

Towards a signature pedagogy for technology-enhanced task-based language teaching: Defining its design principles

Canals & Mor

Supplementary material B | Versions 1 and 2 of the principles

Version 1, % of agreement & version 2	Suggested changes
<p>Version 1</p> <p>1. Use tasks, not texts, as the base unit of instruction.</p> <p>69.5% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>1. TBLT. Use tasks as the predominant base unit of instruction.</p>	<p>-It depends on your def of 'text': is a wide def including any sort of text (eg visuals) , I would texts can be as much the base unit of instruction as tasks</p> <p>-Tasks can be based on texts, but the key principle is that students are always given something active to do, a task.</p> <p>-It depends on the definition of "texts", but use of authentic videos for extensive input can be very helpful and much easier to manage than tasks. You really need both.</p> <p>-Obviously texts - depending on the task - are also important. But task design as such is paramount and goes first</p> <p>-At some levels of language instruction, texts could be as crucial as tasks.</p> <p>-Tasks can draw on text input though; in addition: since multimodal meaning making has become a concept that informs CMC-based language learning and teaching, our understanding of text has widened including any artifact crested with multimodal representational resources</p> <p>-Tasks need texts, and the texts selected are very important, especially relating to student needs and motivation.</p>

<p>Version 1</p> <p>2. Promote learning by doing: using language to produce meaningful outputs.</p> <p>86.9% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>2. Learning by doing. Promote learning by doing and using language (often mediated by multimodal artifacts/ technology) to produce meaningful outputs.</p>	<p>-Promote learning by any means possible. Sometimes direct instruction and more traditional approaches are more suitable (eg with beginner language learners) especially if the aim is to ensure automaticity</p> <p>-Yes, but again, output must be balanced by extensive input.</p> <p>-Meaningful output (respective meaningful task product) is central for communication, motivation, willingness to communicate etc</p> <p>-In today's digital literacies, meaning can be produced with multimodal artifacts, in addition to language.</p> <p>-After being a firm believer in task-based learning I am beginning to think there is too much focus on tasks - and not enough reading, listening and in-depth engagement with key notions and concepts - through language</p> <p>-Again, these outputs can take many shapes; language in a traditional sense, i.e. the spoken or written word are only two out of many multimodal options</p> <p>- I have problems with Doughty & Long's use of input and output. Such terms are for machines, not human beings. These problems perfectly illustrate the limited vision of this perspective on learners and language learning.</p>
---	--

<p>Version 1</p> <p>3. Represent and promote language use as a wholistic, multimodal entity, e.g. without separating language domains, grammar from lexis. (Chun et al., 2016)</p> <p>65.2% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>3. Language use. Represent and promote language use as a holistic, multimodal entity (including non-verbal communication and symbols), trying not to separate language domains, grammar from lexis. However, the extent to which this is possible will depend on the proficiency level of the learners or the type of activity being carried out.</p>	<p>-Again, I think this depends on the level, and on the purpose</p> <p>-It's not clear to me if you are including other non-linguistic modalities in this premise? I would include them.</p> <p>-Sometimes it's useful to make a point about grammar or to have a step in an activity / task in which you deal with the vocabulary and prepare the student to carry out the other parts of the task.</p> <p>-This depends on the context of use and the learners. Generally, I like to promote language use as holistic, but there will be occasions when this might not be possible.</p> <p>-This isn't the only way to represent and promote language.</p> <p>-In terms of meaningful task-based language production this is central. This does not preclude a focus on form at specific point(s) of a task sequence</p> <p>-See my previous comment to #2. In today's digital literacies, meaning can be produced with multimodal artifacts, in addition to language.</p> <p>-This is a trickier question since I am in the usage-based linguistics camp but I agree with not emphasizing traditional grammar, which does not explain language well, nor does it model or map to processes of language processing and use.</p> <p>-Yes, mostly, but work on the different domains can be very useful too. Think about IELTS etc. and the many high stakes testing systems. It doesn't have to be either or.</p>
--	---

Version 1

4. Do not oversimplify, but do not rely on genuine input which is too complex for the average learner either.

Elaborate on genuine input to enhance its comprehensibility first and then simplify by reducing its length. For example, keep a difficult lexical item (genuine input) but also provide a synonym or an explanation (elaboration) and make the sentence shorter by breaking it into two. (Doughty & Long, 2003)

65.2% agreement

Version 2

4. Linguistic complexity.

Balance between oversimplification and overcomplexity by elaborating or scaffolding genuine inputs. For example, keep a difficult lexical item (genuine input) but also provide a synonym or an explanation (elaboration), make the sentence shorter by breaking it into two, or focus on collocations and language chunks.

