one of the recommendations of a pilot study done earlier that was composed of only implicit instruction through using a subtitled video only. The findings of the pilot study showed that a totally meaning-based grammar lesson is insufficient for learners to learn a specific target grammatical structure. This finding is well grounded in the literature as Nassaji and Fotos (2004) report.

“[There is] a large body of research pointing to the inadequacies of teaching approaches where the focus is primarily on meaning-focused communication, and grammar is not addressed. Extensive research on learning outcomes in French immersion programs by Swain and her colleagues showed that, despite substantial long-term exposure to meaningful input, the learners did not achieve accuracy in certain grammatical forms (e.g. Harley & Swain, 1984; Lapkin, Hart, & Swain,
Hence, for learners to develop accurate grammatical structures, they needed a balance between a meaning-based and a form-based lesson. Therefore, students in the present study were not just exposed to the video that contained subtitles with enhanced past perfect forms. Instead they were first introduced to the structure and use of the form through the cartoon and timeline after which they were exposed to the video. This might be a second reason why some students showed a gain in knowledge of the past perfect form without showing any evidence that they noticed the form. To answer the third research question, other factors were also at play (the cartoon timeline, explicit explanation of the form, practice question) that might have caused the learners to learn the past perfect form. Therefore, although subtitled video exposed learners to input through multimodalities that helped foster learning, it should not be interpreted as being the only reason that the learners learned the target form.

**Research question 4: Student interaction**

The fourth research question looks into how students interact with this teaching approach. To know what students said or did during the two class periods, both sessions were video recorded and transcribed. The transcription of the two class periods where data collection took place can be found in Appendix C, (p. 82). The researcher looked for instances where students asked questions, shared answers with the rest of the class or even struggled while giving an answer.

In the first part of the lesson, I could tell that students were struggling to understand how to use the past perfect from the way they shared their answers on the first
activity they were given. This activity consisted of thinking about two events that happened one day earlier; an event that happened at 10:00 in the morning and another one that happened at 3:00 in the afternoon. After the researcher explained to the students what they needed to do and provided them with an example, one of the students asked if they needed to use the past perfect; “We need to use the past perfect?” (Appendix C, p. 84). Clearly the student did not see the connection between the explicit rule presentation that preceded the activity and the activity itself. When time came for students to share their answers, only one student, Sar, volunteered to give his example where two other students were picked by the researcher to share their answer with the rest of the class (Appendix C, p. 84). Hence, students did not ask questions or voluntarily share their answers with the class in the first part of the lesson, as they might have been still skeptical about their knowledge of how to use the past perfect. Although Sar was the only exception, when he gave his answer he was not sure if he was using the past perfect form correctly (Appendix C, p. 85).

Sar: I had took- is it correct? When I gave my-
Researcher: Yeah. When you gave your presentation-
Sar: I took- I had taken

In the second activity, students were required to describe each of the 8 screenshots in a sentence in relation to what they had seen in the video in groups of 3. Unfortunately, it is difficult to see from the transcript how students interacted within their groups since the recording was only capable of capturing the voice of the researcher and students who spoke loud enough with the researcher. On the other hand, observations by the researcher were used in instances where the transcript was insufficient to provide a complete picture.
of students’ interaction. Hence, in the second activity, it was observed that almost all group members participated in reconstructing the events of the story using the screenshots and the answers each group shared with the rest of the class showed that they comprehended the events of the story.

The third activity, which was done in the 2nd class, required the students in groups of 3 to use the past perfect forms that they had noticed from the video subtitles along with their answers in activity 2 to relate the events to each other using the past perfect form and construct at least 2 sentences using the past perfect. After instructions for the third activity were given, an example was used to demonstrate what they were required to do. The example used was “When his wife died, he had begun making toys”. After giving the example, one of the students corrected the researcher that the correct order of events is “After his wife died, he had begun making toys”. This remark by the student shows that he understood how the past perfect is used to express time relations of two past events. While students were working in their groups, the researcher answered a student’s questions, Lin, who asked if the "past participle tense" was used when constructing the past perfect. Unfortunately the exact interaction is not reflected in the transcript as the interaction was inaudible in the video recording. At the end of the activity, each group shared the answers with the rest of the class where all answers used the past perfect tense correctly.

