Instructors’ Linguistic Knowledge when Teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language

Rosa M. Piqueres Gilabert and Rocío Martínez Galiano

Indiana University

Abstract

Previous research on native and nonnative instructors has been largely limited to studies of perception in ESL and EFL contexts (Cots and Díaz 2005; Reves and Medgyes 1994) and has not considered differences in instructors’ linguistic knowledge (as related to grammar and vocabulary). Most of the research on students’ perceptions has been focused on nonnative teachers along with their differences in teaching methodology (Moussu 2002). This study investigates the differences in linguistic knowledge among college intermediate level Spanish instructors (n=12) in relation to their native or nonnative status. It also examines the possibility of students (n=212) perceiving these differences in instructor knowledge and if they are related to select instructor individual difference factors. The results show that native and nonnative instructors differ in some aspects of their linguistic knowledge and that was accurately perceived by their students. This research opens up a new frontier in the linguistic landscape and offers an innovative contribution to this field of study by means of matching students’ perceptions with instructors’ results.
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1. Introduction

Experts in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) have focused on the analysis of different variables in order to reveal how second and foreign language (FL) learning is affected by students’ and instructors’ individual differences (IDs) (e.g., Berliner 2001; Collentine 2011; DeSaint Leger and Storch 2009; Ellis 2002; Ellis 2004; Gurzynski-Weiss 2010; Hernández 2010; Hummel 2009; Mackey, Adams, Stafford and Winke 2010; Mackey, Oliver and Leeman 2003; Mackey, Polio and McDonough 2004; Polio, Gass and Chapin 2006; Porte 1999; Safar and Kormos 2008; Tight 2010; Tseng, Dornyei and Schmitt 2006). Particularly, the study of instructors’ IDs emerged in the past decades when researchers began to question whether and how these IDs might affect students’ learning process and therefore, play a role in SLA.

Traditionally, learning and teaching a FL has been predicated on the distinction between native (NS) and non-native (NNS) speakers (Davies 1991). In most societies, NSs are often regarded as model language teachers and viewed as the embodiment for the standard language. It is generally assumed that native teachers are better language teachers just because they teach their first language (L1), which they acquired in childhood. However, the fact that they have not explicitly learned their mother tongue might cause them to have a less conscious knowledge of grammar structures and certain lexical items when teaching their L1 explicitly through instruction. In other words, NSs might be less aware of grammatical rules and certain lexical items because they were learned implicitly and unconsciously. On the other hand, NNS teachers have learned the language consciously and explicitly, paid attention to grammar rules and memorized new lexical items among other things. In short, they have devoted and still dedicate a lot of time to learning the target language. This causes them to be extremely motivated and committed to L2 learning (Davies 1991).

The starting point of this research is to explore instructors’ grammatical and lexical knowledge in relation to their NS and NNS status. More specifically, the purpose of this study is to analyze and identify any possible differences between the linguistic knowledge, in terms of grammar and vocabulary, that NS and NNS instructors of intermediate Spanish at a large, public, Midwestern research university possess. Additionally, we investigate whether these differences in knowledge are related to various ID factors such as teaching experience and linguistic background, which might have affected its acquisition. Finally, we examine whether instructors’ differences in their linguistic knowledge are perceived by their intermediate learners of FL Spanish.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Native vs. Nonnative instructors

The interlocutor’s NS or NNS background is one of the ID factors that has rapidly received the most attention within the study of instructors’ IDs. Medgyes (1992) has stated that NSs and NNSs are like two different species. He asserts that NS and NNS teachers differ in terms of proficiency and teaching practice and that most of the differences in their teaching practice can be attributed to the discrepancy in language proficiency. In spite of these dissimilarities, he concludes that both types of teachers can be equally good on their own terms. Reves and Medgyes (1994) conducted a study with 216 NS and NNS English teachers from 10 different countries. They hypothesized that the NSs and NNSs would differ
in their teaching practice due to their differing levels of language proficiency. Among their results, they found that 84% of the NNSs admitted having various language difficulties in their teaching practice. Upon reviewing their findings, they suggested that being exposed to the native language frequently might improve the language difficulties of NNS teachers.

Much of the research in this field has attempted to identify differences in terms of classroom behavior and teaching practice according to the NS/NNS background as perceived by language learners. For instance, Barrat and Kontra (2000) and Benke and Medgyes (2005) claimed that NS instructors were thought to be authentic, more relaxed about grades and error correction, talkative and not very successful at explaining grammar among other things. In contrast, NNS instructors were believed to have extensive training and experience, be more demanding, and also be able to predict, which structure would be difficult for students; however, they were regarded as being less creative than NS. Nevertheless, some studies (Benke and Medgyes 2005; Cots and Diaz 2005) suggest that NS and NNS do not differ in their teaching abilities.

Another major strand of investigation with respect to NS/NNS differences has focused on instructors’ beliefs along with the differences in their teaching practice. The majority of the research has employed a qualitative methodology and has been mainly conducted in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Research about NS and NNS instructors still needs to be expanded since very few studies have analyzed the NS/NNS status as an ID factor. One study, Gurzynski-Weiss (2010), triangulated the study of corrective feedback provision with three ID factors: NS/NNS status, SLA education, and teaching experience. Her findings showed that instructor ID factors were significantly related to the type and amount of feedback provided. Regarding the NS/NNS status, she found that NS instructors addressed errors by means of explicit feedback significantly more than NNSs. Another finding was that NSs were not consistent in their treatment of L1 use in the Spanish FL classroom while the NNSs were consistent in ignoring the use of English. In addition to these findings, the study also found that both NS and NNS instructors indicated that their language background influenced their error perception.

In short, previous research on instructor NS/NNS background has been limited to studies of perception. It has mainly addressed NS/NNS instructors’ beliefs or students' perceptions either on their own or in comparison to their teaching practice. The present study aims to expand this area of research by analyzing the NS/NNS status of Spanish instructors in relation to their linguistic knowledge of the language they teach.

2.2 Instructors’ knowledge

The knowledge of instructors has been examined for some decades (Andrews 1994; Andrews 2001; Andrews and McNeill 2005; Grossman et al. 1989; Segall 2004; Wilson et al. 1987) in order to observe how it is acquired, processed and used in the classroom context. The present study will focus on subject-matter knowledge, which is understood as the knowledge of the facts of a discipline (Shulman 1986), as well as knowledge about language (KAL), defined as the knowledge about a certain grammar which teachers possess (Borg 2005).

