TASK-BASED SYLLABUS DESIGNS AND COGNITIVE ASPECTS IN L2 PERFORMANCE

Joara Martin Bergsleithner [1]

Abstract: This article reviews some issues on cognitive aspects of task-based syllabus designs, particularly based on two studies (ROBINSON, 2001; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001) that deal with cognitive accounts of task-based designs. First, I will focus on contrasting positions of these two papers concerning attentional resources. Second, I will present some empirical results of studies on the effects of task difficulty and conditions. Third, I will show pedagogic sequencing of tasks. Fourth, I will display the measures of three dimensions of task performance, and the measures of task difficulty. Finally, I will close the article with a call for longitudinal studies to investigate second language performance and learning.

Keywords: *Cognitive aspects; task-based syllabus designs; L2 performance; L2 learning.*

Resumo: Este artigo revisa alguns tópicos sobre aspectos cognitivos relacionados à aplicação de tarefas, e baseia-se particularmente em dois estudos (ROBINSON, 2001; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001) que lidam com questões cognitivas relacionadas a conteúdos programáticos baseados em tarefas. Primeiramente, focarei nas diferentes posições abordadas nos dois estudos no que diz respeito a recursos cognitivos atencionais. Então, mostrarei resultados empíricos de alguns estudos sobre os efeitos de dificuldades e condições das tarefas. Depois, demonstrarei a sequência pedagógica das tarefas. Em seguida, demonstrarei as medidas das três dimensões de desempenho de tarefas e as medidas de dificuldade das tarefas. Por fim, concluirei sugerindo estudos longitudinais a fim de se obter resultados mais concretos sobre desempenho e aprendizagem de uma segunda língua.

Palavras-chave: *Aspectos cognitivos; programa de conteúdos baseado em tarefas; desempenho de L2; aprendizagem de L2.*

[1] Docente da Universidade de Brasília. E-mail: joaramb@hotmail.com

Introduction

Last decades have seen a huge growth of interest in task-based language learning and teaching (see, for example, BERGSLEITHNER, et al, 2007; BERGSLEITHNER, 2008, 2009; BYGATE, 2001; LEAVER & WILLIS, 2004; SKEHAN, 1998). Such interest may have originated to a significant extent from the fact that a task is seen as a concept of the same relevance to second language acquisition (SLA) researchers and to second language (L2) teachers (PICA, 1997). A task is also important for organizing the content and methodology of language teaching. The Task-Based Approach (TBA), Task-based language teaching (TBLT), Task-based language learning (TBLL), or Task-based Instruction (TBI) have brought a huge contribution to the methodological history of language teaching, as well as to the concern on cognitive aspects of task-based syllabus designs in L2 performance and learning.

For Ellis (2000), a task could be viewed differently depending on the perspective, whether it is related to research or pedagogy. Researchers (LEAVER & WILLIS, 2004; SKEHAN, 1998) have been investigating a task in terms of a battery of variables that may influence L2 performance, development and learning, as well as teaching. Based on the research findings as regards task designs, information on important task variables gotten through research may help teachers to choose important tasks to use in the classrooms and to know the right moment to implement them in language settings, according to different real life situations and language levels. Before doing any kind of task-design, it is necessary to previously do a *needs analysis*, that means a survey of information and knowledge about students' reality as well as students' previous knowledge and language domain (BYGATE et al., 2001; BERGSLEITHNER, 2009). Based on this assumption, this study taps on one of the hot topics that have been discussed in the field of Task-based research and language pedagogy, which regards a polemic discussion on how to design task-based syllabus in order to promote L2 performance and learning.

This article particularly departs from the concept that tasks are "perceived differently by researchers and practitioners, though tasks are all designed to encourage learners to

develop cognitive language skills in real-life situations" (BERGSLEITHNER et al., 2007, p. 379, based on LEAVER & WILLIS, 2004). It also reviews two relevant studies (ROBINSON, 2001; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001) which particularly concern some issues on cognitive accounts of task-based designs. The two studies present essential rationale for task-based research and language pedagogy literature especially on L2 learners' cognitive resources that may affect cognitive demands of tasks, others that may cause some impact of task conditions on task performance, and also some pedagogical considerations for task sequencing.

Based on the cognitive issues discussed in both studies (ROBINSON, 2001; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001), this article centers on (a) different positions between the two studies especially regarding individuals' attentional resources; (b) explanations of empirical results of studies on the effects of task difficulty and conditions; (c) tasks pedagogic sequence; (d) assessment of three language dimensions of task performance; and (e) assessment of task difficulty. Finally, suggestions about longitudinal studies will be offered since they might be profitable for better results on L2 learning.

