

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Editors:

Dr. Arzu EKOÇ ÖZÇELİK & Dr. Zennure ELGÜN GÜNDÜZ

Authors:

Göktuğ BÖRTLÜ

Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN

Dr. Şakire ERBAY-ÇETINKAYA

Dr. Işıl Günseli KAÇAR

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Elif TOKDEMİR DEMIREL

Sultan ULUAD

Mehmet DURMAZ

Pınar ŞAHİN-DURMAZ

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Merve GEÇİKLİ

Dr. Hasan SAĞLAM

Mehmet Akif YILDIRIM

TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

Editör:

Edited by

Dr. Arzu EKOÇ ÖZÇELİK & Dr. Zennure ELGÜN GÜNDÜZ

ISBN

978-625-

© Copyright 2022, Eğiten Kitap Yayıncılık Org. Tic. Ltd. Şti.

Bu kitabın basım, yayın, satış hakları Eğiten Kitap Yayın Organizasyon Ltd. Şti.'ne aittir. Anılan kuruluşun izni alınmadan kitabın tümü ya da bölümleri fotokopi yoluyla, mekanik, elektronik, manyetik ya da başka yöntemlerle çoğaltılamaz, basılamaz, dağıtılamaz.

Kitabın içeriğinden yazarları sorumludur.

Genel Yayın Koordinatörü, Özgür DOĞAN
Genel Yayın Yönetmeni, Aydın Tekin
Grafik Tasarım, Eğiten Kitap Dizgi Birimi
Baskı, Eğiten Matbaacılık
Ankara, 2022
Yayınevi Sertifika No, 47083
Matbaa Sertifika No, 47083

Eğiten Kitap

Zübeyde Hn. Mah. Süzgül Sokak No: 7 İskitler- Altındağ • Ankara

T: 0312 433 08 93 (pbx) • F: 0312 433 07 92

www.egitenkitap.com • egitenkitap@gmail.com

<https://www.facebook.com/Egiten>

PREFACE

Learning has become more accessible as a result of the quick development of information and communication technologies like computers, laptops, smartphones, tablets and the innovative pedagogies built on them. These technologies have opened up new channels for teaching and learning that transcend time and space constraints. The field of English language learning is not an exception to how technology is significantly influencing education and how we learn.

The use of technology in language teaching and learning, including its capacity to support learner-centered instruction, involving students in the learning process, and boosting motivation and the acquisition of fundamental skills has been subject to numerous studies. To add a modest contribution to the literature on technology and English language teaching, the purpose of this book, *Technology Integrated English Language Teaching* is to highlight the value of integrating learning technologies into language teaching and to provide a general overview of resources available for technology integrated language teaching. It includes valuable viewpoints that encourage English language teachers to improve students' learning by utilizing technologies. Besides discussing the use of various technologies, some chapters have also attempted to demonstrate the field's evolution during the Covid-19 pandemic. This book tries to provide a perspective about how to incorporate technology into language education underlining the importance of teachers' willingness, pedagogy, assistance and training. The chapters also present that when applied properly, technology has a lot of benefits for both teachers and students.

As an overall view of the chapters;

In their introductory chapter, "Teaching Language Online: What It Is and How It Works", *Göktuğ Börü* and *Arif Sariçoban* emphasize that language pedagogy, online pedagogy, and pedagogy for educational technology are all topics that educators need to be knowledgeable about. They also note that it is more advantageous for language teachers to grasp teaching approaches and how they can be applied in an online setting rather than trying to concentrate on employing the newest technology as it takes expertise to teach language and culture successfully and efficiently online in a real-world setting.

In Chapter 2, "English Majors' Reflections on Technology-Mediated Joint Research Protocol Writing via Emergency Remote Teaching during COVID-19", *Şakire Erbay-Çetinkaya* explores the students' attitudes and experiences regarding their technology-mediated joint research writing

via emergency remote teaching during COVID-19. Qualitative data were collected and analyzed under five themes: attitudes and feelings towards remote research education, remote joint research writing experiences, realizations, opinions about the joint responsibility and product and decisions to become a better researcher. Based on the findings, the chapter provides implications for practitioners in order to increase the effectiveness of technology-mediated collaborative research writing remotely.

In Chapter 3, “A Fruitful Innovative Professional Support Network Between EFL Pre-service Teachers and Mentors: A Qualitative Case Study into a Virtual Exchange Project”, Işıl Günseli Kaçar indicates the effects of a virtual exchange study with international English instructors who served as mentors on the professional growth of senior pre-service teachers who served as mentees during the spring semester of the academic year 2021-2022. The study also aimed to help the prospective teachers develop their capacity to actively participate in an online global network of professional collaboration and to equip them professionally to meet the challenges of the teaching profession through interactions with local, international English teachers.

In Chapter 4, “Teaching High School Students “Subordinating Conjunctions” Through Data Driven Learning”, *Elif Tokdemir-Demirel* and *Sultan Uluad* focus on data-driven learning. It is presented that data-driven learning accepts language as data. According to this method, students learn the foreign language more like a researcher through guided discovery tasks. It is suggested that using corpora in teaching English can easily be adapted to a suitable data-driven learning method. Within this framework, the study aims at demonstrating sound data on the differences between two different methods; teaching through corpora and conventional course book-based teaching in English language education for high school students. Both quantitative, qualitative research methods have been used in analyzing the results. The results were discussed to make a contribution in the process of the future curriculum designs of schools, institutions or publishers.

In Chapter 5, “Online Teaching: The Ugly Duckling”, Mehmet Durmaz investigates the experiences of English language instructors in the Northern Cyprus setting during the online teaching period. The core data for this study, which was designed as a qualitative study, were gathered through interviews from ten participants who have been working as English language instructors. The findings demonstrated that during the online teaching time, participants had the chance to grow both personally and professionally in addition to facing obstacles and challenges.

In Chapter 6, “Teacher Leadership during Online Teaching: An Autoethnographic Perspective”, *Pınar Şahin-Durmaz* aims to express the worries, conundrums, and experiences of a teacher leader working in a Turkish higher education setting during the ebbs and flows of the pandemic. This study, which was planned and carried out in an autoethnographic manner, uses multimodality to show the researcher’s intense feelings during the Covid-19 pandemic.

