



HAL
open science

DESIGNING TASKS FOR LEARNER ENGAGEMENT, AGENCY AND REFLECTION IN INTERCULTURAL VIRTUAL EXCHANGE

Cathryn Bennett, Ciara R. Wigham

► **To cite this version:**

Cathryn Bennett, Ciara R. Wigham. DESIGNING TASKS FOR LEARNER ENGAGEMENT, AGENCY AND REFLECTION IN INTERCULTURAL VIRTUAL EXCHANGE. 2024. hal-04851014

HAL Id: hal-04851014

<https://hal.science/hal-04851014v1>

Submitted on 20 Dec 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License



DESIGNING TASKS FOR LEARNER ENGAGEMENT, AGENCY AND REFLECTION IN INTERCULTURAL VIRTUAL EXCHANGE

Cathryn Bennett (Université Clermont Auvergne, France)

Ciara R. Wigham (Université Clermont Auvergne, France)

ABSTRACT

Implementing virtual exchanges into schools has long been called for by researchers in telecollaboration/virtual exchange. While research has clarified task design and task sequences (O'Dowd and Ware, 2009), learner engagement in online learning environments is a relatively new area of research. Given the rise of technology in language education, there is a critical need to understand how students show engagement when learning online and equally how teachers can promote this in their virtual classroom. Analysis from an Intercultural Virtual Exchange (IVE) with pre-service Dutch and French students was conducted to investigate students' engagement, agency and reflection over three task types. Findings have been converted into IVE task design tips for future teachers/teacher-trainers.

ABSTRACT SECOND LANGUAGE

La mise en œuvre d'échanges virtuels dans les écoles est réclamée depuis longtemps par les chercheurs en télécollaboration/échange virtuel. Si la recherche a permis de clarifier la conception et l'enchaînement des tâches (O'Dowd & Ware, 2009), l'engagement de l'apprenant dans les environnements d'apprentissage en ligne est un domaine de recherche relativement nouveau. Compte tenu de l'essor de la technologie dans l'enseignement des langues, il est indispensable de comprendre comment les étudiants font preuve d'engagement lorsqu'ils apprennent en ligne et comment les enseignants peuvent promouvoir cet engagement dans leur classe virtuelle. L'analyse d'un échange virtuel interculturel (EVI) avec des étudiants néerlandais et français en formation initiale a été menée pour étudier l'engagement, l'agence et la réflexion des étudiants sur trois tâches. Les résultats ont été convertis en conseils de conception de tâches IVE pour les futurs enseignants/formateurs d'enseignants.

1. Intercultural Virtual Exchange (IVE) in Higher Education

1.1 What is Intercultural Virtual Exchange?

Intercultural Virtual Exchange (IVE) refers to, “the engagement of groups of learners in online intercultural interactions and collaboration projects with partners from other cultural contexts or geographical locations as an integrated part of their educational programmes” (O'Dowd, 2018, p. 1). A multitude of skills have been associated with IVE over the years including “digital literacy, intercultural and intracultural learning” and practising language learning (Çiftçi & Savas, 2017, p. 2). Given these benefits, it is not surprising that there has been a rise in integrating IVEs into school curricula, yet researchers have cautioned against the idea that simply connecting students online yields these results (Dooly & Vinagre, 2022), rather careful planning is needed amongst teachers. Therefore, the focus of research articles presenting how successful IVEs have been implemented and aspects of successful IVE task design have become more prevalent in recent years.

1.1.1 Factors of successful IVEs



Several studies have outlined aspects found in successful IVEs (Wicking et al., 2021; Lewis et al., 2016; Martí & Fernández, 2016; Müller-Hartmann & Kurek, 2016). These include (and are provided in a checklist format for future reference/use):

- Teachers should plan together which tasks will be asynchronous/synchronous;
- Outline the specific aims of the IVE and how students will be assessed at the start of the exchange;
- If planned, training for peer assessment should be given;
- Teachers should outline 'best practices' of communication to foster a comfortable online learning space;
- Provide students the opportunity to create their own content for the exchange (i.e., questions for their partner; rules for effective group work).

However, knowing the advantages of IVE is only part of the solution. Teachers also need training to integrate IVE into their classroom.

