

A Vygotskian Driven Task

Introducing the V-task

Mark de Boer

MA TEFL
University of Birmingham
March 2007

1. Introduction

2. Literature Review

- 2.1 Type A syllabus and Type B syllabus
- 2.2 The Zone of Proximal Development
- 2.3 Scaffolding in the EFL classroom
 - 2.3.1 Learner Autonomy

3. Examining the Objective of the Lesson

- 3.1 The current TBL dilemma
- 3.2 Vygotsky-task (V-task)
- 3.3 The Parameters of the V-task

4. The Lesson

- 4.1 The Students and the teacher
- 4.2 The Learning Objectives
- 4.3 V-task in action
- 4.4 Lesson 2

5. Implications

- 5.1 Scaffolding and microgenesis
- 5.2 Social Interaction in the classroom and the role of the teacher

6. Conclusion

Continuing the path

7. Appendix A

- 7.1 Sample template for the V-task.
- 7.2 Sample from student Lesson 1
- 7.3 Sample from student Lesson 2

References

1. Introduction

The private English school industry in Japan has great advantages over the regular school systems. Students attend because they want to and, rather than being influenced by the Ministry of Education or a school principal, syllabus, curriculum and methodology used in the school are left to the discretion of the owner. With new trends in English education, new methodologies can be tried and tested with results being immediately recognized. This kind of research could have great impact on the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education industry. In this paper, after a literature review discussing key issues in the development of language syllabi and curricula, this author will outline a new theory. The theory itself was tested in a private language school using a task-based lesson. The task and its results are important, but the *reasoning* behind the theory in creating the task is just as important. A task supported by this theory does three important things: it generates learning opportunities in the classroom, it encourages students to become autonomous learners and it becomes a tool that teaches students how to learn. This will be the focus of the paper. It will show that a new definition of task alongside Vygotsky's concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), will help teachers realize that creating autonomous learners in the classroom will create an environment that fosters *learning how to learn*. This could be an ideal setting for any EFL classroom where time for learning is limited to usually an hour a week.

The purpose of this essay is to introduce the link between Vygotsky's concept of ZPD and a new type of task. There is a way to combine methodology and syllabus seamlessly and in such a way, to promote learner autonomy. It is to put the onus on the students to acquire language by providing them with a task that requires them to access language to complete the task. In so doing, students learn an invaluable lesson; they learn to learn language.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Type A Syllabus and Type B Syllabus

For the purpose of introducing a new type of task, current syllabi and methodology first need to be discussed.

Type A syllabus focuses on *what* is to be learnt, while the Type B syllabus focuses on *how* it is to be learnt. This is the most salient characteristic distinguishing the two (White 1988: 44). For the purposes of this essay though, only the basic differences between the Type A and Type B syllabuses will be discussed as the concept of this paper falls under the Type B syllabus umbrella.

Instead of presenting discrete items to be learnt as in a Type A syllabus, the Type B syllabus, a holistic approach, involves learners in the exchange of meaning right from the start. The Type B syllabus is a 'reaction' to the concerns regarding the Type A syllabuses. The Type B syllabus is divided into two parts, process and procedural (White 1988:94). Task-based learning falls under the category of the Type B syllabus. Jane Willis (1996: 23) outlines 'task', as a goal-oriented activity in which the students use their language to achieve a real outcome. The focus is not on the English, but rather on the use of English to achieve the outcome.

The Bangalore Project introduced by Prabhu in 1979, has been very influential in the way tasks have become a familiar resource in the classroom. This learning-centered style procedural syllabus, known as 'Communicational Teaching Project' (CTP), was developed and implemented in public primary schools in India (Howatt and Widdowson 2004: 346-349). Students used English as the medium of communication, learning communication through information gap, opinion gap and reasoning gap activities such as finding, naming or describing specific locations on a map (White 1988: 102-109). These kinds of courses consisting solely of tasks do not fit well into a structured educational system. Assessment is particularly difficult and as for teachers, this sort of syllabus does not fit into the traditional teacher role (Howatt and Widdowson 2004: 349).

The Process Syllabus advocated by Breen and Candlin, is a learner-led syllabus, where the direction of learning comes from the learners themselves. Therefore, the direction

and pace of the syllabus is difficult to determine (White 1988: 95). Candlin argued that if most teachers were asked to compare their initial plans with eventual outcomes they would find a significant disparity. This 'retrospective syllabus' should not be ignored Candlin suggested, but instead, be built into the syllabus (White 1988: 97). The most interesting aspect of this process syllabus is the concept of interdependent learners in the classroom (Breen and Candlin: 2001: 19).