In Chapter 7, “H5P: Designing Technology Enhanced Interactive Learning Environment in ELT”, *Merve Geçikli* outlines the aspects online social constructivism addresses to in the design of technology-based authentic and interactive learning environment in online contexts, and online authentic-interactive activities (OAIA) on this basis. She also puts forward how H5P can be used for creating online authentic and interactive educational contexts in ELT, referring to the characteristics and dimensions of micro learning environment development through H5P. The chapter also involves pedagogical implications for instructors regarding the use of H5P in ELT as powerful means to achieve expected outcomes in foreign language education.

In Chapter 8, “Online Synchronous Speaking Platforms in Mobile-assisted Language Learning: A Review of Cambly© Literature”, *Hasan Sağlamel & Mehmet Akif Yıldırım* suggest that computer-mediated communication (CMS) tools opened new avenues for communication, empowering the learners to become more engaged and more motivated. They indicate that the increasing popularity of online language teaching platforms and the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly increased the attention on applications, such as Cambly©, which enables interaction with competent English-speaking conversation partners. The present study aimed at investigating and summarizing research trends and offering directions for further research.

We believe that this book will increase the awareness of policy makers, teacher educators, prospective teachers and in-service language teachers about embedding technologies into foreign language teaching while at the same time keep all of those involved in English language teaching up to date about the new trends in using digital technologies to teach English as a foreign language.

Dr. Arzu Ekoç Özçelik & Dr. Zennure Elgün Gündüz

CONTENTS

PREFACE	III
CHAPTER 1	
TEACHING LANGUAGE ONLINE: WHAT IT IS AND HOW IT WORKS	
Res. Asst. Göktuğ BÖRTLÜ	1
Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN,	1
CHAPTER 2	
ENGLISH MAJORS' REFLECTIONS ON TECHNOLOGY-MEDIATED JOINT RESEARCH PROTOCOL WRITING VIA EMERGENCY REMOTE TEACHING DURING COVID-19	
Şakire Erbay-Çetinkaya	25
CHAPTER 3	
A FRUITFUL INNOVATIVE PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT NETWORK BETWEEN EFL PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS AND MENTORS: A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY INTO A VIRTUAL EXCHANGE PROJECT	
Dr. Işıl GÜNSELİ KAÇAR	61
CHAPTER 4	
TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS "SUBORDINATING CONJUNCTIONS" THROUGH DATA DRIVEN LEARNING	
Assoc. Prof. Dr Elif TOKDEMİR DEMİREL.....	89
Sultan ULUAD.....	89
CHAPTER 5	
ONLINE TEACHING: THE UGLY DUCKLING	
Mehmet DURMAZ	109
CHAPTER 6	
TEACHER LEADERSHIP DURING ONLINE TEACHING: AN AUTOETHNOGRAPHIC PERSPECTIVE	
Pınar ŞAHİN-DURMAZ.....	131

CHAPTER 7

**H5P: DESIGNING TECHNOLOGY ENHANCED INTERACTIVE
LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN ELT**

Merve GEÇİKLİ 161

CHAPTER 8

**ONLINE SYNCHRONOUS SPEAKING PLATFORMS IN MOBILE-
ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING: A REVIEW OF CAMBLY©
LITERATURE**

Hasan SAĞLAMEL 185

Mehmet Akif Yıldırım 185

CHAPTER 1

TEACHING LANGUAGE ONLINE: WHAT IT IS AND HOW IT WORKS

Res. Asst. Göktuğ BÖRTLÜ

Selçuk University, English Language and Literature

Prof. Dr. Arif SARIÇOBAN,

Selçuk University, English Language and Literature

INTRODUCTION

Language learning differs from other practices in that it requires learners to focus on reading, writing, listening and speaking. In an online course of many disciplines other than language learning, only writing and reading may be fundamental to success while speaking and listening are also crucial elements in order to be proficient in L2. Using these skills, in addition to being competent in the target language, learners make a progress in intercultural communicative competence (ICC). ICC helps them understand not only one another's culture, but also their own culture as well. Learning language and culture online can be facilitated with the help of technological tools. Nevertheless, language teachers must be aware of the fact that technological tools may change eventually. Therefore, instead of trying to focus on using the latest technology, it is more beneficial that they understand teaching methods and how they can apply them in an online setting. Teaching language and culture online effectively and efficiently within a real-world environment requires expertise.

Teaching language online necessitates instructors having specialized knowledge in language pedagogy, online pedagogy and pedagogy for educational technology. The combination of these three domains is essential for educators to become competent in online language teaching. However, these three domains are rarely addressed by teacher education programs. Therefore, when language educators take coursework in order to be able to have expertise in their area, they are usually taught language pedagogy and content knowledge. Even before COVID-19, the popularity of online courses was growing tremendously both at the K-12 and the university levels (Allen et al., 2016). In addition, hybrid courses were also popular. Furthermore, the number of students who enrolled in online courses has improved faster than that of enrollments in traditional classrooms in the US since 2012 (Seaman et al., 2018). While interest in online courses has grown significantly, enrollments in brick-and-mortar classrooms have decreased steadily.

The popularity of online courses displays the need for qualified educators in language teaching and this steady increase means that educators who do not have specialized knowledge in online language teaching are requested to teach online courses. This creates an environment where students and instructors may feel stressed and under pressure. As mentioned, such educators must have necessary knowledge of language pedagogy, online pedagogy and pedagogy for educational technology. In a similar vein, language educators who have been already teaching online

should also be aware of the latest technological developments and related pedagogies for their purposes.

1. ONLINE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN A FLIPPED CLASSROOM

The flipped model depends heavily on students engaging in new material outside the class. They are given the new material before class so that educators use precious class time to do other activities with students to broaden their understanding of the material. Similar to blended and online teaching, language educators who adopt the flipped model also need to be proficient at all stages of language instruction outside class time. Therefore, class time that would have been used for homework in a brick-and-mortar classroom is used for discussion, group work or other activities. In addition, the new material introduced prior to class tends to be more interactive, which gives students more opportunities to practice listening and speaking than traditional homework.

In a flipped classroom, the teacher is a guide on the side, rather than the central figure in front of the board (King, 1993). As the flipped learning approach leads to an interactive and communicative setting during classroom time, learners can concentrate on other linguistic components such as vocabulary, grammar, etc. outside the class (Egbert et al., 2014). Therefore, the nature of flipped classrooms opens a way for using many online tools which may allow learners to be able to deal with the new material outside the class. In turn, language educators need to prove professional development in using online resources in order to meet their students' needs.

