Language Learning & Technology
ISSN 1094-3501

October 2019, Volume 23, Issue 3
pp. 98–115

ARTICLE

Experiential learning of telecollaborative competences in pre-service teacher education

Maike Korinna Grau, University of Education, Freiburg

Anna Turula, Pedagogical University of Cracow

Abstract

This paper aims to contribute to the growing literature on how prospective foreign language teachers can learn to be successful telecollaborators. We investigate Polish and German TEFL students' perceptions of how they develop the competences, attitudes, and beliefs described by O'Dowd (2015) through experiential learning in a virtual exchange. Using grounded theory as its research methodology, our study used data from three different sources: (a) a pre- and post-project survey investigating students' changing perceptions of the relevance of telecollaboratively taught classes for their professional and personal development, (b) a survey and ethnographic observation focusing on students' perceptions of and attitudes toward distributed teaching presence in the exchange project (cf. Turula & Grau, 2018), and (c) a case study employing a survey and a semi-structured interview with a participant who carried out her own telecollaborative project in a primary school. The necessarily tentative results of this small-scale investigation point toward the suitability of the experiential learning approach for the development of organisational, digital, and pedagogical telecollaborative competences, potentially shaping prospective teachers' attitudes and beliefs.

Keywords: *Computer-Mediated Communication, Teacher Education, Learner Autonomy*

Language(s) Learned in This Study: *English*

APA Citation: Grau, M. K., & Turula, A. (2019). Experiential learning of telecollaborative competences in pre-service teacher education. *Language Learning & Technology*, *23*(3), 98–115. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/44698

Introduction

The benefits and challenges of virtual exchanges (VEs)[1] in language education have been acknowledged by a growing body of research publications as well as by guidebooks for practitioners (e.g., Dooly, 2008; Dooly & O'Dowd, 2018; Guth & Helm, 2010; Hockly, 2015). Consequently, VEs have increasingly been included in language teacher training programmes (cf. Guichon & Hauck, 2011; Sadler & Dooly, 2016), frequently with three different objectives in mind: to help the students develop digital, linguistic, and communicative skills; to work on students' reflectivity and propensity for critical thinking, increased openness, and social inclusion; and to prepare prospective language teachers for facilitating their own VEs. In our research, we investigate the potential of telecollaboration in these three pedagogical objectives.

The data to support the study presented in this article come from a telecollaborative project between students in two different pre-service teacher education settings: one in Poland and one in Germany. The Polish group (KRK) consisted of 19 students attending a lecture on *CALL Methodology* that was part of an MA programme called *the Digital Teacher of English* offered at the Pedagogical University Krakow. The German group (FR) consisted of 23 university students attending an elective class in a module on teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL) at Pädagogische Hochschule Freiburg. The module was titled *Online Intercultural Exchange: Benefits and Challenges*. The language of the exchange was English, used by both

groups as a lingua franca.

The project was designed to achieve the three objectives mentioned above through collaborative, experiential learning. Therefore, in addition to completing VE tasks, participants were asked to reflect on their own telecollaborative experiences and to study relevant published research in this field. In all this, a discussion of the teacher's role in VE was an important element. It was based on models where teachers provide instructions and guidance at lower levels of digital and language competences in primary or secondary classrooms (Müller-Hartmann, 2007). Overall, the exchange aimed to help the participants develop a range of telecollaborative competences of the four types defined by O'Dowd (2015): (a) pedagogical competences, (b) organisational competences, (c) digital competences, and (d) attitudes and beliefs. This was done in view of the students' prospective change of perspectives from VE participants to future VE facilitators.

The present article looks at the data obtained in the course of the exchange in order to find out if and how the students' beliefs about and attitudes toward telecollaborative pedagogy—with special regard to teaching presence in VE—can change in the course of an exchange. It also analyses to what extent the participants are likely to see the telecollaborative experience as a way of preparing them for prospective facilitation of their own VEs. We start with a review of relevant literature and then go on to present the three studies we carried out in search of answers to our research questions (RQs).

