

УДК 37.016:811.111'38  
ББК Ш143.21-9-55

ГСНТИ 16.21.27

Код ВАК 13.00.02

### **Кларк Патриция,**

профессор, Институт театрального искусства и танца, Университета Восточной Каролины, Гринвилль, США; e-mail: minyurova@uspu.ru

### **Кейн Элеонора,**

доцент факультета политических наук, университет префектуры Симанэ, Япония; e-mail: minyurova@uspu.ru

## **ВИДЕООБЩЕНИЕ И ОБЩЕНИЕ ЛИЦОМ К ЛИЦУ: ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ СОСТАВЛЯЮЩИХ ПРЕДМЕТНО-ЯЗЫКОВОГО ИНТЕГРИРОВАННОГО ОБУЧЕНИЯ В ОБЛАСТИ ТЕАТРАЛЬНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ И ОБУЧЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ**

**КЛЮЧЕВЫЕ СЛОВА:** видеообщение; драматургия; предметно-языковое интегрированное обучение; четыре составляющих; английский язык как иностранный.

**АННОТАЦИЯ.** Программа «Глобальное партнерство в образовании» делает акцент на видеообщении студентов всего мира, позволяя им общаться и сотрудничать по глобальной сети со своими сверстниками. В данной статье описываются американские и японские студенты, ранее сотрудничавшие только по Интернету, до и после участия в реальном практическом занятии по драматургии. Студенты были опрошены о различиях между видеообщением и реальным сотрудничеством лицом к лицу по четырем составляющим предметно-языкового интегрированного обучения: содержание, познание, общение и культура. Авторы обнаружили, что, хотя студенты весьма положительно оценивали видеообщение, все-таки они предпочитали реальное общение лицом к лицу. Японские студенты в качестве преимуществ реального общения выделили возможность овладения языковыми умениями, в то время как американские студенты отдали приоритет межкультурным возможностям такого общения. Дальнейшее сотрудничество этих групп показало, что проведение реального практического занятия лицом к лицу стимулировало более активное виртуальное общение в последующие месяцы, когда студенты более часто просили организовать виртуальное сотрудничество и чаще общались в социальных сетях.

### **Clark Patricia,**

Professor, School of Theater and Dance, East Carolina University, Greenville, USA.

### **Kane Eleanor,**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Political Studies, University of Shimane, Shimane, Japan.

## **TELECOLLABORATION VERSUS FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION: A CLIL 4CS PERSPECTIVE ON COLLABORATION IN DRAMA AND EFL.**

**KEYWORDS:** telecollaboration; drama; Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL); 4Cs; English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

**ABSTRACT.** The Global Partners in Education initiative focuses on telecollaboration for students around the world, allowing students to communicate and collaborate virtually with their peers. In this study American and Japanese students, who had participated in these virtual links, were surveyed before and after taking part in their first face-to-face drama workshop. Students were asked about the differences between telecollaboration and face-to-face interaction according to the 4Cs of Content and Language Integrated Learning: content, cognition, communication, and culture. It was found that although students were very positive about telecollaboration, they preferred face-to-face interaction. The Japanese students emphasized the content they had learned over traditional language skills, while the American students emphasized intercultural awareness, such as learning how to work with nonnative speakers of English. Later interactions between the two groups showed that the face-to-face workshop led to more virtual communication in the months afterwards, with students requesting more video links, and interacting more frequently with each other via SNS.

This paper examines American and Japanese student preferences for face-to-face interaction over video linking with overseas students from a CLIL 4Cs perspective. The 4Cs model, outlined by Coyle et al., is a framework to ensure balance between content and language in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) courses in regard to content, cognition, communication, and culture. The paper investigates three themes: (i) Content: what did stu-

dents report learning from video linking and face-to-face interaction; (ii) Cognition: which cognitive processes did students report using during the different interactions; and (iii) Communication: which communication tools did students report using during the different interactions. This paper outlines reported learning outcomes (content), cognitive processes, and communication tools based on surveys administered before and after a face-to-

face workshop taught by a Theatre Studies professor and three students from East Carolina University (ECU) to eight EFL students from the University of Shimane (USJ).