2. THE FEATURES OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Learning the grammar of the target language thoroughly is not enough to be competent in communication in that language. Learners should be knowledgeable about cultural and social elements of the target language. Therefore, achieving communicative competence in L2 should be the predominant aim of online language teaching. According to Hymes (1972), communicative competence is the combination of students' grammatical knowledge and use of language in social context. This definition is broadened by Canale and Swain (1980) to include three fundamentals of communicative competence: sociolinguistic competence, grammatical competence and strategic competence. Then, discourse competence is added by Canale (1983).

Grammatical competence means understanding of grammatical forms, vocabulary items and several other linguistic components.

Since grammar is heavily taught in language textbooks, quite a few educators tend to concentrate on teaching grammatical competence, but such emphasis on only grammatical structures does not guarantee communicative competence. One example of this is the fact that being aware of the differences or similarities between L1 and L2 may cause positive or negative transfer. Certain similarities between some vowels or consonants may lead to positive L1 transfer (Uzun et al., 2022). However, according to Wahlbrinck's (2017) book, negative transfer can also occur from L1 German to L2 English since the word "information" can be used in its plural form in German and students almost always use "informations" in English.

Sociolinguistic competence involves knowledge of using the target language in culturally and socially appropriate way and knowing how to construct coherent and cohesive structures. Ishihara (2010) claims that today's foreign language textbooks do not devote enough space to pragmatics. Therefore, the responsibility to teach social aspects of the target language and to make use of online resources mostly falls upon instructors. One of the many approaches that educators could follow is to teach speech acts, which are mainly considered as universal for the world languages. These include greeting, thanking, requesting, complimenting and many more. However, these speech acts may be produced differently in various cultures and languages. If learners are not aware of this difference, they may transfer the way speech acts are realized in their L1 to L2. The vice versa may also happen as shown by Brown (2008) where L2 seems to affect L1 even at low proficiency levels in terms of gesture viewpoint. These instances demonstrate the significant role of sociolinguistic competence on communicative competence.

Strategic competence involves skills such as word coinage, back-channeling and circumlocution. These strategies are crucial for learners to be able to have dialogues with native speakers. Word coinage is the ability to coin words when learners have certain gaps in their L2 vocabulary. An example could be a student saying "snowsculpture" instead of snowman. Instructors should make learners feel comfortable creating such words. The idea is to get their point across and they need to feel relaxed doing it. If learners know that they are free to fill in the gaps in their vocabulary knowledge by producing such words or phrases, they can also enjoy speaking in L2. Back-channeling cues serve a social purpose for learners to continue the communication going on between speakers. For instance, gestures, facial expressions and certain vocal sounds (e.g., uh-huh) are utilized to show that one speaker is listening to another and may also be different in languages. Therefore, it is important that students learn such

back-channeling cues to keep the conversation going. Circumlocution is another component of strategic competence; it is the ability to describe a vocabulary item that is missing from a learner's L2 vocabulary. More often than not, learners may not know the meaning of a word, in which case they should be encouraged to describe that word with the help of the words they actually know. Discussion boards can be used to help learners engage in such an activity.

3. PRAGMATICS-FOCUSED INSTRUCTION

If language educators want to teach pragmatics to their online students, they should engage learners in authentic conversations such as shopping for groceries or clothes, eating out, weather, travel, etc. These are everyday topics that can be used to teach pragmatics. In this regard, LangMedia is an archive of various videos about everyday topics and cultural aspects in many languages across the world with an emphasis on less-commonly taught languages. One can also find transcripts for these videos in both English and the target language. Learners may try to find back-channeling cues that are used by native speakers in these videos and include some of these back-channeling cues into their own L2 production in order to improve their strategic competence. Typically, such back-channeling cues or colloquial forms are not given wide coverage in language textbooks although spoken languages abound with such structures. The language in its cultural and social context may differ from the language in textbooks. For this reason, resources like LangMedia may be more advantageous than language textbooks in terms of developing strategic and sociolinguistic competence of learners in L2.

Language educators need to focus on an online course that will enable learners to advance their communicative competence in L2. In order to achieve this, students should be involved in cultural, social and communicative aspects of the target language. Therefore, the emphasis should not be on teaching grammatical structures. Rather, students should be exposed to the language the way it is naturally produced.

4. COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ONLINE SETTINGS

The communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is supported by quite a few language teacher education programs. The main idea of CLT is to put emphasis on functions of language over linguistic structures. Although grammar is taught within the CLT approach, the main goal is to develop useful communication in the target language and to support communicative competence. According to Richards (2006), CLT puts the

teacher in the position of a facilitator and requires students to engage in cooperative, rather than individualistic, classroom exercises. Also, online CLT approaches may be an opportunity to speak for students who feel shy to participate in traditional classrooms (Teh, 2021).

CLT focuses on everyday conversations and real-world situations. Therefore, if the notion is eating out, then potential functions are asking for the menu or bill, placing your order and paying. These functions are explicit goals of communication while notions are circumstances where communication occurs and help develop learners' communicative competence. This also allows students to discover grammar rules by themselves.

Although it may be demanding at first to shift from brick-and-mortar classrooms to online settings, flipped or blended, there are some principles which can help ease this transition process (Russell & Murphy-Judy, 2020). These guidelines are nowhere near comprehensive; however, they will definitely help instructors deliver online language courses communicatively. First, language educators should emphasize meaning over form and focus on notions and functions of language. This guideline should be taken into account when creating a syllabus. Incorporating this principle will pave the way for a notional/functional syllabus which centers around notions and functions of language rather than grammatical structures which are emphasized by a structural syllabus. With regard to CLT, a notional/functional syllabus will allow language educators to concentrate on real-world circumstances. Therefore, instructors should not depend too much on language textbooks which revolve around a structural syllabus. Even if language educators are expected to follow a textbook that strictly relies on teaching grammar, they can still teach communicatively due to a huge variety of online resources which can be incorporated into their classrooms. For instance, MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching) website offers hundreds of free online materials, including videos, images, audios and exercises. These materials are also categorized according to various topics. Therefore, language educators can modify and use the rich resources in order to teach certain notions such as culture, history, transportation, education, national holidays, etc. In addition, manifold functions can also be taught within such natural contexts. Again, instructors could modify their way of teaching according to the level of students.

