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One of the highlights for the TBL SIG so far was the success of last year’s ‘TBLT in Asia’ conference, which attracted numerous quality presentations from teachers and researchers throughout Asia. We are looking forward to putting together another great conference next spring, so please stay tuned for further details coming very soon. As for this issue, we are pleased to provide you with two feature articles focussing on the somewhat under-researched areas of TBLT-based assessment. First, we welcome a featured article from one of the plenary speakers at last year’s conference, Yuko Goto Butler. This paper discusses a number of issues concerning the implementation of task-based language assessment with young learners. She explains that special considerations need to be made when conducting TBLT assessment with young learners, such as limiting the cognitive load of tasks. She also discusses the goals of such assessment and stresses that rather than measurement-based assessment, with young learners, teachers should be approaching it as “assessment for learning”. Our second feature, from Daniel O. Jackson, also examines task-based assessment and its role within English language teacher development courses. He explains how assessment can be used as a way of raising students’ self-awareness regarding their ability to teach English.

The lesson plans in this issue begin with Joseph Simpson who provides an interactive task in which students have to design a new invention and describe its qualities. Colin Thompson’s lesson plan is based on the topic of food. Students have to design international food menus for their university cafeteria. Finally, Stephen Case provides lesson plan that involves using and adapting a motivating iPad game, Scribblenauts.

Finally, if you are interested in publishing a full-length article or lesson plan in OnTask, please contact Colin Thompson or Justin Harris at tbltinasia@gmail.com

TBL SIG の歴史における重要事項の一つは、昨年の TBL アジア学会が成功裏に終了したことです。この学会では、アジア全土の教師や研究者による数多くの優れたプレゼンテーションが行われました。私たちは、来年の春に行われる次回の学会を計画中です。詳細は間もなく発表されますので、お待ちください。本号には、これまで研究があまり行われていない、TBLT ベースの評価という分野に焦点を当てた特集論文を 2 本掲載しています。特集論文の 1 本目は、昨年の学会におけるプレナリー・スピーカー、バトラー後藤裕子によるものです。この論文では、年少の学習者（5〜12 歳）に対してタスクに基づく言語能力の評価を実施する際に生じる多くの問題について論じています。彼女は、この年齢の学習者に対して TBLT ベースの評価を行う際には特別な配慮（タスクの認知負荷を制限すること等）が必要となることを説明しています。また彼女は、このような評価の目的について述べ、さらに、年少の学習者に対しては測定ベースの評価方法を用いるのではなく、「学習のための評価」を行うべきであるということを強調しています。ジャクソン・ダニエルによる 2 本目の特集論文も、タスクに基づく評価およびそれが英語教師育成コースにおいて果たす役割について述べています。彼らは、学生たちが自分の英語教育能力について持つ自己認識を向上させるために評価がどのように役立つかについて説明しています。

本号掲載の授業計画の1つ目はシンプソン・ジョゼフによるものです、学生・生徒が新しい発明品を考案し、その特性について説明するというインタラクティブなタスクを紹介しています。2 つ目のトンプソン・コリンの授業計画は、食べ物に関するトピックに基づくものです。学生たちは、自分の大学のカフェテリア向けに国際的なフード・メニューを考案しなければなりません。3 つ目の授業計画はケース・スティーブンによるもので、学習者のモチベーションを高めるデジタル・ゲーム（Scribblenauts という iPad ゲーム）を活用する方法です。

最後に、論文または授業計画を OnTask で発表したいお考えの方は、トンプソン・コリンまたはハリス・ジャスティン（tbltinasia@gmail.com）までご連絡ください。
Introduction

The number of young learners of foreign language (FL), English in particular, has been on the rise around the world. Many governments have introduced English as part of the formal school curricula at the primary school level—and even at the pre-primary school level in some nations. Accordingly, there is a growing demand for ways to assess foreign language learning among young learners. In many primary school classrooms, however, assessment is done largely on a trial-and-error basis.

Young learners, who are conventionally defined as children between the ages of 5 and 12 (or who are in primary school), have unique characteristics with respect to their language learning. They are in the process of cognitive, linguistic, and social-emotional development. They are also still developing their first language, which in turn certainly influences their foreign-language learning. Because second-language acquisition research and practice has primarily focused on adult learners, the knowledge and techniques derived from this research may not always apply to young learners.

Considering children’s strong drive to construct meaning through interacting with others, task-based language teaching is suitable for their FL learning. Indeed, various tasks and activities, such as games and role playing, have been widely used in primary school English lessons. Given the importance of aligning learning and assessment, task-based language assessment is likely a good approach for assessing young learners. Due to young learners’ unique, age-related characteristics, however, educators need to be especially careful when planning and administering tasks for assessment and when interpreting and using the assessment results.

In this article I describe a number of important issues for educators to consider when implementing task-based assessment for young foreign-language learners. I begin by discussing characteristics of young FL learning that should be taken into account before implementing task-based language teaching (TBLT) with this group. I then address some important considerations that are necessary when implementing task-based assessment for young learners.

Characteristics of young FL learning and tasks

Young FL learners are distinct from other language learners in a number of ways. Their levels of cognitive, linguistic, and socio-affective maturity are typically higher than those of children learning their first language (child L1 learners) but lower than those of adult L2 learners. Young FL learners’ life experiences also differ from those of both child L1 learners and adult L2 learners. Researchers and educators should take these unique, age-related characteristics into account when conceptualizing and designing tasks for young FL learners.

Even what constitutes a “task” often differs for young FL learners. Although researchers define “tasks” in slightly different ways, they generally agree that tasks involve real-world language use...
(Skehan, 1998). But as Cameron (2001) pointed out, when dealing with young FL learners, what counts as “real-world language use” is not entirely clear, primarily due to children’s limited life experiences. For instance, many young FL learners may not use the target language in daily life or may not clearly envision themselves using it in real life. Thus Cameron suggested that when designing tasks for young learners, educators should strive for “dynamic congruence” (p. 30), meaning that the tasks should be based on their age and life experiences, rather than the “real” or “authentic” use of the target language. For example, because many children are interested in stories and fantasies, these features could be incorporated into tasks. And in addition to integrating different skill domains (e.g., listening, speaking, reading, and writing), integrating kinetic elements such as drawing and creating objects in tasks appears to be an effective way to gain young FL learners’ attention.

