Linguistic and Metalinguistic Implications for Learners Reciprocity and Autonomy in Online Discussions vs. Class Discussions

Dr. lecturer Asmaa' Yahya Qassim

Department of English

College of Basic Education

University of Duhok, Iraq

(received in 14\4\2019, accepted in 11\6\2019)

Abstract: This study investigates the linguistic and the non-linguistic implications for learners' in two different settings; classroom discussion and online discussion. The study aims at exploring the learners' dependency and independency on their teacher being a sole source of knowledge. This particular study has used a mini-questionnaire, pre-structured interviews and electronic archived transcripts of students' interactions with each other. The study has used four themes for investigation "development", "comfort", "difficulty" and "motivation". The results of the study show that students' language competence develops significantly and they feel more comfortable when they learn through computer based teaching. Participants, in computer based instruction, face less difficulty in collaborating with their classmates, communicating with their teachers and engaging in online discussions, nevertheless they articulate their concern in adjusting to computer based instructed settings. They also show positive attitude towards peer and teacher's corrections. Finally, the participants of the study have revealed that their motivation sustained throughout the semester. They have also demonstrated ability to carry out their learning, collaborate with their classmates, communicate with their teacher, correct their colleagues and work independently.
Keywords: network based language teaching – new technology in language pedagogy

الملخص:

تسعى الدراسة الحالية الى الكشف عن التطبيقات اللغوية في سياق الكلام ووظيفة اللغة وتطبيقها الثقافي والاجتماعي لمكانين وزمانين مختلفين يجري فيهما نقاش صفي واخر عبر الانترنيت باستخدام الكمبيوتر. وتهدف الدراسة الى الكشف عن مدى اعتماد الطالب على المدرس والاستقلال عنه باعتباره مصدر المعرفة الاساس. ولقد تم اعداد استبيان ومقابلات معدة مسبقا مع نسخ طبق الاصل مخزونة الكترونيا لتفاعلات الطلبة وتواصلهم مع بعضهم البعض. بالاضافة الى ذلك، تم استخدام اربع افكار للتحقق "التطور" ، "الراحة"، "الصعوبة"، و"الدافعية". حيث تبين من خلال الدراسة الحالية بان كفاءة الطلبة اللغوية تطورت وبشكل مهم واصبحوا اكثر شعورا بالراحة عند التعلم عبر الانترنيت وواجهوا صعوبة اقل من المجموعة التي تتلقى التعلم بالطريقة التقليدية من ناحية التوسع مع زملاءهم في الصف ومتواصلين مع المدرسين ومنهمكين في النقاشات عبر الانترنيت. وعلى الرغم من ذلك، فانهم كانوا موجهين اهتمامهم نحو ضبط موقع التعلم عبر الانترنيت كما ان اتجاههم كان ايجابا نحو تصحيحات المدرسين والنظيرة. وبالنهاية مجموعة التعلم عبر الانترنيت اصبحت لديهم دافعية بارعة اثناء جلسات كورسهم التعليمي. كما اشارت الى قدرتهم على تنفيذ التعلم والتوسع مع الزملاء والتواصل مع المدرس والعمل بشكل مستقل.

INTRODUCTION:

Technology in education has captured the interest of many researchers in the recent years. Application and implementation of this technology in language teaching and learning has also attracted the attention of many language educators. Although the application of technology in education is wide-spread and has occupied a pivotal role in the field of teaching / learning a language, some of researchers / educators still believe that the potentials of technology to improve language learning cannot be spared from some down-sides. This paper aims at exploring potentials of technology in improving language teaching through investigating effects of learners' reciprocity and autonomy in developing their linguistic and metalinguistic competence through investigating students' learning in online and class discussion.

- **BACKGROUND:**

Language embodies cultural, social and environmental aspects, therefore, it is difficult to learn or teach language separated from the cultural, social and environmental contexts of its being. It is also difficult to learn language without practicing it in real life contexts. This makes the task of learning a language in a non-native environment a hard net to crack. It has compelled the teachers to think of ways of teaching language other than the traditional classroom setting such as taking students beyond the walls of classrooms. It further forced the teachers to change their traditional role into a facilitator, an activity organizer, and a sympathetic assistant. Emphasis in this context will be directed toward the access of cultural information, and inventing new dimensions for students' motivation, and their needs as well (Lian, 1997).