Within research in KAL, special attention has been given to the study of grammar (Andrews 1994; 2001) and vocabulary (Andrews and McNeill 2005), which will be the aspects of knowledge examined in the present study. However, although there has been a
tendency to refer to this knowledge as KAL, the work by Andrews and McNeill employs the conception ‘language awareness’, which is operationalized as “the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of language that enables them to teach effectively” (Thornbury 1997).

Andrews (1994; 2001) examined awareness in second language teachers in Hong Kong. In his 2001 study, Andrews measured the impact that teachers’ language awareness (as it relates to grammar) had on pedagogical practice, since the researcher believed that command of grammar-related aspects was not enough to determine practices which are conducive to learning. Along these lines, Andrews suggested that instructors might have awareness, but it does not guarantee they possess the ability to view learning/acquisition aspects from the learner’s perspective. Thus, language awareness does not necessarily go together with pedagogical knowledge. This evaluation of grammatical knowledge was based on isolated class observations, but not on formal assessment. Moreover, NS and NNS knowledge was not compared. Only one aspect of language awareness was taken into account.

One of the few studies that investigated the differences in knowledge between NSs and NNSs was Morris and Cobb (2002), which approached the knowledge and learning of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) students in Quebec. Vocabulary profiles (Vocabprofiler) were created for 122 TESL undergraduate students, through analyses of 300-word writing samples. For this purpose, participants were given a statement from which to write an essay. Their academic success was evaluated according to the grades obtained in two grammar courses required for all participants. Although the results suggested that there was not a direct relationship between the grades obtained in the grammar courses and the vocabulary profiles, it was still significant that NSs outperformed NNSs. Our study explores the vocabulary knowledge needed in order to teach an intermediate Spanish class at a specific university, which impedes the use of any of the instruments used in these previous studies.

For the aim of the present study, teachers’ knowledge is examined according to the grammatical constructions and vocabulary repertoire taught in an intermediate course at a large, public Midwestern research university. For this purpose, original instruments that assessed instructors’ grammatical and vocabulary knowledge were created.

**2.3 Students’ perceptions of instructor NS/NNS background**

In relation to NS and NNS instructors, investigations that have analyzed perceptions have followed two main approaches: (1) self-perceptions of the NNS teacher and (2) students’ perceptions of NNS teachers. This section will briefly discuss the main works carried out on students’ perceptions of NNS as it is most relevant to the current research. One of the first studies in this area was Moussu (2002) who investigated students’ perceptions of ESL (English as a second language) NNS teachers. Her participants were four NNS speakers of English from four different countries (Japan, Argentina, Ecuador and Switzerland) and 84 ESL students from 21 different countries who were enrolled in an intensive English program in the USA. The students completed two questionnaires, one the first day of class and the other after 14 weeks. The researcher also conducted three separate sets of interviews with six students. The results showed that from the beginning of the course, learners had positive attitudes towards their NNS teachers. Specifically, 68% of the students said that they could learn English just as well as with a NNS. In addition, 79% expressed admiration for the NNS.
The first doctoral research into the students’ perceptions was completed by Ahmar Mahboob (2003) at Indiana University in Bloomington, in the United States. His participants were 32 students enrolled in an intensive English program. In order to analyze their perceptions of NS and NNS language teachers, the researcher asked students to write a short essay stating their opinions of NS and NNS language teachers. The results showed that both NS and NNS teachers were characterized by positive and negative comments. In general, NNSs were seen as effective teachers except for speaking and pronunciation teaching. In the case of NSs, the negative comments were related to their methodology, experience as an L2 learner and ability to answer questions. NNSs were seen as more understanding and empathetic than NSs. Mahboob (2003) concluded that students do not seem to have a preference between NS/NNS as they indicate that both types of teachers possess a unique set of features.

To briefly summarize, research on students’ perceptions has focused mainly on their perception of instructors’ teaching practices and has been limited mostly to ESL and EFL contexts. In addition, all these investigations have been conducted on NNSs. There is still a need for more studies that investigate the possible differences regarding instructors’ linguistic knowledge in terms of their NS/NNS status. In this respect, research has not yet assessed students’ perceptions of their instructors’ knowledge of the language. Thus, the current study aims to fill this gap by examining NS and NNS instructors’ knowledge of the language and identifying if potential differences are perceived by FL learners.

3. Research questions and hypotheses

The present study was motivated by the following research questions:

1) Do NS and NNS instructors of intermediate-level Spanish differ in their grammatical knowledge? What grammatical structures are most problematic for NS instructors? For NNS instructors?

2) Do NS and NNS instructors differ in their vocabulary knowledge required by an intermediate curriculum? What lexical items appear to be most problematic for NS instructors? And for NNS instructors?

3) Are there any other factors (ID factors: teaching experience, linguistic background) that relate to the patterns of knowledge observed?

4) Do students’ perceptions correspond to the results obtained in the grammar identification test and vocabulary recognition test completed by the instructors?

5) What aspects do students appreciate most about NS and NNS instructors?

In addition, various hypotheses were formulated according to these research questions. For the first research question we hypothesized that NNS instructors might have a broader knowledge of certain formal grammatical structures. We believed so because these subjects had formally learned the language through explicit classroom instruction, which is different from the naturalistic setting where the NSs acquired the language implicitly. Concerning the second research question we postulated that NNS instructors might have a broader knowledge in this linguistic area, due to the dialectal variations they might have been exposed to. In contrast, NSs might not be aware of this dialectal variation. For our third research question we anticipated that other factors such as teaching
experience might have a direct impact on the instructors’ knowledge of grammatical aspects and vocabulary repertoire. Moreover, the hypothesis for the fourth research question was that students’ beliefs would reflect the results obtained in the grammar identification test and the vocabulary recognition test completed by the instructors. Finally, for our last research question we expected that students would appreciate strengths in NS instructors such as their accent, intonation, and cultural insight; on the other hand, they might find NNSs to be more competent in giving formal grammar explanations due to their own experience with learning the target language.