Overall, there was little interaction between the researcher and the students but most of the interaction occurred between the students as they worked within their groups. A major limitation worth noting here is that the video recording of the class sessions was incapable of showing how students negotiated meaning together within their groups.
especially in the third activity where they were required to form sentences using the
target structure. Nevertheless, there were instances at the beginning of the class after
exposure to explicit rule presentation where students were still struggling with how to use
the structure correctly. Also, there were other instances near the end of the second class
were students were more confident about using the structure after exposure to both rule
presentation and watching the video that contained the embedded structure 7 times.

**Research question 5: Attitude toward a video-based grammar lesson**

The fifth research question is about
the students’ attitude toward the video-based
grammar lesson. In general, answers from the questionnaire showed that the students had
a positive attitude towards this grammar teaching approach. Table 4.5 presents students
answers on the questionnaire that was given to them at the end of the second class. As we
can see from the table, there were general positive comments on the lesson as well as
specific ones; 3 students commented specifically on the video saying that they liked it.
Two other students commented on other things such as the timeline and the PowerPoint
while others liked the cartoon that was presented to them at the beginning of the first
class. On the other hand, one of the students expressed a feeling of confusion while
another student wished he had received handouts of the content of the lesson. Moreover,
similar to the concern expressed in the debriefing session, Lin as well as Kev mentioned
that they needed more examples. This concern was similar to what Lin had mentioned in
the debriefing session that the instances of past perfect use in the video were insufficient.

The debriefing session with 2 of the students (Lin and Sar) also provided insights
about students’ opinions and preferences about the 2 class periods (see Appendix B, p.
76). When asked about their opinion on the usage of video in the class, both Lin and Sar
enjoyed the video and thought it was a new idea to use a video in a grammar class. Lin said that she had had language learning experiences where she watched a video in an oral communication class but not a grammar class. Sar added that the video “give the student example about the grammar rule and how to use it in the real life” (Appendix B, p. 77). Like what was earlier mentioned, Lin would have preferred a longer video with more examples of the past perfect form. She also said that she would have understood more if the video was paused at points where instances of the past perfect appeared and they were explained. Sar expressed another concern which is that the video was sometimes very fast although he later said that it was appropriate because they are “oral communication 4” (Appendix B, p. 79) (i.e. he is at the intermediate level in the oral communication class).

Lin then further added upon Sar’s comment about the speed of the video, saying, “Yeah but maybe if I understand what he say that is that we understand the complete idea but it is good to see to pause in the moment that you can see the sentence that you apply.” Here Lin explains that she has no comprehension issues but restated her previous suggestion about pausing the video at points where the past perfect appeared. She explains that she needed more time to see the subtitles that had the past perfect in order to see how the tense was used. When they were asked if this affected the degree to which they noticed the forms Sar said, “You can’t remember because we got the rule and we got the idea but we didn’t remember the exact word.” (Appendix B, p. 79) What this implies is that Sar’s answers on the noticing activity were not just dependent on whether he noticed the forms but on his ability to recall those forms when he was given the noticing activity. In addition to the difficulty of processing the form in the subtitles while the video was playing and recalling the forms on the noticing activity, Lin mentioned that knowing the
past perfect was also dependent on knowing the past participle of the verb. Hence, Lin would have preferred if there were an explanation of the past participle of the verbs. The last question the researcher asked was about their opinion on the exercises that they had done. Lin liked the production tasks (activity 2 and 3) because they were related to the video and also allowed her to apply the rule at the same time. On the other hand, she would have preferred doing the cloze type of questions (the post-test) before the production tasks (activity 2 and 3). The reason is that the cloze type of activity was easier and she could directly see the application of the rule especially that the exercise had a timeline where she could easily see the relationship among past events. Sar also agreed with Lin that it would have been more beneficial to give them a cloze-type of activity before the 2 production tasks. These concerns could be interpreted as indicating that these students wanted controlled type of questions or drills to practice using the past perfect before they could move on to use it to construct full sentences in production tasks.

