

## **SAME TASK, DIFFERENT ACTIVITIES? A REPLICATION OF COUGHLAN AND DUFF'S (1994) STUDY**

Dogan Yuksel

### **ABSTRACT**

This study describes the similarities and differences in the performances of non-native speakers of English who are given an identical picture description task, and compares the findings to those of Coughlan and Duff's study (1994). Sociocultural and so-called mainstream second language acquisition (SLA) literature is reviewed to define what a task is and how it is perceived and defined by researchers from the two schools. In the study ten Turkish students studying in an American university were asked to describe the same picture in as much detail as possible. The same prompt was used during the tasks to ensure the consistency. Findings of the study revealed that the students who share seemingly similar backgrounds constructed different descriptions while doing the same task. However, there were also some similarities among the descriptions of the participants such as the presence of some linguistic features (there is/are) and tenses (present). When the findings of this study are compared with those of Coughlan and Duff (1994), both similarities and differences are observed. Finally, it has been argued that both Sociocultural and mainstream SLA perspectives offer valid arguments about tasks and task-based pedagogy. The study concludes with suggestions for further research.

### *Introduction*

In recent years, there has been considerable growth in task-based language learning and teaching in second and foreign language literature (Bygate, Shekan & Swain, 2001; Crookes & Gass, 1993; Ellis, 2000a; Willis, 1996, among others). This might be because tasks have attracted similar interests from both researchers and teachers (Pica, 1994). Additionally, tasks have often been viewed primarily as devices to allow learners to practice using the language as a tool of communication rather than as a device to get learners to concentrate on grammatical aspects of the language (Loschky & Bley-Vroman (1993). Littlewood (2004) claims that the task-based approach has reached the status of a new orthodoxy and “in current pedagogical discussions... it is difficult to avoid the term ‘task’ as it once was to avoid the term ‘communicative’ ” (p. 319).

My main motivation for working on the article “Same task, different activities: Analysis of SLA task from an activity theory perspective” (Coughlan & Duff, 1994) was the conflict between what I read previously about task based language learning in ‘mainstream’ SLA literature (Ellis, 2000a; Shekan, 1995, 2003; Willis, 1996) and what generally Sociocultural theory (Appel & Lantolf, 1994; Brooks & Platt, 1994; Donato, 1994), and particularly Coughlan and Duff (1994) claim about tasks. Mainstream SLA, (mainstream when it is compared with and positioned against Sociocultural SLA) or a psycholinguistic perspective as it is defined in Lantolf (1996) and, Dunn and Lantolf (1998), and Sociocultural SLA offer different views about what a task is and which features of tasks should be highlighted.

### *Review of literature*

One of the essential claims of Sociocultural theory is that participants always co-construct the activity they take part in, in accordance with their own socio-history and locally determined goals (Coughlan & Duff, 1994). As Appel and Lantolf (1994) point out “performance [in a task] depends crucially on the interaction of individual and task” (p. 437), rather than on the inherent features of the task itself. Similarly, Brooks and Donato (1994) argue that “tasks cannot be externally defined or classified on the basis of specific external task features” (p. 36). They claim that tasks are internally created through the moment-to-moment verbal interactions of the learners throughout actual performance.

The psycholinguistic view recognizes that “it is possible to predict with some degree of certainty what kind of language performance will result from specific tasks” (Ellis, 2000b, p. 213). Moreover, some features can be, at least theoretically, predicted in tasks, and there are studies about the type of tasks that are potentially closer to the presumed performances of language learners, which in turn would facilitate language acquisition (Pica, Kanagy, & Falodun, 1993). For example, if a task involves a two-way exchange of information it is more likely to induce some particular outcomes (e.g. negotiation of meaning routines) than a one-way information exchange task. Similarly, Shekan (2003) claims that “to choose a particular task type may well mean that learners are being pushed to advantage some areas of language performance and disadvantage others” (p. 395). What is implicitly stated in these lines is that some features of the task can be *a priori* determined by the planners of the tasks (see Platt and Brooks (1994) for a critique of this view in SLA).