## 2. Pre face-to face workshop survey

### 2.1 Pre face-to face workshop survey for USJ students

Seven female students, members of English seminar, aged between 20 and 21 took the survey on a video linking course (Appendix 1 available at eleanorannekane.wordpress.com). The pre-workshop survey was administered to students, via Moodle in July 2015, after taking a 15-week course, where they had linked with Taiwan, Peru, and also with ECU's Storybook Theatre (Clark & Kane, 2013).

#### 2.1.1. What did you learn on the video linking course? (Content)

USJ students were asked an open-ended question about what they had learned in terms of skills and knowledge. They could answer in English or Japanese. Although this course had not been taught as a typical CLIL class, the results show that students emphasized the declarative knowledge they had gained from the course, in addition to language skills, in contrast to traditional EFL classes where students generally refer only to the language skills they have learned. The students' unedited responses are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

### USJ students' self-reported learning outcomes after a video linking course

Student number	What did you learn in this class? Skills? Knowledge?
1	I learned both. For example, how to response politely and knowledge about the country we linked.
2	Important to be positively. If I don't participate positively, I just looking.
3	(Translated) Through cooperation with overseas students, I could make a joint presentation, and that was new for me. I studied about not only my own culture but about different ways of thinking.
4	I learned some skills like speaking and presentation.
5	How to communicate with foreign people who had different culture and language. And also the knowledge about different countries, cultures, and people.
6	I learned how to communicate with foreign people. I also got lots of information about culture or traditions of other countries.
7	I could know about some countries and talk or chat with my partner of Taiwanese or Peru. It was so nice experience.

#### 2.1.2 Which cognitive processes did you use on the video linking course? (Cognition)

Students were then asked to recall which cognitive processes they had used, according to Bloom's revised taxonomy (Anderson &

Krathwohl, 2001). Their responses focused on Understanding, despite the fact that they all created a collaborative presentation with their overseas partners.

Table 2

### USJ students' self-reported cognitive processes during a video linking course

Bloom's Revised Taxonomy	Student responses
Remembering	No responses
Understanding	2. There were some cross-cultural things through video link and exchanging messages. 3. (Translated) We were able to talk about folktales in each other's countries, compare them, and I could learn significant features of their culture, and their way of thinking 4. When I worked on one project with my partner from Peru, Taiwan etc., there were always things that were so different from things in Japan. So, to understand the way they thought, I needed to understand the culture differences. 6. I learned culture and traditions of many different countries, and I tried to understand them. I tried to understand their English too.
Applying	1. When I made some mistakes or say something not good way to response, I was try to correct to for next time. 7. If I asked a question from a foreign students, I had to think and answer it by myself.
Analyzing	No responses
Evaluating	No responses
Creating	4. In this class, I made a lot of presentations. In making it, I thought how should I explain what I want to say.

#### 2.1.3 Which communication tools did you use on the video linking course? (Communication)

Students were asked about the communication tools they had used. Facebook's Messenger was the most popular. Two students wrote that they used Facebook to introduce in-

formation about Japan, and six students used Messenger, citing the ease of sharing files and documents, and the fun of sending amusing stickers.

USJ students had also had a face-to-face class with Australian students on a short-term Japanese language course. When asked which

they preferred, the class was evenly split: half preferred video linking over face-to-face. The survey did not ask them why they felt this way, but it may be that this face-to-face interaction took place in Japanese, and they only met these students once, making it difficult to befriend them. In contrast, USJ students video linked with their overseas partners between four and six times, and also contacted them online after each link.

**2.2 Pre face-to-face workshop survey for ECU students**

Three ECU students, two men and one woman, members of the department of Theatre and Dance, aged 21 took the survey (Appendix

2, available online). The pre-workshop survey was administered to ECU students, on paper in October, after they had linked with Japan twice in the preceding year. These ECU students also had experience linking with Mexico, Peru, and Russia.

**2.2.1 What did you learn via the video linking course? (Content)**

ECU students were asked open-ended questions about what they had learned in terms of skills and knowledge. Their answers are shown in Table 3. ECU students emphasized the content they had learned, specifically children’s stories and Japanese culture.