Literature Review

Experiential Learning

Experiential practices have long been used in language teacher education. Since the 1990s, an ever-increasing amount of research in this area (e.g., Ellis, 1986; Kohonen, Jaatinen, Kaikkonen, & Lehtovaara, 2001; Legutke & Thomas, 1991), informed by the Vygotskyan concept of social development (Vygotsky, 1980), has led to an acknowledgement that "teaching is socially constructed out of the experiences and classrooms of teachers as students and as teachers" (Golombek, 2009, p. 157). In order to benefit from their own experiences, learners need to be guided to reflect upon and process their experiences thoroughly. This concept also underlies the telecollaborative teacher education project we discuss in this paper.

With reference to Kolb's (1984) model, experiential learning is defined as "a cyclic process integrating immediate experience, reflection, abstract conceptualisation, and action" (Kohonen et al., 2001, p. 27). Abstract conceptualisation, as defined by Kolb (1984, p. 43), takes the experience to a different level, Involving the use and construction of theoretical models and concepts. Learners process their experience through guided observation and questioning, which then leads to another stage of experimentation and practical learning. Through these interrelated stages of perceiving, doing, and understanding, learners are involved in a holistic way that is not only multi-sensory, but also includes both cognitive and emotional ways of understanding (cf. Kohonen et al., 2001, p. 29). It is also important to emphasise that, in the experiential approach, learning is a process in which knowledge is created by individual learners through the transformation of experience and not a transmission by a teacher. By putting learners at the centre of their own transformative processes, the concept of experiential learning challenges traditional roles of teachers and learners (cf. Kolb, 1984, p. 38).

Legutke & Thomas (1991, pp. 214–219) suggest the following three defining features of experiential learning in project-based classrooms: *learning in the here-and-now*, *experimentation*, and *reflection*. The first component describes learning in a situation that involves the learners immediately in a real or simulated context. The second element, experimentation, implies that learners actively create and expand their knowledge by testing hypotheses and finding out the truth-value of their own assumptions. The third component is reflection and refers to guided processing and evaluation of the learners' experience. Based on our own background in teacher training through VE projects, we believe that this definition of experiential learning is particularly applicable for the analysis of our project aiming to prepare future teachers for planning, organising, implementing, and evaluating VE in their own classrooms.

Telecollaboration at universities provides teacher trainees with situated learning in the here-and-now. Telecollaborative tasks offer countless opportunities for experimentation with technology, novel pedagogical tools, new communication styles, and so forth. In addition, each exchange inspires reflection, both implicitly and explicitly, in the course of interaction with partners and as prompted by teachers during in-class discussions and reflective writing assignments.

Telecollaborative Competences in Pre-Service Teachers

A considerable number of publications provide accounts of specific telecollaborative skills that teachers need to guide their learners in VE. These capacities include multimodality and multiliteracy (Fuchs, Hauck, & Müller-Hartmann, 2012; Hauck, 2010; Kurek & Müller-Hartmann, 2017; Müller-Hartmann, 2012), intercultural communicative competence (Hauck, 2010; Müller-Hartmann, 2012), task-design skills (Dooly, 2010; Kurek, 2015; Kurek & Müller-Hartmann, 2017; Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2013), appropriate integration of VEs into the class (O'Dowd, 2007), and discourse facilitation (Belz, 2002; Guth & Helm, 2010; Kurek & Müller-Hartmann, 2017). Dooly (2010) and O'Dowd (2015) set out to categorise each of these competences and translate each group into a set of rubrics.

Another body of literature concentrates on how computer-assisted language learning (CALL) skills, including telecollaborative skills, can be learned by teacher trainees (both pre- and in-service). Some authors—such as Schocker-von Ditfurth and Legutke (2002); Meskill, Anthony, Hilliker-Van Strander, Tseng, and You (2006); Dowling (2010); or Fierros and Foley (2014)—investigate the effectiveness of peer-to-peer mentoring or coaching (Melchor-Couto & Jauregi, 2016). Such research efforts, as is the case described by Fierros and Foley (2014), focus on situated learning, enabling insight into what Foley and McAllister (2005) call *field experiences*. In turn, Belz and Müller-Hartmann (2003), as well as O'Dowd (2015), propose reflections on case studies during which trainees analyse descriptions of VEs, pinpoint potential challenges, and react to them. Yet other publications in this area concentrate on the very process of skill learning. In doing so, they attempt to identify factors that maximise VE learning, such as the telecollaborative experience itself (Waldman, Harel, & Schwab, 2016), the quality of interaction (Fuchs, 2016; Vinagre, 2016), or the high degree of task orientation (Fuchs, 2016). They also report on what teacher trainees find the most challenging (O'Dowd, 2015) or beneficial in their future language teaching careers (Lawrence & Spector-Cohen, 2018).