4. Methodology

4.1 Participants

12 instructors and 212 students of Intermediate Spanish as a foreign language participated in the study voluntarily. All students were enrolled in their fourth semester of Spanish and had an instructor who also participated in the study. Six of the instructors were NSs of Spanish from Spain, Mexico and Puerto Rico, and the other six instructors were NNSs from the United States and Brazil. Two of them were lecturers of Spanish, and the rest were Associate Instructors who were pursuing an MA or PhD in Spanish Literature (n=2), Portuguese (n=1) or Hispanic Linguistics (n=7). In addition, all of the instructors had only taught beginner and intermediate Spanish courses. Table 1 includes most background information about these instructors.

All the instructors were between 27 and 35 years old, and had taken a pedagogy course as a prerequisite to teach college Spanish. Furthermore, most instructors used the Communicative Approach when teaching; however two of them reported that it sometimes was difficult to implement it because of the demanding curriculum. Consequently, they mixed the Communicative Approach with other teaching methods, like the Audiolingual method or Task-Based Approach.

For the present investigation, a NS was defined as an individual raised in a household where Spanish was the only language spoken. In addition, he/she must have attended elementary and secondary school where Spanish was the primary language of instruction. Finally, he/she must have completed his/her BA degree at a university in a Spanish-speaking country. A NNS, however, was defined as an individual who was not raised in a household where Spanish was the only language spoken, did not attend elementary and secondary school at an institution where Spanish was the primary language of instruction and finally, did not complete their BA in a Spanish-speaking university. These operationalizations were created in this manner in order to distinguish speakers who learned Spanish implicitly since they were born from those who learned Spanish as a second language and, thus, have acquired Spanish in different contexts. Therefore, they provide better insight into and understanding of the results of the current study by allowing the reader to understand the main concepts mentioned in this paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Native language</th>
<th>Number of second languages</th>
<th>SLA courses</th>
<th>Research projects in SLA</th>
<th>Experience teaching Spanish in years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNS1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Instruments

Instructors and students completed different instruments. Instructors filled out a background questionnaire which included questions about their age, other languages spoken, experiences abroad, experience teaching Spanish, SLA education, as well as personal experiences and thoughts about learning second and foreign languages. Moreover, they completed the General Linguistic Knowledge Packet (see Appendices), which included the following materials:

a) Grammar identification test: This instrument included twenty-five identification items in Spanish, where instructors had to choose one out of three sentences according to the grammar construction requested. All the grammar questions were created following the book *¡Anda! Curso Intermedio* (Heining-Boynton et al. 2010), which was used by these instructors to teach their intermediate classes. Regarding this questionnaire, question 17 was taken out of the results since none of the provided options included the grammatical construction that was asked for. The researchers believed this multiple-choice questionnaire was convenient to measure the NS/NNS instructor grammatical knowledge since they were forced to choose between three grammatical sentences. Other tasks such as creating a sentence by themselves could have caused the appearance of ambiguous constructions and, thus, would have been counterproductive for the purpose of this study.

Example:

1) Seleccione una oración con el pasado progresivo (choose a sentence which includes the past progressive):

a. Yo andaba comiendo turró (I was eating turró).

b. Yo ando comiendo turró (I am eating turró).

c. Yo andaré comiendo turró (I will be eating turró).
b) Vocabulary recognition test: This test contained twenty-five definitions in Spanish, where instructors had to choose one out of three possible words provided. All the words were taken from the vocabulary taught in ¡Anda! Curso intermedio, and the definitions were obtained from Diccionario de la Lengua Española (RAE) (Real Academia Española, 2001). The researchers created this multiple-choice questionnaire to measure the NS/NNS instructor vocabulary knowledge according to the course that instructors taught at that specific time. Therefore, instructors were evaluated following the course curriculum and allowing comparability among the results.

Example:

1) Pelo de las ovejas y de otros animales, que se hila y sirve para tejer (Sheep hair and from other animals that is used to knit).

a. lana (wool)
   b. algodón (cotton)
   c. cuero (leather)

c) Proficiency test: This instrument was created for the purpose of checking instructors’ high proficiency in Spanish. All the instructors obtained scores over 90%, except one of them who obtained an 86%. A Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test was performed, which showed that the test was highly reliable ($\alpha = .85$).

Students completed a perception questionnaire, which included eight 5-point Likert-scale questions and two open-ended questions. For the Likert-scale questions, students chose from five options according to their level of agreement: 1 referred to strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 neither agree nor disagree, 4 agree, and 5 strongly agree. These questions asked students about their perceptions related to their current instructor’s knowledge of grammar and vocabulary, as well as their satisfaction with their level of Spanish and way of teaching. In addition, it also included questions about the importance of the instructor’s first language for the course that was being taught. The two open-ended questions collected comments about the most positive and negative aspects of having a NS or NNS instructor of Spanish.

4.3 Procedure

Instructors were recruited via e-mail and after offering to participate in the research project they signed a consent form with information about the study in which they were going to take part. Later on, the instructors completed the background questionnaire as well as the General Linguistic Knowledge Packet, which included the grammatical identification test, the vocabulary recognition test, and the proficiency test (in this order) while meeting one-on-one with one of the researchers. When completing the General Linguistic Knowledge Packet, the participants did not have access to the textbook, internet or other sources to ensure that the actual internal knowledge of the instructors was being measured. Completing all the materials required between thirty and forty-five minutes.

After instructors completed all the instruments, they agreed on a day when the researchers could visit their classes to recruit participants in their classes. The researchers went to classes during the first or last ten minutes of the class-period, and students were informed about the voluntary basis and characteristics of the study. After the instructor left
the classroom, students who volunteered completed the perceptions test anonymously, which required between four and seven minutes of their time.

5. Results

5.1 Instructors’ questionnaires

In order to answer the research questions specified above, Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regressions were performed with R. Tables 2 and 3 show the overall scores obtained in the grammar identification and vocabulary recognition tests:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Overall grammar results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: number of correct questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Overall vocabulary results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: number of correct questions

For the grammar identification test, no significant differences were attained between NSs and NNSs (p-value 0.411)\(^1\), while NSs do significantly better in the vocabulary recognition test (p-value 0.0015**). According to these results, there is no significant difference between NS and NNS grammar knowledge, but NSs show an advantage in the vocabulary test, which denotes a higher vocabulary knowledge of the terminology employed in the intermediate Spanish book used in their current class.