The use of technology has helped to enhance language learning/teaching in several ways. E-mails, online chatting, instant messaging, news grouping, e-lists, video and audio sharing and video and audio conferencing are some of the examples of powerful modern and technological means which can be helpful in language learning/teaching. These ways have provided learners with a student- centered teaching environment, in which learners/students are masters of their own learning. These methods of learning, according to Gill (2005), impress upon the learners/students to develop a sense of creativity and innovations.

It is assumed that technology has helped learners gaining autonomy (Benson, 2001; Metteram, 1997). However, it must not be forgotten that technology itself cannot do any good unless it is linked with pedagogy. As pedagogy and technology are inter-linked, so, it is important to develop a specific approach/method which takes into consideration the utilization of technology in an autonomous language learning environment (Hafner & Candlin, 2012).

The traces of the concept 'learner autonomy' can be found in literature thirty years back, With the passage of time, this concept has attracted the attention of many language teachers around the world .and hence more communicative pedagogical approaches have been developed which give students a chance to participate in learning process more fully (Miller, 2013). Holec (1988), defines learner autonomy as "the ability to take control over one's learning". It is also defined as a "capacity for detachment, critical reflection decision making and independent action" (Little, 1991, P.A). However, learner autonomy has got different meanings for different people (Benson 2001-Sinclair

2006). It is often falsely paralleled with independent out- of-class learning process m which learners/students have full control over all the aspects of the learning process. According to this point of view, an "autonomous learner" is the one who is self- motivated and does not need any help from the teacher. However, it is believed that class room settings can be designed in the ways which promote learners' autonomy. Similarly, to ensure learner autonomy, the focus of the syllabus should be based on a student-centered approach (Grardner & Miller 1999).

A lot of research has been made in the past on the benefits of computer-mediated communication/online environment According to Itakura and nakajima (2001), computer-mediated/online environment has helped learners in many ways which led them to learn language effectively. In face-to-face learning, the instructor/teacher gives immediate feedback to learners / Students, whereas, in online learning environment learners/students are more independent and self-controlled (Jaeger, 1995). Kern, (1996) found out that "learners now view the computer as a medium through which they must negotiate meaning through interaction, interpretation, and collaboration rather than as a finite, authoritative informational base for carrying out stipulated language task". It was also believed that virtual learning provides greater equality within discussions through reducing social context clues, non-verbal cues, and it gave learners ability to work at their own pace and time (Sproull & Klesler, 1991),

- **METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE**

Study Data

This paper used three sources of information, mainly a mini questionnaire, pre-structured interviews and electronic

transcripts, of students interactions with each other taken from the archive of the program that has been prepared previously and used. Students participating in this study were enrolled in Eng 212 "computer assisted language learning" which was taught by the conductor/ researcher of this study. The participants were divided into two sections. Section one has 26 students whereas section two has 24 students;; The researcher met both the sections two times a week for about one and a half hours each. The content of the course was about how to use computers to learn languages. The students took great interest in the topics of this course. They were engaged in long in-class and online discussions and debates about the topic.

Participants in section one, were taught in traditional classroom setting where they were given syllabus and textbooks and they resumed their learning and in class discussions. The students were divided into four groups in the classroom. Each group consisted of six students. Students were asked to participate in in-class discussions. Students in this section were not asked to engage in any activity when class time finishes.

The participants in section two were taught in computer-based teaching environment, where students were directed by instructor to engage in online discussions via blackboard. In such cases students adopted two ways of communication through the program. They could post their questions or comments and wait for replies from their peers. All students enrolled in the course could access the posts and their replies. Blackboard had an option for students to engage in instant messaging. All posts, replies and instant messages were archived for students' and instructor's reference. The students were directed to be online for three pre-set times for

discussions. Each pre-set time took duration of one hour. All these discussions were stretched over a period of twelve weeks from mid of September to mid of December, 2012. Students' Accommodation to the New Learning Environment

During the course of the study, the conductor of this study observed that some of the students faced difficulty in accommodating themselves in the new learning environment. Low level of students' proficiency in computer was one of the problems. The level of their ability to use computer varied a lot. So far as, software competency is concerned most of them were less mpetent, but they were found interested and motivated in carrying out the tasks and activities during the class time and pre-set times of course. However, they showed utter indifference towards learning as soon as they finished their class.