To summarise, research on how pre- and in-service teacher training courses prepare future and novice educators for VE indicates that the competences needed to be a VE facilitator—technological, digital, pedagogical, organisational, and personal competences (Dooly, 2010; O'Dowd, 2015)—are best learned experientially (Guichon & Hauck, 2011; Meskill et al., 2006), given "the context-specific nature of telecollaborative learning" (O'Dowd, 2015, p. 64). However, there is a scarcity of research demonstrating the relationship between experiential learning of telecollaborative competences and teacher trainees' efforts to plan, organise, and implement their own VEs in the classroom. O'Dowd's (2015) study shows that "teachers are quick to learn from previous experiences in other telecollaborative exchanges" (p. 75), but no specific benefits for their own language classroom are mentioned. Fierros and Foley (2014), whose study focuses on situated learning and field experiences, concentrate on how their subjects (i.e., student teachers and pre-service teachers) see their mutual relations in what the authors call "protective ... electronic dialogue" (p. 57). Similarly, Waldman et al. (2016) demonstrate how telecollaborative experience gained during a university teacher training course can boost perceived self-efficacy to implement VE in the trainees' own future classrooms, but the "raised feelings of competence in designing, organising, running, and assessing an online exchange" (p. 184) are not confirmed by actual in-class experiences of the trainees participating in either of the studies.

KRK–FR Telecollaboration

The two groups who participated in our VE (i.e., KRK and FR) were pre-service TEFL trainees from Poland and Germany. The courses at the two partner institutions followed their own syllabi with

different aims, but shared the objectives that were central to the exchange: developing multimedia literacy, specifically telecollaborative competences, and promoting critical thinking through collaborative, experiential learning, understood as learning in the here-and-now, experimentation, and reflection (Legutke & Thomas, 1991).

In the practice of the KRK–FR exchange carried out in 2016, learning in the here-and-now took several forms. The first task asked participants to upload a short clip in which they presented themselves to others. The clips were uploaded on two Padlet walls and became the source of inspiration for themes to explore in the main task: studying a chosen aspect of culture for both partner groups. Students were encouraged to post ideas for topics, including everyday cultural practices such as Christmas preparations, pop culture, superstitions, and winter sports, as well as more abstract topics such as perspectives on the European Union, attitudes toward homosexuality, or mutual stereotypes. Local teams of two to three students were then formed and encouraged to choose their favourite topics to work on during the project. Based on these choices, international KRK–FR teams were established (i.e., students who chose the same theme were matched). The main task that the students carried out through online communication as an international group required experimentation and reflection in several areas, which were left to the students' discretion: project management and on-task communication; research on the group's topic, followed by the presentation of results in the form of a short clip; or the affordances of various digital tools. The whole project lasted eight weeks, and its completion was celebrated in the final session before the Christmas break by watching the student clips together in the local groups and posting festive greetings and wishes to the partner group.

The project was designed to provide opportunities for experientially learning O'Dowd's (2015) four groups of competences in an implicit or incidental way rather than through direct instruction. Examples of curricular elements and the group with which they are related are:

- The students were given considerable autonomy concerning task completion and management, which called for advanced planning, monitoring, and ongoing (here-and-now) evaluation of the efforts undertaken (i.e., organisational competences, referred to as Area A below).
- The weekly reflective sessions in local groups as well as the reflective essay written at the end of the exchange required critical evaluation of the pedagogical design of the VE as well as individual tasks (i.e., pedagogical competences, referred to as Area B below).
- Both communication in small international groups and task completion required good affordancing of known digital tools or experimentation with new media solutions. During the course of the VE, the students used a number of digital tools either suggested by the teachers (Padlet for presenting self-introductions, for proposing and voting on topics for the main task, and for submitting the final task) or chosen on their own. Examples include the use of Screencast-o-matic or mobile-phone video-recording for making self-introductions, Facebook groups and Google Hangouts for small group asynchronous communication, various voice and text chat tools for occasional synchronous communication, and Windows Movie Maker or WeVideo for editing clips (i.e., digital competences, referred to as Area C below).
- The above-mentioned reflective sessions and essays, as well as the very experience of the exchange, was aimed to have the participants constantly re-consider their own attitudes and beliefs regarding VE and regarding their own preconceived ideas, stereotypes, and other factors in intercultural communication (i.e., attitudes and beliefs, referred to as Area D below).