1.1.2 IVE in Teacher Training

There are a multitude of benefits that teachers receive from IVE such as learning new digital tools and/or platforms, creating an extensive professional network and practising collaborative skills (O'Dowd & Dooly, 2021). Further, Wu (2023) has suggested that teachers who integrate IVE into their classroom learn how to mitigate teaching challenges and accommodate students' diverse needs.

Given these benefits, the demand for teacher training in IVE is logical. To answer this call, several initiatives have been created such as Unicollaboration which provides teachers with group and individual training in introducing IVE and designing collaborative IVE tasks¹. However, Hagley and Green (2022) report the cost of these training programmes are prohibitive for teachers in developing countries. With training, and case studies such as this one, teachers can begin the process of designing IVE tasks.

1.2 IVE Task design

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) is often linked with IVE as this teaching approach prioritises meaningful language learning tasks (Ellis, 2017). Technology-mediated TBLT emphasises the necessity of technology taking an equal role in the learning process (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014).

Guilford's (1967) work with convergent and divergent tasks influenced our study. He specifies that 'divergent tasks' foster several avenues of discussion while 'convergent tasks' ask students to come to a consensus. O'Dowd and Ware's (2009) three categories of IVE tasks was a secondary influence. The first category entails a preliminary 'getting-to-know-you' task wherein students introduce themselves to one another. The second category type asks students to conduct a comparison or analysis of something, typically an aspect of their culture(s). The third task category requires the deepest level of thought by asking students to collaboratively work together to produce something, such as designing a product. It is worth mentioning that their paper also provides an overview of 12 tasks, four examples of tasks per category, to show the variety in task design that is possible for teachers (O'Dowd and Ware, 2009). Lastly, Hoffstaedter and Kohn (2015) have also presented several considerations in IVE task design including students' physical location during the exchange, topics being discussed, how they communicate (written or spoken), how they are taught in the exchange and the digital tools they used.

¹ <https://www.unicollaboration.org/index.php/virtual-exchange-training/>



1.2.1 Factors of successful IVE task design

Researchers have highlighted several aspects in task design that have been found as effective (Avgousti, 2018; Carney, 2006; Sadler & Dooly, 2016; Wicking et al., 2021):

- Designed tasks should build in complexity;
- Match the technology to the task;
- Demonstrate how the technology will be used in the exchange in advance
- Instructions are clear and repeated often
- Ensure tasks involve reflection especially following issues with communication

The present study investigates how to promote critical aspects of the learning process such as learner reflection, engagement and their agency in online language learning when designing IVE tasks.

1.3 Engaging learners in task design

Studies in learner engagement date back to the 1960s, highlighting teachers' (and researchers') fascination of understanding what learner engagement looks like in the classroom and, crucially, how teachers can promote this when lesson planning/designing materials. While a consensus on a definition of learner engagement is far from being set, there has been agreement on 3 (main) dimensions commonly used to describe learner engagement: behavioural, cognitive and attitudinal (Christenson et al., 2012; Fredrick et al., 2019; Skinner and Pitzer, 2012). Broadly speaking, behavioural effort includes the things that students *do*, cognitive effort is the things that students *think*, and attitudinal effort is how students *feel* during the activity.

Recently Gijzen (2021) examined learner engagement in online learning tasks, namely students who were practising a second language in virtual learning environments as a part of the TeCoLa project². In her research, she provides 'markers of learner engagement' for teachers to recognise how their students are being engaged in online learning. Concerning behavioural effort, her general markers included responding to questions, prompting their partner to speak and adding to the discussion. Regarding cognitive effort, she found personalising the task, asking questions and giving explanations as general markers of students' attention to the task. Finally, for attitudinal effort, students' comments about enjoying using the technology and task were reported. For the full list of online learner engagement markers, see Gijzen (2021, p. 59-60).

Given that our particular interest is in student agency and reflection, we use Gijzen's cognitive and attitudinal markers as a baseline for measuring our student-teachers' engagement and to determine if any new markers of online engagement can be identified through our grounded theory analysis. In using Gijzen's markers with our dataset, we could verify to what extent these markers were found in IVE tasks, an area with little research at present. However, learner engagement is only one aspect of task design we were interested in.

1.3.1 Learner agency

² The TeCoLa project "supported foreign language teachers who wanted to set up intercultural virtual exchanges that mainly focused on intercultural communicative foreign language learning with partner schools in other countries in either etandem or PLF constellations" (Gijzen, 2021, p. 45-46). Partner schools were in: Belgium, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Spain and the United Kingdom.