When determining the specific grammar constructions and particular vocabulary terminology that might have been troublesome for the participants, qualitative comparative analyses were conducted. Tables 4 and 5 show the number of incorrect answers for each question on the tests. As can be observed, NSs and NNSs do not seem to struggle with any grammar constructions included in the grammatical identification test, in which no more than two participants of each group gave an incorrect response. However, NNSs seemed to have some difficulties on some of the items in the vocabulary recognition test. Overall, the amount of wrong answers was almost triple in the case of NNSs. In particular, all NNSs missed question 9 related to specific illnesses, which implies that this group of participants has a lack of mastery in this semantic field.

In addition, OLS regressions were performed to ascertain if some ID factors were related to the scores obtained in the grammatical identification and vocabulary recognition tests (Tables 6 and 7). The ID factors included in this regression include the instructors’ gender, age, occupation, number of languages spoken, foreign language learning experience, teaching experience in Spanish, education, and native status\(^2\). The results show that while there are no significant correlations between the grammar scores and the ID factors analyzed, there is one significant correlation between the vocabulary scores and the ID factors: the native status of instructors (p-value 0.028**).
Table 4. Total incorrect grammar questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Nonnative</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Total incorrect vocabulary questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Nonnative</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Grammar results with ID factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.76406</td>
<td>1.15113</td>
<td>0.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.42394</td>
<td>0.33413</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-0.22865</td>
<td>1.84145</td>
<td>0.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of languages spoken</td>
<td>-0.233</td>
<td>0.61921</td>
<td>0.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experience</td>
<td>0.01808</td>
<td>0.94079</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience teaching</td>
<td>-0.12858</td>
<td>0.22858</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.45376</td>
<td>0.64486</td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.88614</td>
<td>1.0993</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent variable: grammar score
Table 7. Vocabulary results with ID factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.8285</td>
<td>0.7567</td>
<td>0.3536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.3652</td>
<td>0.2196</td>
<td>0.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>-2.5781</td>
<td>12.104</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of languages spoken</td>
<td>0.3588</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.4429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning experience</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
<td>0.6184</td>
<td>0.8238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience teaching Spanish</td>
<td>-0.1007</td>
<td>0.1502</td>
<td>0.5506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.5101</td>
<td>0.4239</td>
<td>0.3151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native status</td>
<td>28.591</td>
<td>0.7226</td>
<td>0.0288*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: vocabulary score

5.2 Students’ questionnaire

On the other hand, the same quantitative analysis was performed to determine whether students assessed NS and NNSs in a different manner. According to the results illustrated in Table 8, being a NS was associated with a higher score from students on questions 1 (p-value 0.000***), 4 (p-value 0.02*), 5 (p-value 0.021**), 7 (p-value 0.001**), and 8 (p-value 0.000*). Consequently, students perceive NSs as being more knowledgeable, better able to answer inquiries about vocabulary, and having a wide vocabulary repertoire. Also, students expressed their satisfaction with NSs’ level of Spanish and believed that their instructors’ native language was important.

Table 8. Students’ perceptions questionnaire results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Independent Variable: Native status
*Dependent Variable: Question score

Students reported positive and negative aspects when answering questions 9 and 10. The students who had NSs highlighted that prolonged experience and general knowledge of the language were important. Moreover, they valued the insight that their instructors could provide about culture-related topics, and how real and natural the language sounds. However, they also thought NSs speak excessively fast, which causes some trouble with comprehension between instructors and students. Furthermore, students reported that the use of English by NSs might be a barrier since sometimes there are communication issues, and the particular accent the instructor has in Spanish might add some difficulty to the oral exchange. In the case of NNSs, students felt that they understood the learning process better since they learned the language in the same way, allowing them to establish connections between the native and the target language. Moreover, they maintained the idea that NNSs
could explain concepts in English in a clearer manner, as they might switch to English when there is a lack of comprehension on the students’ part. Nevertheless, students perceived NNSs as more limited in grammar and vocabulary knowledge, in addition to the further difficulty it might cause to understand a NS after getting used to NNS speech.

6. Discussion

After performing OLS regression analyses it was demonstrated that there were no significant differences in grammar knowledge between NSs and NNSs, but a significant difference in vocabulary knowledge. While we thought NNSs would achieve higher scores in the grammar identification test due to the formal, explicit instruction that they received, we were able to conclude that this was not the case and we observed that formal, explicit instruction in NNSs and implicit acquisition in NSs does not have an impact on the identification of specific grammar constructions included in the intermediate book employed for instruction. Similarly, after comparing results among NSs and NNSs it seems none of the grammatical constructions included in the grammar identification test were problematic for these instructors.

However, there was a statistically significant difference between the NSs and the NNSs in the vocabulary recognition test. We believed that NNSs would probably have been exposed to a wider variety of Spanish dialects than NSs, since it is possible NNSs had the need or interest to travel to various Spanish-speaking countries in order to learn the language, which might have allowed them to receive instruction from several NSs originating from numerous countries and with distinct accents. According to our results in Table 3, most of the words employed were rather specific, which caused problems among NNSs. For instance, question 9 on this test was answered incorrectly by all NNSs (but only by two NSs). This question asked about precise terminology related to illnesses, such as chickenpox, measles and mumps. For question 17, three of the six NNSs did not answer correctly, while all NSs selected the correct option. This item included specific vocabulary about water in nature, such as swamps, reefs and streams. Consequently, NNSs showed difficulties when answering these two questions, while no more than two NSs chose the wrong option out of all the questions on the test. Therefore, our results differ from those in Morris and Cobb (2002) where it was determined that NSs outperformed NNSs in their knowledge of the target language (in all the areas that were observed).

A Pearson’s correlation test was performed in order to determine if there is a correlation between the proficiency scores obtained and the grammar identification and vocabulary recognition tests’ results. Even after the correlation test, it was not possible to establish a significant relationship between these scores. This might be due to the fact that the proficiency test only measured grammar in context and grammar constructions did not show significant differences between NSs and NNSs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Test scores Pearson’s correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to our third research question, no ID factors, with the exception of NS/NNS status, proved to be significantly related to the scores obtained on the grammar identification and vocabulary recognition tests. Two different analyses were performed and it was
demonstrated that grammar scores were not connected to any of the ID factors used as independent variables. Nevertheless, only NS status was significant when comparing these variables with the vocabulary scores. Although these results were surprising in light of previous studies’ (Gurzynski-Weiss 2010; Reves and Medgyes 1994), the lack of significance may be owed to the fact that all the participants analyzed shared similar background characteristics. For example, all of them were graduate students who had taken at least one course about how to teach college Spanish, which included formal instruction in pedagogy and SLA. Moreover, none of the participants had more than ten years of experience teaching Spanish as a FL, and the age range was rather narrow. Furthermore, the low number of participants made it even more complicated to establish strong correlations among these factors. Thus, with more participants, it may be possible that some of these ID factors could prove to be significant.