Research Report

In terms of research methodology, this study used grounded theory (Strauss & Juliet, 1994). Operating inductively, we gathered an array of data coming from different sources. First of all, the study was informed by in-class ethnographic observations both carried out by teacher-researchers and reported in weekly emails between the onset of the exchange (October 2016) and its completion (December 2016). Second, the data

came from two surveys implemented before and after the exchange. The pre-survey inquired about the students' previous experience in telecollaboration and their personal objectives for the exchange. In addition, the pre- and post-surveys asked the students to complete three sentences about telecollaboration (i.e., *Telecollaboration is good for …*; *The main advantage of telecollaboration is …*; *The main challenge …*) and to decide which aspects of teaching presence (Garrison, 2011) were the responsibility of the students, the teachers, or the students and the teachers together. The surveys were written in the Survey Monkey platform and filled in online. Their construction and implementation are discussed in greater detail by Turula and Grau (2018). Other data came from student reflective essays. Due to different course requirements, the essays were written by all KRK students (n = 19) but only some of the FR students (n = 8). This took place in class (KRK), in the penultimate meeting devoted to the VE (December 2016), or at home (FR) and lasted for about 30 minutes. The essays were structured by open-ended questions about what the students learned in the exchange, what they appreciated, and what could have been changed to improve the experience. As the KRK–FR exchange continued, patterns became apparent. Among others, they included students' perceptions regarding their learning of telecollaborative competences as well as a change in students' attitudes and beliefs concerning the role of the teacher.

One of the students in the study, after taking part in the KRK–FR exchange, designed and implemented her own VE, and an ad hoc case study was carried out in January 2018. Its aim was to investigate the effects of the student's experiential learning at a university on her own telecollaborative project. The data were collected through a survey based on O'Dowd's (2015) descriptors of the four groups of competences and a qualitative, semi-structured research interview (Kvale, 1996, p. 124). The interview was recorded, transcribed, and analysed through coding, complemented by a form of member validation (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015, p. 290). The interviewee was given the opportunity to respond to the first draft of the analysis and was thus involved in the process of interpreting the interview conversation.

Based on the input we obtained in the course of our research, we formulated three RQs in order to show the effectiveness of experiential learning in our telecollaborative project:

- RQ1. What are the students' perceptions of their telecollaborative competences learned in the course of the experience of university VE?
- RQ2. How are the students' attitudes and beliefs about the teacher's role, understood as teaching presence, influenced by the experience of telecollaboration?
- RQ3. Does the trainee teacher in our case study report transfer of training?

Study 1. Perceived Learning

The data in Study 1 come from two different sources. The first was a sentence completion task in the post-telecollaboration online survey. The second was a reflective essay on the most important thing the participants learned during the exchange.

Both types of data were compiled into a text corpus and divided into utterances (i.e., single-theme statements) that were later coded based on O'Dowd's (2015) four categories of competences (see Appendix). As a result of the coding, all utterances were ascribed between one and five categories, yielding a total number of 574 competence tokens for further analysis (see Tables 1–4).[2] The coding was performed by both authors until adequate inter-rater reliability was achieved, through discussing the differences in coding until a common annotation label was agreed on.[3]

Table 1. *Organisational Competences in Student Utterances*[4]

	Perceived Gains		Advantages		Challenges		What They Learned		
	KRK	FR	KRK	FR	KRK	FR	KRK	FR	Total
A1	6	5	7	6					24
A2	2	3	1	1		1	1	1	10

A3	8	9	1		4	5	7	7	41
A4	5	1	10	6	8	7	20	5	62
A6	5	4	7	4	4	4	10	7	45
A7		2	2						4
A9		1							1
A10		1							1
A11	2								10
A12		3			1				4