Students were instructed at the beginning of the course not to use Arabic during class and online discussion. The use of Arabic was banned and discouraged. However, the researcher of the study noticed that the students of traditional group used more Arabic in class discussion, whereas, the students of the other group used a little Arabic in their online discussions, Constructs, frequencies, and structures of selected learners5 linguistic and metalinguistic aspects.

The use of the expression 'linguistic function' is very common and well known, but there is a need to further explain the meaning of 'metalinguistic function'. While linguistic function deals with the referential context of the language, metalinguistic function examines the relationship between language referential context and its sociocultural impacts. Camps & Milian explain:

The metalinguistic function, even though it keeps referring to the code, diversifies its object as 2 consequence of the confrontation between the general reference model and the sociocultural diversity in linguistic usage. At the same time other factors which are not strictly related to the linguistics but which " influence the perspective on metalinguistic function need to be noted - factors related to the sociocultural background of the interlocutors as well as the setting of the communicative situation, (2000:5)

Even though, psychological and cognitive aspects of language learning approaches are still in use and get wider acceptance from all quarters, the role of social contexts in language learning as one of the major forces in L2 development cannot be denied (Atkinson, 2002; Donato, 1994; Long, 1997). The social context approach of L2 learning has resulted in responses to claim that language learning as a process is achieved without surrounding social factors. The opponents of this approach say that language learning without social context is like a "cactus in the desert"(Atkinson, 2002). Atkinson claims that progress in language learning can best be achieved if the students make efforts to participate in social activities when they are practiced in the classroom setting. It indicates that acquiring L2 successfully depends on the students collaborative efforts with an aim to integrate themselves in a group or a class as a whole. Recent research in L2 acquisition has shown that language learners tend to build their own social community while they improve their sociolinguistic competence (Darhower, 2002, Thorne, 2008)

In an L2 classroom, the students interact with each other bringing their individual experiences into the classroom and establishing a certain relationship

among themselves. They engage themselves in the tasks or the activities that best suit their needs. Therefore, their activities cannot be analyzed in isolation; they are judged and investigated in relation to other learners as a social being. This makes a major behavior of their L2 learning process. Coughlan and Duff (1994) discussed the ways students carried out the tasks and activities, and their Investigation has farther led to the research in this area; they say:

We stand to learn a lot about what goes on in the minds and experiences of individual language learners by looking at the activity that emerges from interactive second language situations. Perhaps through this kind of discourse-based investigation, we will discover that variation in second language acquisition is not entirely intrapersonal — rather, some answers must reside in the interpersonal relationships among participants engaged in second language activities, and in subject-task relationships, (P. 190; emphasis in original)

Research has also been carried out in relation to the use of first language in the second language classroom in order to determine its role. Studies in a sociocultural framework have suggested that the learners use LI as a cognitive tool to help "scaffold" their learning in L2 (Turnbull & Arnett, 2002). It has been argued that L1 is used in peer-to-peer interaction whenever the need arises, and it performs different function:

By means of LI the students enlist each other's interest in the task throughout its performance, develop strategies for making the task manageable, maintain their focus on the goal of the task, foreground important elements of the task, discuss what needs to be done to solve specific problems, and explicate and build on each other's

partial solutions to specific problems throughout the task. (Anton & De Camilla,1998, p.321).

Whether or not a language is learnt needs to be understood in relation to the activities carried out in context where the learners capitalize the use of language, use it with other tools such as in the conducive classroom environment so as to achieve desired goals that result from their motivations and indentations. This gives an explanation of L2 learning which is " embedded in, and emerging from, the experiences of others in the present (social) , the experiences of other from the past, and the immediate experiences of the individual with these others and with the artifacts they constructed" (Lantolf, 2002, p.104).