Learner agency has become increasingly discussed in research, with many scholars suggesting it to be another dimension of learner engagement (Reeve & Shin, 2020). Agency has been defined as students proactively taking ownership of their learning by sharing in class and the teacher incorporating these where possible (Reeve & Shin, 2020, p. 152). Students demonstrate their active engagement in shaping the lesson by expressing preferences, asking questions and providing suggestions. Some examples of students showing agentic engagement include expressing an interest in learning more about a topic within the lesson, suggesting a preference of something they are interested in learning between options presented by the teacher and recommending a change in the lesson that would be more interesting for them.

Research suggests that teachers who are open to students' suggestions in activity design create environments where students are more motivated to learn and enjoy the learning process more (Reeve & Shin, 2020). At present, there is little research that connects learner agency with online learning environments. Therefore we were curious to see how our student-teachers' expressed their agency when completing IVE tasks.

In the present study, student-teachers were asked to complete post-task reflections which served the dual purpose of providing their teacher feedback and changes in future IVE task design (i.e., their agency in the tasks) as well as gauging student-teachers' personal reflections as future teachers (i.e., their pedagogical development in the tasks).

1.3.2 Teachers' reflective processes

Many teacher preparation programmes include an element of reflection as research has suggested that in learning to reflect, teachers set themselves up for lifelong learning and development (Farrell, 2022). As suggested earlier by Wicking et al. (2021), reflection has been a recommendation for successful IVE task design, yet, knowing how to design reflection into IVE tasks has been less clear within research.

Understanding how and to what depth novice teachers reflect has been the focus of Derobertmasure (2012) who, with colleagues, has outlined 13 reflective processes characteristic of novice teachers over three levels which build in depth and cognitive complexity. The first level of reflection involves teachers' descriptions of what occurred in the classroom and their identification of problems or difficulties that occurred. The second level includes comparisons between what they have learned in their studies and how they behaved in the classroom. For example, they may rationalise their reaction to a critical incident in class based on pedagogical theories they studied. The third level prompts the teacher to think beyond what transpired in the classroom and how it would impact their future teaching practice and encourage them to consider alternatives for changing their practice in the future. To see the full list of these reflective processes, please see Bocquillion, Derobertmasure & Demeuse, 2017, p. 11-12.

In utilising previous research in online learner engagement (Gijsen, 2021), agentic engagement (Reeve & Shin, 2020) as well as the reflective processes for teachers (Bocquillion, Derobertmasure & Demeuse, 2017), we designed our research questions. The first question centred on whether students identified a task as more engaging and the second questions focused on how students demonstrated engagement, agency and reflection in this task. This leads us to outline the context of our study.

2. The teaching context



2.1 Participants, data analysis and task design

33 student-teachers from the Netherlands and France met in an IVE which took place over one academic term (Fall, 2022). To understand which task types were preferred by students, our analysis began with assessing their feedback to a post-IVE questionnaire which they completed at the end of the IVE. The questionnaire included both closed questions, such as rating their interest in the tasks, and open questions, such as their feelings while completing the tasks. This enabled us to investigate our research questions both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Following the analysis of students' post-IVE questionnaire, we turned towards analysing students' post-task reflections to ascertain which task(s) engendered the most reflection. Analysis from both of these data instruments pointed towards students' reporting the compare and analysis task (task 2) and helped to answer our first research question. Once a singular task had been identified, we turned to the recordings of this task to be transcribed to gauge how students demonstrated their reflection and engagement in this task (our second research question).

The data we analysed came from 3 student pairs, each pair consisted of one Dutch and one French student. Our analysis began by transcribing their synchronous tasks and applying Gijsen's (2021) markers of online learner engagement employing grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Secondly, we analysed their asynchronous post-task (written) reflections using Reeve and Shin's (2020) agentic functions and Bocquillion, Derobertmeasure & Demeuse's (2017) reflective processes. Finally, we analysed students' post-IVE questionnaires which contained both close- and open-ended questions. Open-ended questions were analysed using thematic analysis to understand students' recurring themes (Braun & Clarke, 2022).

During this exchange, students completed three task types: a getting-to-know-you initial task, a comparison task where teachers discussed their educational systems and the qualification of becoming an English teacher in their respective countries. The final task includes giving feedback on a future IVE activity they could teach with future students.

