Call for Book Chapters

Theory, Research, and Models of Technology-Infused Project-Based Language Learning and Teaching: Focusing on Form and Function

There has never been a greater tension between what is taught in the classroom and what the students will need in the real world once they have left the classroom. In the last decades, that world has changed to such an extent that language teachers are no longer sure of what they are supposed to teach nor what real world situations they are supposed to prepare their students for. (Kramsch, 2014, p. 296)

Project-Based Learning (PBL), also known as Project-Based Instruction (PBI), project work (Beckett, 1999), and project approach (Levis & Levis, 2003), can be an important response to Kramsch (2014) above. PBL was introduced to general education by William Heard Kilpatrick about a century ago (Kilpatrick, 1918) in response to John Dewey's "conviction that schools had to be completely transformed to meet the challenges of rapid economic and social change" (Beckett, 1999, p. 1). PBL is defined as "a comprehensive approach to classroom teaching and learning and is designed to engage students in investigation of authentic problems" (Blumenfeld et al., 1991). Beckett (1999) defined PBL as a series of individual or group activities that involve language/content learning through planning, researching (empirical and/or document), analyzing and synthesizing data, and reflecting on the process and product orally and/or in writing by comparing, contrasting, and justifying alternatives. (p. 4)

PBL pedagogy and research are relatively new to the second/foreign language field where it has been touted as a student-centered approach providing opportunities for authentic second and foreign language use (Eyring, 1989) and engaging students in language, content, and skills learning by using language as a resource (Beckett, 1999). PBL is also believed to push students to search for deeper understanding of content knowledge and theory-practice connection (Krajcik, Blumenfeld, Marx, & Soloway, 1994).

Dewey's experiential learning philosophy (Dewey, 1926; Dewey & Dewey, 1915), social constructionist learning theories (Vygotsky, 1978), systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994), and language socialization (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) theories have informed much of PBL research. Vygotskian Cultural–Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) has also informed recent PBL work that has explored the complex dynamics of PBL such as multiple subjects (actors), goals, objects, tools, division of labor, and the contexts of the activity (Engeström, 2001, in Gibbes 2011, and Zhao & Beckett, 2014).

Findings of various studies have indicated that PBL facilitates the learning of second and foreign languages, content knowledge, academic discourse socialization, decision-making, critical thinking, collaborative work skills, and provides deep engagement with subject matter content (e.g., Beckett, 2005; 2006; Beckett, et al, 2015; 2016) through the use of language as a medium (Beckett & Slater, 2017; 2018). Research also suggests that although ESL/EFL students generally value PBL, they can become frustrated because they are unable to see how PBL helps them focus on the learning of form (e.g., Beckett, 1999; Eyring, 1989). With the exception of Li (2010) and Zachoval (2011), there has been little research, especially experimental research, addressing how PBL promotes the acquisition of language form.

While technology tools have become a large part of project implementation within current language teaching and learning contexts (e.g., Gu, 2002; Salpeter, 2005; Sidman-Taveau, 2005; Zhao & Beckett, 2014), there has been a paucity of published research on how technology-infused PBL facilitates the learning of language form (one example is Lee, 2014, a study published as a MA thesis). Yet as we pointed out in Beckett and Slater (2017; 2018), the lack of published empirical work that focus on technology-infused PBL in the teaching and learning of language form does not mean that teachers and learners are not utilizing various technology tools, including social media, in their implementation of projects. Such work, we believe, needs to be published in a rigorous form that can inform other researchers and practitioners.

To this end, we invite scholars from around the world to to submit chapters that involve:

- Theoretical discussions of PBL in language acquisition (e.g., form, function, and technology, etc.);
- Critical reviews of current ESL and EFL research literature, discussing trends, themes, issues, gaps, and their implications for research, pedagogy, and technology;
- Experimental research on the impact of technology-infused PBL on the acquisition of language form and function;
- Field-tested technology-infused form-focused projects in various language-learning contexts (e.g., various levels of ESL/EFL; Intensive English programs; or other languages such as Spanish, Turkish, or Chinese as second or foreign language);
- Field-tested models/frameworks for assessing technology-infused form focused projects in various language-learning contexts (e.g., various levels of ESL/EFL; Intensive English programs; or other languages such as Spanish. Turkish, or Chinese, etc., as second or foreign language);
- Action research on the strengths and weaknesses of technology-infused form focused projects;
- Field-tested technology-infused second and foreign language-learning projects (e.g., iBook or video projects on the learning of pragmatics, etc.);
- Content-based (e.g., Culture, Biology, Chemistry; Technology) English language teaching research that includes focus on form;
- Form and function focused multimedia language maintenance projects research;
- Technology assisted form and function focused language revitalization projects research;
- Technology infused bilingual content (e.g., language, social studies, science, technology learning and professional training) project research that also focuses on form; and
- Translanguaging (e.g., in social studies, science, technology learning and professional training) projects research; etc.

If you have work that does not fit into a clear category above, please feel free to contact us with suggestions.

All chapters are expected to be theoretically informed; contextualized in existing research/pedagogical literature; address research and pedagogical gap(s) with significance

clearly stating the new knowledge the proposed chapter contributes to advancing our existing knowledge on the topic(s) and how; etc. Each chapter is expected to be maximum 25 pages, including references, and APA 6th edition style guide compliant.

Due Dates

Abstract/Proposal (**500 words** or less):   Sept. 1, 2017
Proposal feedback and invitation for submission: September 30, 2017
Chapter submission: January 31, 2018
Chapter feedback: March 31, 2018
Chapter revision submission: July 1, 2018
Book submission to publisher: September 15, 2018
Anticipated publication date: March, 2019 or sooner

Please note that invitation for chapter submission does not mean the chapter is already accepted. The invited chapters will go through rigorous peer-reviews. Acceptance decision will be based on the reviewers' recommendations.

Communication

Email Abstracts/Proposals and Chapters to:

Dr. Gulbahar Beckett: beckett@iastate.edu
Professor, Applied Linguistics and Technology/TESL,
     Iowa State University, USA

Dr. Tammy Slater: tslater@iastate.edu
Associate Professor, Applied Linguistics and
Technology/TESL, Iowa State University, USA

Publisher (TBD)

- Routledge
-