Task-Based Syllabus Designs and cognitive aspects in task performance

In both studies, Skehan and Foster (2001) and Robinson (2001) seem to join form and meaning in task-based designs. However, the researchers have posed contrasting perspectives about this issue. Skehan and Foster (2001) state that since L2 learners' attentional resources are fundamentally limited in nature, competitive relationship between form and meaning does exist: "...attentional limitations for the L2 learner and user are such that different areas of performance compete for one another for the resources that are available" (SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001, p. 205).

On the other hand, Robinson (2001) sustains a multiple resources view of attention:

> ... there are no general capacity constraints on attention (Newmann, 1987), and therefore no competition for attention, unless this involves attention switching (an executive/action control problem, not a capacity problem) between resource pools (Wickens, 1989). Consequently, where tasks are made increasingly complex simultaneously along dimensions which draw on different resource pools, there should be no competition for attentional resources (ROBINSON, 2001, p. 307).

Compared to Robinson (2001), Skehan and Foster (2001) explicitly depict a distinction between form and meaning. Skehan and Foster (2001) assume that among the three dimensions of task performance (i.e., fluency, accuracy, and complexity), fluency may be a result of L2 learners' focus on meaning, that is, when L2 learners focus on meaning they tend to have a better degree of fluency. In contrast, accuracy (grammatical correctness) and complexity (risk-taking) may be a consequence of L2 learners' focus on form. Moreover, the last two authors claim that "the performance of L2 learners in terms of their fluency, accuracy, and complexity is sensitive to the cognitive demands of tasks, and that therefore the cognitive dimension of task design is a very important consideration" (SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001, p. 198). In the same way, Robinson (2001) predicts that the triadic features of task complexity, condition, and difficulty may have an effect on L2 learners' task performance. Some problems may occur when examining ambiguous empirical results of the previous studies (e.g., see Tables 1 and 2 below).

According to Skehan and Foster's (2001) limited capacity view of attention, the dimensions of accuracy and complexity could not go together, as evidenced by the following remarks:

> ... it would appear that performance on a particular task can, at most, help some of the areas of language development, not all - for example, in one context complexity might be promoted, but this may well have damaging effects upon accuracy (SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001, p. 193).

> ... a basic tension between meaning and form is complexified by a further tension within form between conservatism and risk-taking, with the former manifested in a greater attention to accuracy, and the latter in a prioritization of complexity, and the use of more demanding (and extending) language (SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001, p. 205).

The assumption that L2 learners do not focus on form does not necessarily mean that they focus on meaning instead, which suggests that they may focus on meaning and they may also focus on form depending on different task situations. In addition, the assumption that L2 learners do not focus on meaning does not necessarily mean that they focus on form instead. Accordingly, it seems rational for the researchers above to consider any combination of research results related to the three dimensions of task performance: (a) fluency; (b) accuracy; and, (c) complexity. However, the problem is that even though they could presume

individual research results, there is still no consistence with how attention works with varied task conditions and task characteristics.

Although Skehan and Foster (2001) have shown that the two dimensions – *accuracy and complexity* – could not often really come together, on the other hand, Robinson's (2001) multiple capacity view of attention proposes that fluency could go together with accuracy and complexity, which is again contradictory to some empirical findings on this specific literature. Furthermore, Robinson (2001) suggests that L2 learning could be enhanced by sequencing tasks from simple and easy tasks to complex and difficult ones. Although Skehan and Foster (2001) do not explicitly state how to sequence different tasks, the both studies show that the researchers seem to have the same opinion on this concern. They seem to depict this idea from some cognitive constructs of other common learning processes. As an example, let's say that some students are learning how to play the guitar. Generally, they probably start learning each scale and reading music, and only then they will practice playing from easy to more difficult songs. The implication on task sequencing here is based on the prediction that L2 learning occurs in a gradual and sequential fashion as instructors try to increase task difficulty in L2 classes. Nevertheless, just providing a task with one-step higher degree of difficulty does not guarantee language learning. Many other language aspects should be considered in addition to some cognitive aspects, such as linguistic, pragmalinguistic and sociolinguistic demands, for example, to the enhancement of L2 reading comprehension and of tasks characteristics and task conditions on such task performance.