The age-related characteristics of young learners also influence the effectiveness of TBLT. In the following sections, I describe the role of age in TBLT by following Robinson’s (2001) framework for understanding learners’ task performance. The framework is composed of three factors: task complexity, task condition, and task difficulty.

**Task complexity**

Task complexity refers to cognitive factors underlying task features and implementation (Robinson, 2001). According to Robinson, we can change the cognitive demand of tasks by manipulating sets of features represented in two dimensions: the resource-directing dimension and the resource-depleting dimension. For example, we can reduce attentional and memory demand by reducing the number of elements that learners have to deal with in a task (an example of resource-directing) and by giving learners time to plan for the task prior to the task engagement (an example of resource-depleting).

When designing and implementing tasks for young learners, it is critical to carefully examine the cognitive demand of the tasks. For example, telling a story based on pictures—a common task in English classrooms for young learners— involves a number of cognitively taxing elements for young learners, depending on their cognitive maturity. In order to complete the task, children need to extract important information from multiple pictures, make sense of such information, introduce characters and scenes, and construct plots sequentially while considering the listener’s point of view. While a certain degree of cognitive challenge in any given task is desirable, if the challenge exceeds the child’s capacity (or what Vygotsky called the child’s zone of proximal development [Vygotsky, 1978]), then the task is not only ineffective but also potentially lowers the child’s motivation.

There are a number of different ways to control the complexity of tasks along Robinson’s dimensions, including using fewer pictures, providing the pictures in the right order, using a simpler plot line, and offering sufficient planning time. Cognitive demand can also be reduced by incorporating more scaffolding by teachers and peers, such as whole-class brainstorming of main plots and ideas, and allowing children to work together (Pinter, in press).

**Task conditions**

Task conditions concern interactive elements related to the task; namely, participation requirements to conduct tasks (e.g., whether information flows only from one participant to the other [one-way] or flows in both directions [two-ways]) and learners’ variables related to the interaction (e.g., gender and power-relationships among the task participants) (Robinson, 2001). The body of research on young learners’ interaction during tasks remains very limited, and the information we do have is mostly from L2 learning contexts as opposed to FL contexts, but evidence suggests that young learners can benefit from interactive tasks.

Oliver and her colleagues (e.g., Mackey, Oliver, & Leeman, 2003; Oliver, 1998, 2002) have conducted a number of studies on young L2
learners’ interaction during tasks. According to these researchers, compared with adult pairs, child pairs had fewer comprehension checks but more self- and other-repetitions. The researchers interpreted these results as a sign of developmental difference; specifically, children concentrated more on constructing their own meaning rather than understanding others. Nonnative English-speaking pairs produced more negotiation of meaning and mutual corrections than pairings of native speakers with non-native speakers, perhaps because nonnative pairs completed tasks as equal problem-solvers, whereas in pairings of native English speakers with nonnative speakers, the native speakers served as expert solvers.

Depending on the nature of interaction and children’s age, children may find it hard to work on tasks with their peers. Carpenter, Fujii, and Kataoka (1995) found that paired tasks among FL learners ranging in age from 5 to 10 did not work well because one of the children in the dyads tended to dominate the tasks or used their L1 excessively. This finding led the researchers to conclude that using paired tasks as a form of assessment would be “extremely problematic” (p. 168). Zeng and I (Butler & Zeng, 2014, 2015) found a developmental difference in interactional patterns among FL learners in China; whereas some dyads of 9- and 10-year-old children had problems working collaboratively, depending on the tasks’ interactional requirement, pairings of 11- and 12-year-old children could complete tasks collaboratively.

Task difficulty

Task difficulty refers to learners’ perceptions of how demanding tasks are, and it can be determined by their affective variables (e.g., motivation) and ability-based variables (e.g., aptitude and proficiency) (Robinson, 2001). A number of studies conducted across different regions have shown that young children tend to show high motivation to learn FL but that their motivation declines sometime toward the end of their primary school years (e.g., Carreira, 2012 for a case in Japan). Children’s confidence levels drop at around the same time. While researchers don’t fully understand the reasons for such declines, we suspect that young learners’ perceptions of task difficulty increase as their motivation and confidence drop. It is also important to factor in the role of anxiety in children’s perceptions of task difficulty.

Research indicates that some children start developing anxiety at an early stage of their FL learning. Finally, although it may not yet be particularly salient in Japan, in many parts of the world it is increasingly common to observe substantial proficiency gaps among upper-grade primary school students. When students with a range of proficiency levels occupy a single classroom, teachers often find it challenging to implement pedagogical strategies, including TBLT, that meet the needs of all students.

Task-based assessment for young learners

As the preceding sections make clear, educators and researchers should carefully consider the ways that young FL learners’ unique age-related characteristics can influence the implementation of TBLT. It only makes sense, then, that equal consideration is warranted when using task-based assessments for young FL learners. Given space constraints, in the following sections I focus on three major points: (a) using age-appropriate tasks and formats for assessment; (b) placing “learning” as the core of assessment; and (c) enhancing learners’ confidence and autonomy through assessment.

Using age-appropriate tasks and formats for assessment

Tasks that work well as classroom activities for young learners may not necessarily be effective assessment tools. When children realize that they are being assessed, they may become overly conscious and behave differently. In two recent articles, Zeng and I
argue that children need to be socialized into the world of assessment (Butler & Zeng, 2013, 2014). So the first order of business when using task-based assessments is to make sure that the children understand what they are expected to do during the assessment, which in turn requires that children have a certain degree of cognitive and socio-cognitive maturity.

Children also tend to be very sensitive to pragmatic roles that teachers or other assessors play during the assessment. For example, Carpenter et al. (1995) described how during a one-to-one interview assessment (a teacher-child dyad task assessment), children aged 5-10 were puzzled when their teachers asked them to name objects in pictures if the teacher also saw the pictures. This is an important finding because the one-to-one interview format is a popular oral assessment format for young learners, and because it’s often the case that teachers can see the object that they ask their students to name.

