כנס מיט"ל השמונה- עשר, 2020

דף שער

אנא מלאו את הפרטים הבאים **בצורה מדוייקת** (זו הצורה בה יופיעו בספר הכנס במידה והצעתכם תתקבל).

אנא, הגישו את ההצעה בפורמט PDF. היקף ההצעה הוא **עד 1,500 מילה**, לא כולל התקציר, מקורות ונספחים.

נא לא לציין את שמות המחברים בקובץ זה. השמות ימולאו בעת העלאת ההצעה להגשה.

תאריך	
שם ההצעה	
סוג ההרצאה א. הרצאה (כעשרים דקות להצגה)	
ב. פוסטר או מצגת (הדגישו את הסוג המתאים)	
ג. הדגמה	
ד. סדנה מקוונת	
ה. הצעה ל- SIG ושיח	
ו. Case Study	
ז. אחר	

Towards a Signature Pedagogy for Task-Based Technology-Enhanced Language Learning

Abstract

This paper reports on an ongoing research aimed at characterizing a signature pedagogy (Shulman, 2005) of task-based online language teaching. Our construction of the signature pedagogy proceeded through the identification of pedagogical design principles, their underlying epistemic principles and values, and a set of pedagogical design patterns which implement them. The design principles embody the deep layer of the signature pedagogy, the epistemic principles and values represent its implicit layer, and the design patterns encapsulate the surface layer. The design

principles were initially derived from a literature review and refined via a Delphi study. The epistemic principles and values were deduced from the design principles. The patterns elicited from analysis of exemplars of effective practice.

Introduction

Computer-assisted language learning became an established field of study in the 1980s for research related to technology-enhanced language learning. The field and the terms used to refer to it have evolved and broadened over time to adjust and embrace the unceasing technological innovations, which allowed computer-mediated communication (CMC) or mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) to flourish. As a subfield of Applied Linguistics, CALL is largely influenced by interactionist perspectives of second language acquisition (Chapelle, 2001), sociocultural theory and language learning theories grounded in socio-constructivism (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Hubbard, 2009; Levy & Stockwell, 2013).

These theories consider that the language learning process is embedded in a socio-cultural context which mediates interactions amongst learners. Experiential and situated learning is promoted during these interactions where meaning is co-constructed through negotiation between learners and teachers, and among learners themselves. Therefore, the role and affordances of technology for language learning must be regarded considering its capacity to facilitate the language learning process.

The notion of *signature pedagogies* emerged from the study of professional training, and was later expanded to other knowledge domains (Shulman, 2005; Chick et al., 2009). It is central to practice oriented teacher education approaches, as it highlights the complexities and nuances of educational work. It recognizes that the ways in which we teach are subtle and diverse, reflecting unique cultures of meaning-making and action. Implicit in the articulation of signature practices is the assumption that each domain of knowledge or practice has its canonical set of *epistemic practices* (Kelly, 2010; Kelly & Licona, 2018): the methods by which knowledge is constructed, validated and communicated. We find it fitting to refer to this set as the domain's *signature epistemology*.

The Study

In order to characterize a signature pedagogy of online language teaching, we initially identified 15 pedagogical principles and practices distinctive of Task-Based Language Teaching online programs. This initial set of principles and practices were motivated by second language acquisition theories (Doughty & Long, 2003), methodological approaches of foreign language teaching (Kramsch, 2014) and computer-assisted language learning state-of-the-art publications (Chun et al, 2016; Chapelle & Sauro, 2017). During the first phase of the study, we consulted an initial group of 34 experts and educators in the field, using the Delphi technique in order to achieve gradual consensus about the set of principles. After analysing the first set of responses (N=23) to the principles which attained degree of agreement averaging 70.7% and ranging from 47.8% to 95.6%, we refined the principles incorporating the feedback received and sent out a second questionnaire which allowed us to consensuate a refined set of 16 robust pedagogical principles for online language teaching.

The principles listed in Table 1 (adapted from Canals & Mor, forthcoming a) include the modifications suggested by the experts in the second round.

Table 1. Essential pedagogical principles of task-based computer assisted language learning.

Topic	Principles
TBLT Specific	1. **TBLT**. Use tasks as the predominant base unit of instruction. 2. **Learning by doing**. Promote learning by doing and using language (often mediated by multimodal artefacts/technology) to produce meaningful outputs.
Input	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, and grammar from lexis. 4. **Linguistic complexity.** Balance between oversimplification and over-complexity by elaborating or scaffolding genuine inputs. 5. **Input's characteristics.** 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.
Learning processes	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. 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. 8. **Feedback.** Provide corrective and formative feedback as soon as possible after speech events, without breaking the flow of expression or conversation. 9. **Clinical teaching.** Assess where learners are in their learning trajectories and adapt instruction accordingly taking into account common developmental sequences psycholinguistic research has established, accommodated for individual learning paths. 10. **Immersive environment.** Align the learning environment with the target language to make the learning experience as linguistically immersive as possible according to the level of proficiency of the learners within the given environment, scaffolding when necessary. 11. **Collaborative learning.** Promote cooperative and collaborative learning while retaining learners' autonomy and respecting their preferences and needs.
Learners	12. **Personalization.** Personalize instruction by using technology to adapt to the needs of individual learners, within the constraints and affordances of the learning environment.
CALL specific	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. Given that technology is never neutral, we should enable teachers and learners to critically identify and take ownership of these functions to support learning. 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 affect language learning processes and outcomes.

| | 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.
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, to shaping students' own identities. |
|---|---|

The design patterns were elicited by an auto-ethnographic / phenomenological dialogic method. One of the authors is an experienced teacher and teacher trainer specialising in English as a foreign language courses at a fully online university. The second author is an expert in pattern language extraction. Through a series of interviews, we identified key pedagogical challenges and common responses to these, and articulated these as design patterns. Based on the extensive experience of the language-teaching author, we believe that most of the patterns we developed will be relevant for course designers and language instructors delivering online language courses or interested in undertaking hybrid, blended or online technology-enhanced language tuition.