The role of the teacher should change to someone who should become an interdependent participant and actively share in the responsibility for learning and teaching with the learners. In this role, teachers need to realize that learners have important contributions to make and the teacher needs to be able to distinguish between learning and the performance of what is being learned. All learners are confronted with the effort of discovering how to learn the language. An interdependent participant in a cooperative milieu is positively encouraged to depend on other learners and the teacher when the need arises. The nature of Breen and Candlin's work has been very helpful to the concepts introduced in this paper yet more is needed to better reach learners – the answer lies in scaffolding or the concept of the zone of proximal development. 'Interdependent' appears to be a term isolated to Breen and Candlin (2001: 9-26). 'Autonomous' is a term which can be considered synonymous and this author will use throughout this paper.

2.2 The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)

The zone of proximal development is the key point for understanding the requirement for social interaction in the classroom and the type of task that is needed to create this environment.

Vygotsky described the zone of proximal development as:

“...the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers” (1978: 86).

Vygotsky adds:

“an essential feature of learning is that it creates the zone of proximal development; that is, learning awakens a variety of internal developmental processes that are able to operate only when a child is interacting with people in his environment and in cooperation with his peers” (1978: 90).

It can be seen then that learning is not development. Cognitive developmental processes lag behind the learning process and even though a student may have assimilated the meaning of a word, the developmental process has only just begun. This is different from the traditional point of view that at this point the developmental processes are basically completed (Vygotsky 1978: 90).

The learner has a zone that they work within, which needs to be nurtured with the help of a more capable person through social interaction. Our assumption is that we learn language to communicate, yet with Vygotsky’s approach, children attempt to communicate and in doing so, acquire language (Scovel 2001: 21).

2.3 Scaffolding in the EFL classroom

Scaffolding can be thought of as a similar concept to that of the zone of proximal development as it helps a student carry out a task which would be normally beyond his or her unassisted efforts. Yet a slight variation of this image would be for the teacher to control elements of the task that are just beyond the learner’s capability and therefore allowing the learner to complete those steps which are within his or range of competence. This kind of process can potentially achieve more for the learner, rather than merely assisting in the completion of the task (Wood, Bruner, and Ross 1976). Scaffolding was a key pedagogic approach in order to meet the prime objective of this lesson, that of learner autonomy. Microgenesis (Ohta: 2001: 74) is the term given to the process of development that occurs moment to moment through social interaction.

2.3.1 Learner Autonomy

Kumaravadivelu states that promoting learner autonomy is a matter of helping learners to ‘discover their learning potential’, and ‘understand that autonomy is a complex process of interacting with one’s self, the teacher, the task, and the educational environment’. But it must also be realized that ‘autonomy is not independence, that is, learners have to learn to work cooperatively with their teachers, peers and the educational system’ (2003: 133-134).

3. Examining the Objective of the Lesson

The objective of the lesson is for the students to access the language needed to complete the task.

3.1 The current TBL dilemma

The real-world relationship of many of the tasks proposed in Task-Based learning can be questioned in terms of their practicality. For example, Skehan outlines the concepts and definitions of tasks and identifies examples such as ‘completing one another’s family trees’ or ‘solving a riddle’ (1998: 96-97). Under the right conditions, these tasks perform admirably but greater flexibility is needed in order to maximize language learning. Skehan (1998), Ellis (2003), Willis (1996), and Nunan (1989) unanimously agree that TBL was designed for communication to occur. While the general consensus is that tasks are for communicative purposes only with a focus on the development of interlanguage, Swan states ‘there is no reason or evidence to suggest that the acquisition of a particular syntactic feature such as English negation, third-person –s, or indirect question word order, has any wider repercussions on interlanguage as a whole (2005: 382).