Overall, the students were positive about the new methodology of using a video for grammar instruction that they had never encountered in a grammar class before. Sar believed that it exposed him to authentic use of the language. However, the students had some concerns and suggestions regarding the lessons. Although they did not have comprehension problems, they found it difficult to process the forms while the video was playing and recall them on the noticing activity (even if the forms had been noticed). Finally, the students provided some suggestions: (1) pausing the video at points where the form appears, (2) explicitly explaining the past participle verb, and (3) ordering tasks from controlled to less controlled tasks.
Table 4.6. Summary of students’ responses on the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>What did you like about yesterday’s lesson?</th>
<th>What didn’t you like about yesterday’s lesson?</th>
<th>Did you like the video?</th>
<th>Did you like the idea of using a video to teach grammar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abb</td>
<td>I like look at video</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>It’s interesting to note that the grammar.</td>
<td>Yes, I like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jac</td>
<td>The cartoon the question</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, very much</td>
<td>Yes, I did very like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>The timeline of powerpoint and video</td>
<td>I hope you can give us some handouts which are about your content of lesson.</td>
<td>Yes, I did</td>
<td>Yes I did the reason is that video can give me a deep impression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kev</td>
<td>It’s good.</td>
<td>I felt a little confused about something.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, but I think we need some more examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>I liked the video</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Yes, it is very interesting.</td>
<td>Yes, it is a good idea. But I suggest you to put more sentences that are related with the grammar topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>It’s pretty good</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes the video is awsome</td>
<td>It actually is a idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric</td>
<td>It’s ok.</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>Yes, I like it very much</td>
<td>I like. It’s interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar</td>
<td>Its interested and cool, we learn some grammar with enjoyment.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Yes its nice</td>
<td>Sure its sound good and give an example about how to use the grammar role in the real life (in speaking and writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sev</td>
<td>Father’s struggle</td>
<td>I didn’t saw finish that video.</td>
<td>Yes, I did lik the video</td>
<td>Yes, I did.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Overall, the results of this study have shown that enhancing the past perfect form in video subtitles drew the students’ attention to some degree to that grammatical structure as the noticing results show. Similar to Winke, Gass, and Sydorenko (2010) who found that the use of different modalities aided vocabulary recognition and overall comprehension, the use of the subtitled video facilitated the recognition of the grammatical structure in context. In other words, the video aided students’ recognition of the past perfect form. Although the noticing results were less than expected, there are various reasons that accounts for these results. One of these reasons could be the cognitive load of recalling all the past perfect forms on the immediate noticing activity. Another reason might be that students were not only drawn to the enhanced past perfect structure but also were drawn to the events of the video. In other words, the attempt to comprehend the events in the video might have taken up some of their attention and so they were focusing on both the meaning and form.

The results of this study are based on data yielded from students who were exposed to 2-class periods of instruction on the past perfect tense where the lesson attempted to provide a balance between meaning and form. The difference between the pre-test and post-test scores reflects how much gain in knowledge the student had in the period from before to after the treatment. The positive percentages of gained knowledge shows that the treatment was successful in helping the students learn the past perfect tense. On the other hand, the percentage gain in knowledge (post-test – pre-test) or how
well students were able to learn the past perfect cannot be directly related to the use of subtitled videos alone but also to other various materials and activities used in the lessons. Since the researcher used other materials and methods to teach the past perfect it cannot be concluded that the subtitled video was the sole reason that some students were able to learn the past perfect. However, it can be concluded that the subtitled video that contained the enhanced past perfect form contributed to a gain in students’ knowledge of the past perfect form.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This purpose of this study was to explore the role of enhanced video subtitles in grammar instruction. It examined in a real classroom setting the potential of using multimedia to modify input through subtitles and enhance the past perfect forms in those subtitles to maximize the benefit of input for language learning.

Summary of findings

Enhancing the past perfect form in video subtitles drew the students’ attention to some degree to that grammatical structure as the noticing results show; enhancing the past perfect form aided the recognition of the form. Moreover, the findings of the study shows that providing implicit instruction on meaning by using multimedia (enhanced subtitled video) contributed to a gain in students’ knowledge of the past perfect form. According to the multimedia learning theory, learners in this study were mainly exposed to input through multimodality which helped to learn the past perfect better from text and pictures rather than text alone. Despite some concerns expressed by some students, the students were generally positive about the new methodology of using a video for grammar instruction.