In fact, language is not the product of learner's mind alone. It is set in a context, and created with other participants and classroom artifacts. The classroom teacher, the other learner in his group, his classmate sitting around him, and even the teacher' jotting on the whiteboard, the gossiping and whispering of his friends in the classroom, worksheets, transparencies and the textbook pages contribute toward proper language learning. As a matter of fact, the produced utterances of a learner are the outcome of a mind that depicts - the interactive environment of the setting where language is used (Ohta, 2001)

STUDY ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

1. Results related to the questionnaire

Parts of results of this study were solicited from the distributed questionnaire and pre-structured open-ended interviews with five participating students from each section. Data from the questionnaires are presented as follows: (1) Questions to do with "development",

(2) Questions to do with "comfort", (3) Questions to do with "difficulties", and (4) Questions to do with "motivation".

Questions to do with (skill) "development"

Students were asked to respond 'Yes', 'Sometimes' or 'No', as appropriate, to each of the ten items investigating their level of language development. Table 1 and 2 show the number of students and their responses to each of the ten items. It is noticed that the majority of students of section two believe that, the use of computers developed their language particularly in terms of speaking, writing, grammar, and pronunciation. In addition to this, a lot of students think that the use of computers has resulted in development their social interaction, learning style and their ability to judge, think and solve problems.

Table 1: Students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (skill) 'development (computer based teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	24	20	3	1	27.52
2	24	19	3	2	37.11
3	24	17	4	3	62.41
4	24	16	5	3	55.71
5	23	21	2	0	47.82
6	24	22	2	0	46.26
7	22	21	1	0	22.01
8	24	20	3	1	34.41
9	24	18	5	1	17.22
10	24	21	2	1	09.77

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Table 2: Students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (skill) development' (traditional teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	26	11	5	10	07.38
2	26	8	7	11	21.25
3	26	7	7	12	44.71
4	26	9	6	11	43.88
5	25	7	3	15	09.90
6	25	10	5	10	12.41
7	26	14	4	8	61.25
8	26	10	7	9	11.29
9	26	8	7	11	35.77
10	26				18.17

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Statements to do with (learning environment) "comfort"

Students were asked to respond 'Yes', 'Sometimes' or 'No', as appropriate, to each of the eight items investigating their learning environment. Table number 3 and 4 show the number of students and their responses to each of the eight items. Participants in the second section, unlike those in section one, think that computers made their learning and online discussions, comfortable. In

addition, they feel comfortable to collaborate with their colleagues, talk with their teacher, and to learn at their own pace. Finally, they do not feel judged or evaluated during the course of their study. Table number 3 and 4 show these numbers.

Table 3: Students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (learning environment) 'comfort' (computer based teaching)

Questions	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	24	22	1	1	22.53
2	24	22	0	2	46.51
3	23	19	2	2	22.53
4	24	19	2	3	06.48
5	24	22	1	1	36.72
6	24	21	1	2	16.37
7	23	18	3	2	31.46
8	24	19	1	4	42.11

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Table 4: Students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (learning environment) 'comfort ' (traditional teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	26	7	5	14	26.17
2	25	4	5	16	41.25
3	26	5	8	13	32.41
4	26	5	5	16	15.42
5	26	7	7	12	52.33
6	25	4	7	14	11.31
7	26	6	6	14	26.42
8	26	2	4	20	07.25

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Statements to do with (course) "difficulties"

Students were asked to respond 'Yes', 'Sometimes' or 'No', as appropriate, to the each of the eight items investigating the level of the coarse difficult}7. Students' answers to the questions about "difficulty" indicate that students of section two don't have any difficulty in using the computers and communicating with their classmates and teachers. It is also evident that they don't feel any difficulty involved in discussions with their classmates and accepting corrections from their teachers and classmates. However, the majority of

the students expressed difficulty with technical issues like using computers, software and keyboarding. Table number 5 and 6 show the number of students and their responses to each of the eight items.

Table 5: Students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (course) ' difficulties' (computer based teaching)

Staements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	24	2	5	17	35.72
2	23	4	3	16	42.74
3	24	6	3	15	16.71
4	23	1	1	21	45.26
5	24	2	3	19	31.42
6	24	1	6	17	52.88
7	24	2	4	18	42.26
8	24	18	1	5	21.36

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Table 6: The students' responses on the questionnaire concerned with (course) ' difficulties' (traditional teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	26	10	4	12	55.25
2	26	14	3	9	15.52
3	24	17	3	4	32.44
4	26	15	2	9	53.42
5	25	16	2	7	61.44
6	26	20	2	4	25.62
7	25	18	2	5	33.42
8	26	19	2	5	32.54

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

Statements to do with 'motivation'

Students were asked to respond 'Yes', 'Sometimes' or 'No', as appropriate, to each of the eight items investigating their level of motivation throughout the semester. Students in the computer based teaching unlike the group in the traditional teaching indicated that they remained motivated all the semester and they were ready to engage in more language related issues during their online sessions. They also felt motivated to correct their classmates, communicate with their teacher, collaborate with their colleagues and to work and use computers independently.