Our central question was to determine which type of task category (getting-to-know-you, compare/analyse or collaboration) was viewed as the most engaging by our students. Table 1 outlines the task types and format for the present study.

Table 1: IVE designed tasks

Task No.	Task type (Guilford, 1967)	Task Type (O'Dowd & Ware, 2009)	Pre-task	Main task instructions	Post-task
1	Divergent	Information exchange	Create and upload a video introducing yourself	Comment on your partner's video	Reflective questions
2	Divergent	Compare/analyse	Write a forum post about your education system and how students can become a	Speak about how English teachers become qualified in your country and compare the structure	Reflective questions



			qualified English teacher.	of your education systems	
3	Convergent	Collaboration	Design and upload a future IVE task you could teach.	Give feedback on your partner's IVE task.	Reflective questions

3. Results

3.1 Most engaging task category: Compare and analyse

Concerning the post-IVE questionnaire, students self-reported the compare and analyse task as being most engaging (60%). Additional questions about the aspects of the IVE that they particularly enjoyed were the synchronous sessions, learning about their partner's culture and life in general as shown in table 2.

Table 2: Question responses from the post-IVE questionnaire

Questionnaire item:	Participant response
The interactional dimension made the sessions more interesting.	60% Strongly agree
It was easy to use Flip.	40% Strongly agree 40% Disagree
It was easy to use the BBB environment in Moodle.	40% Strongly agree
I felt comfortable interacting in the foreign language in the video communication environment.	40% Strongly agree 40% Neutral
I was able to learn something about the other student's views, life and culture.	60% Agree
I could concentrate well when interacting in the video communication environment.	60% Agree
This interaction experience did not work out the way I had expected.	40% Disagree
I was worried about making mistakes in the foreign language.	40% Disagree

Qualitatively speaking, students' write-in responses were analysed with the top three most frequent words being: comfortable, fine and confident. The top three words used by students to describe the IVE tasks included: time-consuming, easy and interesting. These words show that although students



felt the IVE was an interesting experience, they also suggested that it could be improved with tasks taking less time to complete.

Analysis of students' post-task reflections showed that students reflected most in the compare and analyse task with 48 instances of reflection, compared with 39 in task 1 and 41 in task 3. However, many of these reflections were from the second level of reflective processes suggesting that students could be at deeper levels for their development. Agentically speaking, using Reeve and Shin's (2020) functions of agentic engagement, our analysis shows that students reported making recommendations the most to the collaborative task (task 3) so that it could be more similar to the second task in terms of planning a future IVE activity together.

With our analysis of the post-IVE questionnaire and post-task reflections indicating that the second task was students' most engaging, we began our analysis of the transcripts of students' online meetings. Our analysis using Gijzen's markers of learner engagement showed that learners who personalised the task were more engaged. Often students did this by talking about personal details regarding teaching experiences and/or using their life experiences as personal examples during the discussion with their partner. In this way, we suggest that Gijzen's (2021) general markers of cognitive effort could be extended to include positive aspects of personalising the task, which we call: Sharing personal details or previous life experiences.

Following this analysis, we present three tips for teachers to consider when designing IVE tasks.

4. Discussion

4.1 Task design tips for promoting learner engagement, agency and reflection in future IVEs

Here we present three tips for future teachers/trainers for designing IVE tasks based on our analysis.

4.1.1 Tip 1: Personalise the task (teacher or student-generated)

Students who modified the task instructions to provide responses which included personal details or experiences reported being more engaged. It is important to note that this pertains to synchronous meetings, as students were required to use personal details in the first asynchronous task, yet students did not report it as engaged since the possibility of asking these more personalised questions was not possible. Although our task instructions asked students to talk about personal details, not all students did so, choosing to focus instead on the more descriptive aspects of the task (describing their education systems and teacher qualifications). Therefore the first tip centres on ensuring that the task instructions require students to ask/exchange personal details by limiting the number of prompts in the task instructions. Additionally, Lambert and Zhang (2019) have suggested that students create the personalised prompts themselves which could be required work before the synchronous meeting tasks place.