Lastly, we anticipated that students’ perceptions would reflect the results obtained in the grammar identification and vocabulary recognition tests completed by the instructors. As previously shown above, students accurately perceived the increased vocabulary skills that NSs demonstrated according to their scores in the vocabulary recognition test. Students also recognized that there should not be any differences in the grammar knowledge between NSs and NNSs in relation to the grammar identification test. In addition, NSs obtained a higher score when students expressed their perceptions about their general knowledge, level of Spanish, and native language. Thus, learners of Spanish as a FL who have NS instructors believe that their instructors are very knowledgeable in Spanish, are satisfied with their level of Spanish, and believe their native language is a relevant factor in their teaching. Although students who have NNSs as instructors consider that these speakers to also have a good command of the target language, NNSs do not achieve such high values as NSs do.

We also expected that students would appreciate strengths in NSs such as their accent, intonation, and cultural insight, and for NNSs they would consider aspects such as formal grammar explanations and experience learning the language to be beneficial. NSs were thought to have better general linguistic knowledge and insight into cultural issues, which allowed them to teach these aspects effectively: “the best aspect of having my instructor as a native in Spanish is that he/she understands the culture and the language better than a nonnative due to his/her immersion from such a young age.” Additionally, students perceived the language of NSs as more real and natural, which let them have a clear idea of how Spanish is spoken in the naturalistic context: “I believe his/her native language gives the class additional insight on how the language should really sound in a natural conversation;” “the accent and dialect are authentic and I feel as if I am learning Spanish from Spain.” Students also highlighted the fact that NSs had longer exposure to the language: “it is nice to have a native instructor because he/she is sharing a language and a culture that he/she really knows. I like that he/she occasionally uses vocabulary and makes references beyond the scope of the class as it stretches me.” Yet, students also pointed at some weaknesses when talking about NSs. For example, students have a hard time understanding them due to their fast speech: “sometimes it is difficult to understand my instructor in Spanish because he/she speaks his/her native language rapidly;” “his/her Spanish can be difficult to understand because of the speed it is spoken”. Also, the use of English by NSs of Spanish was perceived as a barrier for the communication process and understanding on the students’ side: “it is difficult to understand him/her when he/she explains things in English”. As Medgyes (1992) has already suggested, both types of instructors seem to be equally good in their own terms and as Mahboob (2003) demonstrated in his thesis, students do not seem to have any
particular preference between NSs/NNSs because all types of instructors possess their own advantages and disadvantages.

When students expressed their concerns about NNSs they repeatedly mentioned how beneficial it was that NNSs had gone through the same learning process. This provided them with confidence when learning Spanish: “the best aspect of having a nonnative instructor is that he/she at some point did not know Spanish so he/she has a better understanding of the learning process we are going through.” Similarly, students wrote how NNSs can establish relationships between English and Spanish which facilitates language attainment: “it is good that he/she understands grammar rules so he/she can teach us the connection that occurs between English and Spanish.” Contrary to what students maintained about NSs, they reported that NNSs can explain any Spanish language aspect in English without students being lost or confused, which enables them to understand any grammatical aspect more clearly: “I think it is good having a nonnative instructor because he/she is able to explain to us the things we do not understand in clear English with no confusion.” Nevertheless, learners see that there are some downfalls when NNSs are their instructors, such as getting used to the slower NNS speech which complicates understanding of native speech: “Having a NNS is more of a struggle to understand native speakers because of lack of exposure to how they pronounce things.” Besides, students notice that they do not get as much cultural feedback, since NNSs do not know as much as NSs about Spanish-speaking countries: “I feel that cultural significance of language is less emphasized and particular cultural descriptions are lost.” Finally, they supported the idea that NNSs have a lack of deep knowledge in Spanish: “nonnative instructors do not know everything;” “my instructor does not always know every vocabulary word.” However, most students that articulated this assumption were vague when trying to explain how that lack of knowledge in the target language was perceived. Consequently, our findings are in line with those of Barrat and Kontra (2000) and Benke and Medgyes (2005) where students claim that NSs possess a “more real” or authentic target language and NNSs have the ability to connect with students’ struggles when learning certain structures.

One issue that arose when coding open-ended responses from students was linked to the native status of instructors. In the case of NNS 2 and NNS 4, some students commented as if their instructors were NSs, most likely because they perceived that they possessed native-like skills and/or pronunciation. In an attempt to explain this confusion among a considerable number of students, comparisons across NNSs scores were performed to observe if higher results in their tests belonged to these instructors. It was not possible to establish such a relationship.

7. Conclusions and Limitations of the Study

This study investigated the vocabulary and grammatical knowledge that NSs and NNSs possess and found that there are significant differences in their vocabulary repertoire but not in their grammatical knowledge. This expands on previous research on instructors’ individual differences and contributes to our knowledge of the differences between instructors’ backgrounds and how accurately students perceive them. One of the most surprising results was related to the differences in grammar and vocabulary knowledge between NSs and NNSs. As stated in the results, no differences in grammar knowledge were observed between instructors; however, in terms of vocabulary, NSs received higher scores on the vocabulary recognition test. No grammatical constructions seemed to be troublesome for any of the instructors, while only a few specific vocabulary terms caused difficulties among NNSs, who were less familiar with certain semantic fields. Consequently, it can be said that formal
explicit learning by NNSs and implicit acquisition by NSs does not have a strong impact on grammatical knowledge when teaching Spanish as FL at the intermediate level since students believe that their grammatical knowledge does not differ. However, NSs show an advantage regarding their vocabulary repertoire. When looking at students’ perceptions of NS and NNS knowledge, they accurately perceive these differences in vocabulary knowledge.

Nevertheless, all instructors regardless of their NS/NNS status are considered to have upsides and downsides, and further research needs to be conducted in order to observe if these differences in instructors’ knowledge affect students’ performance in class and their command of the FL.