Table 2. *Pedagogical Competences in Student Utterances*

	Perceived Gains		**Advantages**		**Challenges**		**What They Learned**		
	KRK	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**Total**
B1	3	1						2	6
B2		1		3	4	1	2	4	15
B3		1		3	4	1	2	1	12
B4	4	1						4	9
B5	4	1	2	2			5	3	17
B9	2								2

Table 3. *Digital Competences in Student Utterances*

	Perceived Gains		**Advantages**		**Challenges**		**What They Learned**		
	KRK	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**Total**
C1	6	1	1	2	1	3	2	1	17
C2	5		1	2	1		3		12
C3								1	1
C5	1								1
C6			2		1	1	3	1	8
C7									
C8	5		9	5	9	7	17		52

Table 4. *Attitudes and Beliefs in Student Utterances*

	Perceived Gains		**Advantages**		**Challenges**		**What They Learned**		
	KRK	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**KRK**	**FR**	**Total**
D1	3	7	4	7				10	31
D2	6	1	10	5	10	7	16	1	56
D3	6	1	10	5	10	7	16	7	62
D4								6	6
D5								4	4

D6					1	1
D7	17	7	18	13	5	60

As can be seen in Tables 1–4, some competences were frequently reported as gained by the students, in both the post-survey sentence completions and the essay. The highest scoring competences were as follows:

- 60+ tokens. A4 (negotiating effectively with partner-teacher), D3 (willingness to compromise), and D7 (interest in collaborative learning of different aspects of language[5] and culture)
- 50–59 tokens. C8 (modelling social presence and creating an online community of trust and learning) and D2 (openness to alternative beliefs and aims)
- 40–49 tokens. A3 (designing the structure of the exchange) and A6 (maintaining a good working relationship with the partner)
- 30–39 tokens. D1 (a belief in the intrinsic role of culture in language learning)
- 20–29 tokens. A1 (recognizing the importance of establishing international contacts).

In terms of categories, 202 tokens were noted in Area A, 61 in Area B, 91 in Area C, 220 in Area D. This shows that in the students' perception, organisational competences, and attitudes and beliefs were subject to the most intensive learning change; whereas digital and pedagogical competences were less strongly developed as a result of the telecollaborative experience.

Study 2. Distributed Teaching Presence

To continue our research into students' perceptions of their role in the "design, facilitation, and direction of social and cognitive processes" (Anderson, Rourke, Garrison, & Archer, 2001, p. 5) as well as that of the instructor, we included questions to address distributed teaching presence (Kurek & Müller-Hartmann, 2016; Shea & Bidjerano, 2010; Shea, Vickers, & Hayes, 2010; Turula & Grau, 2018) in the pre- and post-project surveys. Both surveys contained a question with 11 statements inspired by Garrison's (2011) study about different aspects of teaching presence. In our study, these statements were changed into 11 questions such as *Who should give instruction?* with three answer options: *the teachers*, *the students*, or *the teachers and students together*. The pre-survey was completed by 39 participants, and the post-survey was completed by 35 participants (see Table 2).

Based on the analysis of the results, it could be noted that participating in a VE resulted in students' attitudes changing in some areas, while others remained unaltered after the VE. The latter included the students' opinions on who should be responsible for designing tasks, fixing technology issues, and resolving methodology problems or motivating participants (the teacher). In turn, the aspects of the exchange in which perceptions of teaching presence distribution changed from pre- to post-test included who should be responsible for making decisions about the goals of the exchange, giving instructions, providing feedback, diagnosing and resolving communication problems and conflicts, and taking care of social and cognitive aspects. Apart from making decisions about the goal of the exchange, where the telecollaborative experience led to an increased preference for teacher responsibility, all other beliefs shifted toward greater student agency.