Table 3

**ECU students’ self-reported learning outcomes before the face-to-face workshop**

Student number	Student responses
1	I’ve learned about the Japanese culture, as well as about the classic Japanese children’s stories.
2	I have learned many Japanese cultural aspects and differences from the USA. I have also learned how similar our cultures are.
3	I have learned and been exposed to their culture through the sharing of their stories, and sharing small everyday aspects of their culture.

**2.2.2 Which cognitive processes did you use via the video linking course? (Cognition)**

ECU students were then asked to recall which cognitive processes they had used, ac-

ording to Bloom’s revised taxonomy. Their answers are recorded in Table 4. They answered about all of the skills.

Table 4

**ECU students’ self-reported cognitive processes before the face-to-face workshop**

Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy	Student responses
Remembering	1. I’ve been able to remember the students’ faces since we first started linking.
	2. We remember lines and the critique given by USJ students.
	3. We link with the same students. Remembering their names and faces helps us communicate.
Understanding	1. After linking USJ students would talk about their interests and their English is wonderful.
	2. We make a great effort to truly understand the culture and Japanese stories.
	3. When speaking, we use English, but it helps us to better understand their culture. In understanding their culture, we are better able to represent it in our stories.
Applying	1. We’re creating a new peach for our story because we’ve learned that peaches are different in America.
	2. We apply what we learn about the stories and the culture to enhance the stories.
	3. We apply the knowledge given to better our stories. For instance, during one linking, we discovered that the color of their peaches are different.
Analyzing	1. When we are given a story, we analyze the story before we adapt it.
	2. We analyze the stories for plot and cultural significance.
	3. With the stories given, we analyze them to better understand the theme and plot as to not misconstrue their meanings.
Evaluating	1. After analyzing the stories, we evaluate the meaning and themes for the stories and how it affects the children.
	2. We evaluate the performance and how well it was received to improve our performance.
	3. Many stories have been shared with us from their university. We read and evaluate them, and determine which we are able to produce and adapt well.
Creating	1. Once we’ve analyzed and evaluated the stories, we then begin to adapt and stage the show.
	2. We recreate the original Japanese tales to work in a theatrical venue.
	3. With the other stories, we craft and create props, set pieces, characters, and other elements of the show to bring the story to life.

**2.2.3 Which communication tools did you use via the video linking course? (Communication)**

ECU students reported using video linking, organized by their professor, email, and Facebook to contact USJ students before the face-to-face workshop.

**3. Post face-to-face workshops survey**

**3.1 Post face-to-face workshops survey for USJ students**

Eight USJ students completed an anonymous paper-based survey after the face-to-face workshop. (Appendix 3 available online).

**3.1.1 What did you learn during the face-to-face workshop? (Content)**

USJ students reported improved listening/ speaking skills (five students); learning how to act from the Theatre students (four students); and cultural differences (three students). Their comments are recorded in Table 5. Recent research has introduced the role of

drama pedagogy in CLIL (Eurydice, 2015; Roman & Nunez 2015), and students responded very positively to the drama workshop. Students seem to be reporting a balance between content and language learning outcomes during the workshop.

Table 5

### ***USJ students' self-reported learning outcomes after a face-to-face workshop***

<i>Student number</i>	<i>Student responses</i>
1	I learned skills of listening, because they are so kind for us and they listened opinions even my English is not so good.
2	To explain in easy words, perform in front audiences
3	They spoke very fast but my listening was getting used to it.
4	I could know what some American students as almost same as my age do in university. And I got more interests about them and other foreign students.
5	I learned lots of cultures of other countries though playing the stories with them.
6	I've learned the skill of acting. They all were good at acting and positive to act. In addition, their knowledge to adapt [to] the situation was so high.
7	I learned the importance of challenge to communicate with them. And if I can't speak English fluently, I can talk with them through a play.
8	I learned conversation skills with people who can't speak Japanese. Also I've learned the differences between their culture and our culture.

#### ***3.1.2 Which cognitive processes did you use during the face-to-face workshop? (Cognition)***

Students were then asked to recall which cognitive processes they had used, according to Bloom's revised taxonomy. Their responses focused on Remembering and Creating, the low-

est and highest skills respectively. USJ students emphasized the amount of remembering they had to do for song lyrics, actions, and lines during the performances (six students). They also referred to the creation of joint performances (five students). Their comments are recorded in Table 6.

