

## From Input, Output, and Comprehension to Negotiation and Attention

### An overview of Theory and Research on Learner Interaction in SLA

Teresa Pica, University of Pennsylvania, teresap@gse.upenn.edu

International Seminar, Vitoria, May 13, 2010

This presentation will begin with an historical overview of theory and research on the role of learner interaction in the processes and sequences of second language acquisition. The overview will highlight the foundational constructs of input, output, interaction, and comprehension, and current constructs of negotiation and attention, and emphasize the ways in which these constructs have illuminated the processes of second language acquisition, the needs of the learner, and the approaches that facilitate effective L2 outcomes. Following specification of these cognitive and linguistic processes and needs, examples of interaction-based approaches will be provided. These include research-validated strategies, materials, and tasks that provide opportunities for learners to interact in the L2 as they negotiate its meaning and attend to its linguistic forms and features.

Input as a theoretical construct (Corder, 1967)	
L2 available for 'intake" (linguistic forms and structures that can be processed by the learner)	
Comprehensible Input (Krashen 1975); Available through;	
Unmodified Passages, Texts	Input at I + 1 level Contextual Cues; Enhancements: Visual Highlighting, Vocal Emphases, Repetition, Attention Getting Devices
Pre-modified Passages, Texts	
Modified Interaction, / Negotiation of Meaning / Interaction Modified through The Negotiation Of Meaning (Long 1980; Varonis, & Gass, 1985 )	
Input made comprehensible through:	Confirmation Checks, Clarification Requests, Signals of Incomprehension >> Responses of Modified Input
Comprehensible Output >>> Pushed Output	Swain, 1985
Stimulus for Learner's Syntactic Processing	Aid to Retrieval of Emergent L2 Features
Available through: Opportunities to Speak and Respond; Self-monitoring	

**Table 1**

#### Findings and Observations on Comprehensible Input, Interaction, and Comprehensible/Pushed Output

##### Findings on French Immersion Achievement (Swain, 1985-1995)

Students' grammatical achievement was lower than their comprehension of spoken or oral texts

##### Possible Reasons:

- (1) Classroom emphasis on comprehension limited students' opportunities to produce and process the L2 syntactically, retrieve emergent features, notice their L2 needs.
- (2) Teachers' use of imperative and present verb forms limited scope of grammatical features available as L2 input

**Table 2**

#### Findings on published research: Content-based Programs/Classrooms Immersion, LSP, Sheltered, Thematic/N=35 (Pica & Jo, 1998) Emphasis on Global Proficiency as a Measure of L2 Learning

L2 Constructs	n studies	% distribution
Global L2 Proficiency	32	91
Reading/Writing/Literacy Skills	1	3
L2 Grammar	2	6
<b>Comparison Groups Inappropriate/Non-existent</b>		
<b>Comparison Groups</b>		
	n studies	% distribution
L2 Learners In FL Classrooms	10	29
NSs Of The L2 In The Academic Mainstream	6	17
L2 Learners In FL Classrooms & NSs in Academic Mainstream	4	11
No Comparison Groups Studied	15	43

<b>Table 3</b>	
<b>During classroom communication, teachers tended to focus on communication rather than negotiation of message meaning. Production of output was invited, but does not result in pushed output (Pica, Washburn, Evans, &amp; Jo, 1999; Pica, 2002; Pica &amp; Washburn, 2002, 2004; Pica, 2009)</b>	
<b>(a) Repetition, rephrasing, and recasting, without signals of incomprehension:</b>	
Teacher	Students
	yeah if he's still proud he mustn't show his humiliation <i>by don't give money</i>
right it's his humiliation that would show	
<b>(b) Greater emphasis on maintaining communication flow than on comprehensible/pushed output:</b>	
Teacher	Students
	the daughter have <i>a pretty good</i> but she also <i>hope</i> to get married but she <i>think</i> about her mother. so they <i>are</i> worried each other you know
mm-hmm (a)	
	so they <i>pretend</i> they <i>think</i> they really have a good life at that time, but when the her mother <i>go</i> to China back
mm-hmm (a)	
	and her mother <i>change change his</i> un thinking and being and then uh her daughter <i>think</i> that she can get married and her mother can <i>independ_</i> on others
really? I had a very different point of view (a)	
<b>(c) Opportunities for production of output, without expectation of pushed output:</b>	
Teacher	Students
There's another conflict in the mother, something else is- the mother is thinking a lot about	<i>go back China</i>
going back to China is one thing... what's another?)	

<b>Table 4</b>	
<b>Comprehensible Input, Interaction, and Comprehensible/Pushed Output Are Necessary, but not sufficient for Language Acquisition</b>	
<b>Learners need:</b>	
<b>1. Input that supplies positive evidence and negative evidence on relationships of L2 form, function, meaning (Long, 1996).</b>	
For all L2 form, function, meaning relationships	
And especially low salience L2 form, function, meaning relationships:	
Perceptually difficult to notice (3 <sup>rd</sup> singular)	
Infrequent (indirect questions in spoken and written communication)	
Not transparent in communicative value (articles the, a, and zero to refer to items previously mentioned)	
Highly complex (modal verbs for argument building)	
<b>2. Opportunities to attend to/notice positive and negative evidence on relationships of L2 form, function, meaning</b>	
Focus on Form in Contexts of Meaning (e.g., through communication breakdown: Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998)	
Notice the Gap between IL/TL (Schmidt & Frota, 1986)	
Notice the Hole in IL (Doughty & Williams, 1998)	
<b>Positive Evidence</b> can be noticed through:	
Authentic samples of language, especially those modified through visual and auditory enhancement, repetition, rephrasing	
<b>Negative Evidence</b> can be noticed through:	
Preemptive rules	
Explicit error correction	
Negotiation of Meaning: Implicit signals during negotiation of meaning, including Confirmation checks (did you say a book?), and clarification requests (what did you say?)	
Negotiation of Form and Prompts to learner output that encourage modification, e.g., Not, I have book. What should you say? You said I have book. Can you say I have a book? book is incorrect	

<i>Attention types</i>	
<b>Incidental:</b> Attention to Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning, as communication problems arise. (Long & Robinson, 1998)	
<b>Implicit:</b> Attention to of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning in “focused tasks” that require specific linguistic features for task completion. (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2003)	
<b>Explicit:</b> Attention to of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning through form focused instruction (described by Spada, 1997)	
<b>3. Socially created co-construction of knowledge and cognitive processes (Swain, 1998, based on Lantolf, with Pavlenko, 1995)</b>	
Hypothesis testing; Lexical learning within Zone of Proximal Development (distance between actual developmental level, determined by independent problem solving, and potential developmental level, determined by problem solving in collaboration with interlocutor (Swain, 1998; Vygotsky, 1978)	
<b>4. Learner Involvement:</b> (Hulstijn 2001; 1998; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), that activates cognitive processes, L2 outcomes through, a) <b>Need (to understand meaning); b) Search (for answers); c) Evaluation (e.g. compare; apply to future context)</b>	
<b>5. Opportunities to participate in different kinds of communication and interaction</b>	Conversation and Discussion <b>Negotiation</b> of Meaning <b>Task-based</b> Interaction that promotes <b>Attention</b> to Form, Function/Meaning Relationships

<b>Table 5</b>	
<b>Overview of Tasks in Teaching and Research</b>	
Tasks for Communicative Language Teaching (Brumfit & Johnson, 1979; Morrow and Johnson, 1979) and Language for Specific Purposes syllabi and methods (Jupp and Hodlin, 1975).	
Problem solving map tasks, information sharing activities (Natural Approach, Krashen & Terrell, 1983 )	
Two way, closed, convergent tasks, e.g., Spot the Difference and Odd Man Out (Long, 1981); Information sharing and transfer tasks (Gass & Varonis, 1983); Dictogloss (Swain, 1998)	