*How task is defined.* One of the central conflicts about tasks lies in the definition of it. Task is conceptualized differently from psycholinguistic and Sociocultural perspectives. From a psycholinguistic perspective Prabhu (1987) explicitly refers to the teacher’s (or researcher) influence and control on tasks when she argues “A task is an activity which requires learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allows teacher to control and regulate that process” (p. 24). According to her, the teacher has the power over the tasks. This view is either implicitly or explicitly acknowledged by other researchers in the psycholinguistic perspective. Similarly, Dornyei and Kormos state (2000), “The theoretical significance of ‘tasks’ lies in the fact that they allow researchers to break down the complex, prolonged learning process into discrete segments with well-defined boundaries” (p. 276).

Alternately, Coughlan and Duff (1994) define a task as “a kind of behavioral blueprint provided to subjects in order to elicit linguistic data” (p. 175), which is something different than an activity that “comprises the behavior that is actually produced when an individual (or a group) performs the task” (p. 175). They further state that an activity, which they believe is used interchangeably in SLA literature instead of the task, could have no set of objectives in and of itself. Deriving from activity theory and its interpretation in second language learning, Coughlan and Duff state that the participants have their own objectives and act along with these objectives together with the researcher’s, and negotiate these throughout the task.

In this sense, the same task may generate different activities among different people; even if they are in the same context and using the same resources, they cannot be

said to be doing the same task (Gonzales, 1996), because the activity they perform has a different meaning for each of them (Wertsch 1984).

In their study of French Immersion programs, Swain and Lapkin (2000) observe “a high degree of variability” (p. 266) in the performances of their participants. Similar observations are made by other researchers from the Sociocultural theory perspective (Donato, 1994; Brooks & Donato, 1994; Appel & Lantolf, 1994; Roebuck, 2000). Brooks and Donato (1994) show that even though the teacher in their study carefully explained the task goals to third-year high school learners of L2 Spanish, the participants engaged in extensive metatalk, typically in their first language, about the task (typically in the L1) to establish the goals and to familiarize themselves with the task and how they might complete it appropriately.

*Review of Coughlan and Duff’s study.* In their study, Coughlan and Duff (1994) question the assumptions that (1) research tasks are constants in research design, (2) researchers have the ultimate power in designing the task, and (3) subjects are expected to perform under certain conditions and according to the researchers predetermined expectations. The psycholinguistic perspective discussed in the previous section either explicitly or implicitly acknowledges all of these assumptions.

The authors question these assumptions from the perspective of Vygotsky’s Sociocultural theory and Leont’ev’s activity theory. As it is discussed in the previous part, Coughlan and Duff distinguish between a task and an activity, the former being “a behavioral blueprint” (p.175) and the latter as the actual behavior produced as a result of doing the task. In order to demonstrate the point that a task is not equal to an activity, the authors explain the findings of a study where five participants were asked to perform a picture description task. The participants, a Cambodian man and four Hungarian secondary school students, were given the same picture description task that portrayed a beach scene. There were not any explicitly stated research questions, rather the researchers aimed to show that (a) a single task used with different learners produces varying results, and (b) a task repeated with the same learner at different times, can result in quite different outcomes. The findings of the study revealed that an identical picture description task indeed generated different activities for different participants.

*Finding 1.* For example, one of the participants apparently read the task as “an exercise in visual acuity” (p. 184), and frequently used ‘I see’, ‘I saw’ (Example 2). By contrast, another participant related the picture to personal experience and “tried to engage the interviewer through introduction of possible shared knowledge” (Example 3, p. 184). Another participant used some of her cultural knowledge while interpreting the task and gave a hypothetical setting for the scene (Example 4).

*Finding 2.* Findings of the study also revealed that same task performed by the same participant on different occasions yielded different activities. During the first interview, the Cambodian immigrant who was enrolled in an ESL program produced a detailed description of the beach scene. However, in the second interview with the same participant, which took place over three years after the first one, when asked to describe the same picture description task, the language he produced was significantly different than the first one.

