

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

Modelling typical online language learning activity

Conference or Workshop Item

How to cite:

Montoro, Carlos; Hampel, Regine and Stickler, Ursula (2014). Modelling typical online language learning activity. In: CALL Design: Principles and Practice; Proceedings of the 2014 EUROCALL Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands, Research-publishing.net, pp. 237–240.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2014 Montoro, Carlos; Hampel, Regine; Stickler, Ursula



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Version of Record

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.14705/rpnet.2014.000224>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

Published by Research-publishing.net, not-for-profit association
Dublin, Ireland; Voillans, France, info@research-publishing.net

© 2014 by Research-publishing.net
Each author retains their own copyright

CALL Design: Principles and Practice
Proceedings of the 2014 EUROCALL Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands
Edited by Sake Jager, Linda Bradley, Estelle J. Meima, and Sylvie Thouèsny

Rights: All articles in this collection are published under the Attribution-NonCommercial -NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Under this licence, the contents are freely available online (as PDF files) for anybody to read, download, copy, and redistribute provided that the author(s), editorial team, and publisher are properly cited. Commercial use and derivative works are, however, not permitted.



Disclaimer: Research-publishing.net does not take any responsibility for the content of the pages written by the authors of this book. The authors have recognised that the work described was not published before, or that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. While the information in this book are believed to be true and accurate on the date of its going to press, neither the editorial team, nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein. While Research-publishing.net is committed to publishing works of integrity, the words are the authors' alone.

Trademark notice: product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Copyrighted material: every effort has been made by the editorial team to trace copyright holders and to obtain their permission for the use of copyrighted material in this book. In the event of errors or omissions, please notify the publisher of any corrections that will need to be incorporated in future editions of this book.

Typeset by Research-publishing.net
Cover design: © Raphaël Savina (raphael@savina.net)
Fonts used are licensed under a SIL Open Font License

ISBN13: 978-1-908416-19-3 (Paperback - Print on demand, black and white)
Print on demand technology is a high-quality, innovative and ecological printing method; with which the book is never 'out of stock' or 'out of print'.

ISBN13: 978-1-908416-20-9 (Ebook, PDF, colour)
ISBN13: 978-1-908416-21-6 (Ebook, EPUB, colour)

Legal deposit, Ireland: The National Library of Ireland, The Library of Trinity College, The Library of the University of Limerick, The Library of Dublin City University, The Library of NUI Cork, The Library of NUI Maynooth, The Library of University College Dublin, The Library of NUI Galway.

Legal deposit, United Kingdom: The British Library.
British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.
A cataloguing record for this book is available from the British Library.

Legal deposit, France: Bibliothèque Nationale de France - Dépôt légal: décembre 2014.

Modelling typical online language learning activity

Carlos Montoro¹, Regine Hampel², and Ursula Stickler³

Abstract. This article presents the methods and results of a four-year-long research project focusing on the language learning activity of individual learners using online tasks conducted at the University of Guanajuato (Mexico) in 2009-2013. An activity-theoretical model (Blin, 2010; Engeström, 1987) of the typical language learning activity was used to analyse and interpret data. The study revealed (1) problems for learners to move beyond the task's objective (i.e. making a video) to attain the set language learning outcomes (e.g. developing speaking skills), and (2) the prevalence of orality over literacy in learning practices. Methodologically, a sample of 10 learners individually engaged with a purpose-built task. This was followed up by stimulated recall sessions (Gass & Mackey, 2000). The resulting video data was segmented using the concept of *disturbances* (Montoro & Hampel, 2011, p. 124; adapted from Engeström & Sannino, 2011), that is, deviations in learner behaviour from teacher expectations. Twenty-three dimensions and six processes were used to categorise data. A major systemic *contradiction* (Engeström, 2001), stemming from institutional and societal mass-production and efficiency-oriented practices, emerged, which partly led learners to take an other-than-language-learning orientation associated with, for instance, their underuse of learning tools and an over reliance on memory, perception, oral instruction and private speech.

Keywords: CALL, online tasks, activity theory, language learning, modelling.

1. DICIS, University of Guanajuato; cmontoro@me.com.

2. FELS, Department of Languages, The Open University; Regine.Hampel@open.ac.uk.

3. FELS, Department of Languages, The Open University; Ursula.Stickler@open.ac.uk.

How to cite this article: Montoro, C., Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2014). Modelling typical online language learning activity. In S. Jager, L. Bradley, E. J. Meima, & S. Thoušny (Eds), *CALL Design: Principles and Practice, Proceedings of the 2014 EUROCALL Conference, Groningen, The Netherlands* (pp. 237-240). Dublin: Research-publishing.net. doi:10.14705/rpnet.2014.000224

1. Introduction

In the context of an unprecedented expansion of and demand for the provision of English language learning and teaching opportunities at the University of Guanajuato (Mexico), a four-year (2009-2013) research project was launched to look into the language learning activity of individual learners using online tasks in a self-access centre.

After modelling the typical online language learning activity in this context, data analysis results revealed a systemic contradiction blocking the movement from the pursuit of the language task's objective (i.e. making a video) to the attainment of language learning outcomes (e.g. developing speaking skills). Most learners completed the task following the most direct route, paying scant attention to learning tools and learning opportunities, relying heavily on orality instead (e.g. private speech) and resisting a more literacy and text-based approach.