4.1.2 Tip 2: Designing reflective prompts to foster deeper levels of reflection

A second tip, also related to task instructions, focuses on designing prompts which promote deeper levels of reflection. In our study, we provided a high number of questions (24 in total) which included a mixture of potential reflections from Bocquillion, Derobertmeasure & Demeuse's (2017) three levels. However, this resulted in students mainly answering the prompts on the lower-level of reflection and few reflecting more profoundly. We suggest limiting the number of reflective prompts and designing



these prompts to include words from the second and third level of the reflective processes will result in higher cognitive engagement by students. New reflective prompts could include the following:

Level 1

- What is a question that you thought about during your lesson?
- What is something you realised when you were teaching?

Level 2

- What was your goal at the start of the lesson? Did you achieve it? Why, why not?
- Why did you choose that methodology/activity?

Level 3

- Is there an alternative method or activity that you considered but did not do? Why?
- Considering a problem you encountered in the lesson, what would you do differently in the future?

It should be noted that the French student-teachers' in our study had little prior teaching experience as compared to their Dutch counterparts. Therefore, this reflective seem is better suited to student-teachers who have begun teaching placements.

4.1.3 Tip 3: Collaboration is key

Our final tip for IVE task design is to include (synchronous) collaboration as at least one of the tasks that students do. O'Dowd and Ware (2009) have recommended collaboration as the final task when designing IVEs as it requires students to work closely together which results in the benefits that have been associated with IVE such as language negotiation and intercultural learning. Gijzen (2021) also suggested that in collaboration students practise problem solving skills which activate deeper levels of cognitive engagement. Our students greatly enjoyed collaborating with their partners which they reported as being the most positive aspect of the IVE. In fact, their main suggestion for improving the IVE was to modify the final task so that future students could design an IVE task together. With more collaborative activities, it may be important to prepare students in advance for potential communication breakdowns. Gutiérrez et al. (2021) and O'Dowd and Müller-Hartmann (2018) have created training handbooks for teachers which cover possible linguistic problems students may encounter during IVE as well as additional information regarding the planning and implementation stages. These publications are welcome resources for teachers interested in implementing IVE into their curriculum and highlight the importance of collaborative tasks in language learning and teaching.

5. Conclusion

In this case study, we have outlined the findings of an intercultural virtual exchange with a French and Dutch university that took place in Autumn 2022. These findings have been converted into three teaching tips for teachers who may be interested in designing IVE tasks to promote student engagement, agency and reflection. Our tips included the teacher or student designing questions that require students to personalise the task during the exchange, creating post-task reflective prompts that align with deeper levels of reflection, and promoting collaborative tasks where possible in the exchange. These recommendations are intended to assist teachers in IVE task design so that their students can reap the reported benefits of IVE.



REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

1. If you were to prepare an intercultural virtual exchange with another country, which one would you choose and why?
2. How engaged do you think your students are in your class at present?
3. What do you currently do to promote student engagement?
4. In your classroom, how can you incorporate students' feedback into your lessons?
5. How can you increase reflection in your classroom?
6. What have you tried to do in the past to increase these aspects in your classroom and did it work? If yes/no, why?
7. Which types of tasks (synchronous/asynchronous) would be easier to plan with a teacher in another country?
8. Which types of tasks (synchronous/asynchronous) do you think your students would enjoy more?
9. Which digital tools are you familiar with and think could be useful integrating in an IVE? Which new tools have you heard about and would like to learn to use in class?

FURTHER READING

This case study was adapted from the scientific publication:

Bennett, C., and Wigham, C. R. (in press). Student-teacher engagement in and reflection on Virtual Exchange task design. *ALSIC*.

REFERENCES

- Avgousti, M. I. (2018). Intercultural communicative competence and online exchanges: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. 31(8), 819–853.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1455713>.
- Bocquillion, M., Derobertmeasure, A., and Demeuse, M. (2017). *Guide pour « porter un regard réflexif sur sa(une) pratique*. Working Papers de l'INAS. Institut d'Administration Scolaire.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33359.18086>.
- Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2022). *Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide*. Sage.
- Carney, N. (2006). Telecollaboration for intercultural learning: An overview of projects involving Japan. *The JALT CALL Journal*. 2(1), 37-52.
https://www.castledown.com/articles/JALTCALL_2_1_j21.pdf.
- Christenson, S., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). *Handbook of research on student engagement* (Vol. 840). Springer.