The teacher-child dyad task format has an advantage in that the teacher can tailor questions and topics according to individual students’ proficiency levels and communication styles. The format allows teachers to stretch children’s abilities, making it particularly valuable when used with children who are less proficient, less confident, and less proactive. The teacher-child format tends to elicit limited types of interactive responses from the children, however, and the elicited language often looks like a reflection of an Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) discourse pattern—a typical teacher-centered discourse pattern in classrooms. In contrast, a child-child paired-task assessment format (two children engage in task assessment as opposed to teacher-child dyad assessment) can elicit a wider range of interactive responses from children. However, teachers’ careful oversight is necessary if the child pairs cannot work collaboratively (Butler, 2011).

## Placing “learning” as the core of assessment

Measuring young learners’ FL proficiency is meaningful only if it directly helps their learning. The notion of assessment for learning, a concept that has received substantial attention in recent assessment research, is therefore particularly relevant to assessing young learners. As opposed to measurement-based notion of assessment (assessment of learning), the primary purpose of which is to measure learners’ outcome of learning, assessment for learning is primarily concerned with capturing a process of learning in order to inform and assist students’ on-going learning.

Teachers play a critical role in the assessment process—after all, they are in the position of closely observing children’s daily learning. In order to make the assessment formative and diagnostic, it is important for teachers to acquire sufficient diagnostic competence, or “the ability to interpret students’ foreign language growth, to skillfully deal with assessment material and to provide students with appropriate help in response to this diagnosis” (Edelenbos & Kubanek-German, 2004, p. 260). After observing teachers’ assessment practices in primary school FL classes, Edelenbos and Kubanek-German identified a list of skills and actions that exhibit teachers’ diagnostic competence. Such skills and actions include giving “concrete examples of an individual child’s language growth,” recognizing “from a child’s face if he/she has understood an
instruction or a key sentence in a story,” and analyzing test material (see Edelenbos & Kubanek-German, 2004, p. 279, for the complete list of skills). To develop such competence, teachers must have sufficient training.

Assessment should provide young learners with positive learning experiences and an achievable next goal. Efforts have been made to better understand young learners’ FL development trajectories so that benchmarks can be developed. For instance, although the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) was not originally designed for young learners, researchers and practitioners are currently developing sublevels within the lowest levels (A1 and A2) for young learners and creating corresponding “can do” descriptors (e.g., “I can name colors”). Such descriptors would help teachers provide reliable feedback to young learners, but it is also important to understand that there are substantial individual differences in children’s FL learning. Not everybody progresses in a way that matches the descriptors. Flexible and individualized approaches to assessment appear to be indispensable for young learners.

Finally, in assessment for learning, remember that children are not merely subjects being assessed but that they are active participants of assessment. They should be actively involved in making inferences about their own performance and in taking actions with the help of teachers and capable peers during the assessment (Brookhart, 2003).

Enhancing learners’ confidence and autonomy through assessment

Children are very vulnerable to teachers’ and parents’ attitudes toward assessment. Some researchers suggest that the relatively quick decline in motivation to learn FL among children as they progress through primary school may be partially due to their negative experience with assessment (e.g., negative results on assessments) and pressure to perform well on assessments (e.g., Kim & Seo, 2012, for a case in Korea). Assessment results may have a long-lasting influence—positive or negative—on children’s successive FL learning outcomes.

Self-assessment is often used as part of TBLT. Self-assessment is a way to promote learners' self-reflection and this, in turn, may help them become autonomous learners. In other words, self-assessment is not merely an assessment tool but can be used as an instructional tool as well. The aforementioned “can do” statements, which are a type of self-assessment, might be a good resource for young FL learners.

Although “can do” statements and other forms of self-assessment have been popular research topics, self-assessment does not seem to have much of a presence in classrooms. Teachers and parents may have doubts about the extent to which self-assessment can obtain accurate information of young learners’ performance. It is important to remember, however, that such concerns likely originate from the traditional measurement-based notion of assessment (i.e., assessment of learning), which is primarily designed for summative purposes. If teachers want to use self-assessment for summative purposes, they indeed need to pay close attention to the selection of age-appropriate assessment tasks, item construction, the context in which self-assessment is conducted, and children’s experience of judging their self-appraisal.

When self-assessment is used for formative purposes (i.e., assessment for learning), the accuracy of students’ responses is less critical. Instead, self-assessment should be designed to help young learners understand the goal of the task, monitor their learning process in relation to the goal, and identify what steps to take to reach the goal. The self-assessment needs to be designed to highlight children’s feeling of accomplishment. Again, teachers’ role in this process is crucial. Research has shown that if teachers do not subscribe the spirit of assessment for learning, the effect of self-assessment on children’s learning remains minimal (e.g., Butler & Lee, 2010).
Conclusion

In sum, while task-based assessment is likely suitable for use with young FL learners, a number of age-related considerations are necessary for its successful implementation. To better understand the interplay between various age-related factors and children's task-based learning, more research is essential.
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Task-based assessment and pre-service teacher development in TESOL methods courses

Daniel O. Jackson
Kanda University of International Studies

Introduction

The rich, complex, and long-term projects associated with TBLT call for revised classroom assessment practices. For instance, task-based assessment, the use of which involves evaluating performances against set benchmarks, can ensure that learners thoroughly understand task goals, so that they not only achieve desired outcomes, but also consequently reflect on how their actions relate to the development of language skill, content mastery, or both. This brief article describes how task-based assessment criteria may support learning outcomes related to English language teaching. It is based on a classroom research project carried out in a language teaching methods course at a university in Tokyo (Jackson, 2012).

Research on task-based language teacher education has sprung up in a range of international contexts, among them Belgium, Canada, and Venezuela. In these studies, various methods of teacher training were employed to introduce task-based syllabuses (Van den Branden, 2006), bring about positive dispositions toward beliefs associated with TBLT (Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010), or offer firsthand knowledge of pre-, during-, and post-task cycles (Chacón, 2012). One key assumption of the present study was that, because teacher cognition is informed by, among other sources, how teachers are taught and assessed, introducing task-based approaches during pre-service teacher training may promote understanding and adoption of TBLT in Japan.