Another principle is to deliver at least 90% of the instruction in L2. To be able to achieve this, language educators should provide plenty of comprehensible input for students. According to Krashen (1980, 1985), comprehensible input is the only essential aspect for language acquisition,

which takes place subconsciously by being exposed to comprehensible input. Consequently, L2 input learners are exposed to should be just beyond their comprehension level ($i + 1$). Although Krashen claimed that adult L2 acquisition and child L1 acquisition cannot be differentiated if learners are exposed to sufficient comprehensible input, some hold differing opinions (Long, 1983; Swain, 1998). However, it is generally agreed upon that comprehensible input is one of the fundamental features of language acquisition. Accordingly, language educators are responsible for making L2 input comprehensible for students. One should bear in mind that exposure to L2 alone is not enough to learn that language. If that was the case, then anyone would learn a second language by, say, watching TV. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) suggests that at least 90% of the instruction should be in L2 (ACTFL, 2017). Needless to say, delivering the instruction only in L2 is not enough to lead to language acquisition. Language educators should make L2 input comprehensible for students. The level of input provided by instructors should be fine-tuned according to learners' proficiency levels. However, this does not mean only using structures which students know since the language acquisition process may actually be hampered by this. Language educators should definitely avoid making such a mistake and optimize their speech with the help of some strategies such as repeating themselves, slowing down or simplifying their speech in order to ensure that the input is comprehensible.

Although the importance of input cannot be ignored, it is not the only necessary aspect of language acquisition. Language educators should be aware of the fact that output and interaction with others are also crucial elements of language acquisition. Swain (1998) claimed that output, along with input, is significant in the acquisition process. She put forward the output hypothesis which emphasizes the necessity of output produced by L2 learners since producing output develops accuracy and fluency in the target language. In a similar vein, Long (1981, 1983) proposed the interaction hypothesis which asserts that in order for language acquisition to take place, learners should talk with others. Mutual understanding is achieved through interlocutors working together. Misunderstandings can be repaired with the help of negotiation of meaning.

Considering the importance of both input and output, online language educators should deliver the instructional content in the target language whether learners are beginner, intermediate or advanced students. However, especially for students who are beginner-level learners, information on the course structure can be delivered in L1 such as course

expectations, grading, information about exam dates and assignment deadlines in order to make sure that these issues are understood.

Rich comprehensible input can be provided in various ways. For instance, videos with visual cues are quite important in facilitating students' understanding in terms of L2 meaning. In the flipped approach, instructional videos are one of the most important aspects of pre-class resources (Egbert et al., 2014). The same applies to online and blended classrooms as well. In such instructional videos, images help teach new vocabulary items. Some institutions have a learning management system (LMS) and many of those systems allow language educators to caption videos or record audio over videos. For institutions without an LMS or with an LMS which does not have a screen recording capability, instructors may use other free online tools to create instructional videos such as Zoom, Screencast-O-Matic, Filmora, Jing, Camtasia and Snagit. Instructional videos with rich comprehensible input can be created through these online tools.

Language educators should also design their online courses according to learners' proficiency level by following professional standards. Whether an online course is delivered asynchronously or synchronously, it should follow professional standards as they offer an elaborate guiding scheme for the course content. Such courses are based on what learners can achieve at a certain level of proficiency. Instructors should make sure that online instruction is meaningful, relevant and helps learners develop their intercultural and communicative competence. In other words, professional standards form the quality basis for online courses. Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) Standards for Languages: Learning, Teaching, and Assessment (Council of Europe, 2011), published in many languages including Turkish, provide standards for Europe and other parts across the world. CEFR also provides some principles which are based on certain tasks students are expected to achieve in L2 in order to decide on the proficiency level of students. CEFR scale is broken down into six proficiency levels (i.e., A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2). With respect to their students' proficiency levels, language educators should differentiate the instruction in order to meet their needs. If instructors have a good understanding of the learners' L2 levels, then they can employ additional strategies or provide some challenge as required.

Another principle is to involve students in communicative activities in which they can produce creative language in three modes of communication: interpretive, interpersonal and presentational. The interpretive mode denotes students' understanding of visual, written or aural L2 input, the interpersonal mode refers to person-to-person

synchronous communication in the target language and presentational mode encompasses all written and spoken L2 output which students can practice before. The interpersonal mode usually takes place through speaking; however, in online settings, texting and chatting are also possible. The interpersonal mode must take place synchronously while the presentational mode can be either synchronous or asynchronous. Two people talking on the phone or via Zoom would be an example of synchronous communication. On the contrary, if one person posted a question on a blog and got an answer from another person a few hours or days later, it would be an example of asynchronous communication.

In order to promote creative language use, the negotiation of meaning and open-ended communication among learners, instructors can use some online tools or applications. Language educators can provide online listening and reading passages, but they should keep in mind that learners can read and listen at a higher level than they are able to write and speak in L2. Accordingly, written and aural activities presented in the target language can be beyond learners' current proficiency. This is because comprehension abilities precede production skills. However, if comprehension skills are challenging for students, it often means that they figure out the meaning by paying attention to details, i.e., bottom-up processing. They try to understand one word at a time and then comprehend the whole utterance. In contrast, native speakers typically engage in top-down processing which denotes that they figure out messages with the help of their background knowledge in order to make predictions. Native speakers use bottom-up processing to analyze the details of the utterance against the predictions they have made after making use of top-down processing. Instructors can aid learners in using their L1 background knowledge by promoting top-down processing. L1 background knowledge can help learners understand L2 input. For instance, if they are reading a poem in the target language, they can take into consideration what might be written in that type of text in L1. Similarities will facilitate learners' understanding in the target language. Learners' background knowledge can be used by them to engage in top-down processing. If learners are reading a text which is about someone who has just started a new job, the instructor can make them think about what kind of experience that person might have. Making predictions about that text will ease top-down processing for students. Providing videos or images about the context of that text will also facilitate learners' comprehension.

Engaging students in creative language use is not an easy task. Conversation platforms such as TalkAbroad, Speaky, WeSpeke and LinguaMeeting have remodeled online language teaching since it is not

always easy for language educators to engage in lengthy conversations in L2 with all the students. The negotiation of meaning, a crucial aspect of the language acquisition process, can be promoted through such conversation platforms via one-on-one or small group conversations in the target language. Online, blended and flipped learners benefit from such platforms since they bring real-world conversations to life. No matter which online tool is being used, opportunities must be created for learners in order for them to receive rich comprehensible input in L2, produce output in L2 and interact with others in L2.