Brumfit (cited in White 1988: 3) states that a syllabus can only specify what is to be taught, it cannot organize what is to be learnt. ‘The issues which face anyone concerned with developing and introducing a new language syllabus are not only – or primarily

questions of content... to talk of syllabus design in isolation from broader educational issues is to deny access to an important body of theory, research and practice' (White 1988: 1). Yet Sinclair and Renouf (cited in Willis 2000: 3) feel that the preoccupation with methodology may lead to a path where syllabus is relegated to a secondary role. The lack of distinction between syllabus, methodology and course book has led to the concerns of treating a course book as a syllabus. Specifically, that course books come packed with methodology and the specification of content should be independent of methodology. Yet in the same breath (Willis 2000: 9) in identifying aims of a language programme, produces three headings, 'Learning about a language', 'Learning to produce a language', and 'Learning to use a language'. The educational system is built on the assumption that there is a close correlation between knowing a language and being able to produce a language with the ability to use the language. What could be added here is a fourth possibility: 'Learning to learn a language'.

What really needs to be taken into account is not a method which teaches to students, nor a method which has students communicate, but a method which *trains* students *how to learn* the language. Having reviewed the literature, this author has not found a syllabus based on this concept. Using the Vygotskian ZPD concept, allows us to re-examine how the methodology of EFL needs to be adapted to fit the needs of the student. Kumaravadivelu (2003), Lantolf (2000), Lantolf and Thorne (2006), Wells (1999), Pinter (2006) and Ohta (2001), have come close to this kind of thinking yet while the concepts are there, the methodology and the syllabus need to be linked.

To this end, a new type of task needs to be developed. A type of task that focuses on language learning from the perspective of the student; a focus on learning how to learn the language, as well as learning how to acquire more language.

3.2 Vygotsky-task (V-task)

A definition of V-task:

A V-task is a tool for the students to learn how to access the language they want or need. It can also be used to learn how to acquire more language using previously acquired language. This task type is driven by the Vygotskian theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The focus is on the learning process rather than immediate results. Therefore the objective is not to complete the task, but to access the language necessary to complete it, and in doing so, the task completes itself.

Within the V-task there are two abstract levels. These levels are seamless; students may move between them as they need to. Both levels are student-led, peer assisted and scaffolded through or by the teacher. The nature of the V-task would determine which level or levels the students would need to work within to access or acquire the language.

The V1-level: (initially and indefinitely): Students learn how to access language.

The V2-level: (indefinitely): Students learn how to use the acquired language to acquire more language.

At a V1-level, the student's questions may resemble;

Example 1: Student 1 (S1): What's this? (pointing to 1:00 on the board)

Teacher (T) or Student 2 (S2): It's one o'clock.

Example 2: S1: What's this? (pointing to a picture)

T: or S2: It's calligraphy.

S1: How do you spell calligraphy?

In a classroom where the teacher uses flash cards, display questions (Chaudron 1988: 127) such as the following would be eliminated by the V-task concept. For example, the *SuperKids2* text recommends teaching time using the following set phrase accompanied by flash cards.

T: What time is it? (showing a flash card with 2:00 written on it)

Ss: It's two o'clock.

At a V2-level, the student's questions may resemble:

Example 3: T: What time is your recess?

S1: Recess? What's recess?
T or S2: When you play outside.

In the Example 3, the student hears a word and wants to know its meaning. In this case, the student needs to acquire language not through pictures, but instead through language that he or she already knows. In this case, 'play' and 'outside' are the vocabulary needed to understand the word 'recess' in the context of the school schedule.

An example of how students might move between a V1-level and a V2-level might resemble the following:

Example 4: T: What time is your recess?
 S1: Recess? What's recess? (V2-level)
 T or S2: When you play outside.
 S1: How do you spell recess? (V1-level)

Ellis points out, 'It is not the tasks themselves that create the context for learning, but rather the way the participants carry out the task.' (Ellis 2003: 180). This author will take this opportunity to disagree, since by this new definition, it will be the tasks that create the context for learning.

In no readings was this author able to find any similar type tasks, Willis outlines six types of tasks (Willis 1996) but nothing similar to what is being proposed here. Ellis also outlines (Ellis 2003: 4-5) various definitions of tasks, but again nothing that resembles the type of task which is being presented here.

This type of task does not focus on communication to the extent that the current TBL model does, but instead focuses on the student being responsible for their own language acquisition because of the way the task is designed. The parameters for the V-task are outlined below.