As noted, data for the present study were collected at a Tokyo university, locating this investigation in a regional context where the use of tasks in language education is on the rise. Robertson and Jung (2006) curated a special issue on TBL in Asia addressing many of the practicalities of using tasks in this environment, including devising and implementing tasks for EFL learners in Japan. Next, Adams and Newton (2009) guest edited a volume documenting the opportunities presented, and the challenges posed, when utilizing pedagogic tasks in this region. More recently, Butler (2011) identified conceptual, classroom-level, and societal-institutional constraints on communicative language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region and, based on recent studies, recounted how TBLT has been adopted and adapted within it. This adaptation to local concerns often requires careful consideration of task authenticity and the role of grammar, among other factors. Also commonly cited in these reports is a concern for the nature of task-based assessment, which, as a criterion-referenced approach is at odds with the norm-referenced approach inherent in many popular, large-scale examinations.

Task-based assessment practices have long been put forth as a complement to TBLT. Brindley (1994) held that task-centered assessment should be valued as it encourages learner involvement. Particularly relevant to this classroom study are the formative, as opposed to summative, uses of task-based assessment. The former refers to classroom assessment for learning during ongoing instructional phases, while the latter refers to higher-stakes assessment of learning at a given time-point after instruction. Formative uses of task-based assessment include...
communicating task expectations, offering guidelines on performance, providing detailed feedback, establishing assessment cycles, and understanding learner development (Norris, 2009). It is also claimed that such uses encourage learner motivation, awareness, and reflection. For example, based on a recent study conducted at a university in Japan, Weaver concluded that the cycle of use and feedback within formative task-based assessment supports learning because it “can help transform hindsight into foresight” (2012, p. 307). In other words, by providing learners with meaningful feedback during their performance of classroom tasks potentially relevant to their career goals, task-based assessment may help learners develop an awareness of their capacity for using language in subsequent tasks and in communicative encounters later on. The substantial insight offered by these and other contributions (e.g., O’Dwyer, 2012) notwithstanding, examples of how task-based assessment can be implemented in university classrooms remain relatively scarce.

Context, goals, and tasks

To address the gap in work on formative task-based assessment, the present paper reports a study based on an English language program seminar course at a private university in Tokyo. The title of this undergraduate course was Approaches to TESOL. Fifteen second-year English majors enrolled and voluntarily participated in the study. Their level of communicative competence was high, as nearly all had lived abroad in English-speaking countries. The course met during two 90-minute meetings per week over one semester. At the beginning of the course, roughly 47% of students expressed interest in teaching English as a potential career choice, and this number increased to 80% by the end of the semester.

The course syllabus listed a number of objectives, as indicated in Figure 1. These objectives were facilitated through course readings, in-class lectures, group discussions, video-based listening activities, brief in-class exercises and quizzes, homework assignments, and short written

Figure 1. Course objectives from the Approaches to TESOL syllabus.

By the end of this course students will...

- Know about a range of learner difference factors
- Understand the roles and responsibilities of teachers
- Consider what their strengths and weaknesses as a teacher might be
- Identify principles underlying various language teaching methods
- Learn language for describing English
- Be familiar with inductive and deductive approaches to teaching English
- Assess the importance of practice in learning English
- Experience planning, teaching, and reflecting on English lessons
- Read assigned and self-selected texts about TESOL
- Facilitate a group discussion based on their reading
- Recognize about a hundred key words and phrases understood by English teachers
- Practice listening to lectures about classroom language learning
- Write a brief report about a class topic of interest
- Reflect on how their beliefs about teaching English have changed
reports, as well as by a four-week series of teaching tasks.

The four-week task sequence, which was based on a needs analysis, consisted of the following group tasks: (a) planning a lesson, (b) teaching the lesson, (c) observing another lesson, and (d) reflecting with peers. Assessment criteria were communicated to students via a list of can-do statements specific to each task (see Appendix). These criteria were presented and discussed in class at the beginning of the four-week sequence, regularly during planning and performance, and upon completion of each task. Given the students’ English proficiency, the program goals, and the course objectives listed in Figure 1, it was expected that students would use English to carry out the tasks.

Methods

Broadly, this paper aims to shed light on how task-based assessment practices may raise Japanese university students’ awareness of their ability to teach English lessons. To this end, the study aimed to examine links between task-based assessment criteria and course participants’ comments on the learning outcomes they attained. At the end of each assessment cycle, students were asked to write open-ended comments in response to the question, “what outcomes do you feel you have achieved so far?” This paper applied a case study approach to these data. Details of the assessment tool used to specify task guidelines at each stage will be described and then data from students’ retrospective written comments will be analyzed.

Results

This section presents the results for each of the teaching tasks in the order in which they were carried out in class. The analysis was based on a total of 53 written comments gathered over the four-week period. The examples in Table 1 were chosen because they relate to this study’s goal of exploring possible connections between the assessment criteria used and student learning outcomes. All names below are pseudonyms.

Planning a lesson

Prior to anything else, teaching involves preparing materials and planning lessons. In class, students joined a group who shared an interest in a given school setting (e.g., high school or university) and planned a joint lesson for their target population. Once written up, the plans were then uploaded to a course website for review by the instructor, who provided feedback on them. Materials needed (e.g., a white board) were also given thought at this stage.

The assessment criteria for this task specified its minimum requirements. On the basis of these criteria, students were able to make connections indicating that they valued planning. Their comments related to both the general and specific advantages of planning. For instance, one student reflected on, “how important it is to have a plan when you teach in class” (Naoki) and another specifically noted “the usefulness of brainstorming” in groups (Takeshi).

Nonetheless, it must also be recognized that merely planning a lesson does not give one a complete understanding of what it is like to actually teach. In this regard, students also considered the limitations of planning. As Yukiko emphatically suggested, practice may be more valuable for teacher development than planning (see Table 1).

Teaching the lesson

Essentially, teaching is a complex activity—this is equally true of language teaching. The assessment criteria for this task referred to key elements of language teaching, including some discussed in the course text (Harmer, 2007). These criteria included using English skills strategically to teach English, engaging learners in the classroom, and maintaining a focus on language. During class, groups performed their demonstration lessons,
typically with one student in the teacher’s role and the others acting as students. The instructor videotaped the lessons and uploaded them to a course website for viewing during the next task in the sequence (described below).