Implications

Videos that are of interest to learners like the one used in this study may hold potential not just for vocabulary learning and increasing oral fluency as previous studies
have investigated but may also be used for grammar instruction. The process of finding a suitable video was not easy. It was difficult finding a potentially interesting video that would grasp students’ attention while at the same time contain language of an appropriate level to the students. Another main problem faced is finding video that is not contrived while at the same time is flooded with a specific target form that is included in the students’ syllabus. Although videos are ubiquitous on YouTube, finding a video that meets basic criteria such as those mentioned might not be an easy task for teachers. On the other hand, while finding a suitable video may be troublesome, subtitling them are becoming increasing simple especially with the use of websites like Amara or programs like the one used in the present study, iMovie. Hence teachers can make use of these applications to make oral input readily available to students through subtitles if they want to encourage noticing of specific forms in authentic input.

**Limitations**

There are various limitations to this study that should be taken in consideration in interpreting the results and planning future research. Interpretation of results should include the recognition that the noticing measure probably did not accurately reflect what the learners noticed. Moreover, the short duration of the treatment might not have given the learners enough time to practice using the grammatical structure. In addition to time constraints limitations, the number of participants was relatively small resulting in large standard deviations. Another possible limitation of this study is the frequency of forms in the input; 7 forms were not regarded as enough by one of the students in this study. In fact, finding interesting and authentic videos that is flooded with a specific type
of form might be difficult.

**Future Research**

Future studies should use more robust measures such as think-aloud protocols or allow the learners to write the forms that they have noticed while the video is being played. Future researchers are also encouraged to carry out studies with longer treatment duration in order to investigate the use of multimedia in grammar instruction over a longer period of time. Moreover, the way the video is modified should also be investigated. In this study, video subtitles used to modify oral input. Finally, other studies might look at other modifications such as pausing the video at points were enhanced subtitles appear to allow longer time for input processing.

**Closing Remarks**

This study sheds light on the role of input enhancement through using multimedia material in providing implicit grammar instruction by drawing learners’ attention to notice certain structures in input. Hence, the bulk of the two class sessions were devoted to draw learners’ attention to certain features in input and using this input to practice using the target grammatical structure. Nevertheless, as research has showed, the role of explicit instruction was not downplayed as students were introduced to the structure of the past perfect as well as what meaning it expresses. Overall, despite the limitations discussed earlier, this study attempts to provide an example of how input enhancement through the use of subtitles holds potential for grammar instruction.
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Look at some important events in Ang Lee’s career, a famous Chinese movie director. Then complete the sentences below using the correct verb tense.

- By 1985, he ____________________________ film school.
- By 1992, he ____________________________ his first movie.
- By 2000, he ____________________________ filming in China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>finishes film school</th>
<th>directs first movie</th>
<th>directs movie in England</th>
<th>starts filming in China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
POST-TEST

Look at some important events in the life of Ole Kirk Christiansen, the founder of the LEGO company. Then complete the sentences below using the correct verb tense.

1. Ole started making toys after his wife ________________________.

2. Luckily, when Ole started making toys he ________________________ from the carpentry production.

3. Ole received a letter from his customer, the wholesaler, saying that he ________________________ for bankruptcy.

4. After Ole ________________________ the company LEGO, sales started to increase.

5. After sales ________________________ to increase, Ole’s workshop was set on fire.
SCREENSHOTS OF VIDEO FOR ACTIVITY 2
LEG GODT
APPENDIX B

TRANSCRIPT OF DEBRIEFING SESSION

This interview took place with two students who volunteered to meet after class. The students were asked about their attitude and opinion of the two class sessions that they took with the researcher.

Researcher: Ok, so we had a class yesterday and what is- did you ever have a class like this where you watched a video and then talked about a specific tense in the video, for example. Did you ever have, in you past experience-

Lin: No, I have some classes that was with video its oral communication class not grammar class

Researcher: aha. Not grammar class

Lin: yeah

Researcher: yeah

Lin: it's the first time for me grammar class

Researcher: Do you think it was something good? Bad?

Lin: I think its good. It’s fine.

Researcher: aha

Lin: and you can learn in a funny way

Researcher: in a fun way [laugh]

Lin: yeah [laugh]

Researcher: Okay and for you?