With this finding, the researchers question post-test construct in SLA. Considering the fact that the Cambodian man had already seen the picture before and that he had already completed several ESL courses, his second task performance was not

improved at all compared to the previous task. The authors conclude that the same task produces different activities not only among different participants but also with in the same individual on two different occasions. In a broader sense this study offers evidence to the claim that “the data collected on presumably the same task cannot be viewed in isolation, removed from the sociocultural context in which the data were created” (Johnson, 2003, p. 154).

*Some concerns regarding Coughlan and Duff's study.* Before discussing my own research questions, I would like to express some problems about Coughlan and Duff's study. In their study they (1) did not use the same instructions and nor did they react similarly during all interviews, and (2) the background of the participants and the settings where the interviews were conducted were quite different. With these caveats in mind, it could be easily argued that there were different tasks assigned to different subjects.

Researchers used different prompts in different interviews. In the first meeting with the Cambodian participant, for example the interviewer asked the following question: “I want you to tell me-or make a story about this picture? Anything” (p. 177). However, in the second interview, which took place three years later, she, first, showed the picture without any prompt (supposedly assuming that the interviewee could do the task without any instruction), and afterwards when she realized that JDB was struggling; she asked, “Can you describe the scene?” (p. 186). Although the researcher was more concise while doing the second set of interviews, she still used two different cue words, which have quite similar meanings: ‘tell’ and ‘describe.’ While reading the article, I thought this might be one of the reasons that would tell us why different activities emerged from the same picture description task.

Another problematic point in the article was something that has been observed in other studies as well. Wigglesworth (2001) argues that the features of the task and “different conditions under which tasks are administered” should be taken into account while analyzing the task outcomes. It is also stated in the article that many of the dissimilarities between the first participant and the others might be explained “by looking at the context in which task was introduced” (p. 183). In the first interview with the first participant there was abundant time for the interviewer and the subject, and that's why interview was able to ask some further explanation questions. However, in the second set of data (in interviews with secondary school Hungarian students) the interview had limited time and minimal responses were given for further elaboration.

Following what the interviewer did in the second set of data, to establish a certain pattern in all of the interviews conducted, the interviewer in this study tried not to make any comment during the interviews, and even there was no time constraint all of the interviews lasted between 2 to 3 minutes. Moreover, in order to minimize the interference of the setting in this study, all of the interviews were conducted in the same place in very similar condition with participants who had similar backgrounds. Another drawback was tackled by asking the same question is all interviews.

#### *Research questions*

Coughlan and Duff problematized the task construct by showing that what is often viewed as a fixed task is really quite unpredictable not only across participants but also within the same subjects at different times. Because of time limitations I will be partially replicating their study by focusing on different participants performing so-called identical picture description task. The research questions that guided this study are: (1) When

performing an identical picture description task what are differences observed (if any) in the performances of participants? (2) When performing an identical picture description task what are similarities observed (if any) in the performances of participants? (3) Are the results of this study comparable to those of Coughlan and Duff's (1994) study?

### *Methodology*

*Subjects.* Ten Turkish graduate students studying in an American university volunteered to participate in the study. All of the participants were non-native speakers of English and their TOEFL scores ranged between 550 and 620. The participants had been living in the US for periods ranging from two months to four years (mean 29 months) at the time of the study. They had studied English for two to fourteen years before coming to the US. Their ages ranged from 25 to 32 years and the female/male ratio was 50/50. Mean of participants' ages was 27.1.

Prompt used for picture description task  
In Heaton (1966) *Composition Through Pictures*. London: Longman.



*Procedure.* Participants performed the same picture description task that portrayed a beach scene. They were asked to describe the picture in as much detail as possible. There was no time limitation in the task. Following what Coughlan and Duff did in their study, the interviewer tried not to interfere with the participants' attempts to describe the picture. However, this was not possible in all cases.

Follow-up interviews were conducted one week after the task with three participants to have better insights regarding (a) how the task was perceived by the participants, (b) why they used some specific patterns or structures. The follow-up interviews were done in Turkish and some parts of them are later translated into English.

A sound recorder was used while recording the interviews and an informal setting; the interviewer's living room was chosen as the setting of the interview.