**Table 6**  
**Task based interaction has revealed about and beyond comprehensible input and output:**  
**L2 learning processes and the learning of relationships of form/function/meaning**

**Tasks as Instructional Activities for Students and Teachers**

Professional References	<b>Brumfit &amp; Johnson, 1979; Morrow &amp; Johnson, 1979, Jupp &amp; Hodlin, 1975;</b> Ur, 1981, 1988
Scholarly Publications:	Ellis, 2003; <b>Krashen &amp; Terrell, 1983;</b> Nunan, 1989
Student Textbooks	Anger et al, 1989; Harmer & Surguine, 1987; Helgesen et al, 2000

**Table 7**

**Tasks as Instruments for Data Collection and Interventions/Treatments for Researchers**

<b>Task Purposes</b>	<b>Studies</b>
Support Provision of Meaningful, Comprehensible and/or Modified Input	Doughty & Pica, 1986; Gass & Alvarez-Torres 2000; Gass & Varonis, 1983; Iwashita, 2003; Izumi, 2002; Long, 1980, 1981; Pica & Doughty, 1985a, b; Porter, 1986; Spada & Lightbown, 1999
Stimulate Feedback, including Explicit Correction and Recasts	Doughty & Varela, 1998; Iwashita, 2003; Leeman, 2003; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998; Mackey & McDonough, 2000; Mackey & Oliver, 2002; Mackey & Philp, 1998; McDonough, 2005; Muranoi, 2000; Nobuyoshi, & Ellis, 1993; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Philp, 2003; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996; Takashima & Ellis, 1999
Stimulate Production of Modified Output	Izumi, 2002; Kowal & Swain 1994; McDonough, 2005; Newton & Kennedy 1996; Swain, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2001

Generate Opportunities for Modified Interaction  
 Doughty & Pica, 1986; Doughty & Varela, 1998; de la Fuente, 2002; Gass & Varonis, 1983; Gass & Alvarez-Torres 2005; Kowal & Swain, 1994; Leeman, 2003; Long, 1980, 1981; Mackey & McDonough, 2000; Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003; Oliver, 1995, 2000; Pica 1991; Pica & Doughty, 1985 a, b; Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006; Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996; Porter, 1986; Smith, 2005; Swain, 1998; Swain & Lapkin, 2001

Draw Attention to Relationships of Form/Meaning/Function  
 Long, 1996; Long & Robinson, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998)

<b>Table 8</b>	
<b>Theoretical Grounding: Relationships between Tasks and Attention Types</b>	
Attention Type	Application to Task Based Research
<b>Incidental:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/ Meaning occurs incidentally, as the need to repair comprehension/ production problems arise in the context of communication. (Long & Robinson, 1998)	<b>Incidental:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs incidentally in tasks, as comprehension/production problems arise during task completion. (Long & Robinson, 1998)
<b>Implicit:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs implicitly as the need to supply specific or required forms arises in order to communicate a function or meaning in the context of communication. (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2003)	<b>Implicit:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs implicitly in tasks that require specific, often obligatory, forms for task completion. (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2003)
<b>Explicit:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs explicitly through form focused instruction and corrective feedback (described , e.g., by Spada, 1997), in follow up to learners' need for form or rule as revealed in the context of communication	<b>Explicit:</b> Attention to relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs explicitly through form focused instruction, as needed, in follow up to tasks in which learners revealed need for assistance with forms, in the context of communication.

<b>Table 9: Theoretical Grounding: Relationships between SLA and Task Purposes</b>		
Time Frame	SLA purpose: Promote L2 development	Task purpose
From 1981 (Long, 1980) to present: (reviewed in Ellis, 2003; van der Braden, Norris, & Bygate, 2008)	<b>Directly through task implementation:</b> (e.g., Mackey, 1999) <b>Indirectly through interaction for:</b> a) input comprehension (Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1983), b) output modification in response to feedback (Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell, 1996); c) collaborative learning (e.g., Swain & Lapkin, 1998); d) negotiation of meaning (Long, 1981).	Provide a context for Researcher Treatment/Intervention
<b>More Recently:</b> From 1993 (Long, 1993) to present: (reviewed in van den Branden, Bygate, & Norris, 2008)	<b>Directly through task implementation:</b> (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; Mackey & McDonough, Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006) <b>Indirectly through:</b> <b>Attention processes</b> (Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006): a) noticing of low salience forms and their functions b) intake to STM; c) awareness of L2 form/function/meaning <b>Learner involvement:</b> (Hulstijn 2001; 1998; Laufer & Hulstijn,) a) need (e.g. understand meaning); b) search (e.g. for answers); c) evaluation (e.g. compare; apply to future context	Provide a context for Researcher Treatment/ Intervention AND Facilitate and activate: Cognitive processes Learner involvement L2 learning processes and outcomes

**Table 10 : Findings on Tasks in SLA Research**

Study	Task Format	Task Title and/or Description	Treatment/ Intervention Form Focus	Treatment/ Intervention: Intensity, Duration	Length of Study	Findings
Ammar, A. & Spada, N. (2006).	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of Recasts and Prompts	One Way Picture Description	Recasts and Prompts as Feedback to errors in French 3 <sup>rd</sup> person possessive determiners <i>his and her</i> Preceded by: Explicit instruction, cloze passage practice	45 minutes instruction and cloze passage practice; 30-45 minutes picture task completion	Four weeks	Prompts more effective overall: High-proficiency learners benefited equally from prompts, recasts; Low-proficiency learners benefited significantly more from prompts than recasts.
Doughty & Varela, 1998	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of Corrective Recasts in response to past formation errors  Preceded by Task as Instrument for learner suppliance of past forms in obligatory contexts	Oral and written reports of classroom science experiments	Corrective recasting of oral errors, circling of written errors on <b>English L2 simple and conditional past</b>	Five sessions/ Week /four weeks	Twenty-two weeks, due to delayed post testing after treatment	Large, significant and durable effect for Past Formation
de la Fuente, 2002	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of researcher intervention to encourage pushed output in negotiation	Follow Directions for Map Placement of Pictures of Targeted Vocabulary	Negotiation with and without pushed output  Receptive and productive <b>vocabulary</b>	Two 20 minute sessions	Three weeks, including 1 week and 3 week delayed post-testing after treatment	Positive effects for negotiation on vocabulary comprehension, for negotiation with pushed output on vocabulary acquisition, productive retention
Ellis, R. & He, X. (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i> , 21, 285-301	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of Teacher provided pre-modified and interactionally modified input, and for Learner negotiated output	Follow Directions for Picture Match and Label task: NNSs listened to oral directions; placed pictures of individual furniture on picture of apartment Learners wrote, then used own directions; modeled vocabulary and directions.	Premodified input: paired learners provided NS baseline directions, premodified for negotiation needs. Interactionally modified input: Teacher provided NS baseline directions, negotiation opportunity Negotiated output: Paired learners wrote and used own directions	One 45 minute session	7 weeks, including pre- and posttest sessions	Negotiated Output Group: Outperformed others on: Direction comprehension; Vocabulary recognition in picture-matching tests; Vocabulary production in picture-labeling tests

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i> , 28, 339-368.	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of explicit and implicit corrective feedback	Story Task 1: Student triads retold story to classmates, from picture slightly different from classmates' pictures. Classmates identified the differences.  Story Task 2: Student triads retold story to classmates, from picture unseen by classmates, who identified the story sequence	Recasts; meta linguistic explanations  English <i>past -ed</i> .	About 2 weeks	1 hour total/2 consecutive days	Metalinguistic Explanations more effective over time:  Oral Imitation Test: Metalinguistic Explanations >Recasts >Control (Trend)  Grammaticality Judgment Test: Metalinguistic Explanations > Recasts >Control  Metalinguistic Test: Metalinguistic Explanations > Recasts >Control
--	--	---	--	---------------	---------------------------------	---

Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y. & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. <i>Language Learning</i> , 44, 449-491	Task as Context for Treatment/ Intervention of Teacher provided pre-modified and interactionally modified input.	Match/Label task: Classes of learners listened to teacher's oral directions; marked matrix picture of kitchen with pictures of individual kitchen utensils	Premodified input: Class listened to Pre-modified directions. Interaction with teacher not permitted  Interactionally Modified Input: Class listened to baseline version. Interaction with teacher permitted  Control Group: Class listened to teachers read baseline version; No interaction permitted  <b>Kitchen vocabulary</b>	1 45-minute class meeting	Three months: Post test and delayed post tests	Input quality: Interactionally Modified Groups received more repetitive input than the Pre-modified Groups, which received more repetitive input than the Baseline Control Groups  Interactionally Modified Groups: Significantly higher in comprehension scores than other two groups;  No significant differences in comprehension or acquisition
---	--	--	--	---------------------------	--	---

Iwashita, N. (1999, 2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i> , 25, 1-36	Task as Intervention for generating NNS' responses to NNS imprecisions as negative feedback and positive evidence L2 grammar learning	Experimental Group: 1 2-way information gap task: Spot the Difference; 2 1-way tasks: Information transfer/Picture description, drawing. Control group: Free conversation on topics of choice	Task generated Implicit negative feedback: Recasts, negotiation moves; Positive evidence: models, completion, translation, simple moves of utterance continuation for <b>Japanese locative-initial constructions; (te-form verbs)</b>	1999: 1 session/ week/12 weeks for longitudinal study of one participant 2003: 1 session for cross-sectional study	1999 Longitudinal study: 12 weeks 2003 Cross-sectional study: 2 weeks: 3 treatment sessions, immediate posttest; delayed posttest 1 week later.	Experimental group > Controls in grammatical accuracy More continuation moves than Negative evidence utterances (75% vs. 25%), but Negative evidence: greater effect on performance than continuation moves. Positive evidence beneficial for learners with above average pre-test scores. Treatment effects on post test for 12 week learners only
--	---	---	--	---	--	---

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i> , 24, 541-577.	Task as Treatment/ Intervention, through learner reconstruction of a written text and as Context for researcher designed treatments of +/- input and output modification for generating learner noticing and SLA	Computer generated Text Reading> Reconstruction	Visual input enhancement, learner output modification isolated or combined for noticing, acquisition/ <b>4 Groups</b> read/re-read texts; wrote summary. In addition: <b>1:</b> Output/ Unenhanced Input: Read> reconstructed text. <b>2:</b> Output/ Enhanced Input: Read > Reconstructed unenhanced enhanced texts. <b>3:</b> Enhanced Input Only: Read text> answered questions, <b>4:</b> Unenhanced Input Only: Read text; answered questions.	6 sessions/ 2 weeks; Output Groups: 30-60 minutes/ session Non-output Groups: 30-45 minutes/ session	3.5 weeks, including 2 weeks treatment; post-testing	All groups improved, but Output Groups > Input and Control Groups; No difference between Input and Control Groups; No difference between Output Groups with Enhanced Input and Output Only Groups
---	--	---	---	---	--	---

Leeman, 2003	Task as Context for researcher interventions of stressed-enhanced positive evidence and negative evidence	Information Gap Tasks	Negative evidence, with, without recasts, stress-enhanced positive evidence for <b>Spanish noun-adj agreement</b>	One 20-minute session	One week including delayed posttest	Positive effect for recasts and positive evidence; no effect for negative evidence alone
Leeser, M. J. 2004. Learner proficiency and focus on form during collaborative dialogue. <i>Language Teaching Research</i> , 8-1, 55-81	Task as Treatment/ Intervention to generate noticing forms and discussion and resolution of form errors through collaborative text reconstruction	Dictogloss Tasks in Content Based, University Geography course:  Learner dyads listened to and reconstructed texts Lexis, Morphosyntax	Learners paired according to same or different proficiency levels, 8 with higher proficiency, 9 with lower proficiency, 4 with higher – lower proficiency.	2 sessions	2 sessions	Learners focused on both grammatical and lexical forms meanings, more grammatical than lexical; but varied according to learner proficiency/higher proficiency: form noticing, discussion, and resolution than other groups
Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. <i>Applied Linguistics</i> , 27, 405-430.	Task as context for teacher intervention of answer to generate learner questions in a Jeopardy-style game show format	Jeopardy-style game: Teacher provides answers to generate learner oral and written questions	Experimental Learners described 2 pictures, 1 video clip, designed to elicit different linguistic forms. 1 <sup>st</sup> picture- <b>past tense</b> , 2 <sup>nd</sup> picture- <b>Plural – s</b> ; Video clip: <b>Questions</b> . Control group: same as experimental but with additional activities, no feedback	3 50 minute classes	150 minutes	Experimental group showed high levels of noticing (operationalized through: learning journals completed in class; stimulated recall interviews, specific questions about forms noticed,) of a) question forms, b) plural forms, and c) past tense, compared to Control group. Levels of noticing: question forms, > plural forms > past tense
Mackey & McDonough, 2000	Task as treatment to promote negotiation and form noticing for noun classifiers and questions	Spot The Difference; Information Transfer through Picture Description, Drawing; Collaborative Story Sequencing		Three 50-minute sessions per week	One week	Tasks triggered negotiation recasts that promoted noticing for noun classifiers.  No negotiation or recasts for question forms

<p>Mackey, A. &amp; Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. <i>System</i>, 30, 459-477.</p>	<p>Task as context for treatment of interactional feedback, including negotiation and recasts, to see if it would facilitate second language development in children</p> <p>Hypothesis: Child ESL learners who take part in conversations with interactional feedback will develop more than child ESL learners who take part in conversations without such feedback</p>	<p>Information gap tasks in student-researcher dyads for tests and treatment, designed to elicit target forms from students and allow for interaction adjustments</p> <p>Meet your partner. Spot the difference (Identifying differences between similar pictures), Story completion (by asking questions), Picture placement (small cutouts placed on outline), Picture sequencing (Discovering order picture story), Picture drawing</p>	<p>Interaction and feedback group: Researchers provided interactional feedback such as recasts and negotiation to the learners during communication breakdowns</p> <p>Control group: Researchers' input was premodified; conversation continued without feedback</p> <p><b>Question forms:</b> <b>Wh: Do-fronting, Copula inversion</b> <b>Yes/No inversion</b> <b>Negative/Do 2nd</b> <b>Do/Aux</b> <b>SVO</b></p>	<p>One treatment session per day for 3 days</p>	<p>5 weeks, including Pre-test, Treatment, and Posttests:</p>	<p>8 out of 11 children in the interaction and feedback group showed sustained stage increase</p> <p>Only 3 out of 11 children in the control group showed sustained stage increase</p> <p>Increase significant at <math>P &lt; .05</math> for posttests 2 and 3</p>
<p>Morris, F. 2002. Negotiation moves, recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. <i>Foreign Language Annals</i>, 35, 395-404.</p>	<p>Task as treatment to generate learner collaboration and interaction in co-construction of text and as context for researchers to study whether learners would provide implicit negative feedback in response to each others' ill-formed utterances and whether there were relationships between types of errors and feedback; types of errors and repairs; timing of feedback and repairs</p>	<p>Dyadic Jigsaw activity; collaborative writing task:</p>	<p>Learners given even- or odd-numbered pictures in story about daily routine, then co-constructed story orally, co-wrote essay about the pictures</p> <p><b>Syntax/ Lexis</b></p>	<p>One class period</p>	<p>50 minutes</p>	<p>1) 70% of errors received implicit negative feedback. 2) Syntactic errors: Recasted 91% of the time, Lexical errors: Negotiated 70% of the time. Low frequency of repaired errors; only negotiation responses led to repair</p>