3.3 V-task parameters

A V-task will require the following parameters in order to follow the Vygotskian ZPD concept:

1. In order for the task to be completed, students need to access L2 through social interaction either with a peer or with a more capable peer.
2. The objective of the task is to access the language needed or wanted, and completion of the goal becomes a by-product of working through the objective.
3. The task will be unable to be completed without accessing L2.
4. The acquisition of L2 will come from the student's need to access the L2 in order to complete the task.
5. The teacher should provide the scaffolding required to assist the learners through their ZPD. The teacher should also redirect questions to encourage social interaction.
6. Students determine what language they want or need to acquire through questions. This assists the students in acquiring L2.

The task would need a clear goal, otherwise there would be no motivation for the student to access the language needed to complete the task. Yet the focus of the lesson is still based on the current model of TBL where the task is not language focused, but uses language to complete the task.

There is one point that needs to be addressed concerning the teachability and learnability hypotheses. Swan (2005: 381) is quick to point out that a student may notice they lack a difficult structure long before they are ready to learn it. Wood *et al* state clearly though 'the learner must be able to recognize a solution to a particular class of problems before he is himself able to produce the steps leading to it without assistance' (Wood, Bruner and Ross 1976: 90). Swan fails to bring scaffolding into his arguments and it must be recognized too, that scaffolding only provides the steps, it does not specify a time-line.

4. The lesson

4.1 The students and the teacher

There were four students in this class, two boys and two girls, aged seven to eight.

These student's parents were made aware that the class results would be used in a research assignment and their children's privacy would be maintained throughout. These students have completed *Finding Out 1*, (Paul 1991) which focuses on reading, writing, speaking and listening skills. The students have completed *SuperKids 1* (Krause 2005a), which is a textbook primarily PPP structured and are now currently using the textbook *SuperKids 2* (Krause 2005b). The teacher in both of the lessons was the author of this paper.

4.2 The learning objectives

Although the student textbook is structured around a Type A Syllabus (PPP methodology), this lesson was designed to get the students to interact and gather the language they needed to complete the V-task.

The lesson was done in two parts. In part 1, students needed to create their school schedules. In part 2, students needed to ask about each other's schedules based on the TPR section in the text. Part 2 was a regular TBL communication type lesson, done as a check to see how much language was actually acquired during part 1.

The lessons were done a week apart. All four students were present for both lessons.

The first lesson was designed around *SuperKids 2* and *SuperKids 3* material.

The chapters this lesson was derived from can be seen in the following table (fig. 2).

SuperKids 2 Syllabus (Krause 2005b)		
Unit 4	Telling Time	1:00~12:00, 12:15, 12:30, 12:45
Unit 4	TPR verbs Done as a TBL lesson)	Daily activities; what time do you: get up, go to school, eat lunch, do homework, take a bath, go to bed?
Unit 8	After School	After school activities; English class, calligraphy class, art class, baseball practice, dance class, swimming class, soccer practice, math class
SuperKids 3 Syllabus (Krause 2005c)		

Unit 1	Days of the Week	Mon., Tues., Wed., Thurs., Fri., (Sat., Sun.)
--------	------------------	---

(Fig. 2 The content for the V-task outline)

4.3 The V-task in action

The lesson had to conform to the parameters of the V-task (section 3.3). The task had only one objective; the students needed to access the language in order to complete their school schedules. In accessing the language, the objective of the V-task would be accomplished and the goal, being to complete their school schedules, would also be reached. These students had not been taught any of the vocabulary prior to the task, and had not been taught any of the lessons within the SuperKids2 text that pertained to the task.

On the walls of the classroom on a regular basis, there are a number of signs, two of which are the following:

1. How do you say... in English?
2. How do you spell...?

Students are familiar with these two ‘lexical chunks’ and were able to use them at any time during the lesson. The role of the teacher then, in accordance with the V-task parameters, is to redirect these questions back to the other students, or to encourage the other students to answer each other’s questions.

The students all have notebooks. The teacher wrote the abbreviated days of the week (not including Sat. or Sun.) across the top of the board and the times (starting from 8:00 and ending at 5:00) along the left side of the board. (See Appendix A - 7.1)

The teacher instructed them in English, to complete their school schedules for the week. The students up to this point had not been exposed to the days of the week, time, or school classes or daily activities.

The lesson had to follow the V-task parameters so the students needed to ask questions in order to write the information in their books.

The first clarification that needed to be made concerned the words written along the top of the board.