Transcription convention used by Coughlan and Duff was adapted in the study. Data coding and analysis were done in accordance with the model study. Each of the activities was further analyzed for any difference or similarity.

### *Findings*

In the next section, all of the examples are touched upon; however particular attention is given to the following three participants who generated interesting performances while doing the activity.

#### Example 1

- 01 I= Now I want you to describe this picture to me in as much detail as possible.  
02 P= Ok... now... There is a man is swimming -I guess- he is drowning and  
03 he is asking for help- and- there is a man running, so maybe he is running  
04 to save him- but also there is a man filming so this might be just a play...  
05 and there is a fat guy with a newspaper and there are some boys and  
06 a girl behind him I guess there are angry with him and they are throwing some  
07 ball with him and there is a man who is sleeping and his boy is covering him with  
08 the sand. And -and- and a couple of guys they are sitting far so they are small.  
09 and there are a couple of people in the center of the sea which are -I guess-  
10 jumping. And -and- and there are some ships they are sailing and we can see  
11 some beach houses in here. And -and- there is a radio. And -and- and- there are  
12 some people I guess they are watching the filming of a movie and also clapping  
13 and some fishes.  
14 I= Ok .  
15 P= That's it. Ok. Thank you very much.

#### Example 2

- 01 I= Could you please describe this picture to me in as much detail as possible?  
02 P= Hmm. People are having fun on the beach. Uh... One person is claiming for  
03 help I guess and the ... the...  
04 I= Lifeguard  
05 P= Yeah, lifeguard is trying to help. And then I think... somebody is also  
06 shooting a movie. There were some audience. Several people are watching them.  
07 Maybe it is a movie. It is a movie scene or somebody is...you know...taking  
08 the then the other there are like people. One two women four guys and one kid are  
09 watching and one guy is lying on the beach taking -like- sunbathing and his son I  
10 guess playing with the sand maybe doing a castle. There is an old guy. He has t-  
11 shirt pants and even shoes. I don't know. There ...  
12 I= Rock- Sand?  
13 P= It may be a rock. He is sitting on his chair and then watching -reading his  
14 newspaper and then listening to radio at the same time. And there are three kids  
15 behind him. They are playing. They are throwing the ball. I think the ball is  
16 coming to guy's head. The guy is so happy. Smiling I think he is reading  
17 something fun. But the kids are kind of uh concerned that the ball is ..... and  
18 there are a lot of ....like these are cottages? Or maybe changing rooms?.  
19 I= Yeah. Changing rooms.... Dressing rooms  
20 P= Yeah...yeah. There are these dressing rooms. There are some people. Some  
21 other people on the beach. They are drawing them small so they must be too  
22 far. There are swimming boats and there are like four like six... and... there are  
23 bunch of people in the middle of the water but I don't know what are they on?  
24 I= A rock?

- 25 P= Maybe but There are like there are so many people on that. I mean it is dark  
26 actually.  
27 I= Here's weird.  
28 P= You know here is very white. You know. There are some houses. Uh m.  
29 I= Ok. Thank you.

### Example 3

- 01 I= Could you take a look at this picture, and could you please describe this  
02 picture to me in as much detail as possible?  
03 P= Ok. There are people- people- uh. Ok... on the beach they- some of them-  
04 lying down... there are children, they are playing together. There are some  
05 people taking picture and... or doing movie. I don't know. I saw houses  
06 I saw birds. Is it a beach? I don't know. How come they ya. Ok. Ya ya ok?  
07 There are...ok? What do you want more?  
08 I= Ok. That's enough.

*Finding 1: The differences in the performances of the participants.* Coughlan and Duff's study revealed that "the 'same task' did not yield comparable results when performed by several individuals" (p. 175). The replication of the study displayed somehow similar results. Even the subjects were asked to describe a picture, and while some of the participants did this, what some others did was more than describing the picture; they (1) created stories based on the picture and (2) used their imaginations and added some personal knowledge to their descriptions either by making guesses or uttering hypothetical statements.