<p>Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement : Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFLclassrooms. <i>Language Learning</i>, 50, 617-673.</p>	<p>Task as context for interaction enhancement , formal and meaningful debriefing and generation of attentional processes</p>	<p>Problem-solving role-play: rehearsal phase: paired learners prepare for role- play&gt; performance phase: learner representative role-plays with teacher&gt; debriefing phase: teacher explains form or meaning</p>	<p>Interaction enhancement – recasts or requests for repetition; explicit correction for 2 groups Interaction enhancement + formal debriefing and Interaction enhancement + meaning-focusing debriefing 3. Observers No treatment (controls)</p> <p><b>English indefinite articles (a/an)</b></p>	<p>Whole study including pretest, posttest and delayed posttest: 8 weeks Treatment: 3 weeks</p>	<p>Whole study including pretest, posttest and delayed posttest: 8 weeks Treatment: 3 weeks</p>	<p>Positive effects for interaction enhancement on article use, especially if followed by formal debriefing. Effect lasted after 5-week period, suggested balanced instructions on form, meaning key to long-term effect. Oral elicitation more effective on oral performance than written on written performance., possibly. Both participating and observing learners improved use of indefinite articles</p>

<p>Newton, J. &amp; Kennedy, G. (1996). Effects of communication tasks on the grammatical relations marked by second language learners. <i>System</i>, 24, 309-322.</p>	<p>Task(s) as treatment designed/selected to generate learner interaction and need for form focus</p>	<p>Shared information task: medical dilemma: read, reach consensus Shared information: zoo layout; reach consensus on arrangement Split information: medical dilemma, decide surgery recipient Split information on zoo layout/ exchange information to complete layout</p>	<p>Learner interaction  Use of prepositions and clauses</p>	<p>20 -36 /each of 4 tasks</p>	<p>1 session</p>	<p>Higher use of prepositions in zoo topic than in the medical topic.  Higher proportion of prepositions and conjunctions in split information than shared information task  Fewer prepositions by learners than by native speakers in both split and shared tasks.</p>
<p>Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on 'noticing the gap': Nonnative speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i>, 25, 99-126</p>	<p>Task(s) as treatment to generate learner interaction and need for form focus in order to achieve task objective; and as Context for learners to respond to researcher intervention</p>	<p>Picture-drawing: NNS asked questions to NS . Story-completion: NNS viewed 6 pictures in sequence, asked questions about story</p>	<p>Recast to any non targetlike utterances, especially question mis-formations  Linguistic Form: Improvement in English question formation</p>	<p>NS-NNS dyadic interaction Subjects asked questions about pictures and NS gave recast</p>	<p>Whole study including the pretest: approximately 3 weeks Treatment: 2 weeks (100 minutes)</p>	<p>High and intermediate level recalled recasts more accurately than low level. Recasts with 1-5 morphemes recalled more accurately than 6+. Recasts with 1-3 changes recalled more accurately than with 3+ changes. Related to working memory capacity</p>
<p>Pica, Kang, &amp; Sauro, 2006</p>	<p>Task(s) as treatment to generate learner modified interaction, noticing, and awareness for low salience noun and verb phrase forms in order to achieve task objective</p>	<p>Text based Spot the Difference, Jigsaw, Grammar Communication with text sentence differences</p>	<p>Learner dyads followed task directions to identify and describe sentence differences, make correct selections and recall them for reconstruction <b>Articles, verbs</b></p>	<p>Three days of one 2-hour session and different task/day</p>	<p>Three days</p>	<p>Learners able to identify and describe form differences, make correct selections, recall them for text reconstruction through modified/ unmodified interaction</p>

Polio, C., Gass, S., & Chapin, L. (2006). Using stimulated recall to investigate NS perceptions in native-non native speaker interaction. <i>Studies in Second Language Acquisition</i> , 28, 237-267	Task(s) as context to generate learner interaction and need for form focus in order to achieve task objective; <i>and</i> respond to teacher/researcher feedback in a study of learner perception and its relation to teachers' experience	2 way information exchange tasks with picture description and stimulated recall between teachers and learners	Recasts, negotiation, and ignoring of phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical errors through conversational interaction	1 treatment session	1 treatment session	No assessment completed of uptake of feedback. Analysis of teacher feedback, stimulated recall showed experienced teachers recast more than preservice teachers, but the difference was not robust
---	--	---	--	---------------------	---------------------	--

Shekary, M., & Tahririan, M. H. (2006). Negotiation of meaning and noticing in text-based online chat. <i>The Modern Language Journal</i> , 90, 557-573.	Task as treatment for learners to notice gaps between their interlanguage and the target language during negotiation of meaning in online chat rooms	Dictogloss, Jigsaw, Free discussion	Computer assisted interaction by mixed-level dyads Grammar, vocabulary, spelling, Language-related episodes LREs (Reactive, Preemptive); Source (Code, Message); Length: (Simple, Complex); Explicitness of feedback (Direct, Indirect); Combination of complexity, directness (Light, Heavy); Timing of response (Immediate, Deferred); Learner response (+/-Uptake): (Successful, Unsuccessful); Type: Inform, Recast, Elicit	30 minutes of interaction per session; total of 250 sessions among 8 groups; 7500 minutes total	1 month	1) Students initiate LREs but rate of LREs /minute lower than in other studies because it involves NNS-NNS, negotiated, written interaction, but the ratio of LREs to talk is higher than in other studies because text-based communication allows greater opportunity to notice the gap. 2) Learners able to remember 70% corrections in immediate posttests, 57% of corrections in delayed post tests. Decrease consistent with previous findings, but still shows success in learning. 3) Successful uptake significant predictor of correct answers: learners who comprehended correction retained knowledge.
--	--	-------------------------------------	---	---	---------	---

Smith, 2005	Task as context to generate learner text chat and need for form focus in order to achieve task objective; <i>and/or</i> for learners to respond to each other's negotiation moves	Jigsaw and Decision-Making Tasks conducted through Computer-mediated text-chat	Text chat-generated negotiation for uptake of target lexical items	One 30 minute task session/ week/4 weeks	Six weeks, including final delayed post test given 1 week after final treatment	Uptake rare; had no effect on acquisition of target lexical items
Swain & Lapkin, 1998	Task as treatment to generate learner interaction and need for form focus in order to achieve task objective	Jigsaw Task: Collaborative Story Building through Pictures	Mini-Lesson followed by pair task implementation	Two sessions	Five weeks, including pretest; 2 weeks treatment and posttest	Collaborative dialogue effective for resolving communication breakdowns and providing assistance with SLA
Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds), <i>Researching pedagogic tasks</i> (pp. 99-118). New York: Longman	Task as treatment to generate learner interaction and need for form focus in order to achieve task objective	Jigsaw task: Story Construction from 8 pictures  Dictogloss task: Participants listened to teacher-presented passage; reconstructed with partner	Instruction on targeted form/function, followed by dyadic task implementation  Two grade 8 mixed-ability French immersion classes. 30 - 35 students/class.  Noun gender marking; vocabulary recognition; sentence grammaticality	Pretest, post test, two treatment sessions per day /2 weeks,  Each task took 10- 14 minutes	5 weeks	Jigsaw task appears to have constrained the range of students' time on task, range in the total number of language-related episodes produced, and the range of student performance in their written narratives, in particular with respect to vocabulary use.
Takashima & Ellis, 1999	Task as instrument to draw attention to form through (a) input provided in task content/directions, <i>and/or</i> (b) interaction <i>and/or</i> output generated by task implementation, and mediated by researcher clarification requests in response to non target past verb forms, in order to achieve task objective of story reconstruction and presentation	Story reconstruction and presentation	Focused vs. non-focused clarification requests in response to utterances with <i>non-target past-verb forms</i>	One 45-minute session/week for 3 weeks	Six weeks, including posttests and delayed posttests following treatment	Clarification requests were effective for learners' self-correction and reformulation; mixed results for verb tense accuracy

