

# Task-Based Language using SCMC & ACMC

Tomotaka Shiroyama  
[reading2671@gmail.com](mailto:reading2671@gmail.com)

2022/12/03 14:00~14:40

# Background

- In EFL environment, “becoming able to communicate in English with people in other countries” (Hagley, 2020)
- ◆ MEXT(2012; 2013) emphasizes the following points
  - ◆ (1) Learner-centered activities
  - ◆ (2) Grammar is a supplemental tool that supports communication
  - ◆ (3) English lessons using translation are not recommended

# 1. Effective Teaching Approach

- To acquire language, what elements are required ?
- Enough Input (Krashen, 1985)
- Interaction (Long, 1983)
- Output (Swain, 1985)



**TBLT**  
Task-based  
Language Teaching

# Learners' Performance in TBLT Framework

- Skehan (2003) argues that learners' production on tasks has been operationalized in the following three ways, depending on the assessors' theoretical position:
  - 1) Cognitive approach: Complexity-Accuracy-Fluency(CAF) is measured
  - 2) In Interaction : Negotiations of meaning is used
  - 3) In Interaction : Socio-cultural theory is used
  -
- → Skehan (2003, p.8) argues that Complexity-Accuracy-Fluency(CAF) dimension of assessment on task performance have been justified theoretically and empirically.

# Before the Pandemic & In the Pandemic

- MEXT (2012; 2013) encourages students' interaction in-class.
  - In 2020, the pandemic happened...
- MEXT (2020) suggested...
- ◆ School with advanced approaches are using tablets, PCs, electric blackboards, video conferencing systems etc.,

# The Advantage of Using IT in Language Teaching

- The merit of using technology language education (Ahn & Lee, 2016)
- (1) Promoting language use
- (2) Increasing self-learning
- (3) Increasing feedback and interaction mutually



Technologies + TBLT ??

# The Integration of TBLT (Research Tools)

- Communications, mediated by interconnected computers between individuals or groups separated in space and / or times”, which is called Computer-Mediated Communication(CMC) (Luppini, 2007, p. 142)

F-T-F Interaction	SCMC	ACMC	Essay / Composition
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Instancy</li><li>• Highly Interaction</li></ul>	Reciprocal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Time differences</li><li>• Low</li><li>• Reciprocal Interaction, being <u>planned in advance</u></li></ul>	

# 1. Previous study (Hwang, 2008)

- Hwang(2008) investigated the characteristics of linguistic output in SCMC and ACMC modes and the transferability of text-based CMC to oral performance. The total number of participants were 46 students (SCMC/n=24), (ACMC/n=22).

RQ1) What are the characteristics of linguistics output produced in the SCMC and ACMC?

RQ2) Are the linguistics characteristics gained from the SCMC and ACMC transferred into Oral performance?



## 2. Previous study (Stockwell, 2010)

- Stockwell(2010) investigated 24 advanced level of university students' discourse features', lexical density, grammatical complexity and accuracy using SCMC and ACMC.
- RQ1) . How do interactions in tasks carried out in SCMC and ACMC compare in terms of lexical density and spelling accuracy?
- RQ2) How do interactions in tasks carried out in SCMC and ACMC compare in terms of syntactic complexity and accuracy (c.f., Sotillo, 2000)?
- RQ3) What other features are there in the discourse when completing tasks through SCMC and ACMC?

### 3. Previous Study (Shiroyama, 2022)

- Shiroyama (2022) investigated 9 advanced level of university students' discourse features', lexical complexity and grammatical complexity using SCMC and ACMC in EFL classroom.
- RQ1) Are there any differences in lexical complexity between the discourse produced using online chats and forum discussions?
- RQ2) Are there any differences in grammatical complexity between the discourse produced using online chats and forum discussions?

# The Rationale for this study

- (1) Despite of increasing interest in TBLT and CMC, research on TBLT and CMC are scant
- (2) The number of studies using more than one form of CMC in TBLT framework especially scares (Stockwell, 2010)
- (3) Most past studies were focused on students' interaction, negotiate meaning or intercultural communication.