S1:	What's mon, tues... ?	(V1-level)
T:	The days of the week, Monday, Tuesday... (pointing to the calendar)	

In this instance the teacher neglected to see if any other students knew the answer to the question posed by S1.

The next problem for the students was the fact that the times did not correspond with their school schedules. We needed to work as a group to correct this.

S1:	<i>ichiji kan me</i> , eight, eight... forty (first period)	
S3:	eh? Eight... how do you say <i>sanjyugo</i> in English?	(V1-level)
T:	I don't know. Does anyone know?	Teacher redirects question
S1:	thirty five.	
S2:	eight thirty five	
S4:	<i>uchiha</i> eight forty	
T:	Your first class is at eight forty?	
S4:	Yes.	
T:	Then write eight forty.	

Some of the students put dash marks between the whole hours to indicate the 30-minute mark.

The next negotiation was the actual class names. This author wanted to dispel that foreigners all know the Japanese language, so the teacher redirected many questions back to the group, initially, and found that during the class the questions to the teacher became fewer.

S2:	How do you say <i>hirugohan</i> in English?	(V1-level)
S1:	lunch <i>jyanai</i> ? (isn't it lunch?)	student interaction

T:	Lunch? What time do you have lunch?	
S2:	eh... twelve twenty.	
S4:	How do you spell lunch?	(V1-level)
T:	Does anyone know how to spell lunch?	Teacher redirecting question
S1:	l-u-n-s-h?	
T:	lun- CH (accent on the ch)	scaffolding
S2:	l-u-n-c-h?	
T:	That's right.	
S3	l-u-n-...? One more time	student interaction
S2	l-u-n-c-h	student interaction

This is an example of ‘scaffolding’ in which the teacher provided the students with only the information they needed to complete the spelling. With the initial question ‘how do you spell lunch?’ the teacher could have easily answered the question, but instead posed it to the rest of the class for collaboration. An attempt was made, and through a bit of help from the teacher, the spelling was completed. S3’s question to respell the word was not directed at the teacher, but directed at S2.

Also, S1 had used the concept of a digital clock to begin with and the others followed. Questions were more in tune with how to say some of the larger numbers. S1 and S2 were able to answer most of those questions helping S3 and S4.

There were some subjects which, as a group, they were unable to determine:

S1:	Teacher, what is <i>zukou</i> in English?	(V1-level)
T:	I don’t know. Does anyone know?	
S3/S4:	<i>wakaranai.</i> (I don’t know)	
S2:	I don’t know.	
T:	No one? I don’t know either.	(V1-level)
S2:	<i>aaaaa, dameda</i> (this is not good)	
(it was at this point that S2 began to look through his SuperKids2 textbook)		
T:	Well, what do you do in ????	
S1:	<i>Zukou</i>	
T:	what do you do in <i>zukou</i> ?	(V2-level from

		teacher)
S1:	<i>nanka tsukuru toka</i> (make things)	
T:	make things? you mean like shop class?	
S4:	shopping?	
T:	shop class, you make things	
S1:	painting <i>toka</i> , (painting and...)	(V2-level student follow-up)
T:	painting? In shop?	
S2:	<i>mitsuketa!</i> (I found it!) ... art class!	Student use of resource other than T or Ss.

The classroom is only one resource in language teaching, but it is also the meeting-place of all other resources – learners, teachers, and texts. (Breen and Candlin 2001: 17).

4.4 Lesson 2

The second lesson was done primarily as a TBL lesson. Students could use the TPR section in their SuperKids2 texts to ask each other what time they did various activities. The students made charts in their notebooks and recorded the times of each student (and the teacher) for each activity. This was done to see if students were able to use the language of time to be able to complete the task. The students were able to complete the task without much difficulty, which led this author to believe that the lesson on ‘telling time’ could be thought of as complete. Students were given the assignment to ask their parents about their daily schedules as well (See Appendix A - 7.3).

5. Implications

5.1 Scaffolding and microgenesis

As Ohta (Ohta 2001: 9) points out, assistance from peer interlocutors is possible because even true peers have different abilities and the nature of the task will also enable peer listeners to provide assistance. In the V-task, developing learner autonomy is a key issue and ‘increasing autonomy is evidence of increasing internalization’ (Ohta 2001: 74). By creating a learning opportunity through student-student or

student-student-teacher interaction this maximizes the learning opportunities (Kumaravadivelu 2003: 57) as well as provides the necessary scaffolding for microgenesis to occur. Swain (Swain 1993 cited in Ohta 2001: 47) proposed that there are three options a learner has when faced with a gap in knowledge of L2 during production. Ohta proposes a fourth option 'test the candidate form or forms in social interaction' (Ohta 2001: 47). In testing the form in social interaction, she states, 'the learner moves beyond individual resources to draw on collective resources to solve the problem' (ibid: 47). Yet it is interesting to note that these concepts proposed here were not tied together with the V-task type being introduced in this essay.