-It is not so much about the level of difficulty of the input, but about the level of difficulty of the task - eg a complex task with a level-appropriate task can be suitable for beginners, and a simple text with a very complex task can be suitable for advanced learners.

-Excellent suggestion. We shouldn't be dogmatic about the use of authentic resources, but aim for what is most suitable for the particular group of students.

-Not Always easy to do with lower levels.

-Again, a tricky question, since modifying input is always necessary, but I would be more inclined toward modifying input via translanguaging.

-If you are considering language in a traditional sense only, then yes; however, I thought we had moved on from this conceptualisation of language (see previous comments in this survey)

-There are numerous examples of authentic texts that are simple and short. What you call genuine input (spoken & written) is very important, even for beginners.

-I teach advanced learners and with them I use authentic resources. Rather than explaining the difficult items, I draw their attention to collocations and language chunks. They usually base on relatively simple items, but the way they are combined is unusual for an average learner.

-It depends on the level

<p>Version 1</p> <p>5. Provide rich and comprehensible (not complex), quality input derived from native-speakers samples of use in a variety of authentic situations. (Doughty & Long, 2003)</p> <p>65.2% % agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>5. Input's characteristics/nature. Provide rich and comprehensible, quality input derived from competent language users in a variety of authentic situations, including different language varieties and accents, selected or adjusted to the level of the learners.</p>	<p>-The native speaker as a focal point is increasingly questionable in online discourse and therefore should not be centered in CALL.</p> <p>-The use of the word 'native-speaker' gives me pause.</p> <p>-As much as possible, agreed. A variety of native speakers is also important, different accents, geographical settings, etc.</p> <p>-Not necessarily native speakers. Language learners benefit from input from second language speakers too - from hearing and seeing how they use the language in global contexts.</p> <p>-Yes, yet again, this becomes a challenge for A1 and even sometimes A2 levels.</p> <p>-I ticked 3 because yes, we need to provide rich and comprehensible quality input in authentic situations, but this does not necessarily need to come from native speakers. I thought we have moved beyond the native speaker approach for while, (Byram 1997, Common European Framework 2001 etc)</p> <p>-It is not necessary to be native. Would be nice to have this updated to include comprehensible NNS as well.</p> <p>-Only from native speakers? No, not at all.</p> <p>-I am totally against the concept of native-speakers - why does input have to come from native speakers? In real life we don't only talk to native speakers of languages!!</p> <p>-Luckily we have overcome the obsession with the native speaker a while ago ;-)</p> <p>-Once more, it depends on the level. We would also need a definition of "complex"</p>
---	--

<p>Version 1</p> <p>6. Encourage inductive (“chunk”, “formulaic sequences”) learning rather than deductive declarative knowledge of how languages work. (Doughty & Long, 2003)</p> <p>60.9% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>6. Inductive vs deductive learning. Encourage inductive (“chunk”, "formulaic sequences") learning but allow for deductive focus on form episodes when the context (students, task) and level require it.</p>	<p>-Again, at lower levels I would take the approach of teaching chunks and formulae, but at higher levels I might encourage a more deductive approach</p> <p>-I think that both are important and the focus would depend on purpose of the task, level of the learner and the learning context at that time. In short - I had a hard time deciding on the 'essentiality' of this one.</p> <p>-Again not being prescriptive about it, sometimes it may be useful to present a rule, although in the majority of cases it's helpful to make the student work out the rule or learn things in chunks.</p> <p>-In my practice I have observed that both are complementary. Some students -especially Asian students - are reassured by deducing rules.</p> <p>-I agree with the value of chunking, but don't see that it needs to be "rather than".</p> <p>-Yes, as a basic approach this is important since this is how languages are learned best. But again, this does not preclude a focus on form at specific points of a task sequence, hence a deductive declarative approach to specific language items</p> <p>-Of course, both inductive and deductive learning are important, so some combination of both is desirable.</p> <p>-Achieve a balance. Not one over-emphasising the other.</p> <p>-I fear that you are only relating to language in a pre New London Group (1996) meaning I think you should/need to engage with multiliteracies in your study</p> <p>-In my educational culture much more attention is given to individual language items than to how they combine.</p>
---	--

Version 1

7. Focus on form in meaning-focused communicative tasks by shifting learners' attention to linguistic forms in context (e.g. dealing with misunderstandings, negotiating meaning, clarifying during oral interaction).
(Doughty & Long, 2003)

65.2% agreement

Version 2

7. **Meaning vs form.** Use predominantly meaning-focused communicative tasks but allow focus on form by directing learners' attention to linguistic forms within the context of the task. For example, dealing with misunderstandings (lexical, phonetic, etc.), negotiating meaning, using clarification requests during oral interaction.