2. Method and results

Following a cultural-historical activity-theoretical (CHAT) approach (Engeström, 1987; Leontiev, 1978; Vygotsky, 1987), the unit of analysis in the study was the language learning activity system (see Montoro & Hampel, 2011 for details). Building upon work by Blin (2010), the system was refined to achieve a model of the typical language learning activity that applies to this context. Next, extensive video data was analysed. It consisted of video-recorded and computer-tracked individual sessions with a sample of ten intermediate language learners at a higher-education institution who engaged with a purpose-built online task followed by stimulated recall (SR) (Gass & Mackey, 2000) sessions to discuss their performance.

Data was segmented using the concept of *disturbances* or “deviations in learner behaviour from the language teacher-designer's expected course of events” (Montoro & Hampel, 2011, p. 124; adapted from Engeström & Sannino, 2011). Later, 23 dimensions (e.g. inner speech-private speech, technological affordances), grouped under six main processes (e.g. mediation by tools, orientation), were used to categorise the data and characterise the language learning activity.

Qualitative and quantitative results revealed the existence of a major systemic *contradiction* (i.e. an instance of a “historically accumulating structural tensions within and between activity systems”; Engeström, 2001, p. 137) affecting the transition from the learner to the immediate, practical objective of the task

and ultimately to the attainment of more general language learning outcomes. Institutional and societal forces based on mass-production and efficiency-oriented practices were reflected in the ‘getting things done’ approach and in an aversion to errors and tool-use shown by most learners.

3. Discussion

An other-than-language-learning orientation to the task meant several learners understood *what* they were doing (i.e. making a video to introduce themselves in English) but, because they derived their motivation from sources other than improving their English, they cared less about what they were doing this *for*, which resulted in poor language learning gains. This orientation affected the system in various ways, such as in the observed underuse of learning tools, the emergence of a hidden curriculum with self-imposed rules and the need for support from the community.

For instance, learners overwhelmingly preferred ‘hearing’ (from others and from themselves through private, self-addressed speech) to reading when learning, and relied on memory, on knowledge existing ‘in their heads’, rather than on text-based sources such as dictionaries and their own written notes. This explains why they would rather ‘find’ information (on *Google translate*, for instance) instead of ‘searching’ for information. Learners seemed to operate orally at the level of perception and memory instead of using higher psychological skills (e.g. problem solving) that require advanced literacy skills (e.g. summarising, reformulating).

4. Conclusions

To conclude, learners in this context are in need of more opportunities to work within their zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) with more capable peers or teachers. The focus must be placed firmly on language learning and learner development to assist learners in their efforts to make the transition from orality to literacy, from memory and perception to higher psychological functions using more complex learning support tools.

A number of concepts can help in this regard, such as *dynamic assessment* (Lantolf & Poehner, 2011), fusing instruction and assessment, and practical applications of activity theory such as the *miniature cycles of expansive learning* (Engeström, 1999) and the *change laboratory methodology* (Engeström, Virkkunen, Helle, Pihlaja, & Poikela, 1996), notwithstanding the potential value of CALL tasks and SR as teaching-learning-researching tools.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank *PROMEP*, *SEP*, *DICIS* and the University of Guanajuato in Mexico, and the Open University in the UK for much needed funding and support. We are also grateful to Yrjö Engeström, Annalisa Sannino, Anu Kajamaa and all the CRADLE colleagues in Helsinki for being wonderful hosts during a three-month research visit. We also acknowledge the anonymous reviewers, colleagues and participants in the study for their time and effort.

References

- Blin, F. (2010). Designing cybertasks for learner autonomy: Towards an activity theoretical pedagogical model. In M. J. Luzón, M. N. Ruiz-Madrid, & M. L. Villanueva (Eds), *Digital Genres, New Literacies, and Autonomy in Language Learning* (pp. 175-196). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Engeström, Y. (1987). *Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental research*. Helsinki: Orienta-Konsultit.
- Engeström, Y. (1999). Innovative learning in work teams: Analyzing cycles of knowledge creation in practice. In Y. Engeström, R. Miettinen, & R.-L. Punamäki (Eds.), *Perspectives on Activity Theory* (pp. 377-404). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511812774.025
- Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 133-156. doi:10.1080/13639080020028747
- Engeström, Y., & Sannino, A. (2011). Discursive manifestations of contradictions in organizational change efforts: A methodological framework. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 24(3), 368-387. doi:10.1108/09534811111132758
- Engeström, Y., Virkkunen, J., Helle, M., Pihlaja, J., & Poikela, R. (1996). The change laboratory as a tool for transforming work. *Lifelong Learning in Europe*, 1(2), 10-17.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Poehner, M. E. (2011). Dynamic assessment in the classroom: Vygotskian praxis for second language development. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(1), 11-33. doi:10.1177/1362168810383328
- Leontiev, A. N. (1978). *Activity, consciousness, and personality*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Montoro, C., & Hampel, R. (2011). Investigating language learning activity using a CALL task in the self-access centre. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 2(3), 119-135.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1987). *The collected works of L. S. Vygotsky. Volume 1. Problems of general psychology: including the volume Thinking and speech*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.