5.2 Social Interaction in the classroom and the role of the teacher

Through the V-task, one can see microgenesis developing through the social interaction occurring not only between the teacher and the students but also between the students themselves. This student-student interaction is an ideal situation as observed, but most importantly it defines a new role for the teacher as the peer who can help create the scaffolding opportunities in the classroom during the V-task. 'Well executed scaffolding begins by luring the child into actions that produce recognizable-for-him solutions. Once that is achieved, the tutor can interpret discrepancies to the child. Finally, the tutor stands in a confirmatory role until the tutee is checked out to fly on his own' (Wood, Bruner and Ross: 96). The teacher, obviously being the choice for students to direct questions towards, may not provide the students with the interdependence that could otherwise occur if the teacher redirected the questions back to other students in the class. Redirecting the question could also provide information to the teacher as to who else may have the same difficulty or which student may be able to provide the scaffolding for language acquisition to occur (Kumaravadivelu 2003: 58).

Swan argues (Swan 2005: 390) 'If one was seeking an efficient way of improving one's elementary command of a foreign language, sustained conversation and linguistic speculation with other elementary learners would scarcely be one's first choice.' Vygotsky points out (1978: 90) 'cooperation with his peers' and Wells argues, based on a range of studies, 'it is not necessary for there to be a group member who is in all

respects more capable than the others. This is partly because most activities involve a variety of component tasks such that students who are expert in one task, and therefore able to offer assistance to their peers, may themselves need assistance on another task' (Forman and McPhail, 1993; Tudge, 1993 cited in Wells 1999: 323-324). This lesson shows that this may indeed be the case and that the scaffolding that occurs can be attributed not only to the teacher but to student's peers.

6. Conclusion

The objective of the task was for the students to access the language needed to complete their school schedules. The goal, a by-product of the objective was completed. The students did communicate to access the language needed and remained focused throughout the lesson. The second lesson was also successfully completed. The idea of social interaction in the classroom is not a new concept but linking it to methodology or to a type of task that encourages it, is new. The students used the V-task as their own tool to access language, the language they needed in order to complete the task. It must be reiterated that out of this research of four students, lessons such as this one have yet to be tested on a wider audience and the results, although for the purposes of this essay stand firm, need more research before they can be deemed to be useful elsewhere. The link between this V-task and Vygotsky based on the premise that the students will be able to distance their ZPD is a new concept that will need to be tested further across a wider audience, but for the purposes of this essay shows a strong start. It also at this point cannot prove that language accessed for the purpose of completing a task will be acquired. But the idea that TBL can be streamlined to not only foster communication in its current model, but can possibly be used to acquire language using this Vygotskian driven task shows possibility for a much more effective EFL classroom.

7. Appendix A

7.1 Sample template for the V1-task.



7.2 Sample from Student (used with permission from student 2)

	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thurs	Fri
8:00	Activity time	activity time	activity time	Activity time	activity time
9:00	Japanese	JAPANESE	computer	JAPANESE	JAPANESE
10:00	Japanese	social studies	Math	music	social studies
11:00	recess	recess	recess	recess	recess
12:00	Math	P.E.	Japanese	recess	recess
1:00	science	math	computer	math	math
2:00	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
3:00	recess	recess	recess	recess	recess
4:00	cleaning	cleaning	cleaning	cleaning	cleaning
5:00	computer	JAPANESE	P.E.	gohme	gohme
6:00	gohme	gohme	gohme	gohme	gohme
7:00				English	calligraphy
8:00					gohme

Appendix A continued...