Additionally, creating an online course with authentic materials is of great significance. Authentic materials expose learners to the language as it is used by native speakers in natural circumstances. Reading and listening to authentic materials allow students to develop perspectives on the target language in terms of culture, events, concepts, etc. One website that provides authentic materials is Freedom Forum where one can find the front pages of hundreds of newspapers around the world. These front pages, sorted by region, can also be downloaded as PDFs. Although the website only offers the front pages of newspapers, learners are able to view different cultural perspectives on the same news story, which enables comparison between the L1 and L2 countries. In this regard, authentic materials such as poems composed by poets from different countries can help grasp the underlying interconnectedness of culture. For instance, the use of the word 'ararat' can carry converging meanings in the poems written by poets from different cultures (Altunsoy, 2010). These authentic materials are useful for learners at different proficiency levels. Discussion on the similarities or differences will help promote the development of ICC especially for higher-level students. Başol and İnözü (2019) state that developing ICC is one of the most crucial skills of the 21st century. However, in order for learners to develop ICC, choosing the appropriate text among the authentic materials is also important. The difficulty of the texts incorporated into online class activities should be appropriate for learners' proficiency levels with scaffolding from the language educator. It is not an easy task for instructors to find appropriate authentic materials and create activities from these materials; however, authentic materials not only attract students' attention, but also help them understand that the target language they are learning has many speakers who may have various and rich cultural differences.

Furthermore, language educators should create a cultural context that is meaningful for their students. One way to do this is to allow students to use the target language for their enjoyment and improvement. In addition to using the target language within the classroom, students

should also use L2 beyond the classroom, interacting with others in the globalized world. Both of these guidelines can be achieved through language partnerships which allow learners to communicate with their peers in the target language. Video conferencing platforms such as Zoom or Skype can be used to create such online environments. Although it may be challenging for instructors to grade students' exchanges, instructors should provide guiding subjects, questions or discussion points in order to increase the efficiency of students' exposure to natural conversations with their peers. If the online platform they are using has the capability to store the conversations they have had, the learners should analyze the recordings and reflect on how they can develop their speech in terms of accuracy and fluency. Designing such a language exchange with native speaker peers can be quite difficult; however, it is an effective means to connect students to the L2 outside the classroom. By communicating with native speaker peers, learners will have a chance to build a better understanding of cultural perspectives and practices.

Language educators can also ask their students to curate the cultural artifacts they can discover online. Then, students will display those cultural artifacts on the online platform used in language instruction. When students search on the Internet and try to select artifacts that are interesting to them, they will have to organize the artifacts in a way that is meaningful for both their instructor and peers. If language educators require students to curate only authentic materials, then students are exposed to the L2 as it is being used by native speakers in its natural context. In addition, the fact that students choose materials that are interesting to them makes the lesson content much more meaningful for them. For instance, the instructor may ask learners to find examples of street food in NYC. Some students may prefer to research hot dogs while others may opt to research bagels. The curation of this type is an outstanding means of discovering the culture and the target language. These student curations and language exchanges are not easy to implement; however, a meaningful context can be created by making students engage in natural contexts. Learners who are placed in small groups in order to discuss issues interesting to them can communicate in an authentic and meaningful way. It is important that instruction occurs within meaningful cultural context and that communication takes place through real-world information. Practices which lead to real-world communication should be used in online, blended, and flipped language learning classrooms.

4.1. Lesson design

Instructors use goals to design their lesson plans, objectives in lesson plans and assessments. Can-do statements such as "Can communicate

in English within a limited range of contexts” prove valuable assets for language educators to make sure that tasks are aligned with their students’ proficiency levels. Of course, can-do statements should be fine-tuned according to the lesson plan at hand. Learners find can-do statements useful when they set their own goals and keep track of their own progress. Motivation and focus will also be maintained when students eventually meet their own goals.

Lesson plan activities should not include mechanical drills. Such activities are remnants of the audio-lingual method (ALM) which is based on the fundamentals of behaviorism. This teaching method is founded on the assumption that languages are learned through repetition and habit formation. In line with behaviorism, errors must be avoided since they can be deep-rooted throughout learners’ acquisition process. This usually results in overcorrection of errors. However, since languages cannot be learned through mechanical drill activities or rote memorization, ALM is not considered as a useful instructional method today. Students should be allowed to make mistakes and it is not possible for them to acquire a language without making mistakes.

In mechanical activities, students are expected to fill in a blank with a certain L2 structure. Then, the purpose of such activities is not to understand meaning in L2, but to provide the correct grammatical structure. Paulston (1972) came up with a taxonomy of activity types for L2 classrooms: mechanical, meaningful and communicative. Mechanical and meaningful activities have only one correct answer, but the student must associate meaning with the input in the latter (e.g., What day is it today?). Communicative activities, on the other hand, resemble meaningful activities; however, they have more than one correct answer (e.g., What are your plans for next week?). A big disadvantage of mechanical activities is that giving the right answer does not require learners to fully comprehend the input. For instance, students may fill in a blank with the conjugated verb by simply describing the subject of the sentence; however, it is not certain whether they comprehend the meaning of the sentence or even their answers. As such mechanical drill activities do not develop the target language acquisition, they are considered to be a loss of time and should be avoided (Wong & van Patten, 2003).

Russell and Murphy-Judy (2020) believe that nearly 80% of the activities in language textbooks fall under the group of mechanical drills. This requires utmost attention when language educators create lesson plans to make sure that learners are not wasting time in such unproductive grammar activities. Learners may acquire the targeted structures; however, this will not last long if they do not use these structures in

meaningful ways. For that reason, language educators should try to include communicative and meaningful activities in their lesson plans instead of such mechanical drills. Language acquisition can be achieved if learners especially participate in communicative activities where there is no definitive answer. In addition, grammar should not be at the center of language instruction. Meaning rather than form should be emphasized.

One way to teach grammar communicatively in online education can be through processing instruction (PI) which is based on van Patten's (2004) input processing model. This technique requires students to process L2 forms accurately to get to meaning. This set of principles seems to be only useful for grammatical forms which have some semantic meaning (e.g., -s = plural in English). However, it is not effective for forms which only have grammatical information (e.g., indefinite articles). According to Lee and van Patten (2003), language educators should make use of PI when they expect their students to encounter a processing problem.