Some limitations exist in the present study. One of the main difficulties when coding students’ perceptions arose when some learners thought their NNS instructor was a NS. Although we tried to find if this perception was related to higher scores on the tests, these analyses were not significant. Also, the small sample pool of participants in combination with similar background characteristics prevented us from finding any ID factors which could be strictly related to differences in knowledge between NSs and NNSs. Thus, when operationalizing linguistic knowledge, grammar and the vocabulary knowledge were measured according to what these instructors teach at the intermediate level, but other aspects in language such as phonetics, phonology, pragmatics, and culture were not taken into account, as well as language that goes beyond the classroom content.

8. Pedagogical Implications and Further Research

This investigation helps shed light on the research of instructors IDs and suggests that instructors’ knowledge might affect students’ performance and consequently play a role in SLA. The results of this study suggest that NNS instructors of Spanish must take it upon themselves to augment their vocabulary knowledge as much as possible in order to reach the native linguistic threshold. That said, it is vital to bear in mind that the present study only examined intermediate Spanish instructors’ linguistic knowledge in terms of grammar and vocabulary. More research is needed to investigate instructors’ complete linguistic knowledge. The present investigation only examined NS and NNS instructors’ knowledge as two different groups. It did not analyze NS and NNS knowledge on an individual basis. Therefore, it remains unknown whether or not NSs and NNSs differ among themselves in terms of their linguistic knowledge. Future research could fill this gap by investigating whether there are differences among the NNSs and NSs in terms of their knowledge and whether or not these differences are related to other ID factors.

For future investigations, it will also be crucial to implement a greater number of subjects from different levels of instruction. As it was previously mentioned, participants in this study were very similar in terms of multiple variables such as SLA education, age, and teaching experience. This study suggests that the role of teaching experience might have a direct impact in the instructors’ linguistic knowledge. Thus, to explore the effect of teaching experience on instructors’ linguistic knowledge, it would be necessary to analyze inexperienced versus experienced instructors in order to observe to what extent their teaching experience plays a role in their linguistic knowledge.

In the present investigation, students perceived NS as having more cultural awareness than NNS. This study suggests that future investigations should address instructors’ cultural knowledge in order to determine whether students’ perceptions reflect their actual cultural
knowledge. Considering the multiculturalism of the Spanish-speaking world, NSs might be knowledgeable in terms of the culture from their country; yet, they might be unaware of other cultural manifestations from other Spanish-speaking countries. In contrast, NNS might have studied and experienced various cultural manifestations of Spanish culture; therefore, they might possess a better understanding of the general cultures of the Hispanic world.

In general, much research is still needed in order to keep investigating instructors’ IDs. More specifically, further research is needed on instructors’ linguistic knowledge along with their role in SLA. Future research on this issue must investigate to what extent instructors’ knowledge impacts students’ performance.

Notes

1. Significance according to the following: *P-Value < .05, **P-Value < .01, ***P-Value <.001.
2. Question number 17 was excluded from the results since it was not formulated correctly and none of the responses provided answered this question. Qualitative comparative analyses were performed after taking this question out of the results.
3. Instructors’ education considers the SLA and pedagogy courses taken, as well as the research projects participants have conducted up to their participation in this study.
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Appendices

1. Background questionnaire for instructors

Por favor, responda a las siguientes preguntas de la forma más precisa posible.

INFORMACIÓN GENERAL

1) Escoja su sexo: Masculino    Femenino

2) Especifique su edad: _____

3) Especifique su ocupación: AI    Faculty

INFORMACIÓN LINGÜÍSTICA

4) Especifique su lengua nativa: ____________

5) ¿Es Ud. Hablante nativo de español, hablante no nativo de español o hablante de español por herencia?

________________________________________________________________________

6) Si habla segundas lenguas o lenguas extranjeras, especifique los datos a continuación:

I. Segunda lengua/lengua extranjera:
   i. ¿Durante cuántos años ha estudiado esta lengua?________
   ii. ¿A qué edad empezó su estudio?________
   iii. ¿Dónde aprendió tal lengua? __________
   iv. ¿Ha vivido en algún país donde dicha lengua sea la lengua nativa?
       Especifique el lugar, el motivo de la estancia y su duración:
       ____________________________________________
       ____________________________________________
   v. ¿Utiliza esta lengua actualmente? ¿Con qué frecuencia? ¿En qué contextos?
      ___________________________________________________________________

II. Segunda lengua/lengua extranjera:
   i. ¿Durante cuántos años ha estudiado esta lengua?________
   ii. ¿A qué edad empezó su estudio?________
   iii. ¿Dónde aprendió tal lengua? __________
   iv. ¿Ha vivido en algún país donde dicha lengua sea la lengua nativa?
       Especifique el lugar, el motivo de la estancia y su duración:
       ____________________________________________
       ____________________________________________
   v. ¿Utiliza esta lengua actualmente? ¿Con qué frecuencia? ¿En qué contextos?
      ___________________________________________________________________

Si domina más de dos lenguas (a parte de las mencionadas más arriba), indíquelo en la parte posterior del cuestionario a través del mismo procedimiento.
7) Asimismo, como hablante nativo de español, ¿habla otras lenguas de forma nativa? Si la respuesta es afirmativa, especifique cuál/es.

8) Si usted no es hablante nativo de español, indique su nivel de proficiencia:
   Intermedio          Avanzado          Muy Avanzado

9) ¿Cree que su condición de hablante nativo o no nativo influye su forma de enseñar de manera positiva o negativa? Positivamente     Negativamente

10) Puntúe su experiencia como aprendiz de segundas lenguas o lenguas extranjeras:
    Muy negativa     Negativa     Neutral     Positiva     Muy positiva

INFORMACIÓN DOCENTE

11) ¿Ha tomado cursos sobre adquisición de segundas lenguas? En caso afirmativo, especifique cuáles:
    ___________________________________________________________

12) ¿Ha tomado algún curso de pedagogía o de enseñanza de lenguas? En caso afirmativo, especifique cuáles:
    ___________________________________________________________

13) ¿Ha llevado a cabo proyectos de investigación relacionados con estos campos? En caso afirmativo, indique el tema de los mismos:
    ___________________________________________________________

14) ¿Cuánto tiempo lleva enseñando español? Especifique el baremo de tiempo en años: ____

15) ¿Qué tipo de cursos ha enseñado? ¿Qué niveles? (Ejemplo: composición, literatura, lengua…)
    Cursos: _____________________________________________________
    Niveles: ____________________________________________________

16) ¿Qué método de enseñanza emplea generalmente?
    ___________________________________________________________
    ¿Se corresponde con el método de usted considera más efectivo? Sí    No
    Si no es así, por favor indíque que método de enseñanza le resulta más eficaz y el motivo por el que no lo emplea actualmente en sus clases.