<b>Table 11</b>	
<b>Task-Based Interaction: Directions for Research and Practice on Comprehensible Input and Output</b>	
<b>1. Need for Long Term Study of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning in SLA</b>	
<b>Treatment Intensity Comparison of Studies that used Tasks to Focus on Form</b>	
Iwashita, 1999	One session/12 weeks
Doughty & Varela, 1998	Five sessions/week/4 weeks
Spada & Lightbown, 1999	Four 60 minute sessions/week/2 weeks
Pica, Kang, & Sauro, 2006	2-hour sessions/3 days
Takashima & Ellis, 1999	One 45-minute session/3 weeks
Smith, 2005	One 30 minute session week/4 weeks
Izumi, 2002	Six 30-60 minute sessions/2 weeks
Mackey & McDonough, 2000	Three 50-minute sessions/week/1 week
Mackey & Oliver, 2002	Three 30 minute sessions/week
Mackey & Philp, 1998	Three 15-25 minute sessions/week
Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993	One session/week for 2 weeks
Oliver, 1995	30- minute session per week/2 weeks
Swain & Lapkin, 1998	Two sessions
Newton & Kennedy, 1996	One 120 minute session/group
de la Fuente, 2002	Two 20 minute sessions
Gass & Alvarez Torres, 2005	Two 20- minute sessions
Muranoi, 2000	Three 30 minute sessions/weekly class
Swain, 1998	One dictogloss/week/3 weeks
McDonough, 2005	Three 10 minute sessions
Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998	One 40-minute session
Iwashita, 2003	One session
Leeman, 2003	One 20-minute session

<b>Table 12</b>		
<b>Total Length Comparison of Studies with Delayed Posttesting that used Tasks to Focus on Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning in Comprehensible Input and Output</b>		
<b>Study</b>	<b>Treatment Intensity, Duration</b>	<b>Length of Study</b>
Doughty & Varela, 1998	5 sessions/week/4 weeks	22 weeks
Iwashita, 1999	1 session/week/12 weeks	12 weeks
McDonough, 2005	Three 10 minute sessions	8 weeks
Muranoi, 2000	Three 30 minute sessions/weekly class	8 weeks
Smith, 2005	One 30 minute session week/4 weeks	6 weeks
Spada & Lightbown, 1999	Four 60 minute sessions/week/2 weeks	6 weeks
Takashima & Ellis, 1999	One 45-minute session/3 weeks	6 weeks
Swain & Lapkin, 1998	Two sessions	5 weeks
Swain, 1998	One dictogloss/week/3 weeks	4 weeks
de la Fuente, 2002	Two 20 minute sessions	3 weeks
Izumi, 2002	Six 30-60 minute sessions/2 weeks	3 weeks
Iwashita, 2003	One session	1 week
Leeman, 2003	One 20-minute session	1 week

<b>Table 13a</b>		
<b>Text and Form Selection:</b>		
<b>Text Selection: based on Content Course Curriculum, Student Familiarity and Interest</b>		
<b>Form Selection: based on Linguistic Theory and SLA Research</b>		
<b>Easier to notice &amp; learn</b>	<b>More difficult to notice &amp; learn</b>	
<b>Perceptual Saliency</b>		
progressive ing	third singular -s	
irregular past	regular past -ed	
<b>Frequency</b>		
simple past	past perfect	
<b>Transparency of Form, Function &amp; Meaning</b>		
quantifiers plural -s tense markers for time modal verbs of ability pronoun referents for single topics	articles third singular -s tense markers for generalizations modal verbs of probability pronoun referents for multiple topics sociolinguistic rules & pragmatic speech acts	
<b>Students' Developmental Needs &amp; Readiness for Learning</b>		
<b>-saliency, -transparency, +functionality of form/function/meaning</b>		
L2 Forms	Functions & Meanings in Film Texts	
Determiners, Articles Pronouns, Connectors, Conjunctions	Refer to Text Elements, Distinguish General & Specific Text Elements; Organize & Distinguish New & Given Information Mark Transitions, Make Connections	
Verb Tense, Aspect, Modality	Build Arguments, Make Predictions, Suggestions, Speculations; Organize & Sequence Information; Refer to Sequence & Duration	
<b>Table 13b</b>		
<b>Criterion a. To be authentic, tasks should comply with curricular and classroom objectives</b>		
<b>Purpose Statement:</b> The purpose of this activity is to help you become more accurate and precise in your speaking and writing		
and to review and edit information more carefully	and to organize information more carefully	and to report information accurately
Spot the Difference	Jigsaw	Grammar Communication
<b>Criterion b. Tasks must be easy to use directly, and as a basis for new activities</b>		
<b>Features</b>	<b>Examples</b>	
Single, pre-specified goal	Reconstruct story or report	
Gap between information given to participants and information required to meet goal.	Individually held sentences from story or report	
To fill gap/reach goal, participants must verbally exchange and combine their information.	Participants combine sentences	

<p align="center"><b>Criterion c. Tasks should encourage learning of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning in Comprehensible Input and Output</b></p>					
<p><b>Three approaches/formats:</b>  <b>Incidental:</b> Attention to of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs incidentally in tasks, as comprehension and production problems arise in task completion. (Long and Robinson, 1998)  <b>Implicit:</b> Attention to of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs implicitly in tasks that require specific linguistic features for task completion.(Doughty &amp; Varela, 1998; Doughty &amp; Williams, 1998; Ellis, 2003)  <b>Explicit:</b> Attention to of Relationships of L2 Form/Function/Meaning occurs explicitly through form focused instruction (described by Spada, 1997), as needed, after completion of tasks with implicit format.</p>					
<p align="center"><b>Criterion d. Tasks should provide reliable data on learning, teaching processes, outcomes Attention and Interaction Processes across Task Steps</b></p>					
<p align="center">Tasks, Cognitive Processes, Learner Involvement</p>					
Task Step	1. Read original passage	2 Read Version A or B of original passage	3. Choose between phrases in Versions A and B. Justify choices	4. Recall choices from Step 3. Insert in cloze of original; Explain, justify	5. Compare choices with original/Identify differences;List/ use to complete original
Attention Processes	<b>Notice</b> low salience forms that encode function, meaning	<b>Notice</b> low salience forms that encode function, meaning.  <b>Display awareness</b> of form, function, meaning through explanation, justification	<b>Notice</b> low salience forms that encode function, meaning  <b>Notice differences</b> between forms that encode function, meaning;	Recall forms from Step 3 to reveal <b>intake from STM</b>  <b>Intake</b> for further application to text passage completion  <b>Display awareness</b> of form, function, meaning through explanation and/or justification	<b>Notice the gap</b> between needed and unneeded forms  <b>Intake</b> for further task application to list or passage  <b>Display awareness</b> of form, function, meaning through explanation and/or justification
Involvement	<b>Need</b> to understand passage	<b>Search</b> for differences	<b>Evaluate</b> choice of differences by comparing choices	<b>Evaluate</b> choices by comparing choices with application to cloze passage completion	<b>Evaluate</b> choice of differences by comparing choices, apply to list or passage completion

**Table 14**  
**Research Tasks**

Figure 1: Task Step 1. Passage Excerpt for Task Step 1 (R. Ellis, 2003:160)

(1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.