As in example 1, the picture description between lines 2 and 5 is story-like. The participant is relating each person in the picture to others and making a story out of the picture. He is also using transition signals like 'and, so and but' which helps him to establish connections between each person in the picture. Even though the participant was asked to describe the picture, he preferred telling a story at least in the first part of his explanation.

The second participant's description portrayed the picture very vividly (example 2). This was the longest and, in Coughlan and Duff's words, "a model picture description, rich with detail" (p. 180). Although the participant described the picture most of the time by using 'there is/are' structure, she frequently incorporated her imagination into her account of the picture as well. For example when she uttered, "one guy is lying on the beach taking -like- sunbathing and his son I guess playing with the sand maybe doing a castle" (lines 09-10) she added two things to the picture that were not explicitly revealed. First of all, she referred to the man and little child as 'the father and son', which is also claimed by some other participants (excerpts 4, 6, 7). Second, she said that the child was building a castle, which is difficult to figure out by looking at the picture. Also in lines fifteen and sixteen she stated that the old man in the picture is "so happy and he is reading something fun." From these examples we can, without difficulty, infer that this participant not only grasped the literal meaning of describe by listing what she sees in the picture but also interpreted it in a broader sense which also included adding some imagination.

As it is stated before, the performances of the participants were primarily intended to be monologue and the interviewer tried not to make any comment during the interviews. However, the performances in the second example turned out to be dialogue probably because of the enthusiasm of the participant and her eagerness to portray the picture vividly.

Quite different than the previous example, the third participant generated a very short account of the picture (example 3). She just stated what she saw by using 'there is/ are' and 'I saw' patterns. She did not add any personal knowledge to this task and her performance was similar to what Coughlan and Duff called 'visual acuity' where the participant listed the things she saw without making any other inference about the picture.

*Finding 2: The similarities in the performances of the participants.* A remarkable similarity among these activities was the use of 'there is/ are' pattern while describing the picture. All of the participants used this pattern; some of them used only once (example 3), and some others used more than ten times (example 1, 2; excerpts 6, 9) during three-minute interviews. For instance the participants in the first and second examples used this pattern twelve and thirteen times respectively. During the post-task interviews, when asked about the use of 'there is/are' pattern in the task, one of the participants stated that it might be because of the English classes he took in Turkey which were grammar-based and reinforced the use of some specific formal features. Another participant stated that in one of her English classes in Turkey, the instructor encouraged them to use this pattern in similar tasks.

Something related to this was the use of present tense during the picture description task. Almost all of the participants used this tense exclusively, and only the participant in the third example included past simple tense sentences in her description (lines 05-06). This might be again something related to the prior formal English education.

*Finding 3: Comparison of the findings to those of Coughlan and Duff.* Coughlan and Duff identified four main categories of task perception in their study: These were (a) straightforward description of the picture, (b) viewing the task as a visual acuity, (c) relating the picture to personal knowledge, (d) referring to cultural knowledge while describing the picture.

Two of the participants, similar to those of Coughlan and Duff study, viewed this task as visual acuity task, and listed what they saw in the picture (example 3, and excerpt 8). Moreover, most of the participants related the picture to their personal experiences by making some inferences or interpretations of what they saw. This was observed in all participants but one (example 3). However, structure and the content of the statements varied from person to person. Some of the participants used 'I guess', and 'maybe' frequently while some others directly made statements as if they were their observations. For example, some of them uttered statements like calling the guy and the little kid as 'the father and the son' (examples 1; excerpts 4, 6, 7), or calling the old man who is sitting on the chair as 'the producer or the director of the movie' (excerpts 5 and 10)

However none of the participants incorporated any cultural knowledge like referring to the movie 'Jaws', or places like California, Hungary or Greece as observed in Coughlan and Duff's study. This was an interesting finding, and if interpreted together with the use of 'there is/are pattern, it can be claimed the participants alienated themselves from the picture and even though they created some stories, they did not

relate the picture to any personal experience, and tried to avoid any form of engagement that might have happened through the introduction of possible shared knowledge.