The act of teaching prompted several written observations concerning the ability to use English to lead and manage classrooms, as students used their English to conduct the tasks. As shown in Table 1, Noriko and Eri commented on the necessity of speaking in a loud, clear voice, making eye contact, and using check questions. These comments are representative of those made by other students. Another theme that was related to the assessment, and to content covered in the seminar, was that of engaging learners. One person indicated that engagement with the class depends on the classroom circumstances (Marie). Yet another reflection speaks to the satisfaction of achieving a language focus. The lesson given by Daisuke focused on teaching teenage slang, hence the comment that, “I have achieved my goal upon teaching new things that the people their own age do”.

**Observing another lesson**

Because of their facilitative role in teacher development, peer observations were implemented in the seminar, in the following way. Each groups’ videotaped lesson was posted in a password-protected section of the course website. The task assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>What outcomes do you feel you have achieved so far?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lesson planning    | *I think I’ve achieved how to make a detailed plan for something. I’d never imagined how important it is to have a plan when you teach in class before I took this lesson.* (Naoki)  
*I realized the usefulness of brainstorming during group meetings.* (Takeshi)  
*We need to practice more than planning! Activities always take longer than expected.* (Yukiko) |
| Teaching demo      | *When teaching in front of a class, you need to speak clearly and loudly.* (Noriko)  
*Eye contacts and check questions to learners. So I can make sure if they understood.* (Eri)  
*I have learned that it is sometime difficult to teach something because the lesson is not always going as I expected. I have to learn more about handling the class depending on the circumstances.* (Marie)  
*I have achieved my goal upon teaching new things that the people their own age do.* (Daisuke) |
| Observation        | *How to exchange information and opinions about the lessons.* (Hirokazu)  
*By watching other peoples’ lessons you can have a broad viewpoint about giving a lesson. I have thought that there is no such thing as a “proper lesson” but it is essential to have variety and coherence in every lesson.* (Haruka)  
*I took notes while watching the video. I will do discussion according to the note.* (Masa) |
| Debriefing         | *I feel I’ve achieved how to find the points needed to be improved/every lesson would have some weak points, this could be helpful to improve each lesson.* (Naoki)  
*Other point of views that I’ve never had before because by talking with a lot of people about same topic and share some ideas, we get new informations.* (Taeko)  
*It is important, not only speak our opinion but also listening to others’ opinion. It is also important to respect others remark.* (Saya) |
criteria were designed to be analogous to those involved in coordinating a classroom observation by a teaching colleague in real life. Students invited peers to view their lesson, exchanged information pertaining to the location of the lesson (i.e., passwords), decided the purpose of the observation, watched the videos, and took notes to prepare for a later debriefing.

All students met these requirements. Focusing on their comments, we can see that the basic can-do statements served as a springboard for students’ thinking about the value of such actions. For instance, Hirokazu noted exchanging information and opinions as an achieved outcome. Haruka elaborated on outcomes related to watching the video-recorded lessons: “by watching other peoples’ lessons you can have a broad viewpoint about giving a lesson”. Students also viewed the task and its requirements as important preparation for the final discussion task, particularly Masa, who remarked that the notes would be useful to the discussion.

Reflecting with peers

In many debriefing sessions, the observer comments on the lesson, the teacher offers his or her perspective, and both reflect on alternatives that may enhance future instruction. The assessment criteria for the final peer group discussions stipulated providing and responding to comments. Even these simple directions were adequate to prompt student debriefings, as the task input they themselves provided took center stage. At this point, the course instructor rotated between groups, providing assistance as needed.

The comments here pertain to the roles of peer observation, other points of view, and collaborative dialogue in teacher development. Naoki discovered that there is always room for improvement and that reflecting with peers “could be helpful to improve each lesson”. Taeko considered the discussion to be a forum for the provision “of views that I’ve never had before”, which might lead to pedagogic alternatives. Saya pointed out that offering opinions is important, but so is listening respectfully to others’ remarks. This highlights the importance of collegiality in discussions about teaching.

Discussion

This article attempted to illustrate how task-based assessment was employed to motivate students to enact their own understandings of several teaching tasks. This helped raise their awareness of: (a) the strengths and limitations of planning lessons, (b) the challenges and rewards of teaching English, and (c) the roles and responsibilities inherent in teacher collaboration, as indicated in the reflections in Table 1. The practical use of task-based assessment here was to guide learners in their engagement with this pre-service teacher training course by setting expectations for their performances based on the actual demands of teaching. This, in turn, arguably enhanced the value of the course by linking its objectives to possible future uses of English for communicative purposes. In the present case, formative task-based assessment, which balances autonomy and support through clear communication of basic expectations and ongoing classroom dialogue, appeared to promote development in the area of English language teaching ability. If such assessment practices can inform subsequent teacher cognition, one final positive interpretation of this study is that participants gained exposure to task-based teaching and assessment, which, when properly implemented, may contribute to improving language education in the Asia-Pacific region.

Conclusion

The procedures outlined here could be adapted for other language teacher development courses, such as those at the Master’s level. However, it is also important to
note that the value and use of task-based assessment is not limited to this context. Assessment criteria such as those listed in the Appendix can be developed for a range of tasks, depending on students’ present and future needs. For instance, classroom tasks might be designed which relate to studying, volunteering, or working overseas. In each case, upon consideration of the multiple dimensions of relevant target tasks, the basic requirements should be listed and these requirements then compiled into a set of criteria to be used to guide instruction and assessment. Then, as a general guideline, teaching to the task implies that learners be given ample feedback and support in order to meet these criteria for success in the real world.