-This claim has oral interaction in mind. Focus on form can take other shapes too. Delayed feedback for example. Or exchanges in the forum... The main idea is not to focus on "forms" isolating them from the communicative context and the meaning.

-Yes, in the many interactions we have studied, we saw there was a trade-off between attention to meaning and attention to forms.

-Yes, even if students have declarative knowledge, this is the best way for it to become procedural.

-I don't think linguistic forms are the only cause of misunderstanding.

Version 1

8. Provide corrective feedback as early as possible after speech events (Doughty & Long, 2003) along with other types of formative assessment (feed-forward, assessment for learning).

47.8% agreement

Version 2

8. Feedback. Provide corrective and formative feedback as soon as possible after speech events, without breaking the flow of expression or conversation. For example, leverage the affordances of screen-recording and video-recording tools to make feedback more relevant and efficient without interrupting the flow of an activity.

-It's not clear to me what is meant by 'early as possible' - interruptions during an oral event, for instance, for me would be 'no, don't do that ...'.

-In an activity promoting communication, giving feedback too quickly may harm the flow of the activity.

-It really depends on the situation of communication. Sometimes delaying feedback can help learners correct themselves.

-Corrective feedback on writing or recorded speech can be done later if the student can see the writing/hear the recording accompanying the feedback. This might even be better in the case of speech.

-Yes, but I would add "indirect" corrective feedback

-Corrective feedback can be provided early and often without the expectation that learners will correct their own production immediately and consistently.

-Yes, but recognise that this is not always possible.

-Feedback is important, but note that there are lots of flavors -- implicit, explicit, recasts, and also full systems of feedback that are not based on Doughty and Long, such as Vygotskian Dynamic Assessment.

-Depends on the task and whether the focus is on fluency or accuracy.

-In case of some speech events corrective feedback is not possible (e.g. in videoconferencing). Frankly, I find it difficult to think of a more authentic communicative context in CALL but this is perhaps because I mainly teach academic-level students.

-In general I agree with the statement. However, we need to think how much feedback is provided and on what we focus when providing the feedback.

Version 1

9. Acknowledge common developmental sequences psycholinguistic research has established, as well as individual learning paths. (Doughty & Long, 2003)

60.9% agreement

Version 2

9. Clinical teaching. Assess where learners are on their learning trajectories and adapt instruction accordingly taking into account common developmental sequences psycholinguistic research has established, accommodated for individual learning paths. For instance, Spanish learners of English will have trouble acquiring adjective-noun word order in English. Regarding individual learning paths, learners' motivational interests can determine the level of L2-proficiency attainment.

-This might also depend on how experience a language learner the learner is. I have researched polyglots who don't always follow a 'traditional' progression, but learn first about topics/structures that they want to use in the wild.

-Yes, but extremely hard to do in some contexts (and perhaps more so in CALL where the teachers may have multiple students from around the world with very diverse backgrounds).

-From the principle to the theory, there's a big step. Of course, Learning should be individualized. Then, what happens when the teacher has to deal with large groups?

-This is good in principle, but very difficult in practice as developmental sequences are only well established for a few structures like questions, negatives, and inflectional morphology.

-This principle is not really that clear. I think one would need to specify what is meant by well-established developmental sequences or give an example, the same for individual learning paths.

-Established developmental sequences can provide guidelines but individual differences among learners can be great and must definitely be seriously taken into consideration.

-Yes. Respect the existence of individual language acquisition strategies.

-Research shows that differing mediation can indeed create differing developmental trajectories, but it is also the case that developmental sequences for L1-->L2 learning are robust.