### *Discussion*

Findings of the study revealed that each of the participants discussed in the previous section understood the task in different ways. The participant in the first example chose to tell a story at least in the first part of his explanation. The second participant interpreted the task in a different way and besides describing the picture added some imaginary statements to her description. The third participant viewed the task as a 'visual acuity' and listed the things she saw without adding any personal information. Therefore, similar to what Coughlan and Duff (1994) claim, the same task was "conceptualized differently by different people" even if they had quite similar backgrounds. The participants in this study reflected their own interpretations while describing an identical picture.

However there were also some similarities in the performances of the participants. While describing the picture almost all of the participants incorporated their personal experiences and interpretations into their descriptions. Moreover use of some particular linguistic patterns (i.e. there is/ are) and tenses (i.e. present) was marked as well. Even though there was not a single discourse type, there were patterns of some discourses, which might offer some evidence against Coughlan and Duff's claim that "the same task does not yield comparable results when performed by several individual" (p. 175). To some extent, this might be an example of a failure among some Sociocultural researchers to acknowledge the fact that task characteristics and variables do impact on task performance (Ellis, 2000b). It might be reasoned that although it is difficult to predict the nature of the activity that arises out of a task, certain features of the outcomes of the tasks might be predicted while developing the task, which in turn increases the pedagogical value of planning in task construction.

### *Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Research*

In this study some changes in the task structure were made while designing the task to prevent multiple interpretations of the task and to control the outcome of the task as much as possible. Using the same prompt in all interviews while introducing the task and choosing the same setting and participants who shared similar backgrounds were done in order to minimize the outside effects. However, one feature of the task that might have been altered stayed unmodified because of logistic reasons. This was the type of task used in this study, similar to Coughlan and Duff's study, which was a non-structured open task: a picture description task. In my opinion, in order to have more robust claims about the influence of the task on activity, a more structured communicative and two-way information task should be chosen. Or similar to what Gonzales (1996) did researchers might employ different types of tasks ranging from structured (closed) to less structured (open) tasks.

The problem with picture description task is the fact that it is difficult to categorize what constitutes the description of a picture. There would hardly be a consensus on the operationalization of the expected and accepted outcomes of a picture description task. This is acknowledged by the authors while presenting the analysis of the first example in their study as well. The Cambodian man, JBD, adds some personal interpretations to his task description, similar to what the participant in second example did in our study. Even though he did more than describing the picture, his performance

was labeled as a model picture description performance. Because outcomes of this type of task is open and varies a lot, it is difficult to uncover the personal accounts of task description and label them. A more structured task might have prevented this situation by controlling, to some degree, what constitutes an acceptable outcome and what is not.

The participants of the study were Turkish graduate students studying in a university in the US. A follow-up study can be conducted with a different sample (e.g. Korean graduate students, Chinese graduate students) to examine any between group differences and similarities in the performances (activities) of the participants. This study might yield some interesting results considering the cultural and academic differences in the conceptualization of similar tasks.

### References

- Appel, G., & Lantolf, J. (1994). Speaking as mediation: a study of L1 and L2 text recall tasks. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78, 437–452.
- Brooks, F.B., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communication tasks. *Hispania* 77, 262–274.
- Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M., (Eds.), (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Crookes, G., & Gass, S., (Eds.), (1993). *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Coughlan, P., & Duff, P. (1994). Same task, different activities: analysis of SLA from an activity theory perspective. In J. Lantolf and G. Appel, (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. (pp. 173–194). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. Lantolf and G. Appel, (Eds.), *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*. (pp. 33–56). Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Dornyei, Z., & Kormos, J. (2000). The role of individual and social variables in oral task performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 275-300
- Dunn, W., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's  $i+1$ : In commensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language Learning*, 48, 411-442.
- Ellis, R. (2000a). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2000b). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220.
- Gonzalez, M.M. (1996). Tasks and activities. A parent-child interaction analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 6,(4), 287-306.
- Johnson, M. (2003). *A philosophy of second language acquisition*. Yale, London: Yale University Press.
- Lantolf, J. (1996). Second language acquisition theory-building: 'Letting all the flowers bloom!' *Language Learning*, 46, 713–749.
- Littlewood, W. 2004. The task-based approach: some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319-326.