17) Evalúe su conocimiento en las siguientes destrezas:
    
    I. Vocabulario:    Deficiente    Mejorable    Adecuada    Muy adecuada    Nativa
    II. Gramática:     Deficiente    Mejorable    Adecuada    Muy adecuada    Nativa

2. General Linguistic Knowledge Packet

TEST DE IDENTIFICACIÓN GRAMATICAL

Por favor, escoja la opción que sea correcta:
1) Una oración con el pasado progresivo:
   a. Yo andaba comiendo turrón.
   b. Yo ando comiendo turrón.
   c. Yo andaré comiendo turrón.

2) Una oración con subjuntivo en cláusula adverbial de lugar:
   a. Iré para que estés contento.
   b. Iré cuando quieras
   c. Iré donde quieras.

3) Una oración con el condicional perfecto:
   a. Me comería una manzana.
   b. Me comeré una manzana.
   c. Me habría comido una manzana.

4) Una oración con un adjetivo demostrativo:
   a. Algún perro tiene hambre.
   b. Aquel perro tiene hambre.
   c. Mi perro tiene hambre.

5) Una oración con el futuro perfecto:
   a. Habría hecho cocina en el instituto si hubiera podido.
   b. Habré hecho mucha cocina cuando me haya casado.
   c. Cocinaré mucho cuando me case.

6) Una oración con un mandato informal:
   a. Abra la ventana.
   b. Abre la ventana.
   c. Abran la ventana.

7) Una oración con subjuntivo en cláusula sustantiva de deseo:
   a. Espero que me llames.
   b. Espero tu llamada.
   c. Recomiendo que me llames.

8) Una oración con un pronombre de complemento/objeto directo:
   a. Ella lo toma.
   b. Ella le toma.
   c. Ella se toma.

9) Una cláusula de si hipotética:
   a. Si hubiera comido pan, hubiera engordado.
   b. Si como pan, engordo.
   c. Si comiera pan, engordaría.

10) Una oración con “se” impersonal:
    a. Se dice que los mexicanos son muy amables.
    b. Los mexicanos se levantan temprano.
    c. Los mexicanos se abrazan diariamente.
11) Una oración pasiva con el verbo “ser”:
   a. Se construyó el puente.
   b. Es el arquitecto quien construyó el puente.
   c. El puente fue construido por el arquitecto.

12) Una oración que emplee “¡cuánto!” de forma apropiada:
   a. ¡Cuánta casa más bonita!
   b. ¡Cariño, cuánto lo siento!
   c. ¡Cuánto doctor!

13) Una oración recíproca:
   a. Él nos dio mucho dinero.
   b. Mis amigas y yo nos queremos mucho.
   c. Las arañas se comen a los mosquitos.

14) Una cláusula de sí de posibilidad:
   a. Si hubiera hablado español, habría aprendido mucho.
   b. Si hablo español, aprendo mucho.
   c. Si hablara español, aprendería mucho.

15) Una oración con el uso correcto de “por”:
   a. Por tu bien, estudia en los exámenes finales.
   b. Trae la tarea por el viernes.
   c. En marzo salgo por Cancún.

16) Una oración de “se” pasivo:
   a. Se escribieron las cartas.
   b. Las cartas fueron escritas.
   c. Las cartas se las escribieron el uno al otro.

17) Una oración con un antecedente indefinido:
   a. Ojalá que Paola se pase por la fiesta.
   b. Recomiendo que invites a Paola a la fiesta.
   c. Dudo que Paola venga a la fiesta.

18) Una oración con un verbo irregular en pretérito:
   a. Él anduvo por los campos de Castilla.
   b. Ellos andan por la playa.
   c. Yo andase hasta la saciedad.

19) Una oración que emplee “¡qué!” de forma apropiada:
   a. ¡Qué te lo agradezco!
   b. ¡Qué lo siento!
   c. ¡Qué anillo más bonito!

20) Una oración con un mandato formal:
   a. Cierren la puerta.
   b. Cierra la puerta.
   c. Cerrad la puerta.
21) Una oración con el uso correcto de “para”:
   a. Gracias para tu ayuda.
   b. Tengo un billete de avión para el viernes.
   c. Para tu bien, necesitas estudiar.

22) Una oración con un pronombre preposicional:
   a. Mi gato es muy dócil.
   b. Mi gato no puede vivir sin mí.
   c. Para el gato, jugar es importante.

23) Una oración con un mandato negativo informal:
   a. No quiero que vayas al teatro.
   b. No vayan al teatro.
   c. No vayas al teatro.

24) Una oración con un comparativo de superioridad:
   a. John es más alto que Joseph.
   b. John es súper alto.
   c. John es tan alto como Joseph.

25) Una oración con un superlativo:
   a. John es altísimo.
   b. John es más alto que Joseph.
   c. John es menos alto que Joseph.

¿Qué criterios has empleado para responder al siguiente test? Por ejemplo: intuición, base gramatical, azar… etc.

TEST DE RECONOCIMIENTO DE VOCABULARIO

Por favor, seleccione el término que más se acerque a la definición proporcionada.