Sar: About the same thing?
Researcher: yeah

Sar: It-ah- first time that I saw a video in this method in grammar class

Researcher: aha

Sar: and I think its cool

Researcher: aha

Sar: and very good and enhance the understanding

Researcher: Okay, so it made you understand better?

Sar: yeah. It give the student example about the grammar rule

Researcher: aha

Sar: and how to use it in the real life

Researcher: aha

Sar: in speaking

Researcher: aha

Sar: in listening

Researcher: Was there something you didn’t like?

Lin: No. It was okay

Researcher: It was okay

Lin: Yeah. It was okay. Fine

Researcher: Do you think that- uh- there was something that you wanted in the class and it was not there?

Lin: No. It was okay the class.

Researcher: yeah. Like you said here [pointing to her questionnaire responses]- give
more examples about how to use the grammar

Lin: Maybe its good if in the video there is more practice example about the topic because if you see maybe- I don’t know- 10 examples

Researcher: aha

Lin: or something like that

Researcher: aha okay

Lin: and the video is for

Researcher: 7 minutes

Sar: 7 minutes

Lin: Maybe if you can find some video that has more examples

Researcher: oh okay

Lin: its good

Researcher: now I understand

Lin: I can understand more

Researcher: okay

Sar: Maybe if pause during the video

Researcher: Oh

Sar: When there is the example

Researcher: the past perfect

Sar: the past perfect

Researcher: I stop it

Sar: Stop it and explain
Researcher: Explain yeah
Sar: [unintelligible] sometimes the video very fast
Researcher: aha
Sar: and you can’t – can’t catch it
Researcher: Okay. You thought the video was fast”
Sar: Its-its good for us maybe
Lin: yeah
Sar: because we are oral communication 4
Researcher: aha but you under- I mean you understood
Sar: understand
Researcher: You understood the video
Lin: Yeah but maybe if I understand what he say that is that we understand the complete idea
Researcher: aha
Sar: but it is good to see- to pause in the moment that you can see the sentence that you apply the grammar
Researcher: That would be a good idea. Never thought about that. So maybe when I gave you the sheet where you had to write- notice –all
Sar: Yeah
Researcher: the words
Sar: You can’t remember because we got the rule and we got the idea but we didn’t remember the exact word
Researcher: The exact words. Maybe that was the problem?

Sar: Yeah

Researcher: aha okay

Lin: and maybe in this topic its important that maybe you explain the past participle of the verbs

Researcher: aha

Lin: because the sometimes it is difficult to remember

Researcher: the past participle

Lin: Yeah, the past participle of the verb

Researcher: like get-gotten

Lin: Yeah

Researcher: aha okay and would you like for example- did you like the exercise where you has the pictures and you had to form sentences. What did you think about that exercise?

Lin: I think that is good because it relates to the video and you can apply the

Researcher: apply the rule

Lin: apply the rule

Researcher: Would you want for example exercises like those ones [pointing to the post-test] –like this- would you have preferred that I gave you an exercise like this or would you prefer something were you had to- you would have to make the full sentence on your own. What would you have-

Lin: I think that [pointing to the post-test] is useful in this way because you have a
Lin: and you see how you can apply the rule and you use first past and then after that past perfect and it is good if you only need to apply the rule in all the sentence because you spend more time and you can do all exercise and only apply the rule. It's good idea

Researcher: You mean like this exercise. Yeah but I mean did you like the idea when you wrote the whole sentence on your own or do you want it more structures where you just fill in the blanks

Lin: I prefer this [the fill in the blanks post-test]

Researcher: You prefer fill in the blanks. And?

Sar: I prefer this but the two exercises is important

Researcher: aha

Sar: because when you make the whole sentence you should depend on the rule [unintelligible] the rules. I think that its better than but it should have complete sentences

Researcher: okay

Lin: Maybe this exercise can be first because you-

Sar: easier

Lin: try to apply and its easier and after that you can make you own sentences

Lin: Yeah

Researcher: I see. Okay thank you for your time. Thank you very much. Thank you
APPENDIX C

TRANSCRIPT OF CLASS RECORDING

This is the first class session that took place in a classroom on October 10, 2012. The students are level 4 grammar students (intermediate level) in an intensive English program at a Midwestern University. The number of students in the class was 12 but data from 9 students only who consented to participate was used in the study.