The Patterns

Six design patterns were derived from accounts of pedagogical practices in technology-enhanced language learning and teaching identified so far. Given that this is not a comprehensive set of patterns for TBLT-CALL, we intend to continue working with colleagues and practitioners in the field to identify additional patterns derived from existing practices. The full text of the patterns is available in (Canals & Mor, forthcoming, b).

Table 3. TBTL-CALL patterns

Pattern name (principles addressed)	Description
Assessing for authenticity (1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15)	Encourage learners to produce authentic speech.
Purpose to communicate (1, 2, 3, 4, 5 ,6 , 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)	Include a purpose to communicate orally using the target language.
Avoiding plagiarism (1, 2, 4, 5 , 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15)	Scaffold the writing process to avoid plagiarism.
Oral interaction practice (1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15)	Device systems of having learners practice their oral interactive skills.
Tangram feedback (3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15)	Provide a variety and constant flow of manageable feedback.
Choreographing teamwork (1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)	Monitor teamwork to increase learner's engagement and resolve conflicts.

3.1 Related patterns
We used the following repository (www.learningenvironmentslab.org/openpatternrepository) to find related patterns in the field of technology-enhanced foreign language learning which are related to our own:

Table 4. Related existing patterns

Pattern name (principles addressed)	Description
Content-Compatible Language (3, 7, 10)	Identify the language constructs and expressions of the course domain which are additional to the obligatory language. Create opportunities for learning these in your course design and course execution.
Lucky Language Clover (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 15)	Promote reading and listening, and let students write and speak in the foreign language as well. Include all four types of linguistic competences in your course design.
Metatalk (2, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16)	Stimulate foreign language learning by including exercises or other appropriate course parts which require a collaborative reflection on language usage.

Future work

The next phases of this study aim to further validate the principles, values, and patterns presented here, and in tandem extend the set of patterns to form a comprehensive design language for task-based technology-enhanced language learning. We will survey a broader cohort of language educators to scrutinise the principles and values and elicit a larger number of concrete examples of practices embodying these principles, and distil design patterns from these. This can be done using various "pattern mining" techniques, such as pattern workshops, pattern scouting or surveys. The epistemic principles and values will also require further validation and refinement through a similar process in order to qualify as a reliable resource for the community. Finally, after going to process we hope to be able to device a comprehensive and coherent articulation of a signature pedagogy for task-based technology-enhanced language learning. A website will be constructed, where the values, principles and patterns will be presented, and fellow experts and practitioners will be invited to rate and comment on them. This will allow us to validate the patterns in two ways: first, we will survey site visitors for their evaluation of these constructs. Second, we will invite them to share evidence of applying these patterns and the consequences of their application.

Yishay **:Commented [LC1]**

Conclusions

This paper presents a phase in an ongoing project. Having articulated design principles (the deep structure in Shulman's concept of signature pedagogies) epistemic practices and values (the implicit structure), we have now started to turn our gaze towards the surface structure. We argue that this process provides rigor and method to the analysis, articulation and promotion of good pedagogical practice in a domain. We see the initial set of patterns presented here as a proof of concept, and intend to continue developing and validating them to a rich and comprehensive language. Nevertheless, we hope that even at this preliminary phase, our findings carry value both to practitioners and to researchers of task-based technology-enhanced language learning.

REFERENCES

Canals, L. & Mor, Y. (forthcoming, a) Design Principles for Task-Based Computer-Assisted Language Learning, Language Learning & Technology

Canals, L. & Mor, Y. (forthcoming, b) Towards a Signature Pedagogy for Task-Based Technology-Enhanced Language Learning: Design Patterns, EuroPLoP 2020

Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Learning strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign language annals, 22*(1), 13-22.

Chapelle, C. A. (2001). Computer applications in second language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.

Chapelle, C. A., & Sauro, S. (Eds.). (2017). The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning. John Wiley & Sons.

Chick, N. L., Haynie, A., Gurung, R. A. & Regan, A. (2009). From generic to signature pedagogies: teaching disciplinary understandings. In *Exploring signature pedagogies: Approaches to disciplinary habits of mind.* (pp. 1-16). Stylus publishing.

Chun, D., Kern, R., & Smith, B. (2016). Technology in language use, language teaching, and language learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 100*(S1), 64-80.

Doughty, C. J. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 206–257). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language learning & technology, 7*(3), 50-80.

Duff, P. A., & Polio, C. G. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *The modern language journal, 74*(2), 154-166.

Hubbard, P. (Ed.). (2009). Computer assisted language learning: Critical concepts in linguistics. Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues.* Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, G. J. & Licona, P. (2018). Epistemic practices and science education. In *History, Philosophy and Science Teaching* (pp. 139-165). Springer.

Kelly, G. J. (2010). Scientific literacy, discourse, and epistemic practices. In *Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy* (pp. 71-83). Routledge.

Koper, R., & Manderveld, J. (2004). Educational modelling language: modelling reusable, interoperable, rich and personalised units of learning. *British journal of educational technology, 35*(5), 537-551.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *The modern language journal, 98*(1), 296-311.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development* (Vol. 398). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levy, M., & Stockwell, G. (2013). CALL dimensions: Options and issues in computer-assisted language learning. Routledge.

Sauro, S., & Chapelle, C.A. (2017). Toward langua-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.

Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134, 52-59.