4.2. Grading and Feedback

Assessing students is just as important as the delivery of instruction. Students should be graded holistically and provided with corrective feedback. Most students expect to write or speak without making any mistakes; however, all students make mistakes while learning another language. Therefore, it is important for instructors to make sure that students understand it is okay to make mistakes. Even after studying the L2 for a long time, perfect accuracy may not be achieved. Language educators should focus on developing students' skills in the target language and not make them feel as if they fail in the target language. However, quite a few students are afraid of making mistakes. Therefore, even though students' performance in the L2 is not perfect, a learning environment where all students are encouraged to use the target language communicatively should be created. Creating such a learning environment, thus emphasizing meaning rather than form also reduces students' anxiety about communicating in the target language. Furthermore, if students are to be penalized for every single mistake they make, this will decrease their encouragement. They should not be penalized for their production in the target language. Language educators may use rubrics to assess some criteria holistically. Among these criteria, grammatical accuracy should be only one principle to keep in mind when grading. If instructors only grade their students based on grammatical accuracy, this will be nothing but counting students' errors instead of assessing their whole production. Grading students holistically places emphasis on the overall quality of students' performance. The most significant criterion to consider, especially at the beginner-level through intermediate-level proficiencies,

is whether learners are able to produce meaningful utterances which could be understood by a native speaker. As students' level of proficiency increases, expectations about their production can also start to increase in terms of accuracy and fluency. The complexity of lesson activities can begin to increase over time in line with students' advancement in the L2.

In language teaching, performance is usually measured, rather than proficiency. Performance and proficiency are connected constructs; however, there is an essential difference in their assessments. In educational frameworks, language educators will have an instructional goal according to which they prepare clear-cut learning objectives for their classes. Then, students will have a chance to practice the vocabulary items and language functions that are related to these lesson objectives. As students are learning the content, the language educator continuously assesses how students are learning the new material throughout the course with formative assessments. After assessing the progress of students toward reaching the learning objectives and goals, language educators might also decide whether they need to re-teach specific materials depending on the results of formative assessments. They may also determine whether they need to spend more or less time on certain content. Finally, a summative assessment, which is usually conducted at the end of the instruction, measures students' proficiency of the materials that were taught during the course. A summative assessment example would be a student giving an oral presentation on a specific content in the L2 after learning the necessary vocabulary items and cultural information that pertain to that content. In online and blended courses, it is especially significant that learners comprehend how they will be assessed on all assignments and interactions. The grading rubrics in the course and examples of target-level performance should be provided by language educators to students before the due dates. For instance, if beginner-level students are doing a writing assignment in the target language, the instructor may provide a piece of writing with simple grammatical structures. Adult learners usually endeavor to write or speak the target language on a level which might be above their current level. More often than not, this leads to production which is incomprehensible output with many errors. If students know the grading rubrics and assessment criteria, then they can shape their production based on what is expected of them.

To help create useful rubrics, language educators may also find a few websites such as RubricMaker, RubiStar, Annenberg Learner and Teachnology which provide online tools in order to create your own online rubrics. It is advantageous to leave some space for instructor

feedback and for learners to analyze their learning process. Learners may also be supported to assess themselves on the rubrics and compare their evaluation with that of the instructor.

Although correcting every single mistake students make is not needed, they must be provided with negative evidence, which is information related to what is not possible in a language, in order to facilitate the acquisition process of the target language (Ellis, 1994). In online, blended or flipped language classes, corrective feedback may be oral or written. Oral feedback enables language educators to correct pronunciation errors of students. This is of great significance in asynchronous online classes since students do not have typical classes where their pronunciation errors can be corrected. Listening skills in the L2 can also be developed with the help of oral feedback. The tone of the instructor in oral feedback must be motivating rather than critical and the instructor must speak in a way that is easy to understand. In addition, positive feedback must be provided as well as negative feedback in order not to discourage students.

Written feedback may be provided in different ways. One way is to use the track changes feature in Microsoft Word to give feedback. E-mail or text may be used to send written feedback as well. An online tool such as Padlet may also be used to leave feedback and interact with students about their errors. Google docs is another online tool which allows language educators to leave comments on written work of students.

No matter what kind of online tool is used in corrective feedback, language educators are advised to use correction codes which are symbols used to demonstrate certain mistakes such as p (punctuation), ww (wrong word), wo (word order), etc. If learners re-write their work after they receive feedback from the instructor, they can advance their writing and acquire metalinguistic awareness about the way the language works since they must search for every error and comprehend exactly the reason why their production was inaccurate.

In short, language educators should emphasize meaning rather than form when they grade their students' work. Instructors should reward students for making meaning in the L2. One advantage of online language learning is that instructors are able to correct students' production errors asynchronously thanks to online tools when students submit recordings of their oral work. This leads to a learning environment where students feel less embarrassed about the oral corrections their instructors make as these corrections can be made privately rather than in front of their peers.

5. A REVIEW ON ONLINE LANGUAGE TEACHING

Several instructors who teach in brick-and-mortar classrooms and who do not have any experience in online language teaching are of the opinion that online language teaching is highly demanding, detached, mundane and even inadequate for language learning. Furthermore, some language educators may also be concerned about the fact that their evaluations at the end of the course would be lower if they were teaching online. Therefore, they adamantly oppose teaching language online. Sadly, online courses are perceived negatively by instructors, students and even administrators. These bad perceptions generally have no basis and are simply false since many negative perceptions result from those who have never taught or taken an online course. A survey conducted by Allen et al. (2016) across different disciplines at the university level reveals that less than 30 percent of the faculty members acknowledge the worth and validity of online education. This survey unearths a significant correlation between the number of students taking online courses and the level of approval for online teaching. For instance, at institutions where a great number of students were taking online courses, the majority of the faculty members noted that they valued online learning. However, at institutions where there were not as many students taking online courses, 34.6 percent of faculty acknowledged the validity of online teaching while this number goes down to 11.6 percent at institutions where there were no online enrollments. It should also be noted that this survey was not limited to teaching foreign languages and was conducted across disciplines.