Researcher: So for today we’re going to learn about a new tense. You might have learned it before at school but we’re going to kind of review over it today. So for today-if you loo at this cartoon- okay barely moves and doesn’t speak- okay. It says my son Julius had ever seen a camel before we went together to the zoo in summer 1990. Okay. Can you all see that or do you want it bigger?

Student: Bigger

Researcher: Bigger? This way? Good. So my son Julius had never seen a camel before we went together to the zoo in summer 1990. Can anybody guess what does he mean or what is he talking about?

Lin: last time he see a camel was in 1990

Researcher: Exactly. The first time his son saw a camel was in 1990 so is he talking- so this person is talking right now-right? If we go to the past- “Have you see a camel? No Daddy. Today we’re going to the zoo. Hurray!” Okay so did he see the camel at that time?

Student: No

Researcher: No. So this is the past. Okay. We went back. This is the past. Now he can
see the camel because he took him to the zoo. Okay. So now in the present, he is talking about something that happened in the past. Right? Okay. He is talking about this event that he had never at that time he had never seen a camel and then later he saw the camel bit before that time he had never seen a camel. Okay. Can you guess what verb is this? Had seen. No. Had seen. It is the past perfect. Okay. It’s the past perfect. Okay we’ll look at it again but in a different format. [changes to PowerPoint]. Okay so again. This is the present; now. He is talking; “My son had never seen a camel before we went together to the zoo” He is talking about something in the past. Okay. But then they went to the zoo. So he is talking about something in the past and then it relates to something else that also happened in the past. So two things happened in the past but he is fist talking about the first even that happened in the past and he uses which verb tense? Student: had seen

Researcher: the past perfect. Okay. Here is the past perfect, had seen, and then he talks about the second event, went. Okay. A small little exercise for you; think- okay so today is October 10th. Now we are in the present. Okay and yesterday is-uh- something happened in the past; whatever you did yesterday was stuff that happened in the past. Okay. Think about something that happened at 10 and something that happened at 3. Okay. Think about two events; something that happened at 10 and something that happened at 3. On a piece of paper just draw this. Okay, and write something that happened at 10 and then another thing that happened at 3 and then write a sentence using the past perfect. Okay. And then I’m going to ask you what sentences did you write. 

[pause] Something that happened at 10 o’clock and then another things that happened at
3. So for example- we have an example here [uses the example on the slide] I’m going to give you two minutes to think about that because you just need to write one sentence.

Student: [unintelligible]

Researcher: what?

Student: We need to use the past perfect?

Researcher: Of course. Because something that happened at 10 and ten something that happened at 3 which I the second event. So here –something that happened in the morning and then something that happened in the afternoon. Then when you write a sentence, I want you to use the past perfect just like the example [points to the example]. Is that clear? Do you have any questions? [Researcher monitors students]

Researcher: [Draws a timeline on the board] Okay so who would like to give me their example, something that happened at 10- something that you did at 10. Who would like to give me their example? No one. Okay.

Sar: [unintelligible] or something else?

Researcher: Anything

Sar: I wrote Julius had discussed with reading teacher before she presented her subject at 3 pm.

Researcher: Okay. Can you think about something that you did yesterday at 10 am?

What were you doing at 10?

Sar: taking classes

Researcher: Okay So I was taking classes- I took a class. Okay

Sar: I took a reading class.
Researcher: [writes on the board under 10 am] took reading and then at 3?

Sar: I had a presentation

Researcher: You had a presentation

Sar: yeah

Researcher: You gave a presentation. Oaky. [writes on the board]. So now, you are telling me now something that happened yesterday. So, what do you say? When…

Sar: When

Researcher: Yeah. When- you could start with when

Sar: When I gave my presentation

Researcher: aha [writing on the board]

Sar: I had took- is it correct? When I gave my-

Researcher: Yeah. When you gave your presentation-

Sar: I took- I had taken

Researcher: I had taken the reading class [writes on the board]. Okay someone else. Who would like to try their example to check if they are right or wrong.? Jac?