Table number 7 and 8 show the number of students and their responses to each of the eight items.

Table 7: Students responses on the questionnaire concerned with ' motivation' (computer based teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
1	24	20	1	3	42.53
2	24	19	2	3	11.52
3	24	21	1	2	31.44
4	23	18	3	2	24.33
5	24	19	2	3	21.23
6	24	17	4	3	42.32
7	24	19	2	3	11.13
8	24	21	1	2	42.34

X2 = Chi-square $p = < .01$

Table 8: Students ’responses on the questionnaire concerned with ' motivation' (traditional teaching)

Statements	N	Yes	Sometimes	No	X2
L	26	9	4	13	42.57
2	25	10	4	11	34.61
3	26	11	5	10	35.56
4	25	8	2	15	35.44
5	26	7	3	16	13.63
6	26	8	3	15	43.24
7	26	5	4	17	36.37
8	26	6	2	18	52.01

X2 = Chi-square p = ‹ .01

2. Results related to “ the interview”

The pre-structured questions of the interviews were based on the four themes of the questionnaire: "development", "comfort", "difficulty" and "motivation".

The first section of the interview deals with the students’ “development”. It was found that the students felt satisfied with the existed teaching / learning style. They believe that they can learn in a better way by using computers as compared to the group which learns by

adopting traditional teaching style. They think that the use of computers enhances their acquisition of language and makes this process easier, enjoyable and sustainable. They find the use of computer is of help to them in developing all aspects of language learning i.e., listening, speaking, grammar and writing. On the other hand, the group of learners with traditional teaching environment, perceive the course in different way. They think that the course doesn't develop all aspects of language. This is clear from the students' answer to questions from one to six in "development" questionnaire. The learners in computer based teaching group view language learning through computer as a very useful tool to develop their social interaction with their colleagues in addition to augmenting their ability to judge, think, evaluate and analyze speedily, critically and analytically unlike the traditional teaching where such faculties receive less-weight.

The second section of the interviews deals with "comfort". The conductor of the study found that the students who participated in computer based teaching were more comfortable while using language. They found at ease while engaging themselves in online discussion, and working in partnership and pooling available learning resources in order to maximize the use of language. The students believed that they love working independently and at their own pace. They didn’t have feeling of being judged, corrected or evaluated either by teachers or by their colleagues. Moreover, they found it to the best of their enjoyment to learn at- any time they like. So far as the group with traditional teaching is concerned, the students felt it comfortable to be taught through traditional teaching, but they felt uncomfortable while engaging

themselves in class discussion and working in groups with their colleagues. They also found fault with the pace of learning and talking with the teachers. They found themselves exhausted while talking to teachers and using language outside the classroom setting. Another factor that also undermined their performance was their fear about being judged and evaluated.

The third section of the interviews discussed "difficulty". It became evident from the interview responses from computer based teaching learners that they felt more collaborating with their colleagues, more communicative with their teacher and more engaging in discussion as compared to their counterparts in traditional teaching. Students felt more accepting to their classmates and teachers' corrections in computer based teaching. Interviewees from the other section, on the other hand found it difficult to accept correction from their colleagues and teachers. In addition, students in traditional teaching found it easier to adjust to classroom setting than those in the computer based teaching. Some interviewees expressed their concerns in using techniques of computer such as keyboarding and browsing etc.

The fourth section examined "motivation" in computer based teaching and traditional teaching. The students in computer based teaching believed that they remained motivated throughout the semester. They experienced freedom in the choice of topics, working on their own pace and without any direct supervision. They felt motivated while correcting their colleagues and accepting corrections. Moreover, the use of computer Itself was a good source of motivation for them. The learners with traditional teaching were found motivated off and on during their study. But, they were less motivated while

talking to the teachers, engaging in class discussion and accepting and making corrections. They also felt less motivated while working independently.