Although online education is perceived negatively by those who do not teach online courses, recent research has shown that such negative perceptions contrast with the results. For instance, a common misconception is that student satisfaction is lower in online classes than in face-to-face classes. In fact, studies have found that the satisfaction of learners taking online language classes is higher by comparison with that of their peers in brick-and-mortar classes (Chenoweth et al., 2006; Harker & Koutsantoni, 2005; Young, 2008). Some studies show that online language learners perform better than their peers who are in face-to-face classes with regard to oral proficiency (Moneypenny & Aldrich, 2016) and written production (Chenoweth & Murday, 2003). However, no matter how effective online language classes seem to be, their efficacy largely depend on the pedagogical effectiveness of the instructor (Young, 2008). For this very reason, it is of vital importance that online language instructors receive adequate professional development in terms of online language pedagogy.

5.1. Factors Influencing Teacher and Student Satisfaction

Teacher and student satisfaction have been found to largely depend upon class size, teacher preferences, student expectations, student beliefs and institutional support (Russell & Curtis, 2013). Institutional support includes an environment in which language educators have the resources and the time to employ their knowledge of online language pedagogy. On the contrary, when institutional support is not enough for instructors, even though they may have deep knowledge of online language pedagogy, teacher and student satisfaction are badly affected.

It has been found that the instructor and the students in a small-scale class with fewer than 20 students were much more satisfied than their counterparts in a large-scale class with more than 100 students (Russell & Curtis, 2013). This is not surprising as the language instructor who had more than 100 students noted that she did not have enough time to thoroughly follow pedagogical principles. Therefore, the online language instruction she delivered was far from being desirable. She was not able to provide her students with ample opportunity for student-teacher and student-student interactions owing to the time limitations in terms of grading assignments for so many learners. The students revealed their own dissatisfaction as well. One of the students complained that the assignments were too long and the instructor was not involved in the subject enough. The response of this student demonstrates her disappointment in the course and a lack of support from her teacher. The student's frustration with the course might be a consequence of the administrative choice to allow more than 100 students to enroll in the class, which is overwhelming for the instructor. Unfortunately, a number of administrators think that online teaching is far less demanding than teaching in a traditional classroom and may consider online courses as a way of making more money by allowing excessive amounts of enrollments. In fact, students enrolled in small-scale online classes reported being satisfied with their online language learning experiences, even more than their peers in brick-and-mortar classrooms (Chenoweth et al., 2006; Harker & Koutsantoni, 2005; Young, 2008). Therefore, the studies on teacher and student satisfaction point out the need for smaller online class sizes.

5.2. What is the optimal online language class size?

Class sizes have been under debate since 1956 when the Modern Language Association proposed that the size of a foreign language class should not be more than 20 students. According to Horne (1970), an effective language class should not exceed 12 students. Also, Horne suggested a class size of five to nine students for intensive language classes.

In addition, Alatis (1992) claimed that the quality of language education is heavily influenced by class size and better results are achieved through smaller class sizes. According to Yi (2008), students in larger language classes were outperformed by their peers in smaller language classes with regard to reading, listening and writing. Furthermore, Morgan (2000) asserts that affective factors such as anxiety have been reported to play a role in small class sizes. Orellana (2006) approaches the issue of class size differently and claims that optimal class sizes may change depending on the interactivity level that is necessary for learners to finish the course.

Massive open online courses (MOOCs), which are open-access courses delivered on a large scale, may not be a good option for interactional language courses where student-student and student-teacher interactions are needed. However, MOOCs can be quite useful for other disciplines. For instance, courses which center around foundational content and do not require high student-teacher interaction can have class sizes of 40 or higher and still be successful (Taft et al., 2019). On the contrary, class sizes of 15 or fewer seem to be more suitable for more complex courses. In addition, Goertler (2011) emphasizes the significance of student interaction with the teacher, with the materials and among peers in online language classes. In addition, learners may get lost without opportunities for interaction. To be able integrate adequate interaction into a course, language educators should ensure that the class size is small.

According to the statement issued by The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in 2010, an optimal traditional or online language class size should not exceed 15 students. ACTFL states that a small class size is required for language learning since written and oral proficiency are achieved through student-teacher and student-student interactions thanks to a small class. In short, an optimal class size should be capped at 15 students. Although this may not be achievable in every educational environment, online language educators should push for small class sizes.

SUMMARY

This chapter is aimed to analyze the process of designing and delivering useful and successful online language courses. In Section 1, the definition of flipped classroom is given and how it can be integrated into online classrooms is explained briefly. In Section 2, the communicative language teaching approach is detailed and its features are defined. It has been reported that communicative competence is the combination of students' grammatical knowledge and use of language in social context. Then, four fundamentals of communicative competence

are described: sociolinguistic competence, grammatical competence, strategic competence and discourse competence. In Section 3, it has been shown that pragmatics-focused instruction is valuable in terms of helping learners develop communicative competence in the target language. Learners should be engaged in the social and communicative aspects of language. In Section 4, some principles are provided as guidelines in order to help educators teach communicatively online. Incorporating these principles, language instructors can design, develop and deliver online courses which ease the language acquisition process. In addition, holistic grading and corrective feedback should be utilized to facilitate the language acquisition process and to encourage learners to continue speaking in the L2 despite their mistakes. In Section 5, a great deal of research was reviewed on topics such as bias against online education, teacher and student satisfaction and class size. Negative perception of online education is baseless as shown by recent research. Teacher and student satisfaction can be achieved if both teachers and students have proper institutional support regarding infrastructure, resources and technology. It is also important that teachers have freedom to design online courses using their knowledge in online language pedagogy.

REFERENCES

- Alatis, J. (1992). *State university system of Florida foreign language and linguistics program review* (Report No. FL020250). Florida State University.
- Allen, I. E., Seaman, J., Poulin, R., & Straut, T. T. (2016). *Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States*. Babson Survey Research Group Report. <http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/online-report-card.pdf>
- Altunsoy, Ş. (2010). Cultural reception of the place images in the poems of Mark Doty and Murathan Mungan, a Turkish poet. In B. Marek & J. Wojciech (Eds.), *One world many cultures: Reflections on the cultural aspects of globalization* (pp. 139–148). KPU (Kujawy-Pomorze University) Publishing House.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2017). *Use of the target language in language learning*. <https://www.actfl.org/resources/guiding-principles-language-learning/use-target-language-language-learning>
- Başol, H. Ç., & İnözü, J. (2019). Educating the 21st century language teacher. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 65(3), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.11575/ajer.v65i3.56581>
- Brown, A. (2008). Gestures in language development. *Gesture*, 8(2), 256–276. <https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.8.2.08bro>
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Chenoweth, N. A., & Murday, K. (2003). Measuring student learning in an online French course. *CALICO Journal*, 20(2), 285–314.
- Chenoweth, N. A., Ushida, E., & Murday, K. (2006). Student learning in hybrid French and Spanish courses: An overview of language online. *CALICO Journal*, 24(1), 115–145.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge University Press.
- Egbert, J., Herman, D., & Chang, A. (2014). To flip or not to flip? That's not the question. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijcallt.2014040101>
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
- Goertler, S. (2011). Blended and open/online learning: Adapting to a changing world of foreign language teaching. In N. Arnold & L. Ducate (Eds.),

Present and future promises of CALL: From theory and research to new directions in language teaching (pp. 471–502). CALICO.