<p>Version 1</p> <p>10. Make the learning experience as immersive as possible within the given environment. (Genesee, 1987)</p> <p>78.2% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>10. Immersive environment. Align the learning environment with the target language to make the learning experience as linguistically immersive as possible, while providing scaffolding according to the level of proficiency of the learners.</p>	<p>-Again, traditional classrooms don't always allow for this but online ones have that potential</p> <p>-This can make the experience more enjoyable, but it's not essential</p> <p>-I'd need a definition of immersive. If the idea is to mimick reality as closely as possible, I think this is not Always needed.</p> <p>-This sounds good, but what is "immersive" in online learning?</p> <p>-Scaffolding is also necessary in immersive situations, particularly in the early stages of language acquisition.</p> <p>-This is highly dependent. Immersion is only one piece of a language learning environment.</p> <p>-Immersive = multimodally rich</p>
--	--

<p>Version 1</p> <p>11. Promote cooperative and collaborative learning. (Doughty & Long, 2003)</p> <p>86.9% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>11. Collaborative learning. Promote cooperative and collaborative learning while retaining learners' autonomy and respecting their preferences and needs.</p>	<p>-Depends on the student, this should be promoted but never required. It creates a lot of issues for those who are time-poor, have additional requirements (mental health, prisoners...).</p> <p>-Yes, this is especially important given the heavy interactionist leanings of Doughty and Long 2003. The past 16 years have seen the "sociocultural turn" in SLA, and this isn't well represented so far in this questionnaire.</p> <p>-But also allow for individual learning some of the time, particularly for those who prefer that type of learning.</p> <p>-Huge believer in this. But, a few small number of learners prefer learning alone.</p> <p>-Since language is used for interaction with others (people as well as devices), this is a good idea.</p> <p>-Not everyone likes cooperative and collaborative learning all the time</p> <p>-preferably in telecollaborative/virtual exchange settings</p> <p>-Yes, but individual learning just as important.</p> <p>-As much as I like cooperative and collaborative learning, we need to take into account our students' learning styles. We need to create a learning environment that addresses the needs of students who do not appreciate cooperative and collaborative activities in the classroom.</p>
--	---

<p>Version 1</p> <p>12. Individualize instruction according to communicative needs after a careful needs analysis of the context and the learners. (Doughty & Long, 2003)</p> <p>60.9% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>12. Personalisation. Personalise instruction by using technology to adapt to the needs of individual learners, within the constraints and affordances of the learning environment. For example, adaptive elements could be in the shape of e.g. individual vocabulary practice using personalized digital flashcards or quizzes with incorporated feedback.</p>	<p>-Not essential - I suspect most teachers do this because of a misguided belief in learning styles</p> <p>-Ideal but difficult (see comment 9: Yes, but extremely hard to do in some contexts and perhaps more so in CALL where the teachers may have multiple students from around the world with very diverse backgrounds)</p> <p>-Hard to do in most educational contexts, given time pressures on teachers.</p> <p>-Important but not Always easy to carry out.</p> <p>-This is a great idea but is often unrealistic in practice.</p> <p>-Of course, this is easier said than done.</p> <p>-Yes, but again, not always possible. So, ideally, yes.</p> <p>-Adaptive learning environments are moving in this direction. Large group face-to-face instruction makes this an unlikely approach, however.</p> <p>-needs and interests can change</p> <p>-the challenge is that - with the arrival of technology - we are all moving in and out of a great variety of online and offline contexts on a daily basis, plus the shifting between formal and informal learning ... hence, I'd say that it is important to embrace complexity and flexibility in the way we approach instruction</p> <p>-This answers my comment above.</p>
---	---

Version 1

13. Tackle the distinction between the computer as an intelligent tutoring system (able to provide customized instruction or feedback), the computer as a source of information and resources, and the computer as a (non-neutral) communication medium. (Bax, 2003). The term computer here should be understood as any device connected to the internet (tablet, smart-phone, etc.)

73.9% agreement

Version 2

13. Techno-pedagogical empowerment.

Technology has different functions in teaching and learning: as a tutoring system, as a mediator for information and resources, and as a communication medium. It is never neutral: it enables teachers and learners to critically identify and take ownership of these functions to support learning.

-Yes, mostly to make sure learners understand the different affordances

-Depending on the age and maturity of the student, this may be self-evident to some of them.

-Technology can be used in many different ways, it's important to clarify for the instructor and the student what use is being proposed in each instance.

-Yes, making these distinctions is important, especially since the computer wasn't then or now particularly intelligent as a tutoring system.

-These are two very different functions of computers.

-I always agreed with Stephen B.

-This is uncontroversial since differing uses of technology make differing metaphoric framing of technologies relevant and necessary.