Table 6

### ***USJ students' self-reported cognitive processes after a face-to-face workshop***

<i>Bloom's Revised Taxonomy</i>	<i>Student responses</i>
Remembering	1. I remembered how I should act during the play.
	2. Remember the performance: what we do
	3. Remembering dancing at the play
	4. Remembering some phrase I use in conversation
	6. I remembered the sentences to say in a drama we acted.
	8. I had to remember lyrics to sing.
Understanding	1. I need to understand what they say and act. It was fun.
	3. Understanding the stories then make facial expressions.
	4. understand what they mean
	5. I needed to understand what they said immediately
	6. I understood how to act.
	7. Trying to understand English when they speak to me
	8. All the time when we communicated with them.
	3. Asking questions about the play
Applying	7. Trying to speak and cooperate with people who I've not talked [with before]
Analyzing	6. I analyzed the good point and bad point of acting and conveying something.
Evaluating	3. Cheering [for] each other
	6. I evaluated the acting of another group
Creating	4. Making a story with them
	5. We created a play together
	6. I created the process of acting
	7. Making a short play
	8. When we played a short story with them

#### ***3.1.3 Which communication tools did you use during the face-to-face workshop? (Communication)***

USJ students emphasized face-to-face talking as a communication tool, and three wrote that they had become Facebook 'friends' with their ECU partners, 'liking' their comments and sharing photographs. All of the USJ students preferred the face-to-face workshop

over video linking. Students wrote 'I enjoyed video chat, but face to face is more efficient'. They noted that it was easier to see facial expressions; to start conversations; it was easier to 'jump into the conversation'.

### **3. 2 Post face-to-face workshop survey for ECU students**

#### ***3.2.1 What did you learn during the face-to-face workshop? (Content)***

ECU students reported learning about Japanese customs, some Japanese phrases, and Japanese animal noises. They reported that their own communication skills improved: they could no longer rely on colloquialisms and common references to communicate with someone from a different culture. They also reflected on more technical content such as the importance of character movement, and how

to explain theatre direction to someone whose first language is not English.

*3.2.2 Which cognitive processes did you use during the face-to-face workshop? (Cognition)*

Students were then asked to recall which cognitive processes they had used, according to Bloom’s revised taxonomy. Their longer responses focused on evaluating and creating.

Table 7

***ECU students’ self-reported cognitive processes after a face-to-face workshop***

<i>Bloom’s Revised Taxonomy</i>	<i>Student responses</i>
Remembering	1. Recalling parts of the Japanese language 2. We taught USJ students some of repertoire stories... and the students remembered all of their lines and blocking when we performed 3. Names, blocking, changes [to the play] from the night before, cultural differences and similarities USJ students helped us add into the shows
Understanding	1. Using different languages and gestures to communicate ideas 2. During the process of communicating, sometimes there be some confusion on the words’ translations and once the definition was presented to us in English or Japanese, we all understood. 3. I wanted to make sure USJ students understood what each direction... meant
Applying	1. Workshop execution 2. After we analyzed the stories, and then created the stories and blocking and costumes... 3. I applied changes to the scripts and sounds of animals that USJ students made us aware of.
Analyzing	1. Realizing the moral of the story, and using that as a basis for the performance 2. We analyzed the classic Japanese children’s stories before we adapted them into plays to perform 3. We analyzed the stories USJ students sent us for theme and other important elements
Evaluating	1. Adjusting everyday behavior to make students feel more welcome and comfortable 3. We evaluated our performances and rehearsals each day. It was important for us to get feedback from USJ students because they better than anyone could tell us if the stories were clear and understandable.
Creating	1. Turning the story into a mini-play with aspects of drama 2. The students and I adapted a classic Japanese story and created movements for the characters to tell the story. By working together, we helped make it come to life with movement, costumes, and creativity. 3. We created new pieces with the students. We took classic Japanese tales on paper and with the help and input of USJ students turned them into short plays.