- Harker, M., & Koutsantoni, D. (2005). Can it be as effective? Distance versus blended learning in a web-based EAP programme. *ReCALL*, 17(2), 197–216. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095834400500042X>
- Horne, K. M. (1970). Optimum class size for intensive language instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 54(3), 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.2307/321979>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
- Ishihara, N. (2010). Adapting textbooks for teaching pragmatics. In N. Ishihara & A. D. Cohen (Eds.), *Teaching and learning pragmatics: Where language and culture meet* (pp. 145–165). Routledge.
- King, A. (1993). From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College Teaching*, 41(1), 30–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.1993.9926781>
- Krashen, S. (1980). The input hypothesis. In J. Alatis (Ed.), *Current issues in bilingual education* (pp. 175–183). Georgetown University Press.
- Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Lee, J. F., & van Patten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *Native language and foreign language acquisition* (pp. 259–278). Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences.
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126–141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/4.2.126>
- Moneypenny, D. B., & Aldrich, R. (2016). Online and face-to-face language learning: A comparative analysis of oral proficiency in introductory Spanish. *The Journal of Educators Online*, 13(2), 105–133. <https://doi.org/10.9743/JEO.2016.2.2>
- Morgan, L. Z. (2000). Class size and second-language instruction at the post-secondary level: A survey of the literature and a plea for further research. *Italica*, 77(4), 449–472. <https://doi.org/10.2307/480283>
- Orellana, A. (2006). Class size and interaction in online courses. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 7(3), 229–248.
- Paulston, C. B. (1972). Structural pattern drills. In H. B. Allen & R. N. Cambell (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second language* (pp. 129–138). McGraw-Hill.
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.

- Russell, V., & Curtis, W. (2013). Comparing a large- and small-scale online language class: An examination of teacher and learner perceptions. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 6, 1–13.
- Russell, V., & Murphy-Judy, K. (2020). *Teaching language online: A guide for designing, developing, and delivering online, blended, and flipped language courses*. Routledge.
- Seaman, J. E., Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2018). *Grade increase: Tracking distance education in the United States*. Babson Survey Research Group Report. <http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradeincrease.pdf>
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 85–113). Cambridge University Press.
- Taft, S. H., Kesten, K., & El-Banna, M. M. (2019). One size does not fit all: Toward an evidence-based framework for determining online course enrollment sizes in higher education. *Online Learning*, 23(3), 188–233. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v23i3.1534>
- Teh, W. (2021). Communicative language teaching (CLT) in the context of online learning: A literature review. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(2), 65–71.
- Uzun, İ. P., Kırçalı, C. E., & Güçlütürk, Y. (2022). İkinci dil olarak Türkçe öğretiminde ünlü boşluğu dizilişlerinin sesbilimsel görünüşleri. In *Türkçenin Eğitimi-Öğretiminde Kuramsal ve Uygulamalı Çalışmalar 12*. TDK.
- van Patten, B. (2004). Input processing in SLA. In B. van Patten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 5–31). Erlbaum.
- Wahlbrinck, B. (2017). *German-English language interference - 56 innovative photocopiable worksheets for teachers & ESL students*. Tumbleweed.
- Wong, W., & van Patten, B. (2003). The evidence is IN: Drills are OUT. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(3), 403–423. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2003.tb02123.x>
- Yi, H. (2008). The effect of class size reduction on foreign language learning: A case study. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(6), 1089–1108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818X.2008.00090.x>
- Young, D. J. (2008). An empirical investigation of the effects of blended learning on student outcomes in a redesigned intensive Spanish course. *CALICO Journal*, 26(1), 160–181.

Göktuğ BÖRTLÜ is a PhD candidate in the Department of Linguistics at Ankara University. He earned a Master's in Linguistics from Hacettepe University in 2020 and received his BA in Foreign Language Teaching at Boğaziçi University in 2017. He is currently working as a research assistant in the Department of English Language and Literature at Selçuk University. His research interests include theoretical phonology, acoustics of vowels and phonology-phonetics interface. He was awarded a Fulbright FLTA scholarship in 2021 and he worked as an instructor at Syracuse University where he also received the Certificate of Advanced Studies in Language Teaching: TESOL/TLOTE. He volunteered as an English teacher for Educaminos in Colombia in 2021. Being the translator of several books, he also worked as a dubbing and subtitle translator for several platforms including Netflix between 2014 and 2021.

Arif SARIÇOBAN is a senior lecturer at Selçuk University. Prof. Sariçoban holds his BA Degree in English Language Teaching at 19 Mayıs University in 1986, MA in Teaching English as a Foreign Language at Bilkent University in 1989, and his PhD in English Language Teaching at Çukurova University in 1994. He started his academic career as a research assistant in the department of English Language and Literature at Yüzüncü Yıl University in 1987. Upon completion of his MA study, he was appointed to the ELL Department at Gaziantep University where he worked as a research assistant from 1990 to 1994 and as an assistant professor of ELL from 1994 to 1997. Then, he was appointed as an assistant professor of ELT at Hacettepe University in 1997. He was awarded his associate professorship by the Board of Interuniversity (UAK) in 2008. He has been working as a professor of English Linguistics for 6 years at Selçuk University. He has authored and edited many books in his field of study. He is professionally interested in teacher training, teaching English as a second and/or foreign language, bi/multilingualism, language use and attitudes, language learning, language acquisition, language and identity, materials development in EFL/ESL, testing and assessment, classroom management in language learning and teaching, and translation techniques. He established the Association of English Language Teacher Educators (AELTE) in Turkey in March, 2021.