Footnotes

1. Criterion-referenced tests evaluate an examinee’s ability to perform based on ‘can-do’ statements without emphasizing comparison between test-takers.
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**Appendix. Assessment criteria for each teaching task**

**Collaboration in teacher development group: Did you…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...join a group with a shared interest in a grade level or school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...choose a role for yourself and tell it to your group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...help the members create a plan for the demonstration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...use English to communicate and collaborate within the group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...assist the group by providing something needed for your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interactive teaching demonstration: Did you…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...arrive prepared and on time for your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...demonstrate strategic knowledge of English (see Ch. 3 class notes)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...balance TTT [teacher talking time] and STT [student talking time] carefully?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...utilize elements for successful language learning (ESA [Engage, study, activate])?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...arrange seating appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...explain points, encourage practice, and employ feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...incorporate a language focus into your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer observation: Did you…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...invite a peer to observe your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...exchange information to enable them to view your lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...decide in advance the observation purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...watch your peer’s lesson?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...take notes related to the purpose of the observation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peer debriefing: Did you…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...arrive prepared and on time for your debriefing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...provide your peer with comments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...respond to comments provided by your peer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructor comments:**
Introduction

This speaking lesson is centred on the topic of new inventions. Students are asked to create a new product and provide reasons as to why it would be useful to other people. The objective of this interactive task is to broaden the learners’ ability to describe the good and bad qualities of an object; typically Japanese high school students’ vocabulary in this area is limited to words such as nice, good etc., while negative aspects would typically also be described using simplified terms such as bad or not good etc. The first part of the main task intends to foster in the learners the ability to describe the properties of an object using more precise terms e.g. it is made of paper so it is light, it has three engines so it is fast, it has a large handle so it is easy to hold etc. The second stage of the main task is designed to elicit vocabulary developed in the first stage in a context in which learners must express opinions, clarify information and reason with each other.

Preparation

Each student requires a printed copy of the example invention and task questions (Appendix 1). Students work in groups of four for the pre-task and part one of the main task, while in part two of the main task one member alternatingly joins another group to present the new invention created during part one.

Pre-task

Part 1. Place students in groups of four and ask them to compile a list of products they deem useful and the properties of the items that make them useful. The students should also consider any bad qualities the products may have. The teacher should then seek feedback from each group and use their answers to create a list of items and properties on the
blackboard. The teacher should clarify what is meant by each quality to ensure all students have understood their meaning. When compiling the list, the teacher should ask students to think of other products that share the same quality e.g. yes, a raincoat is light, what else is light? The table below provides an example of the pre-task list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invention</th>
<th>Good qualities</th>
<th>Bad qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a bed</td>
<td>comfortable</td>
<td>heavy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an iPhone</td>
<td>convenient</td>
<td>expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chopsticks</td>
<td>hygienic</td>
<td>difficult to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tent</td>
<td>easy to carry</td>
<td>cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a watch</td>
<td>compact</td>
<td>easy to break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a suit</td>
<td>stylish</td>
<td>difficult to clean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. Provide each student with a copy of the worksheet about Karl’s cushion pants (see appendix 1). Begin by reading through the text about Karl’s invention and then ask the class to identify the qualities that Karl believes make his invention useful, e.g. Karl believes his cushion pants are comfortable, convenient, and stylish. Secondly, elicit from the students which aspects of Karl’s design supports his claims e.g. Karl thinks his invention is comfortable because it has a cushion. Subsequently, in groups of four students answer questions 1 and 2 through group discussion. Students are encouraged to use bilingual dictionaries in order to find suitable new adjectives to describe Karl’s invention in line with their own opinions about the cushion pants. The teacher should then seek feedback from each group and write the students’ original opinions about Karl’s pants on the blackboard. The teacher should clarify the meaning of any new vocabulary used by an individual student to all of the students and ask them to think of other contexts in which that item could be applied: for example in the case of I think Karl’s pants are silly because the cushion is enormous, the teacher should elicit from the students other objects that could be described as silly e.g. a clown, and other objects that could be described as enormous, e.g. a giant.

Part 3. This step is done collectively and provides learners the opportunity to implement language that was presented in Part 2. The teacher should ask individual students to give reasons why they would or would not purchase Karl’s new invention, again compiling these on the blackboard e.g. Yuka wouldn’t buy Karl’s pants because they cost 9,500 which she thinks is too expensive.

**Task**

Part 1. In groups of four the students are asked to create a new invention. They should create a list of their invention’s good qualities and why it is useful to other people, while also considering any bad qualities their new product may have. The role of the teacher here is to
go to each group individually, monitor language use and, in preparation for Part 2, ask the students to present their new product to them e.g. *this is our robotic dog, we believe that it is helpful because it can clean your house*. The teacher should provide the language support needed to do this i.e. helping with accuracy, in preparation for part 2 of the task.

Part 2. The basis for this stage of the task is the television programme *Dragons’ Den*, a show in which inventors and entrepreneurs attempt to gain finance for their new products from a group of wealthy investors. In this part of the task one member of each group will go to another group’s table to ‘pitch’ their idea, i.e. *this is our robotic dog, we believe that it is…*. The member pitching the idea then asks members of the host group, who are acting as the *Dragons*, questions 1-3 from the previous worksheet. The pitching member collects the feedback and then returns to his original group to relay the feedback received. A different member of the group then goes to pitch the idea to another group and this pattern of rotation should continue the invention has been presented to all of the groups.

Report

Each group must choose their favourite design from amongst those that were showcased to them by the other groups and explain their decision to the rest of the class. The teacher should be actively listening for common errors during the presentations i.e. difficulties in transferring information that was presented to them in the 1st person during Part 2 of the task – *our invention is unique because we…* into the 3rd person - *their invention is useful because they created…*, which are then reported back to the learners after the presentations have been completed.

Language focus

1. Encourage learners to focus on the language required to complete each task: use adjectives other than *good* or *bad* and implement these new items appropriately when describing the positive and negative features of objects e.g. *our design has a solar panel which makes it efficient and environmentally-friendly*; support opinions with reasons e.g. *I would buy Karl’s invention because the cushion seems comfortable* or *I wouldn’t buy Karl’s invention because it is too expensive*; alternating between 1st and 3rd person e.g. *we think your design is useful because it moves quickly*, becoming *they think our design is useful because it moves quickly*.

2. The teacher should monitor for any newly acquired adjectives being applied inaccurately, and report such errors to the class, providing reasons why its use may be inappropriate in the given context.