Jac: uhh

Researcher: Something you did at 10- what did you do at 10?

Jac: uhh. Got up?

Researcher: got up? You woken up? Okay. You woke up here and then at 3-

Jac: took a oral communication class

Researcher: Okay. You took a class [writes on the board] Now you tell me about something that happened yesterday. What would you say?
Student: When I took a oral communication class, I had woke up at 10

Researcher: Okay I had waken up. I had already. Okay someone else.

[Missing transcription because it includes the transcription of a student that has not consented to participate in the study]

Researcher: Past perfect. Okay. The past perfect – and the 2nd event is just the simple past. Okay is that clear. Okay. I hope it is going to be clearer with our next activity [pause] Okay so right now we are going to watch a little video. It is 7 minutes long. Okay. Do you know what is this? [pointing to the LEGO bricks in the video]

Students: LEGO

Researcher: A LEGO. Have you ever played with it?

Student: yeah. As a child

Researcher: Exactly. Okay so now LEGO is 80 years old and this is a video about LEGO. Okay. I did not get the full video because we do not have the whole class for that. This is just 7 minutes from the video; if you want to watch the rest of the video you can go to YouTube and watch it. Okay. So now I want you to watch the video and I want you to pay attention to what’s happening. Okay. Because later on I’m going to out you in groups so you tell me what happened in the video. So pay attention to what happens in the video; the events that happen in the video. Okay.

[Plays video]

Researcher: Okay. So we only get to watch till this point because the video actually is almost 13 minutes – 7 minutes longer. So we don't get to the part where he actually makes LEGO- the actual bricks that you know. Okay. So for now this is where we stop.
For now, I want you to get into groups and I have you into groups. [Put up the slide that has the names of students and their group numbers] So those are your groups. Okay. Find your group and sit together. Stand up. I got your names off the paper you gave me yesterday. [Discusses a problem of misspelling a student’s name and makes sure that the students are in their groups]

Researcher: Okay, now I have pictures of the video. What you need to do is write one sentence as a group together. Okay. Write one sentence describing the event in the video. So for example, this first picture- what happened in this first picture?

Students: He lost his wife.

Researcher: Ole lost his wife. So you write Ole lost his wife. Just one sentence and then you move on to the next picture and so on. Just write one sentence for each picture. Okay. I have papers here. Okay. So picture 1- you write the sentence [holding the paper to explain]. Picture 2- you write the sentence. [Distributes the papers]. There you go. This is for your group.

You have around 7 minutes or let’s say 8 minutes because they are 8 pictures. Okay. Let’s say you have 8 minutes to finish that because we are going to watch the video again.

[Students do the activity 2]

Don’t worry about using the past perfect now. Just write what happened in the picture.

[Researcher monitors groups]

Researcher: [speaking to one of the groups] yeah you’re right, you’re right. He made toys. Yes, you are right.

[Pause]
Researcher: Okay you have 5 more minutes.

[Pause]

Write your names at the top of this paper. Okay. So we have 8 pictures. Right. So each group will tell me 2 sentences- I mean 1 sentence for each picture. Let’s start with this group. What happened in this picture [pointing to the screenshots on the slide] I told you [laugh]

Student: He lost his wife

Researcher: Okay [Writing the sentence on the board]. He lost his wife. Okay the second picture. What happened here?

[Missing transcription because it includes the transcription of a student that has not consented to participate in the study]

Researcher: Okay good. Okay, this group.

Student: The wholesaler wanted to buy his toys[writing the sentence on the board]

Researcher: Aha. The wholesaler wants to buy his toys. Very good. Do you know what’s a wholesaler? Who knows? [pause] No one. A wholesaler is a person who buys products or goods in big amounts. Okay. So not just one or two, very big amounts- in bulk

[Continues to write the sentence on the board]. Then this picture.

Student: [unintelligible]

Researcher: Okay wuld you say that a but slowly

Student: His son-

Researcher: His son- [writes on the board]

Student: helped his father pack the toys
Researcher: helped his father [writes on the board] Okay thank you. This group.

Student: He lost his order.

Researcher: He lost his order? Mmm- what else can we say?

Student: He got a mess-a letter-

Researcher: Yes

Student: saying that he lost his order.