Figure 2a. Task Steps 2 and 3: *Spot the Difference* Versions for **Articles and Determiners**  
***Incidental Format: Modification to noun or premodifier***

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
<p>(1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list <u>some unusual principles</u> for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which <u>learners</u> must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take <u>the style</u> of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw <u>a picture</u>, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally <u>error confusion</u>. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate <u>the input</u> to their own lives.</p>	<p>(1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list <u>some general principles</u> for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which <u>teachers</u> must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take <u>the form</u> of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw <u>a diagram</u>, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally <u>error identification</u>. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate <u>the output</u> to their own lives.</p>

**Differences are underlined for illustration. Forms are not underlined in student versions**

Figure 2b Task Steps 2 and 3: *Spot the Difference* Versions for **Articles and Determiners**  
**Implicit Format: Modification to Article or Determiner**

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
<p>(1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list <u>some general principles</u> for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which <u>the learners</u> must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take <u>a form</u> of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw <u>the diagram</u>, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally <u>an error identification</u>. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate <u>the input</u> to their own lives.</p>	<p>(1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list <u>the general principles</u> for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which <u>learners must</u> make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take <u>the form</u> of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw <u>a diagram</u>, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally <u>error identification</u>. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate <u>input</u> to their own lives.</p>

**Differences are underlined for illustration. Forms are not underlined in student versions**

Figure 3. Task Step 4: Cloze Version of Figure 1 Passage

1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list \_\_\_\_\_ for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which \_\_\_\_\_ must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take \_\_\_\_\_ of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw \_\_\_\_\_, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally \_\_\_\_\_. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate \_\_\_\_\_ to their own lives.

Figure 4. Task Step 5: **Read Original Passage with Noun Phrases Underlined and Compare**

1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.

### ***Incidental and Implicit Formats***

#### **Compare the passage with the one that you and your partner**

**wrote.** If you and your partner find any differences, explain the reasons to each other. Write your reasons next to the numbers below.

You can write as many reasons as you would like. You don't have to write reasons next to all the numbers.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

**Explicit Format:**

**Compare the passage with the one that you and your partner wrote.** If you and your partner find any differences in the way you used a and the, you can find the reasons for the difference in the chart below. (Learners provided with rules encoded with minimal metalinguistic terminology)

Sentence	If you/your partner used:	instead of the correct, underlined answer:	You didn't follow this rule for using articles:
2	article <u>the</u> , or no article at all	I list <u>some general principles</u>	Do not use article <u>the</u> with words in a general category. Do not leave out the article when you have a general modifier that describes a word. In sentence 2, <u>some general principles</u> refers to a small number of principles that Ellis will list.
3	article <u>a</u> or <u>the</u>	stimulus to which <u>learners</u> must make some kind of response	Do not use article <u>the</u> with words in a general category. In Sentence 3, <u>learners</u> refers to learners in general.
4	article <u>a</u> or <u>no article at all</u>	<u>the form</u> of spoken or written input	Use article <u>the</u> with words that are described right after them. In Sentence 4, <u>the</u> form is followed by <u>spoken or written input</u> , which describes the kind of form the stimulus can take.

**To practice these rules, copy the correct answers into the passage below.**

1) Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list \_\_\_\_\_ for designing this kind of focused task, which I call 'interpretation tasks'. (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which \_\_\_\_\_ must make some kind of response. (4) The stimulus can take \_\_\_\_\_ of spoken or written input. (5) The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw \_\_\_\_\_, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task can be sequenced to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally \_\_\_\_\_. (7) Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate \_\_\_\_\_ to their own lives

Figure 5a. *Jigsaw Task* Versions for **Articles and Determiners**, for Steps 2 and 3

**Incidental Format: Modification to noun or premodifier**

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
Sentence 1. Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks.	Sentence 1 Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks.
Sentence # ____ The stimulus can take the style of spoken or written input.	Sentence # ____ The stimulus can take the form of spoken or written input.
Sentence # ____ These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners must make some kind of response.	Sentence # ____ These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which teachers must make some kind of response.
Sentence # ____ Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.	Sentence # ____ Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the output to their own lives.
Sentence # ____ In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some unusual principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call ‘interpretation tasks’	Sentence # ____ In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call ‘interpretation tasks’.
Sentence # ____ The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a picture, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal.	Sentence # ____ The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal.

Figure 5b. *Jigsaw Task* Versions for **Articles and Determiners**, for Steps 2 and 3

**Implicit Format: Modification to article or determiner**

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
Sentence 1. Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks.	Sentence 1 Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks.
Sentence # ____ The stimulus can take a form of spoken or written input.	Sentence # ____ The stimulus can take the form of spoken or written input.
Sentence # ____ These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which the learners must make some kind of response.	Sentence # ____ These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners must make some kind of response.
Sentence # ____ Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.	Sentence # ____ Learners should have the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate input to their own lives.
Sentence # ____ In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call ‘interpretation tasks’	Sentence # ____ In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I call ‘interpretation tasks’.
Sentence # ____ The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal.	Sentence # ____ The response can take various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw the diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal.

Figure 6a. *Grammar Communication Task: Versions for Verb Forms, for Steps 2 and 3*

***Incidental Format: Modification to verb***

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
<p>Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I <u>show</u> ‘interpretation tasks.’ (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners <u>must make</u> some kind of response. (4) The stimulus <u>can take</u> the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response <u>can show</u> various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task <u>can be followed</u> to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification (7) Learners <u>should have</u> the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e. relate the input to their own lives.</p>	<p>Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I <u>call</u> ‘interpretation tasks’ (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners <u>must say</u> some kind of response. (4) The stimulus <u>can be</u> the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response <u>can take</u> various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task <u>can be sequenced</u> to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification. (7) Learners <u>should like</u> the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.</p>

Figure 6b. *Grammar Communication Task: Versions for Verb Forms, for Steps 2 and 3*

***Implicit format: Modification to Verb modal or ending***

Version to Student A	Version to Student B
<p>Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I <u>can call/could call</u> ‘interpretation tasks.’ (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners <u>might make /can make</u> some kind of response. (4) The stimulus <u>can take/could take</u> the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response <u>should take/ takes</u> various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task <u>are sequenced/must be sequenced</u> to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification (7) Learners <u>should have/could have</u> the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e. relate the input to their own lives.</p>	<p>Our main concern here is with the structured input stage of a lesson as this involves the use of focused tasks. (2) In Ellis (1995: 98-9) I list some general principles for designing this kind of focused task, which I <u>call/ might call</u> ‘interpretation tasks.’ (3) These include the following: An interpretation task consists of a stimulus to which learners <u>could make/ might make</u> some kind of response. (4) The stimulus <u>should take /takes</u> the form of spoken or written input. (5) The response <u>can take/could take</u> various forms, for example, indicate true-false, check a box, select the correct picture, draw a diagram, perform an action, but in each case, the response will be completely nonverbal or minimally verbal. (6) The activities in the task <u>can be sequenced/could be sequenced</u> to require first attention to meaning, then noticing the form and function of the grammatical structure, and finally error identification. (7) Learners <u>can have/ might have</u> the opportunity to make some kind of personal response, i.e., relate the input to their own lives.</p>

**Research Findings**

**Study 1:** (Pica, 2002 and Pica, Kang, and Sauro, 2006)

Purpose: To examine the effectiveness of **Implicit Format tasks** designed to promote SLA processes, i.e., to help task participants:

1. Notice L2 forms and the functions and meanings they encode.
2. Notice the gap between interlanguage and L2, especially for low salience forms.

Design: 6 pairs intermediate English L2 learners carried out 3 different types of tasks in their classrooms.