# Main Study

- Shiroyama (2022) investigated 8 participants (One British L1 English speaker and 7 pre-intermediate students') discourse features lexical complexity using synchronous and asynchronous CMC.
- RQ 1) Are there any differences in lexical complexity between the discourse produced using SCMC and ACMC when NES interact with NNS?

# Instruments

- Two decision-making tasks (Revised Cambridge CAE, 2014)
- Background questionnaires
- ZOOM accounts for SCMC
- Microsoft accounts for ACMC

# Methods (Participants)

- One L1 British interlocutor (academic staff)

Age	20 (19-21)
Length of time on learning English (Range)	9.7 years (6-17 years)
Length of time participants had spend living in an English-speaking country (Range)	1 week (0-3 weeks)
TOEIC (L&R) (Range)	487 (225-550)

# Data Collection

	Group A			Group B			
	Intercalator 1			Intercalator 1			
	Learner 1	Learner 2	Learner 3	Learner 4	Learner 5	Learner 6	Learner 7
Session1	Guidance & Questionnaires  Chat (Task A) 20 mins  ↓			Guidance & Questionnaires  Forum (Task B) At least 3 times a week  ↓			
Session2	Forum (Task B)  At least 3 times a week			Chat (Task A)  20 mins			

### 3. Results (Lexical Complexity)

- RQ 1) Are there any differences in lexical complexity between the discourse produced using SCMC and ACMC when NES interact with NNS?
- The definition of Lexical Diversity : McCarthy and Jarvis’s (2007) definition of lexical diversity as “the range and the variety of vocabulary deployed in a text by either a speaker or writer” (McCarthy & Jarvis , 2007, p. 459).
- Shapiro-Wiki’s test,  $p=.063>.05$ . The results of a paired-samples  $t$ -test indicated  $t(6)=1.181, p=.282$ .

Table 1. MTLT using SVE and AVE

SVE (Chat)		AVE (Forum)	
Mean	SD	Mean	SD
64.52	18.46	54.09	12.63
Note. N=7.			



## Future studies

- It is necessary to investigate grammatical complexity and accuracy.
- It is necessary to clarify why there is no significant difference between two CMCs from vocabulary aspects.
- It is hoped to examine whether this study is effective to enhance students' output skills.

# References

- DeBoer, F. (2014). Evaluating the comparability of two measures of lexical diversity. *System*, 47, 139-145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.10.008>
- Hagley, E. (2020). Effects of virtual exchange in the EFL classroom on students' cultural and intercultural sensitivity. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, 21(3), 74-87.
- Hwang, P. A. (2008). Characteristics and transferability of text-based CMC to oral performance. *English Teaching*, 63(2), 3-21. <https://doi.org/10.15858/engtea.63.2.200806.3>
- Lee, S. M. (2016). User experience of a mobile speaking application with automatic speech recognition for EFL learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 47(4), 778-786. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12354>
- McCarthy, P. M., & Jarvis, S. (2007). vocd: a theoretical and empirical evaluation. *Language Testing*, 24(4), 459-488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532207080767>
- Ribeiro, A. (2016). Discourse strategies in computer-mediated communication between native and nonnative English speakers. *Electronic International Journal of Education, Arts, and Science (EIJEAS)*, 2.
- Shiroyama, T. (2021). Task-based language learning and teaching using synchronous and asynchronous CMC. *English Usage and Style*, 38, 35-55.
- Shiroyama, T. (2022). Comparing Lexical Complexity and Grammatical Complexity Using Online Chat and Forum in EFL Context. In Dr David Shaffer, More Than Words : Teaching for a Better World : KoreaTESOL proceedings 2022 (pp. 91-100)
- Shiroyama, T. (2022). Comparing lexical complexity using two different VE modes: a pilot study. in *Intelligent CALL, granular systems and learner data: short papers from EUROCALL 2022* edited by Birna Arnbjörnsdóttir, Branislav Bédi, Linda Bradley, Kolbrún Friðriksdóttir, Hólmfríður Garðarsdóttir, Sylvie Thouésny, and Matthew James Whelpton , pp. 1-6