DISCUSSION

Students in online discussion exhibit different learning models as compared to the class discussion. They reported that their use of online discussions enhance their opportunities for learning in a variety of different ways which were considered as interesting and enjoyable. These different ways can be classified in four categories:

Firstly, students feel that they have more control on their pace and content of learning. They can go beyond the classroom environment. They can allocate time for different activities according to their needs. They feel more confident while communicating online. The students found that online discussion augmented their interaction. It promoted their interest manifold that resulted in greater learning outcome. In addition, the use of computers and online discussions made their learning experience more enjoyable and pleasing. As a result, the acquisition of learning tasks sustains for longer time. There is no denying the fact that students learn a language more speedily if they feel that they are not evaluated and observed. This is very much true for online discussions. Students point out that they can communicate confidently while interacting online. The discussion archive in the software used shows that students utilized complex grammatical structures and complicated vocabulary. It shows that students become more risk-takers if they know they are not observed. It was also noticed that students became more co-operative and collaborative during online discussion unlike class discussion where students felt they were given finite and authoritative information.

Secondly, the social context is more encouraging in online discussion. The students say that they don't feel shy and bullied in online discussion. They feel more autonomous and independent during the course of learning. Bergen (Cited in Dam, 1995, pages 1-2) explained learners' autonomy as:

"...a readiness to take charge of one's own learning in the service of one's end and purposes. This entails a capacity and willingness to act independently and in co-operation with others, as a socially responsible person..... It is essential that an autonomous learner is stimulated to evolve an awareness of the aims and processes of learning and is capable of the critical reflection which syllabuses and curricula frequently require but traditional pedagogical measures rarely achieve. An autonomous learner knows how to learn and can use his knowledge in any learning situation she/ he may encounter at any stage in her / his life".

The pressure of peer evaluation reduced in online discussion. The students experienced complete freedom. Another encouraging aspect of online discussion was making of repair moves on the part of students. Students were very much responsive to make repair moves either by themselves or from their partners. Repair moves took place in the form of clarification requests, self-repairs and explicit correction.

Thirdly, it was observed that the students found online learning tasks manageable and doable. They felt that they could achieve the objectives more easily and comfortably than in the classroom environment. It is so because students worked under no pressure and with no teacher's control. Students' role kept on changing through the discussion. The students' roles' as teachers and as learners were overlapping and tacit. They bifurcated the learning tasks and worked

to complete them at their own convenience.

Fourthly, students were also found taking great interest in setting up ' channels 'of learning other than the ones mentioned in this study. They intended to use channel such as Skype and face book. They utilized these channels in order to enhance their language. They seemed to concentrate on communication channels such as voice chat etc. The researcher found it important to engage with the students in their voice discussions and chats in Skype and face book. In the course of this engagement with the students, the researcher found out that students learnt from their partners through imitation rather than repetition. Lantolf (2003) differentiated between imitation and repetition arguing that repetition doesn't entail intentionality unlike imitation where constructive and creative intentions of learners are present.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION FOR TEACHERS AND LEARNERS

In traditional style of teaching, teachers' method of assessing the language competency and level of students' acquisition of a language is mostly based on psychological observations where students' physical presence makes a major part of this observation. for example, the teacher can base his observation of student's level of language competence by observing his confidence in the use of language in the classroom. On the other hand, in online discussions, teacher's absence gives more confidence to the students. Moreover, the students don't feel being judged and under observation. They talk more freely and confidently.

Proficiency in academic literature is explained as" the outcome of social interaction with a linguistic environment.

(Bialystok, 1998)". In online discussion, lack of social interaction can slow down students' ability to use language in real social environment, although it provides linguistic environment. Hence, it presents a problem for the learners and the teachers as well.

In online discussion, students use language as a whole. While talking online, they listen, speak, write and check their grammatical and syntactical mistakes. Their level of communicative competence enhances rapidly as compared to the traditional style of teaching and learning. They practice different models of language instructions at the same time. They are exposed to all aspects of language learning.