Tasks designed to draw attention to Articles, Determiners, Pronouns, Connectors, Verb Morphology, Modals

**Study 2:** Pica, Sauro, Lee, 2007 and Pica, Sauro, Lee, and Peng, 2007

Purpose: To compare the effectiveness of Incidental, Implicit, and Explicit Formats on SLA processes/outcomes,

Noticing, Oral Production, and Knowledge (based on Grammaticality Judgment test scores)

Design: 6 pairs intermediate English L2 learners carried out 3 different formats of *Spot the Difference* tasks in their classrooms. Tasks designed to draw attention to Articles, Determiners.

*Noticing:* All participants showed notable gains.

*Production:* Incidental and Explicit participants showed greatest gains.

*Knowledge:* Explicit participants showed notable gains. Others made no gains.

**Findings**

**Task Participants noticed and compared forms in relation to meaning/function:**

**Step 3.** Choose between sentences/among phrases in Passage Versions A, B. Justify choices.

Sentence __ Since Andrew believes he had been fired because of his illness, he plans to fight the firm in court.	
	Sentence __ Since Andrew believes he has been fired because of his illness, he plans to fight the firm in court
Oh yeah, seven. He recog, ah. Ah since Andrew believes he had been fired because of his illness, he plans to fight the firm in court. Right?	
	Uh-huh. Since Andrew believes he has been fired because of his illness, he plans to fight the firm in court. In court.
<i>You know my sentence is he had been fired, but your sentence is he has been fired.</i>	
	<i>He had been fired. He had been fired? Your sentence.</i>
<i>He had been fired.</i>	
	<i>Had been fired.</i>
<i>Your sentence, he has been fired.</i>	
	<i>I guess has been fired.</i>
<i>Ah. Okay.</i>	

(Jigsaw task, based on review of *Philadelphia*, Ebert, 1997, pp. 593–594)

**Task Participants noticed, compared, and evaluated forms, and showed awareness of relationships between form and meaning.**

**Step 3.** Choose between sentences/among phrases in Versions A and B. Justify choices.

3. The students in his class _____ are considered were considered failures and potential dropouts. 4. Escalante believed they _____ to succeed could be able would be able in math if they paid attention and worked hard.	3. The students in his class _____ might be considered could be considered failures and potential dropouts .4. Escalante believed they _____ to succeed might be able were able in math if they paid attention and worked hard
Student A	Student B
Escalante believed that they would be able to succeed in math if they paid attention and worked hard. If they	
	<i>Okay, but he was talking in past. He believed they were able.</i>
<i>No, no, no if, right? If is hypothetic</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>So maybe we need a will modal</i>	
	He believed
He believe?	
	Believed. Past
Yeah, he believed	
	believed that they were able. He believed—in past tense. He thought they were able.
No, they will... He believed they will be able to succeed in math if they...	
	Yes, but it is not here. It is not in the options.
So do the past tense. <i>Will</i> past tense is <i>would</i> , right?	
	<i>would be able, would be able. Okay. Okay. Some said that they would be able</i>

(Grammar Communication task, based on review of *Stand and Deliver*, Ebert, 1990, pp. 699-700)

**Task Participants recalled choices from memory**

**Step 4.** Recall choices from Step 3, insert in cloze version of original passage, use in discussion while reconstructing passage:

..... (7) Since Andrew believes he _____ because of his illness, he plans to fight the firm in court.
(8) However, because of the firm's reputation, no lawyer in Philadelphia _____ handling his case. ...

Jigsaw Task (based on Ebert, 1997, pp. 593–594).

**Task Participants recalled forms, connected them to function and meaning while reconstructing passage:**

	Before we used <i>would risk</i> . It's a supposing sentence. Usually we use <i>would</i> ...
<i>Now I got it. This sentence is any lawyer will not risk. Right. So it means, I don't want to take that risk so. This is the future</i>	
	<i>Yeah. We know the difference use. Any lawyer would not listen. Would not. It's supposing, supposing sentence, right. If you would...</i>

Jigsaw Task (based on Ebert, 1997, pp. 593–594).

**1. Task implementation assisted attention to low salience forms:**

*Noticing:* 85-95% All participant pairs were able to notice forms, form differences and gaps when making decisions about text versions. This was especially prominent during Step 3—the choosing step.

*Awareness:* All pairs were able to demonstrate awareness during one or more steps.

*Recall:* All pairs were able to recall phrases with the targeted forms during cloze step

**2. Tasks differed in the extent to which their implementation drew attention to form, function, meaning.**

*Spot the Difference and Jigsaw > Grammar Communication*

**Study 3: Pica & Lee, 2009**

Purpose: To compare the effectiveness of Incidental, Implicit, and Explicit Formats on SLA processes/outcomes,

Noticing, Oral Production, and Knowledge (based on Grammaticality Judgment test scores)

Design: 6 pairs intermediate English L2 learners carried out 3 different formats of *Spot the Difference* tasks in their classrooms. Tasks designed to draw attention to Articles, Determiners.

*Noticing*: All participants showed notable gains.

*Production*: Incidental and Explicit participants showed greatest gains.

*Knowledge*: Explicit participants showed notable gains. Others made no gains.

Participants: •52 volunteers – 44 participants

•6 pairs – implicit/explicit, 7 pairs – incidental, 3 pairs – control group

1.2 weeks

2.30 minutes of task treatment and 1 hour of exposure to language

3.2 treatment sessions per week (120 minutes)

•Pre and Post Tests of Noticing, Knowledge, Production Accuracy of Article Form/Function/Meaning Relationships

Design of Study : Preliminary Activities> Individual Interviews,Pretests>Instruction, Research Activities					
Session 1	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4	Session 5	Session 6
Experimental and Control Participants Complete individual Pretests	All Participants discuss theme related to Passage 1*Experimental and Control Participant Pairs carry out/read respective Task /Passage 1.	All Participants discuss theme related to Passage 2* Experimental and Control Participant Pairs carry out/read respective Task /Passage 2	All Participants discuss theme related to Passage 3*Experimental and Control Participant Pairs carry out/read respective Task/Passage 3	All Participants discuss theme related to Passage4* Experimental and Control Participant Pairs carry out/read respective Task/Passage 4	Experimental and Control Participants Complete individual Posttests

\*Passages taken from Mims & Nollen (2000); adjusted for consistency in length and number of items.

**Comparison by SLA Processes and Outcomes: Observations and Inferences**

<b>Noticing</b>		
<b>Observations:</b>	<b>Further analysis:</b>	<b>Inferences:</b>
<p>Explicit, Implicit, and Control: consistent pre- and post –test percentage scores. Incidental: Considerable improvement</p>	<p>Cloze section of task treatments: Each Cohort retained a level of similar Noticing during each task treatment. Incidental: Post test score elevated by absence of participants with low pre-test and task treatment scores</p> <p>Participants’ oral discourse during task implementation: Noticing, Learner Involvement among all Cohorts: Searched for, forms, identified as different, compared them with partners’, evaluated appropriateness, accuracy, referred to them during cloze passage.</p>	<p>Possible that all three approaches were effective for task implementation and completion, But their impact on Noticing required a greater number of task treatments and a longer study duration.</p>
<b>Knowledge</b>		
<b>Observations:</b>	<b>Further analysis</b>	<b>Inferences</b>
<p>Explicit and Control: Similar patterns in scores and gains Implicit: Little change Incidental: Lower pre-test scores; highest gains</p>	<p>Interim tests of Knowledge after Task Treatments: Implicit: Consistent with pre and post-test scores Incidental, Explicit: Progression throughout.</p> <p>Oral discourse during Treatment Tasks:Evidence of appropriateness judgments, Learner Involvement.</p> <p>All Cohorts searched for, advanced forms identified as different, compared with partners’, evaluated appropriateness, accuracy.</p>	<p>Explicit and Incidental Approaches promoted Attention and Learner Involvement in distinct, but important ways for SLA: Explicit: Form focused correction, instruction on final step of Treatment Tasks. Incidental: Decisions and deliberations about noun and modifier appropriateness entailed repetition of same and different nouns and modifiers in phrases encoded with same, accurate articles.Implicit: Greater challenge during decisions and deliberations on noun phrase appropriateness: focused on locating low salience articles only. Likely to have performed better with Form focused correction, instruction, based on results of Explicit Approach, which was exactly like Implicit Approach in all other steps. Might require more time to impact SLA.</p>
<b>Production Accuracy</b>		
<b>Observations:</b>	<b>Further analysis</b>	<b>Inferences</b>
<p>Explicit, Implicit, Incidental: comparable pre-test percentage scores, gains. .Control Cohort lowest pre-test scores; highest gain scores. Implicit: More modest gains, possibly due to task demands on time needed to identify word, phrase differences, choose which was better; did not require L2 production.</p>	<p>Oral discourse during Treatment Tasks: Evidence of oral production as Cohorts searched for, advanced forms identified as different, compared with partners’, evaluated appropriateness, accuracy</p>	<p>Explicit Approach: More opportunity for accurate articles production during Treatment Task Exercise. Incidental Approach: More opportunity for accurate articles production during Choosing step, as accurate article is used by participants in two different noun phrases/task.</p>