1) Pelo de las ovejas y de otros animales, que se hila y sirve para tejer.
   a. lana
   b. algodón
   c. cuero

2) Cosa apreciable que se adquiere a poca costa o con poco trabajo.
   a. oferta
   b. ganga
   c. liquidación

3) Banda o aparato pendiente del hombro para sostener la mano o el brazo lastimados.
   a. radiografía
   b. cabestrillo
   c. camilla

4) Que no está preparado por medio de la acción del fuego o que no lo está hasta el punto conveniente.
a. fresco  
b. crudo  
c. helado

5) Traje típico de la mujer panameña, que consta de una blusa y una falda de amplio vuelo, finamente bordadas.  
a. pollera  
b. guayabera  
c. chola

6) Mestizo que, en los siglos XVIII y XIX, habitaba la Argentina, el Uruguay y Río Grande del Sur, en el Brasil, era jinete trashumante y diestro en los trabajos ganaderos.  
a. alfajor  
b. gaucho  
c. trompo

7) Dicho de una superficie: que no presenta asperezas, adornos, realces o arrugas.  
a. largo  
b. liso  
c. estrecho

8) Fenómeno patológico que se manifiesta por la elevación de la temperatura normal del cuerpo y mayor frecuencia del pulso y la respiración.  
a. náusea  
b. gripe  
c. fiebre

9) Enfermedad febril, contagiosa y muchas veces epidémica, que se manifiesta por multitud de manchas pequeñas y rojas, semejantes a picaduras de pulga, y que va precedida y acompañada de lagrimeo, estornudo, tos y otros síntomas catarrales.  
a. paperas  
b. varicela  
c. sarampión

10) Sentido corporal que permite percibir los sonidos.  
a. tímpano  
b. oreja  
c. oído

11) Maletero del automóvil.  
a. baúl  
b. tanque  
c. llanta

12) Ganancia o provecho que se saca de algo.  
a. adquisición  
b. venta  
c. lucro

13) Bastidor con cristal que lleva el automóvil en su parte interior para resguardar a los viajeros del aire cuando el vehículo se pone en movimiento.
a. llanta  
b. parabrisas  
c. volante

14) Persona nombrada por un cuerpo para representarlo. 
   a. diputado  
   b. alcalde  
   c. senador

15) Sacudida del terreno, ocasionada por fuerzas que actúan en lo interior del globo. 
   a. terremoto  
   b. tormenta  
   c. inundación

16) Acción de pelear, combatir. 
   a. matar  
   b. luchar  
   c. morir

17) Costa peñascosa, acantilado, farallón. 
   a. arrecife  
   b. pantano  
   c. arroyo

18) Lugar donde se vierten escombros. 
   a. vertedero  
   b. basura  
   c. efecto invernadero

19) Conjunto de preguntas tipificadas dirigidas a una muestra representativa, para averiguar estados de opinión o diversas cuestiones de hecho. 
   a. discurso  
   b. campaña  
   c. encuesta

20) Tributo que se exige en función de la capacidad económica de los obligados a su pago. 
   a. bienestar  
   b. defensa  
   c. impuesto

21) Habilidad, arte, primor o propiedad con que se hace algo. 
   a. bono  
   b. jornada  
   c. destreza

22) Pintura que se obtiene por disolución de sustancias colorantes en aceite secante. 
   a. acuarela  
   b. lienzo  
   c. óleo
23) Contingencia inminente de que suceda algún mal.
   a. riesgo
   b. peligro
   c. daño

24) Dicho de un compuesto químico: Que puede ser degradado por acción biológica.
   a. ecológico
   b. biodegradable
   c. renovable

25) Mamífero sirenio de hasta cinco metros de longitud, cabeza redonda, cuello corto, cuerpo muy grueso y piel cenicienta, velluda y de tres a cuatro centímetros de espesor. Tiene los miembros torácicos en forma de aletas terminadas por manos, y tan desarrollados, que sirven a la hembra para sostener a sus hijuelos mientras maman. Vive cerca de las costas del Caribe y en los ríos de aquellas regiones. Es animal herbívoro, y su carne y grasa son muy estimadas.
   a. venado
   b. manatí
   c. picaflor

- ¿Qué criterios has empleado para responder al siguiente test? Por ejemplo: intuición, familiaridad con el término, azar… etc.

TEST DE USO DE LENGUA

Por favor, lea el siguiente texto sobre que Sarah narra sobre las diferencias culturales y escoja la opción que considere más oportuna.

Sin duda, opino que las diferencias culturales pueden _______ de lo más embarazosas si __ resulting
__ resultar
__ resulta

no se tiene una idea de lo que en ciertas culturas _______ apropiado. Por ejemplo,
__ está
__ es
__ hay

recuerdo la primera vez que _______ a Colombia y me presentaron a un chico, ______
__ viajaba
__ viajo
__ viajé

__ lo
__ la
__ le

di la mano y él se abalanzó sobre mí para dar____ un beso, sin que _________ tiempo
__ me
__ le
__ se

__ tengo
__ tuviera
__ tengas

para moverme. ______ cara se me puso _______ roja y no supe _______ reaccionar.
__ una
__ la
__ llenamente
__ enteramente
__ qué
__ cómo
Más tarde, una de mis amigas me contó que en este país la gente _____ da un beso en la
mi eventualmente porqué
le les se

mejilla _______ saludarse. “¡_____ raro!”, pensé. Para mí, ___ un momento muy
para cómo era
por quién fue
en qué estuvo

extraño, a pesar de que ahora ya me _______ acostumbrado. Otra situación embarazosa
fui estoy he

que experimenté, está _______ con el espacio corporal. Antes de que _______ a los
relacionada volver
relacionando vuelva
relacionante volviése

EEUU, decidí hacer una fiesta en mi casa ya que _____ despedirme de mis compañe
quisiera quería quiero

de clase. Durante ______ fiesta, charlé con mucha gente y me sorprendió que una
de mi mi mía

conocida se _______ tanto a mí, a pesar de que prácticamente casi no me conocía.
acercó acercaba acercara

Además, mientras _______ conmigo me tocó el brazo. Sinceramente, me _______
hablaba hablara habló

aguado que _______ mantenido las distancias. En el futuro, cuando _______ a un país
habría hubiera había

nuevo para mí, _______ en cuenta las diferencias culturales _____ mi propio bien.
tendría para
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3. Students’ perceptions questionnaire

Please, answer the following questions about your instructor, choosing your level of agreement according to the following scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree. Remember that your answers are anonymous and your instructor will not have access to them.

1) Overall, I believe my instructor is knowledgeable on Spanish.
2) My instructor explains grammatical aspects successfully.
3) My instructor can answer my inquiries related to grammatical aspects.
4) My instructor uses and offers a wide vocabulary repertoire.
5) My instructor can answer my inquiries related to vocabulary.
6) Overall, I am satisfied with my instructor’s teaching.
7) Overall, I am satisfied with my instructor’s level of Spanish.
8) I believe my instructor’s native language is an important aspect in my language class.
9) What are the best aspects of having a native or non-native instructor in Spanish? Please, base your response solely on your current instructor.
10) What are the worst aspects of having a native or non-native instructor in Spanish? Please, base your response solely on your current instructor.