Online learning follows the pattern of developing language in learners by adopting Vygotsky's sociocultural theories of language and literacy. Teacher has to be innovative and bear small mistakes made by learners. Learners enjoy full freedom in the use of language. They work in groups and learn from each other. In line with Vygotsky's theories of language, learners base their acquisition of new language items on the known items. They travel from the known zone to unknown zone which Vygotsky termed as "the zone of proximal development". This journey to an unknown world gives the learner more confidence, increase their ability to think and create and interact with each other in a more effective way. They become active learner by taking full responsibilities of their learning. But the researcher finds it important to warn that the teachers shouldn't focus on correcting small grammatical mistakes at the expense of endangering learners' freedom and confidence. Classroom language learning practice should be as White (2000) described it as, a process focusing on whole language development

not mere identification of errors and instructions to motivate learning and encourage critical thinking and problem solving.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, D. (2002). Toward a soeiocognitive approach to second language acquisition. The Modem Language Journal, 86(4), 525-545.
2. Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F, (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of LI collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 54(3), 314-342.
3. Benson, P. (2001). Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning. London: Longman.
4. Benson, P. (2003). Learner autonomy in the classroom. In D. Nunan (Ed.), Practical English language teaching (pp. 289-308). New York: McGraw Hill.
5. Bialystok, E. (1986). Factors in the growth of linguistic awareness. Child Development 57: 498-510.
6. Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. (1994). Samè task, different activities: Analysis of a SLA task from an activity theory perspective. In J. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), Vygotskian approaches to second language research (pp. 173-191). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
7. Dam, L. (1995). Learner autonomy 3: From theory to classroom practice. Dublin: Authentik.
8. Darhower, M. (2002). Interactional features of synchronous computer-mediated communication in the intermediate L2 class: A sociocultural case study. CALICO Journal, 19, 249-277.

9. Donato, R (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (Eds.), Vygotskian approaches to second language research (pp. 33-56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.
10. Gardner, D., & Miller, L. (1999). Establishing self-access: From theory to practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Gardner, D., & Miller, L. (1999). Establishing self-access: From theory to practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Gill, T. G. (2005, March). In-depth tutorials: Distance Learning Strategies that Make Sense, Part 1. eLearnn , p. 1.
13. Hafners C, A., & Candlin, C. N. (2012). Corpus tools as an affordance to learning in professional legal education. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6(4), 303-318.
14. Holec, H. (1988,). Autonomy and self-directed learning: Present fields of application. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
15. Itakura, H., & Nakajima, S. (2001). IT jidai niokeru nihongo kyôiku: Honkon-Kagoshima no denshi mëru sôhôkôkei purojekuto wâku no kokoromi [Teaching Japanese education for the era of IT: Research findings from an e-mail project between Hong-Kong and Kagoshima]. Sekai no nihongo kyôiku [Current réport on Japanese- Language Education Around the Globe], 6,227—240.
16. Jaeger, M. (1995). Science teacher education at a distance. The .A.msric««n Journal of Distance Education. 8.2:30-42.
17. Kern, R. (2005, February). Multiliteracies and foreign language education. Paper presented at the Berkeley Language Center

Colloquium, University of California, Berkeley.

18. Lantolf, J. P. (2003). Intrapersonal communication and internalisation in the second language classroom. In A. Kozulin, G. Gindis, V. S. Ageyev, & S. M. Miller (Eds.), Vygotsky's educational theory in cultural context (pp. 349-370). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
19. Lantolf, J. P. (2002). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics (pp. 104-114). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
20. Lian, A. P., & Lian, A. B. (1997). The secret of the Shao-Lin monk: Contribution to an intellectual framework for language learning. On-CALL 11(2), 2-18.
21. Little, D. (1991). Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems. Dublin: Authentik.
22. Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. System, 23(2), 175-181.
23. Long, M. H. (1997). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. Text from the McGraw-Hill videoconference: Grammar in the communicative classroom. Retrieved June 15, 2004, from http://www.twhhe.com/socscience/foreignlang/top.htm
24. Miller, L. (2013). Reflective lesson planning: Promoting learner autonomy in the classroom. In R, Pemberton, S. Tpogood, & A. Barfield (Eds.), Maintaining control: Autonomy and language learning (pp. 109-124). Kong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
25. Ohta, A. S. (2001). Second language acquisition processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.

Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

26. Sinclair, B. (2006). Multiple voices: Negotiating pathways toward teacher and learner autonomy. In T. E. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities and responses (pp. 237-268). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
27. Sproull, L., & Kiesler, S. (1991). Connections: New ways of working m inc networked organization. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
28. Thorne. S, (2003), Artifacts and cultures-of-use in intercultural communication. Language Learning & Technology, 7(2), 38-67. Retrieved January 8, 2008, from http://lltmsu.edu/vol7num2/thorne/default.htmI.
29. Turnbull, M=, & Arnett, K. (2002), Teachers' uses of the target and first language in second and foreign language classroom. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 22, 264-218.
30. White, E.(2000), Teaching and Assessing Writing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Appendix A

Statements to do with development

1. The computer developed my language learning.
2. The computer developed my speaking and made me communicate freely.
3. The computer developed my writing and made me express myself freely.
4. The computer developed my grammar and made me write sound sentences.
5. The computer developed my pronunciation and accent
6. The computer developed my overall understanding of English.

7. The computer developed my social interaction with my colleagues.

8. The computer developed my style of learning.

9. The computer developed my ability to judge and think.

10. The computer developed my relations with my friends and colleagues.

11. The computer developed my ability to solve problems.

Statements to do with development (traditional teaching)

1. The course developed my language learning.

2. The course developed my speaking and made me communicate

freely.

3. The course developed my writing and made me express myself

freely.

4. The course developed my grammar and made me write sound

sentences.

5. The course developed my pronunciation and accent

6. The course developed my overall understanding of English.

7. The course developed my social interaction with my colleagues.

8. The course developed my style of learning.

9. The course developed my ability to judge and think.

10. The course developed my relations with my friends and

colleagues.

11. The course developed my ability to solve problems,

Statements to do with comfort (computer-based instruction)

1. I feel comfortable learning through computer.

2. I feel comfortable engaging into online discussion.

3. Ï feel comfortable collaborating with my colleagues.

4. I feel comfortable to learn by own.

5. I feel comfortable to learn at any time not just in class.

6. I feel comfortable to learn at my own pace.

7. I feel comfortable talking with my teacher.

8. I don’t feel judged and evaluated by teacher or students.

Statements to do with comfort (traditional instruction)

1. I feel comfortable learning through traditional teaching.

2. I feel comfortable engaging into class discussion.

3. I feel comfortable collaborating with my colleagues.

4. I feel comfortable to learn by my own.

5. I feel comfortable to learn at any time not just in class.

6. I feel comfortable to learn at my own pace.

7. I feel comfortable talking with my teacher.

8. I don't feel judged and evaluated by teacher or students.

Statements to do with difficulty (computer-based instruction)

1. I have difficulty using the computer and the software.

2. I have difficulty collaborating with my classmates.

3. I have difficulty communicating with my teacher.

4. I have difficulty reviewing the archived content of the software.

5. I have difficulty engaging in online discussion.

6. I have difficulty accepting my classmates correction.

7. I have difficulty accepting my teacher correction.

8. I have difficulty with keyboarding.

Statements to do with difficulty (traditional instruction)

1. I have difficulty adjusting to my class and classmates.

2. I have difficulty collaborating with my classmates.

3. I have difficulty communicating with my teacher.

4. I have difficulty reviewing taught material.

5. I have difficulty engaging in class discussion.

6. I have difficulty accepting my classmates correction.

7. I have difficulty accepting my teacher correction.

8. I have difficulty with traditional classroom settings.

Statements to do with motivation (computer-based instruction)

1. I feet motivated to learn English all semester long.

2. I feel motivated to carry out my learning by my pace.

3. I feel motivated to discuss other issues in online discussion.

4. I feel motivated to correct my classmates.

5. I feel motivated to communicate with my teacher.

6. I feel motivated collaborate with my classmates.

7. I feel motivated to learn and work independently.

8. I feel motivated by the use of computer.

Statements to do with motivation (traditional instruction)

1. I feel motivated to learn English ail semester long.

2. I feel motivated if I carry out my learning at own my pace.

3. I feel motivated to discuss other issues in class discussion.

4. I feel motivated to correct my classmates.

5. I feel motivated to communicate with my teacher,

6. I feel motivated to collaborate with my classmates.

7. I fee! motivated to learn and work independently.

8. I feel motivated by the traditional method of teaching