Çiftçi, E. Y., & Savaş, P. (2017). The role of telecollaboration in language and intercultural learning: A synthesis of studies published between 2010 and 2015. *ReCALL*. 30(3), 278–298. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344017000313>.

Dooly, M., & Vinagre, M. (2022). Research into practice: Virtual exchange in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*. 55. 392-406. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000069>.

Emir, G., & Yangın-Ekşi, G. (2024). The role of telecollaboration in English language teacher education: a systematic review. *Smart Learning Environments*. 11(1), 3. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-024-00290-0>.

Farrell, T.S.C. (2022). 'I felt a sense of panic, disorientation and frustration all at the same time': the important role of emotions in reflective practice. *International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2038125>.

Fredricks, J. A., Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2019). Interventions for student engagement: Overview and state of the field. In J. Fredricks, A. L. Reschly, & S. L. Christenson (Eds). *Handbook of student engagement interventions: Working with disengaged students* (pp. 1-11). Academic Press.

Gijzen, L. (2021). *Task engagement in virtual pedagogical lingua franca communication*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Utrecht University.

González-Lloret, M. & Ortega, L. (2014). *Towards technology-mediated TBLT: An introduction*. In González-Lloret, M. & Ortega, L. (Eds). *Technology-mediated TBLT* (pp. 1-22). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.6.01gon>

Guilford, J.P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. McGraw-Hill.

Gutiérrez, B.F., Glimäng, M.R., O'Dowd, R., & Sauro, S. (2021). *Mentoring handbook for virtual exchange teachers. Strategies to help students achieve successful synchronous and asynchronous online intercultural communication*. Stevens Initiative. <https://www.stevensinitiative.org/resource/mentoring-handbook-for-virtual-exchange-teachers/>.

Hagley, E. & Green, W. (2022). Helping teachers help their students participate in virtual exchange: The importance of teacher training. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*. 4 (3) 94-110. <https://doi.org/10.46451/ijts.2022.03.08>.

Hoffstaedter, P. & Kohn, K. (2015). Telecollaboration for intercultural foreign language conversations in secondary school contexts: Task design and pedagogic implementation. *TILA Research Results on Telecollaboration*, 21-47.

Konishi, M. (2017). Effects of international online video talk in a language exchange situation on Japanese EFL college students taking a teacher training program. *Language Education & Technology*. 54, 113-133. https://doi.org/10.24539/let.54.0_113.

Lambert, C., & Zhang, G. (2019). Engagement in the use of English and Chinese as foreign languages: The role of learner-generated content in instructional task design. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(2), 391-411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12560>.

Lewis, T., O'Rourke, B., & Dooly, M. (2016). Innovation in language learning and teaching – Online intercultural exchange. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(1),



<https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2015.1133541>.

Martí, N. M., & Fernández, S. S. (2016). Telecollaboration and sociopragmatic awareness in the foreign language classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2016.1138577>.

Lewis et al., 2016; Martí & Fernández, 2016; Müller-Hartmann & Kurek, 2016

O'Dowd, R., & Ware, P. (2009). Critical issues in telecollaborative task design. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*. 22(2). 173-188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220902778369>.

O'Dowd, R. (2018). From telecollaboration to virtual exchange: State-of-the-art and the role of UNICollaboration in moving forward. *Research-publishing.net*, 1, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2018.jve.1>.

O'Dowd, R., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2018). A training manual on telecollaboration for teacher trainers. *Leon: University of Leon*.

Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. 36, 50-72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000094>.

Reeve, J., and Shin, S.H. (2020). How teachers can support students' agentic engagement, *Theory Into Practice*. 59:2, 150-161, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2019.1702451>.

Sadler, R., & Dooly, M. (2016). Twelve years of telecollaboration: What we have learnt. *ELT Journal*, 70(4), 401-412. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw041>.

Skinner, E. A., & Pitzer, J. R. (2012). Developmental dynamics of student engagement, coping, and everyday resilience. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 21-44). Springer.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Wicking, P., Barrera, J., and Suzuki, S. (2021). International Virtual Exchange: Task Design, Implementation and Assessment. *Meijo University Journal of the Faculty of Foreign Studies*. 4, 61-71. <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1050858906073902720>.

Zhang, X., & Zhou, M. (2023). Information and digital technology-assisted interventions to improve intercultural competence: A meta-analytical review. *Computers & Education*. 194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104697>.