7.3 Sample from Student from lesson 2 (used with permission from student 2)
 (names have been hidden by the labels)

	Student 1	Student 4	Student 3	Teacher
Getipat	7:00	7:00	6:30	6:00
Go to school	7:45	7:20	7:40	8:00
Eat lunch	12:20	12:15	12:30	12:00
Dohomevarkat	4:00	4:00	6:00	10:00
Take a bath	7:20	7:15	8:30	6:10
Go to bed	9:00	10:00	9:00	1:00
Wtdm				
Getupat	5:30	6:00		
Grab work	7:30	7:30		
Itanhetmu	1:00	1:00		
Dohomevarkat	2:00	5:30		
Take a bath	6:00	6:00		
Go to bed	9:00	10:00		
exok	9:00	7:00		

References

- Anton, M. and DiCamilla, F. J. (1999) Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, Volume 83 (2), 233-247.
- Breen, M.P. and Candlin, C.N. (2001) The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. In Hall, D.R. and Hewings, A. (2001) *Innovation in English Language Teaching*. Routledge. New York, NY.
- Brown, H.D. (2000) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching 4th ed.* Addison Wesley Longman. White Plains, New York
- Chaudron, C. (1988) *Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge UK.
- Edwards, C., Willis, J. (2005) *Teachers Exploring Tasks in English Language Teaching*. Palgrave Macmillan. Hampshire, UK.
- Ellis, R. (1993) Second language acquisition research: how does it help teachers? An interview with Rod Ellis in *ELT Journal*, vol. 47, no. 1. Oxford University Press
- Ellis, R. (2003) *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, U.K.
- Forman, E.A., and McPhail, J. (1993) Vygotskian perspectives on children's collaborative problem solving activities. In Wells, G. (1999) *Dialogic Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- Howatt, A.P.R., Widdowson, H.G. (2004) *A History of English Language Teaching. Second Edition*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, U.K.
- Krause, A. and Cossu, G. (2005a) *SuperKids 1*. Pearson Education. Quarry Bay, HK.
- Krause, A. and Cossu, G. (2005b) *SuperKids 2*. Pearson Education. Quarry Bay, HK.
- Krause, A. and Cossu, G. (2005c) *SuperKids 3*. Pearson Education. Quarry Bay, HK.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003) *Beyond Methods. Macrostrategies for Language Teaching*. Yale University. New Haven, CT.

- Lantolf, J.P. (2000) *Sociocultural Theory & Second Language Learning*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, U.K.
- Lantolf, J.P., Thorne, S.L. (2006) *Sociocultural Theory And the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, U.K.
- Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- Ohta, A.S. (2001) *Second Language Acquisition Processes in the Classroom: Learning Japanese*. Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc. Inc. Mahwah, N.J.
- Paul, D. (1991) *Finding Out 1*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd. Oxford, UK.
- Pinter, A. (2006) *Teaching Young Language Learners*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK.
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Second Edition*. Cambridge University Press. New York, NY.
- Richards, J.C. and Schmidt, R. (2002) *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics 3rd Edition*. Pearson Education Limited. Harlow, England.
- Robinson, P. (2001) *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K.
- Scovel, T. (2001) *Learning New Languages. A Guide to Second Language Acquisition*. Heinle and Heinle. Boston, MA.
- Skehan, P. (1996) "Second Language Acquisition Research and Task-Based Instruction" in J. Willis and D. Willis (eds.) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: MacMillan. pp17-30.
- Skehan, P. (1998) *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK.
- Swan, M. (2005) Legislation by Hypothesis: The Case for Task-Based Instruction. In *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 26, No. 3: pp. 376-401
- Tudge, J. (1993) Vygotsky, the zone of proximal development , and peer collaboration: Implications for classroom practice. In Wells, G. (1999) *Dialogic Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.

- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978) *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge MA.
- Wells, G. (1999) *Dialogic Inquiry*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK.
- White, R. (1988) *The ELT Curriculum*. Blackwell Publishing. Oxford, UK.
- Willis, D., Shortall, T. & Johns, T. (1997) *Pedagogic Grammar*. University of Birmingham: The Centre for English Language Studies.
- Willis, D. (1990) *The Lexical Syllabus*. Collins. COBUILD. London, UK.
- Willis, D. (2000) *Syllabus and Materials*. Birmingham. The Center for English Language Studies. Birmingham, UK.
- Willis, J. (1996) *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Addison Wesley Longman. Malaysia, PJB.
- Willis, J. and Willis, D. (1996) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Macmillan Education. Oxford, UK
- Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., and Ross, G. (1976) The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Child Psychiatry*, 17, 89-100