- Loschky, L., & Bley-Vroman, R. (1993). Grammar and task-based methodology. In G. Crookes and S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second language learning, conditions, processes, outcomes? *Language Learning*, 44, 493-527.
- Pica, T., Kanagy, R., & Falodun, J. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction and research. In G. Crookes & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*. (pp. 9-33). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Platt, E., & Brooks, F. (1994). The 'acquisition-rich environment' revisited. *The Modern Language Journal* 78, 497-511.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roebuck, R. (2000). Subjects speak out: How learners position themselves in a psycholinguistic task. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. (pp.81-98). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1995). A Framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (2003). Focus on form, tasks, and technology. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 2003, 16(5), 391-411.
- Skehan, P., Foster, P., & Mehnert, U. (1998). Assessing and using tasks. In W. Renandya & G. Jacobs, (Eds.), *Learners and language learning*. Singapore: Seameo.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2000). Task-based language learning: The uses of first language use. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 253-276.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1984). The zone of proximal development: Some conceptual issues. In B. Rogoff & J. V. Wertsch (Eds.), *Childrens learning in the 'zone of proximal development'*. (pp. 7-18). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wigglesworth, G. (2001). Influences on performance in task-based oral assessments. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain, (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing*. (pp. 186-209). Harlow, Essex: Longman.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.

### ***Acknowledgements***

*The data used in this study have been collected during the Sociocultural Theory course in 2004 fall semester at the Florida State University under the supervision of Dr. Frank Brooks. The author would like to thank Dr. Frank Brooks for his constructive feedback in the preparation of the manuscript and Monica E.McLin for her help during data collection process.*

## 8. Appendix

### Excerpt 4

- 01 I= Ok. Now... Could you describe this picture for me in as much detail as  
02 possible? (pointing the picture) This picture.  
03 P= All right. Um... This is a beach -I guess- so there are people of course  
04 and I guess somebody is making a movie or recording something....by  
05 chance somebody is.. How do you call this one?  
06 I= This one?  
07 P= Dying?  
08 I= Uh uh about to die.  
09 P= About to die. He is lucky then. A rescue guy is running towards him so  
10 I guess... Those people are celebrating something while somebody is dying  
11 interesting- and a daddy and his son playing with sand. And...and a fat guy-  
12 oh my goodness- is reading newspaper with his radio with him and he is sent back  
13 right how do you call this one? around him but –but- like a bed. Right behind him  
14 kids are playing ball. And the ball is going through his head fat guy's head. And  
15 behind these people there are some other lying down and some other walking  
16 around there are couple of houses I guess motels and there are couple of places to  
17 for people to change their clothes I guess and showers of course two showers and  
18 little ships one two three four of them are waiting and two of them are sailing  
19 and –and- .... that's pretty much I see out of this picture.  
20 I= Ok. Thank you  
21 P= That's it?

### Excerpt 5

- 01 I= Now, could you please...ok you can open the book... and then it is  
02 page 177. Look at this picture and could you describe this picture to me in as  
03 much detail as possible?  
04 P= uh mm. Some people are on the beach...and then children are  
05 playing. And then- some guys are making film. Some tourists are looking at  
06 them...and there are uh... houses behind the picture and there is...there is  
07 a lady wanting helping and then a guy is running to save her as a- uh m as a-you  
08 know... they are all in the same stone. Tourists are looking at them. One of  
09 the guys lying on the beach and one kid is burying him....and....and  
10 producer of the film is sitting on the chair and he is not caring what are the  
11 actors are doing he is reading newspaper and then he is listening to radio.  
12 Kids playing ball- throw the ball to the - on his head  
13 I= Ok.  
14 P= Uh mm... (long pause around 9 seconds). That's it.  
15 I= Ok that's it thank you very much.