Researchers in the task-based research field (e.g., ELLIS, 2000, 2003; SKEHAN, 1998; WILLIS, 1996), such as task pedagogy, and task design, have investigated the effects of task characteristics and task conditions on task performance. Some measures have been used for the three dimensions of task performance upon which many researchers seemed to be in agreement. For example, accuracy has usually been measured via percentage of error free clauses. In a previous study, Bergsleithner (2007) questioned whether it is a valid measure of accuracy in error free clauses, and proposed a distinct accuracy assessment in the performance of L2 oral tasks by counting number of errors in the target structure of the treatment, only. Thus, it should be considered that different errors may cause different implications in a given context, and then they may include task complexity as well. Some

errors may be global errors, which can cause serious communication problems, whereas other errors may be local ones, which may not hinder communication at all. The author concern is that the simple counting of error free clauses cannot distinguish the two error types, and can involve complexity as well, conflating their relative implications and significance for L2 use.

The dimension of fluency has usually been measured via number of pauses or number of words per utterance. However, it should be considered that native-like performance does not necessarily mean the fastest speech in L2 speaking. Instead, there are a lot of communication contexts where slowing down the speech rate and/or having appropriate pauses are highly important for L2 learners to achieve native-like proficiency. In other words, since frequent pauses and slowing down of speech are extremely natural even within native speakers' conversations, it is a controversial postulation that fluency may be measured by merely counting number of pauses or words per each utterance. Thus, further studies should investigate other ways to assess fluency during oral tasks performance. Differently, for the measure of complexity, the use of subordinate clauses is usually considered a crucial indicator of internal complexity in L2 speaking and writing performance. Thus, Foster and Skehan, 1996; Ortega, 1999, 2003; and Skehan (1998) suggest that the number of subordinate clauses made by each participant should be counted per 100-word text.

Most significantly is that this line of research has such limitation that it cannot fully capture the influence of tasks on the L2 learning process. The main concern of the two papers is related to manipulations of tasks, conditions of task performance and their effects on the three different dimensions of learners' task performance. Their studies are largely based on a short period of observation for quasi-experimental treatment conditions. What is missing there is a crucial consideration that L2 learning is more longitudinal and unquestionably more multi-faceted than we may expect. Definitely, longitudinal investigations should be encouraged to understand more deeply the impact of cognitive demands of tasks on L2 learners' task performance and their subsequent L2 development.

Table 1 shows the impact of task difficulty on task performance while Table 2 shows the impact of task conditions on task performance.

Table 1 - Impact of task difficulty (task characteristics/cognitive demands of tasks) on task performance (summarized from SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001)

Brown, Anderson, Shillcock, & Yule, 1984; Foster & Skehan, 1996	Tasks based on concrete and immediate information ⇨ greater fluency and accuracy
Bygate, 1996	Familiarity with task contents ⇨ greater complexity and accuracy
Skehan & Foster, 1997	A narrative with a well structured and obvious storyline ⇨ greater fluency Decision-making tasks ⇨ greater complexity
Brown, 1991	Information interpretation tasks ⇨ greater complexity
Robinson, Ting, & Urwin, 1995	'here and now' tasks ⇨ greater fluency, but less accuracy

Table 2 - Impact of task conditions on task performance (SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001)

Ellis, 1987	Pre-task planning	Unplanned conditions with narrative tasks ⇨ less accuracy
Crookes, 1989		10 min of planning before two information-gap tasks ⇨ greater complexity and fluency, no significance with accuracy
Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997		Planning ⇨ greater complexity, fluency, and accuracy Detailed planning ⇨ greatest level of complexity cf. undetailed (standard, 10 min) planning ⇨ greatest level of accuracy
Skehan & Foster, 1999		Language and content-oriented planning ⇨ no effects
Wigglesworth, 1997		High proficiency group doing the difficult task ⇨ greater planning effects on complexity cf. low proficiency group ⇨ greater accuracy
Mehnert, 1998		Effects of different amount of planning time (control, 1, 5, 10 min): 1 min ⇨ greater accuracy/10 min ⇨ greater complexity/increasing planning time ⇨ greater fluency
Ting, 1996		Effects of planning on spoken and written description tasks ⇨ no effects
Ortega, 1999		With narrative tasks ⇨ significant effects on complexity, fluency, and one of two accuracy measures
Skehan & Foster, 1997	Post-task	Threat of a subsequent public performance on three tasks ⇨ effects not on complexity and fluency, but on accuracy
Foster & Skehan, 1999		A requirement that subjects transcribe one minute of their own recorded performance ⇨ effects on accuracy