Follow-up

This lesson can lead into a subsequent one in which the students launch their product and their group of four is treated as though it were a business. Each member is assigned a role e.g. treasurer, marketer, chairperson. The group will be responsible for creating an advertising campaign, pricings and costings for their product, deciding investment targets etc. As in the previous lesson, one member of the group will go to each of the other groups, however on this occasion the student pitching their invention will attempt to receive an investment in their product from a fund allocated to each group, as in the show *Dragons’ Den*. 
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Appendix

Karl’s Cushion Pants

Karl invented a pair of pants which contain a cushion so that when Karl sits down he feels comfortable. When Karl goes to the supermarket, he removes the cushion and uses the space as a shopping bag which he believes is very convenient. Karl likes the colour of his pants and thinks that they are stylish. Karl wants to sell his pants in Japan for ¥9,500. Here are some photographs of Karl’s cushion pants:

1. What in your opinion are the good qualities of this product?

2. What in your opinion are the bad qualities of this product?

3. Would you buy this product? Please explain your reasons.
Introduction

Does anyone enjoy the food from their university cafeteria? Given the budgets most universities have for providing meals, it’s nice to imagine what your university cafeteria could provide with an unlimited budget. In this lesson, students in groups will pretend they are in charge of their university cafeteria and for one week they can offer any international food they wish. Specifically, they have to design menus that include famous foods from a different country for each day of the week. The students have to perform two tasks. The main task follows on from task one. This lesson always seems to motivate my learners to use English as students tend to enjoy talking about food.

Preparation

Provide each group of 3/4 learners with a printed copy of the menu from the Appendix. For reasons of space in this issue, only a menu for Monday is offered. As a result, please edit the title of the menu to provide a copy for Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday so that each group receives five menus for each day of the week.

Pre-task

Part 1: Brainstorming. Place the students in groups of three or four. Ask them to think of three countries and to write down names of famous food from each one. Allocate about five minutes planning time for this and then elicit responses from each group and write them on the whiteboard. From the whole class, it should be possible to elicit at least five different countries with food products from each one. Provide written feedback with countries’ names such as “Italia”
becoming “Italy” and include the heading “Italian food” with the food dishes written underneath. 

Part 2: Inform the class that each group is to be put in charge of their university cafeteria and for one week they can provide any international food they wish. First, the groups must choose five countries so they can offer a famous meal from each country for each day of the week. Each student must think of their favourite five countries for food. Give the students a few minutes planning time to write down their choices on paper. Then inform the students that, in their groups, they will have to take turns agreeing or disagreeing with each other’s choice of country. To do this, ask the groups to think of phrases for agreeing and disagreeing. For example, write on the whiteboard “to agree, we say…” Give the class a couple of minutes planning time then elicit responses for agreeing such as “Me too”, “Yes, I agree”, as well as disagreeing “No, I don’t think so” etc.

Task

Instruct the students within their groups to take turns reading out their five country choices whilst the other group members agree or disagree with each one. When all the students have mentioned their choices, each group must decide on the five most popular countries. As the students do the task, monitor and provide corrective feedback where necessary. However, as the purpose of this task is to prepare students for the following main task, some L1 use is acceptable.

Pre-main task

Part 1: After completing task 1, each group should have their five country choices. Hand out a copy of the five food menus to each group. Inform the learners that the next task involves making a lunch menu using a different country for each day of the week. Instruct the groups to have a selection of food for each day, not just one dish. Students may or may not be familiar with terms such as ‘set meals’ or ‘dessert’ etc. I don’t pre-teach these terms. Instead I hold up one of the menus and instruct the students to choose one meal from their designated country, write down the name and then think of two ‘extra’ dishes, for example, ‘salad’. Inform the students that they have to give their opinions about what food they want on their menu. To do this, ask the groups to think of examples of how to express their opinions about the food they want. Write on the whiteboard, “to give opinions about the food we want, we can say…” Allocate a few minutes planning time for this then elicit responses and write them on the whiteboard. For example, “I like to eat pasta”, “I think pasta is good….”

Main task

Tell the groups that they have to write their chosen country’s name on the title of each menu and then decide on the food and drink for that day. Each student must give their opinion and agree or disagree with each other. After they have decided on the food, they can fill in the menu for each day. As the students discuss and complete the menus, monitor each group and provide corrective feedback where necessary. For example, the correct menu headings being ‘Italian’ not ‘Italy’.

Planning and Report

When the students have completed their menus, they then have to present them to the rest of the class as an oral presentation. The class then votes on the group with the best menus. With large class sizes, the class could be split in two to allow groups to present simultaneously. Provide planning time for the presentations (about 10 minutes). Again monitor each group as they prepare and provide feedback on errors produced. After planning time, each group stands up and presents their menus. Note any common errors observed during the presentations.
Language focus

1. Focus on errors produced during the main task. I find my learners’ range of English tends to be limited for making suggestions and expressing opinions therefore I like to provide suggestions with discourse markers. For example: “First, why don’t we have....” or “Second, how about having.....”

2. Provide alternative phrases for agreeing and disagreeing in the main task. I like to suggest different phrases from the standard terms used by students such as ‘Me too!’ For example: “I’m with you on that one”, “Excellent” or “No way! I’m not sure about that because.....”

3. Offer suggestions for describing information using discourse markers for presentations. I find discourse markers really help intermediate learners to explain things coherently. For example: “First, we like to have...”, “After that, the main dish is...”, “Finally, we have...”

Follow up

A homework activity could involve asking the students to find a restaurant near to where they live and to take a photo of the menu. They then have to translate the menu into English, and in the following class, present their menus in groups.
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Appendix – Example menu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday’s Menu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drinks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lesson Plan 3
Adapting an iPad game to a TBL class

Stephen Case
Baiko Gakuin University

- Key words: Digital Games, iPads, Written Outcome, Group Work, Imperatives
- Level: Beginner to Pre-Intermediate
- Age: High School or University
- Preparation time: 20 minutes
- Activity time: 90 minutes
- Materials: Copies of Appendix 1 for each student. One iPad for each group of students with a copy of Scribblenauts installed or one iPad that can be connected to a TV or projector.

Introduction

Using digital games in the classroom for training and education is not a new idea. Many digital games embody sound learning principles such as creative problem solving, persistence, attention to detail and effective collaboration. The content of digital games is often motivational and engaging in a way that traditional materials might not be, especially as digital games are already part of learners’ lives outside the classroom (Mawer & Stanley, 2011). In language teaching, educational digital games have been used to help with vocabulary acquisition (Ranalli, 2008) and improve willingness to communicate (Rankin, Gold & Gooch, 2006). However, as with bringing all authentic materials into the classroom, using digital games requires a principled approach which makes sure the game helps towards the achievement of learning outcomes.