-don't really understand the first part of the question but I do think the acronym CALL is outdated

-I'm not sure which context you mean. I always highlight this distinction in CALL teacher training, but for regular students it seem useless.

<p>Version 1</p> <p>14. Strive towards using technology as an almost transparent instrument, but keep a critical stance to assess how it affects language learning processes and outcomes. (Chun et al., 2016)</p> <p>78.2% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>14. Techno-literacy. Promote students technological literacy, in the sense of sustaining the balance between fluency and “transparent” (or convivial) use while maintaining a critical stance to assess how the cultures-of-use (Thorne, 2016) affect language learning processes and outcomes.</p>	<p>-Important but not necessarily a pedagogical goal that should override other objectives.</p> <p>-The critical stance is important. I'm not sure presenting technology as "an almost transparent instrument" helps in being critical.</p> <p>-Hmmm. This sounds good but also contradictory. How can you take a critical stance toward something almost transparent?</p> <p>-Technology is <i>*not*</i> neutral.</p> <p>-Not totally crucial.</p> <p>-check out Sean Michael Morris/ work on critical digital pedagogy (general) as well as the work by Ron Darwin (language learning and teaching specific)</p> <p>-Actually, it is transparent for a younger generation of students. What is lacking is criticism</p> <p>Bax, S. (2011). Normalisation revisited: The effective use of technology in language education. <i>International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)</i>, 1(2), 1-15.</p> <p>Thorne, S. L. (2016). Cultures-of-use and morphologies of communicative action. <i>Language Learning & Technology</i>, 20(2), 185-191.</p>
---	--

<p>Version 1</p> <p>15. Approach the four basic skills (writing, listening, reading, and oral interaction) by embracing new literacies, 21st century skills, and including the new texts and genres supported by digital technologies. (Chun et al., 2016)</p> <p>95.6% agreement</p> <p>Version 2</p> <p>15. Skills and competences. Approach the basic modes of communication (reception, production, interaction and mediation) by embracing critical digital literacies, the new skills for the future work order, including new texts and genres supported by digital technologies.</p>	<p>-I would argue that the notion of 21st century skills is misguided</p> <p>-This is important to a greater or lesser degree depending on the context.</p> <p>-Yes, but in terms of an integrated skills approach. And you list only four skills. mediation should be part of this list</p> <p>-The fifth "skill" is missing -- is it cultural understanding?</p> <p>-5 intralingual skills??? Yes, practise all 4 skills with critical digital literacies and use relevant new texts and genres. Updated each year where applicable and possible.</p> <p>-You only mentioned four skills --> writing, listening, reading, and oral interaction. That said, I believe that teaching digital literacy is necessary for our students and should be part of the school curriculum.</p>
---	---

Additional principle based on comments on the question: Would you like to propose additional principles?

16. Transformative learning. Foster the development of learners' digital repertoires and competences striving for the transformative role of language learning from content knowledge, through competences, critical literacies, to identities.

Sauro, S., & Chapelle, C.A. (2017). Toward lingua-technocultural competences. In C.A. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 459-472). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Darvin, R. (2017). Language, ideology, and critical digital literacy. *Language, Education and Technology*, 17-30.

-Foster lingua-technocultural competence. See Sauro & Chapelle (2017)

-Teach communication (multimodal, multilingual) not language.

-Use technology where it adds to the quality of teaching not as a gadget or gimmick.

-I'd like to see more acknowledgment of socio-cultural positions, including scaffolding and collaborative dialog.

-I fully appreciate and applaud your question dealing with critical digital literacies for 21st century learning. More emphasis on this.

-Assess the "cultures-of-use" of digital communication tools (Thorne, 2003, 2016) in order to leverage and better understand the specific ways certain digital environments are meaningful and appropriately used by

students/participants. This is very important aspect to 21st century communication and cultures-of-use differ across language and nation state borders as well as across generational lines.

-Consider giving students the agency/choice to bring in digital texts/practices that they are passionate about as a way to link instructed L2 learning with organic and interest-driven interaction in the wild (outside of school). There are many models for this (e.g., Thorne & Reinhardtts, 2008).

-To include broader issues around ethics, online safety, problems with algorithms, privacy etc.

-One of my principles is task and tool authenticity. I mean, one really needs respond to technology advancement and students' current literacy practices as there should be clear correspondence between them and our pedagogical practices. E.g using PCs has given way to mobile apps while emailing and forum discussions have been replaced with messengers and videocalls. catching up with these trends, as I can see, is a very important principle of successful CALL.