### Excerpt 6

- 01 I= I'll show you a picture. And I want you describe me this picture in as much  
02 detail as possible.  
03 P= Ok. Oh wonderful picture. This is...this look vacation place and I think there  
04 is a beach. And there are so many people- and all of them are at different age.  
05 and uh There are women and men, and children. And somebody playing baseball-  
06 I think and some other uh...uh try to I think, somebody is uh uh somebody is uh I

07 think somebody is uh swimming and other I think there is movie. There is a  
08 movie maker and he try to take pictures and there is a man who is reading  
09 newspaper and there is a child who is trying to cover with soil his father. And uh  
10 the other ...there are some birds and apartments and... uh uh and the other  
11 thing.... there are... there is... the man who is reading newspaper also I think he  
12 is listening a radio because there is a radio- and other thing- there are three  
13 children playing uh baseball –I think- and some people some people is watching  
14 the film makers’ actions- and wonderful scene. Ok  
15 I= Thank you

#### Excerpt 7

01 I= Now could you describe this picture... to me in as much detail as possible.  
02 P= Ok. (long pause around 6 seconds) uh m.This picture is a scene of summer and  
03 in the edge of an ocean or sea. There are lots of people having fun and sun and  
04 sea and sand.They are sunbathing... swimming. ...and uh a person is on the  
05 water and needs some help. And a bodyguard (laughs) -sea guard- I think  
06 I= Yes, seaguard- bodyguard whatever  
07 P= Sea guard is running to help him. And a man lying on the sand  
08 and his son is helping him cover with the sand. And... children are  
09 playing. And... (long pause round 4 seconds).That’s it.  
10 I= That’s it? Ok... Ok. Thank you.

#### Excerpt 8

01 I= Could you please describe this picture to me in as much detail as possible?  
02 P= I think uh. The first thing I see the guy sitting on a chair and then reading a  
03 newspaper. Three children are playing. Two guys and a girl. And uh. Close to the  
04 sea they are shooting a movie. One guys is running they are recording him and on  
05 the sides one two three four five six people watching. And they are smiling I  
06 guess they look like they are having fun. And I am seeing a guy lying on the  
07 beach and a little boy is burying his feet with sand and we don’t aware of what  
08 ??? In the sea there is a guy and I don’t know I don’t think he is drowning but he  
09 looks like you know his arms are around he looks like he is weaving and maybe to  
10 the camera. On the far side there is a little I don’t know border but it looks like  
11 maybe it’s an island. It may also be a ...  
12 I= maybe a rock.  
13 P= Yeah. And on the far side there are ... a couple of houses. In the four- far we  
14 can see couple of people sitting on chair. There are some cabins I guess they  
15 are... cabinets or cabins and yeah and yeah.  
16 I= Ok? All right

#### Excerpt 9

01 I= Could you please describe this picture to me in as much detail as possible?  
02 P= Ok. This is a beach. I guess.. Yes. This is a beach. There are several people.  
03 Kids are playing with sand. There is a man laying and reading a newspaper. There  
04 are some people in water. There are some tourists tourist no maybe...they are  
05 shooting a movie. Yeah there is a camera. There are a couple of houses. There  
06 are birds flying. There is a man sleeping and another there is another kid trying to  
07 cover him with sand. There is a radio. Newspaper guy is listening to radio and  
08 There is person running -there is an athletic person-

09 I= Lifeguard.  
10 P= Yeah yeah. I gotcha. I got you. Yeah There is a person in water I think uhm.  
11 she is in danger and she is drown and lifeguard is running towards her.  
12 I= All right thank you  
13 P= You are welcome.

**Excerpt 10**

01 I= Could you please describe this picture to me in as much detail as possible?  
02 P= Ok. There are people in beach. And then some people playing ball on the  
03 beach. They throw the ball on a.... on the head...of on the one man's head. He is  
04 reading newspaper. He is wearing sunglasses and hat. And then there are some  
05 people probably they are making film- movie... And this man might be a director  
06 of the film- movie. I guess that and then one of the men lying on the beach and  
07 then the other one kid is burying him. And then he is not aware of this.  
08 Some children taking pictures of the actress – actors and actress... and  
  
09 then. (long pause around 8 seconds) Ok...  
10 I= Ok. Thank you