This lesson plan shows how to adapt an iPad game, Scribblenauts, into a task based lesson resulting in written outcomes that focuses on imperatives and language for giving instructions. For example, level 1 of the game players are asked to “Cut down the tree and grab the real starlite” (collecting starlites is the currency of the game, like coins in a game like Mario). Players can do this in a variety of imaginative ways – for example a player may create an axe, chainsaw or even a beaver to accomplish the task. There are 16 ‘worlds’ with ten levels each. Each level presents a puzzle like the one above which the player must solve. To solve the puzzle you must create objects in the game by writing out what you need. The game has a huge library of nouns and adjectives so almost anything can be imaged and created. After each puzzle is solved, the next level unlocks and the player can progress onto new challenges.
The language of the game uses imperatives to give instructions. Scribblenauts can be used to teach both imperatives and ordinal phrases. Scribblenauts suits this target well. Each level has multiple tasks to complete and, as part of the task, students will have to explain how they solved it, step-by-step, in the post-task report. The language of the game is also appropriate for beginner students as 86% of words fall in the first 2000 of the New General Service List of the most frequent words in English.

**Preparation**

First the teacher should familiarize themselves with the game Scribblenauts. This will involve playing through the first ten levels a couple of times. This should take about 30 minutes. Depending on available resources an iPad will be needed for each group of 4-5 students in your class, or one iPad that can be connected to a TV or projector. The task plan explains how both can be done with maximum participation. Each iPad should have the game Scribblenauts installed on it. It is quick to download from the iTunes store, being only 179mb. A copy of the worksheet (see Appendix) should be made for each student.

**Procedure**

**Pre-Task**

**Step 1:** Show the class the first two levels of “World One” of the game. The first two levels are very simple and can be done in less than five minutes. Play each a few times demonstrating that there are multiple ways to complete each level of the game. Encourage students to contribute their own answers by calling on individual students to suggest items that might help solve tasks. After completing each level of the game, show the students the report paper (see Appendix). After students have given some of their own ideas on how to solve the level, you could write a short report on the board to demonstrate how to write one (See Appendix for an example). Show students how to use imperatives and ordinal phrases to write a report. The report examples have these phrases highlighted. The report should resemble what is known as a ‘walk-through’ which is essentially a list of instructions for how to successfully complete the game. Tell students that they will need to complete the first ten levels of the game and write a report for each level.

**Step 2:** Put students in groups and pass one iPad to each group. Check that each group can play the game and then give them approximately 45 minutes to complete the first “World” (ten levels) of the game. Tell them to check the words in the vocabulary list as they encounter them in the game.

For a large class with just one iPad connected to a projector or TV:

**Step 2:** Choose a student to assume the teacher role and come to the front to control the game. Other students have to offer solutions for the puzzle. Again, give them approximately 45 minutes to complete the first “World”, ten levels, of the game. Tell them to check the words in the vocabulary list as they encounter them in the game.

**Task**

**Step 1:** Students play through the first ten levels of the game. This involves reading and understanding the instructions that each level presents and then working out how to solve the puzzle. Students should rotate who is in control of the iPad. Students should be taking notes on
how they complete each level to write the reports later (See Appendix 1). The teacher should circulate, help and monitor.

**Step 2:** All students should complete their report forms detailing how they completed each level of the game.

**Post-Task**

*Small groups with one iPad each:*

**Option 1:** For shyer or lower level students, the teacher should go to each group and check the reports. Get students to read them out loud to show you how they completed each level. Draw attention to any mistakes with imperatives or ordinal phrases, for example adding unnecessary pronouns before the verb - *First, you pick up the fork.*

**Option 2:** With higher level students get each group to come to the front of the class and present to everyone how they completed the levels. If you can hook one iPad to a projector, students can demonstrate to the class as they explain. Again, draw attention to any mistakes with imperatives or ordinal phrases.

*If the whole class completed it together:*

Circulate among students as they complete the reports. Ask students to read the reports to you. Point out any mistakes. Ask students if they can think of any alternative ways they could have completed the levels.

**Conclusion**

From my experience, the game itself never fails to interest students once they have seen it demonstrated. Once playing, students have always been motivated to solve the puzzles presented. There is a tendency for students to discuss in their L1 how to solve the puzzles but the use of the L1 is offset by the requirement of writing a report in English. The game has over 100 levels so the task can easily be repeated without it getting monotonous and can both help with written fluency and increase the chance of vocabulary acquisition.
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Appendix

Scribblenauts

1. Vocabulary: As you play the game check these words in your dictionary as you see them. Write the translation next to them.

Grab Replacement Tires Step-Brother
Heist Disguise Ancestor Knight __________

2. Reports: Please write a report for each level explaining how you finished it. Example:

Level 1
In this level we have to cut down the tree to get the star. First make a chainsaw in the notebook. Then give Maxwell the chainsaw and tell him to use it on the tree. Finally grab the star.

Level 2
The goal of this level is to give two people something they use in their job. There is a fire-fighter, a nurse, a police officer and a chef. At first make a pair of handcuffs and give them to the police officer. Second, make a thermometer for the nurse and pass it to her. After that a star should appear, so finally pick up the star.

Level 1


Level 2


Level 3


Level 4


Level 5


OnTask welcomes submissions of articles concerning TBLT, particularly with reference to the Japanese context.

Contributors are asked to follow the guidelines set in the sixth edition of American Psychological Association (APA).

Research or theory-based articles should be 3000 words or less. Lesson/activity plans should be 1000 words or less. The editors reserve the right to edit articles for length, style, and clarity.

Email submissions along with biodata (50 words or less) to: Colin Thompson at tbltinasia@gmail.com.

Deadlines for submission are as follows:


テーマは、日本においての TBLT とする。

◆刊行日程
本紀要は年2回発行する。発行までの日程は原則として次のとおりとする。
　秋号：7月31日（必着）投稿原稿締め切り
　春号：1月31日（必着）投稿原稿締め切り

◆体裁・分量・使用言語・引用書式・参考文献書式等は APA（第6版）に準じるものとする。
　分量・使用言語
　研究論文：3000語以内（英語）
　実践論文（授業計画）：1000語以内
　提出されたものについては編集者に一任のこととする。

◆投稿方法
投稿論文は50語以内にまとめた経歴等を添えて tbltinasia@gmail.com 宛に電子メールで送信すること。
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