As can be seen in Tables 1 and 2, according to Skehan and Foster (2001) most authors have carried out studies on tasks performance and many of them have found that planning is important for enhancing accuracy, fluency and complexity. In other words, planning is crucial for enhancing learning and language development (ELLIS, 2000, 2003; FOSTER & SKEHAN, 1996; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001). That means, for example, when the L2 learner has time to plan his speech his language performance will probably be better in all language dimensions. Moreover, Skehan and Foster (2001) also suggest that teachers should work with task (pre-) planning in order to improve students' performance as regards accuracy, fluency, and complexity in the L2 learning process. For these authors, planning is important before any kind of task performance since L2 learners could organize their thoughts, ideas, and speech through the previous knowledge they already have about the topic and also through the previous planning before any task performance, improving, thus, their speech in a more accurate, fluent, and complex way (BYGATE, 2001).

Additionally, familiarity with tasks may help L2 learners improve the three dimensions of language performance. In contrast, unplanned conditions may make learners' speech less accurate and probably less fluent and complex in L2 task performance. Taking all these factors into account, and analyzing and reflecting upon the two papers mentioned (ROBINSON, 2001; SKEHAN & FOSTER, 2001), which take into consideration (i) the issue of task difficulty, (ii) the effects of task difficulty and task conditions, (iii) the sequencing of tasks, (iv) the measures of

three dimensions of task performance, and (v) the measures of task difficulty, one can realize how difficult it is to measure and assess fluency, accuracy, and complexity in the L2 learning process, as well as to design task-based syllabus. Moreover, it is complex to judge if a language dimension comes before the other or if the three language dimensions or aspects enhance simultaneously in the L2 learning process. Further studies should investigate these three language dimensions in depth.

In sum, based on this multifaceted issue, I propose a call for longitudinal studies as regards task-based syllabus designs and cognitive aspects in L2 learning, since all these issues are related to task designs and to the development of the three dimensions of task performance. I also propose to assess and to analyze whether such task syllabus designs are appropriate and profitable to improve L2 performance and learning.

References

BERGSLEITHNER, J. M. Working memory capacity, noticing, and L2 speech production. PhD dissertation. Florianópolis, 2007. 153 pages. Doutora em Letras: Língua Inglesa e Lingüística Aplicada. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

BERGSLEITHNER, J. M. Cognitive Aspects Of Task-Based Syllabus Designs. Revista Língua & Literatura. Frederico Westphalen: URI, v. 10, p. 15, p. 9-18, 2008.

BERGSLEITHNER, J. M. Linguagem oral e aspectos cognitivos em Linguística Aplicada: ensino/aprendizagem de L2/LE através de tarefas. Revista Língua & Literatura. Frederico Westphalen: URI, v. 11, 17 p. 113-124 Dez. 2009.

BERGSLEITHNER, J. M.; GALINDO, M.; KIM, Y.; & KWONG, D. Book review: Betty Lou Leaver and Jane R. Willis, editors, 2004: Task-based Instruction in foreign language education: Practices and programs. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA, p. 378-382, 2007.

BYGATE, M. Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language. In; BYGATE, M.; SKEHAN, P. & SWAIN, M. (Eds), Researching pedagogic tasks: second language learning, teaching, and testing. Longman, 2001.

ELLIS, R. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UK, 2003.

ELLIS, R. Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research,* USA, 4, 2000, pp. 193-220.

FOSTER, P.; SKEHAN, P. The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, n. 18, p. 299-323, 1996.

LEAVER, B. L.; WILLIS, R. Task-based instruction in foreign language education: practices and programs. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA, 2004.

ORTEGA, L. Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. *Studies Sec. Language Acquisition*, *21*, 1999, 109-148.

ORTEGA, L. Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of College-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics,* 24/4: 2003, pp. 492-518*.* Oxford University Press.

ROBINSON, P. Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design: A triadic framework for examining task influences on SLA. In P. Robinson (Ed.),

Cognition and second language instruction. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 287-318.

SKEHAN, P. A. Framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. Applied Linguistics, n. 17. Oxford University Press, 1996.

SKEHAN, P. A. A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

SKEHAN, P.; & FOSTER, P. Cognition and tasks. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 183-205.

PICA, T. Second language teaching and research relationships: A North American view. *Language Teaching Research* 1: 1997, 48–72.

WILLIS, J. *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman, 1996.