Researcher: Yes [writes on the board] Exactly. He got a letter saying that he lost his order. Okay, then this is the fifth picture.

Student: He replaces the toys for food.

Researcher: He replaces the toys for food. Good [writes on the board]. Okay last group.

Student: He tried to [unintelligible]

Researcher: He tried to?

Student: He tried to make the company’s name,

Researcher: Okay we can say- what else can we say? [writes on the board] to think for a name for his company?

Student: Yeah

Researcher: [writes on the board] okay and the last picture.

Student: He lost his workshop

Researcher: [writes on the board] He lost his workshop. Okay now we are going to watch the movie again but this time try to see where did they use the past perfect. Okay. Try to notice the past perfect in the video. Don't write anything down. Just try to notice it.
[Plays video again]

Researcher: Okay good. So now you got an idea how the past perfect – I hope you got an idea of how the past perfect was used. Okay. You’re going to do this alone so you need to separate a little but from your partner. Ahh- I think I’ll have this. Pass this down to me please first [i.e. the handouts that they were working on]. Now you need to write some past perfect forms that you have noticed from the video. Okay as much as you can remember. [Passing the noticing activity handout] Don’t talk to your partner. Do this alone. Okay you have two minutes so try as much as possible to remember [The researcher erases the sentences written previously on the board] You don’t need to write the full sentence Just the form- the past perfect form you remember.

[Class 1 ends]

Class 2- October 10, 2012

Researcher: For today we are going to review-talk about the past perfect again. Could someone just remind me what’s the form of the past perfect- how do we form the past perfect?

Student: had gotten, had given

Researcher: Exactly, Okay so because yesterday- we were watching a movie yesterday and we didn’t have enough time to do that activity- that last activity so I thin we’ll do it again but before we do it again we’re going to watch the video for the final time. Okay. So this is the last time we’re going to see the video and then we are going to do the same activity that you did yesterday and then another activity- 2 more activites. Okay so now-for now- we are going to watch the video and try to concentrate- do not write anthing- on
the past perfect forms. Can you all see this or do you want me to switch off the lights.

Student: Switch off the lights

Researcher: Switch off the lights? Okay. Like this.

Students: Yeah

[Plays the video]

Researcher: Better. Okay. So like yesterday- I hope you didn’t write anything down.

Okay, like yesterday, I want you to write the past perfect forms that you remember from the video. Just pass it down [i.e. noticing handouts]. I’m going to give you five minutes to do that because we have other stuff to do. Did you write it down [Talking to Jer]

Please don't talk to you partner. You don’t need to write the full sentence just the verb.

Whe you’re done copy your answers here. If you’re done, you can pass me the papers. You don't have to wait. Okay can I have your papers now please. Not this one. The other one.

*Researcher: Okay. You jyst wrote the past perfect forms from the video. Right? And now I want you to write three sentences using the past perfect. Right? You have the pictures so that you can remember what happened in the video. Okay. And you can use the past perfect forms that you just remembered from the video to form three sentences. So for example, if you remembered had gotten, try to remember how was that used in the video- Okay- and write a sentence. So for example-

Student: The same sentence in the video or-

Researcher: No no no. Not the same sentence in the video. So for example, when- give me two events that happened in the video- two events from the pictures. What was the
first event that happened in the picture?

Student: lost his wife

Researcher: Ole lost his wife and then what happened second- the second picture

Student: They began to make toys.

Researcher: Okay. So how can we form a past perfect sentence using these two events.

Student: [unintelligible]

Researcher: When he [writing on the board]

Student: When his wife died

Researcher: When his wife died-[writing on the board]

Student: he had begun making toys

Researcher: he had begun making toys [writing on the board] Okay something like that.

I want you to make three sentences.

Jer: I have a question

Researcher: Aha

Jer: I think its “After his wife died because it is after his wife died he had begun making toys.

Researcher: [Drawing a timeline on the board] What happened first? His wife died’

Jer: Yes and the he started making toys

Researcher: Oh yeah. Okay [Erasing the word ‘when’] So after his wife died he had begun making toys

Jer: he had begun making toys

Researcher: Yes you are right.[Writing the word ‘after’ instead of the erased word
‘when’] Okay so his wife died first and then he started making toys.

Jer: Yes