<b>Comparison by Cohort: Observations and Inferences</b>			
<b>Explicit</b>	<b>Implicit</b>	<b>Incidental</b>	<b>Control</b>
<p>Highest pre-test scores in Knowledge.</p> <p>Highest post scores, gains in Production Accuracy.</p> <p>Production Accuracy: opportunities for conversation and discussion through study participation, participants from large pool of applicants, eager to participate because research was classroom based, content focused, conversational.</p> <p>Declines in Knowledge and Noticing scores possibly due to Treatment Task demands: More focused attention to form differences; no opportunity for follow up instruction and corrective feedback.</p>	<p>Highest pre-test scores in Knowledge, Noticing; Highest gains in Production Accuracy</p> <p>Production Accuracy: opportunities for conversation and discussion through study participation, participants from large pool of applicants, eager to participate because research was classroom based, content focused, conversational.</p> <p>Knowledge: Demands of sentence comparison, instruction and correction invited learner involvement, accurate focus on form in the context of meaning</p>	<p>Highest pre-test percentage scores in Knowledge. Highest post-test percentage scores, gains in Production Accuracy.</p> <p>Considerable development of Noticing. Performed better and displayed continual development more than other Cohorts</p> <p>Possibly due to emphasis on locating differences in meaning of noun phrases with same, accurate articles in each task. More noticeable differences in premodifiers and nouns, e.g. ‘the old clock’ vs. ‘the old watch’ allowed participants to produce more language, hear more accurate phrases, notice their features.</p>	<p>Highest pre-test scores in Knowledge, Noticing</p> <p>Highest post-test scores, gains in Production Accuracy.</p> <p>Opportunities for conversation and discussion offered by participation in the study. Higher pre test scores for Noticing and Knowledge, remained relatively low in post testing. Possibly due to exclusion from Treatment Task participation and accompanying opportunities to practice Noticing, build grammar knowledge through production of article form in two noun phrase contexts/task.</p>

## Discussion

1. An Incidental Approach that uses Spot the Difference Tasks with Meaning Focused Phrase Differences might be more effective for L2 Noticing, Knowledge, Production Accuracy than an Implicit Approach that uses Spot the Difference Tasks with Form Focused Morpheme Differences or an Explicit Approach that uses these same Form Focused Tasks and follows them up with Form Focused Instruction.
2. Possible reasons for the effectiveness of an Incidental Approach. It provides opportunities for learners to do the following:
  - 2a. Hear and read correct encodings of articles in context, as produced by themselves and each other.
  - 2b. Hear and read correct articles in two times as many np contexts
  - 2c. Receive modified, meaningful input and produce modified, meaningful output that extends beyond input flood or output practice.
3. Whether an Incidental Approach would be effective without a Spot the Difference task could not be determined by results of this study.
4. When designing tasks for promoting SLA of low salience features, teachers should use **phrase** function and meaning as a unit of design. For example, they should provide phrases that cover multiple contexts:

To make articles salient to learners, teachers should make sure the articles occur in exophoric, anaphoric, unique contexts, with two different nouns or modifiers in each context.

To make verb ending differences salient, they should make sure the endings are used with each of two different verbs that introduce, background, generalize, and detail information, or that make temporal and spatial references with pronouns and adverbs.
5. Choosing, Recalling, and Comparing *the old clock* and *the old watch* might be a more effective way for learners to notice, acquire, and produce correct forms of articles *a*, *the*, and  $\emptyset$  than Choosing, Recalling, and Comparing *an old clock* and *the old clock*.
6. Overall Success of the Cohorts was consistent with Cognitive and Learner Involvement Constructs

## Selected References

- Brumfit, C. J., & Johnson, K. (1979). (Eds). *The communicative approach to language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Doughty, C. & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form, In: C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 114-138.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- Long, M. (1980). *Input, interaction, and second language acquisition*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1980).
- Long, M. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition, *In*: H. Winitz (Ed.): *Native and Foreign Language Acquisition* (Vol. 379): *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, pp. 259-278.
- Fuente, de la, M. J. (2002). Negotiation and oral acquisition of L2 vocabulary: the roles of input and output in the receptive and productive acquisition of words, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 81-112.
- Gass, S., & Alvarez Torres, M. (2005). Attention when? an investigation of the ordering effect of input and interaction, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27, 1-31.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second-language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258-286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: differential effects on L2 development, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25, 1-36.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 541-577.
- Joe, A. (1998). What effect do text-based tasks promoting generation have on incidental vocabulary learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 357-377.
- Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness, *Language Awareness* 3, 73-93.
- Laufer, B., & Hulstijn, J. (2001). Incidental vocabulary acquisition in a second language: The construct of task-induced involvement. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 1-26.
- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development: beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 25, 37-63.
- Long, M., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA, *The Modern Language Journal* 82, 357-371.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: theory, research, and practice, *In*: C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 15-41.
- Mackey, A., & McDonough, K. (2000). Communicative tasks, conversational interaction and linguistic form: An empirical study of Thai, *Foreign Language Annals* 33, 82-91.
- Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development, *System* 30, 459-477.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal* 82, 338-356.

- McDonough, K. (2005). Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses on ESL question development, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 27, 79-103.
- Mims, J. & Nollen, E. *Mirror on America*. (2000). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms, *Language Learning* 50, 617-673.
- Newton, J., & Kennedy, G. (1996). Effects of communication tasks on the grammatical relations marked by second language learners, *System* 24, 309-322.
- Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition, *ELT Journal* 47, 203-210.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 17, 459-481.
- Pica, T., Kang, H., & Sauro, S. (2006). Information gap tasks: Their multiple roles and contributions to interaction research methodology, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 301-338.
- Prabhu, S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher, in M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks, Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing*, Harlow, Longman.
- Smith, B. (2005). The relationship between negotiated interaction, learner uptake, and lexical acquisition in task-based computer-mediated communication, *TESOL Quarterly* 39, 33-58.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition, *The Modern Language Journal* 83, 1-22.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection, In: C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 64-81.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together, *The Modern Language Journal* 82, 320-337.
- Takashima, H., & Ellis, R. (1999). Output enhancement and the acquisition of the past tense, In: R. Ellis (Ed.), *Learning a Second Language through Interaction*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 173-188.
- Van den Branden, K., Bygate, N., & Norris, J. (2009). *Task-Based Language Teaching: A Reader*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/non-native conversation: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 71-90.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*, Harlow, Longman.