*3.2.3 Which communication tools did you use during the face-to-face workshop? (Communication)*

ECU students reported that they relied on talking with the students face-to-face. They used Facebook, instant messaging, and phone calls, but there was a very strong preference for face-to-face communication. ECU students’ reasons for this preference were the pleasure of seeing someone’s reactions clearly; making friendships; ease of communication; and being able to have more meaningful conversations. After the workshop, they all reported having more confidence in working with people from different cultures, and greater sensitivity to cultural issues.

**4. Discussion**

**4.1 Teacher reflection from an EFL perspective**

This project shows how video linking can produce similar results to face-to-face contact, although students show clear preference for face-to-face interaction. These students had video linked with each other only twice in the year before the face-to-face workshop. However, after the face-to-face workshop in October 2015, the students linked four times in the following four months. Face-to-face contact made

students wish to link more frequently, and led to more collaborative projects. Despite a fourteen-hour time difference, the students coordinated to perform via video link at a public event in Japan. In addition, online contact via a dedicated FB group increased, and informally the students reported messaging each other more frequently.

Wilkinson and Wang’s research on videoconferencing between Taiwanese English majors and American journalism majors showed that, despite the difference in their fields, both sets of students gained from the experience: the English majors practiced their foreign language, while the journalism majors practiced interviewing nonnative speakers (p. 109). Similarly in this study, the EFL learners practiced their language skills, while the Theatre Studies majors practiced their own professional skills and gained intercultural awareness.

**4.2 Teacher reflection from a Theatre Studies perspective**

During the linking sessions, ECU students performed stories for the USJ students gathered during the telecommunications sessions which lent itself to separate responsibilities during all interchanges. The face-to-face in-

teraction, however, provided opportunities for both partners to unite and use critical and creative thinking skills to explore and discover a collaborative way to perform as one ensemble. Students worked together to problem solve and create storytelling skills, translations and interpretations. Before rehearsing a final performance during the face-to-face class, USJ students worked alongside ECU students to prepare presentations of stories. Throughout the process, students brainstormed, explored, and developed theatre techniques, communication skills and how to incorporate the strengths of both groups. ECU students learned pronunciation and interpretive skills from the USJ students, who in turn, learned performance techniques including adaptation of stories for the stage, participatory theatre techniques, and vocal projection.

ECU students developed lasting friendships with USJ students. The face-to-face meetings and classes provided students with not only the opportunity to work together, but to also share insights, personal thoughts, laughter, and a new sense of understanding. Upon returning to the United States, ECU students were excited about sharing their experiences with others from their university and made several presentations to the interest of

many other students. ECU students gained a greater appreciation for and understanding of the Japanese culture and their USJ partners and also looked forward to linking sessions following the face-to-face experience. The linking sessions now reflect a deeper understanding and shared history between the partners and a lasting relationship for the future.

### **5. Conclusion**

To prepare students to compete in an increasingly globalized job market, content knowledge alone is not enough. They must be able to work with colleagues from different cultures. The surveys here have shown that although students prefer face-to-face contact, they are still learning content, using Higher Order Thinking Skills, and a variety of communication tools during video linking.

### **Acknowledgements**

The writers wish to thank East Carolina University for funding three students' travel to Japan. ECU wishes to thank the students, faculty, community and the University of Shimane for their wonderful hospitality during our face-to-face visit in the fall of 2015. This work was also supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) Grant Number (c) 26370688, Principal Investigator: Eleanor Kane.

### **R E F E R E N C E S**

1. Anderson L. W., Krathwohl D. R. *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing*. New York : Longman, 2001.
2. Clark P., Kane E. Collaborative story-telling for intercultural understanding // East Carolina University and the University of Shimane Joint Conference. 2013. P. 33-43.
3. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge : CUP, 2010.
4. Eurydice. *Playing CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning Inspired by Drama Pedagogy*. Brussels : Eurydice European Unit, 2015.
5. Roman S. N., Nunez J. J. T. *Drama and CLIL*. Bern : Peter Lang, 2015.
6. Wilkinson J. S., Wang , A. L. Crossing borders: How cross-cultural videoconferencing can satisfy course goals in dissimilar subjects // P. Tsang, R. Kwan, R. Fox (Eds.). *Enhancing learning through technology*. London : World Scientific Publishing Company, 2007. P. 109-123.

Статью рекомендует д-р пед. наук, проф. С. А. Минюрова.