Table 2. *Students' Answers Regarding Responsibility for Aspects of the Teaching Presence*

Question	Survey	The Teachers	The Teachers and Students Together	The Students	Total
Who should decide what the goal of the telecollaboration is?	Pre-	4	31	4	39
	Post-	13	19	3	35
Who should design the tasks?	Pre-	22	16	1	39
	Post-	22	11	2	35

Who should give instructions?	Pre-	35	4	0	39
	Post-	27	8	0	35
Whom should regular feedback come from?	Pre-	9	29	1	39
	Post-	4	28	3	35
Who should provide help regarding technology-related problems?	Pre-	10	28	0	39
	Post-	11	24	0	35
Who should provide help regarding methodology-related problems (if the task is a TEFL task)?	Pre-	33	6	0	39
	Post-	27	7	1	35
Who should diagnose and resolve misunderstanding and communication problems?	Pre-	9	25	5	39
	Post-	0	26	8	35
Who should diagnose misconceptions (e.g., personal, cultural, etc.) and resolve conflict?	Pre-	3	27	8	39
	Post-	1	31	3	35
Who should take care of the social aspects of the exchange?	Pre-	3	23	12	39
	Post-	0	24	11	35
Who should provide resources and cognitive challenges?	Pre-	29	10	0	39
	Post-	15	14	6	35
Who should motivate the participants?	Pre-	9	29	1	39
	Post-	9	24	2	35

As shown by the *p*-values and χ^2-values (see Table 3), the attitude change was statistically significant in three cases: goal-setting, providing resources, and resolving misunderstanding.

Table 3. *Statistical Significance of Attitude Change*

Question	***p***	χ^2
Who should decide what the goal of the telecollaboration is?	.020	7.59
Who should diagnose and resolve misunderstanding and communication problems?	.009	9.41
Who should provide resources and cognitive challenges?	.004	10.94

Study 3. Transfer of Training

Context

C, a student in FR's primary teacher education programme, had already attended another university course with a telecollaborative element before taking part in the 2016 KRK–FR exchange. Growing up bilingual, it was important for her to find a topic for her exam thesis that linked England and Germany, as both countries were a part of her life. She therefore chose to do her final school placement in a British primary school and planned to do a telecollaborative project with a friend, a teacher in a German secondary school. In both schools, the project took place in the foreign language lessons. Both teachers had chosen English as the project language, focusing on "the potential of an email exchange to support intercultural communicative competence in the primary classroom" (Allan, 2017). Before starting her school placement, C had planned the exchange thoroughly with her partner teacher, deciding on *My typical day* as the main topic. During the four weeks of the project, the children were to send three letters—first introducing themselves, then describing their days, and finally saying goodbye. These were then scanned by the teachers and emailed back and forth. Based on her knowledge of telecollaborative projects, C assigned one lesson

per week on the writing and reading of letters, and the other lesson on reflection and discussions of the students' impressions, questions, and overall learning triggered through the exchange. However, once in the classroom, she had to change this plan and adapt it to the fact that she only had one lesson per week.

Survey and Interview Analysis

11 months after C completed her 4-week exchange project, and shortly after she handed in her research report on the project, she agreed to be the subject of our case study. A survey based on O'Dowd's (2015) descriptors of competences (see Appendix) and a semi-structured interview were used as research instruments. The data are presented alongside the list of competences mentioned above, but also following the main themes that emerged during the data analysis.

The survey pointed to two trends. First, C rated her competences as a telecollaborative teacher quite highly: 32 out of 40 descriptors were ticked, meaning that she believed that she had the competence or attitude expressed in the statement. Second, in her opinion, the 2016 KRK–FR exchange helped her acquire many of these 40 competences: In 30 out of 40 cases, it helped much (rated 4 or 5 on a scale of 1–5) or somewhat (four descriptors were rated 2 or 3 out of 5).

The interview was based on C's answers to the survey and aimed at exploring them further. To start, C was asked which of the four areas (i.e., organisational competences, pedagogical competences, digital competences, or attitudes and beliefs; see O'Dowd, 2015, pp. 67–69) she considered most significant in her experience as a telecollaborative teacher. She decided on pedagogical competences (B) and attitudes and beliefs (D). In Area B, she mentioned that her most important roles were to identify appropriate tasks for her students (B1) and support her students throughout the exchange (B2). She regretted not having enough time for B2, although she spent a lot of planning time working on this together with her partner teacher. Based on her own project experience, C wanted to engage the students in something relevant but also enjoyable: "We chose this typical day because we thought it was nearest to the children's 'normal life' and everyday interests."

When talking about choosing the topic of the exchange, C demonstrated how closely-linked Area B and Area D were, pointing out the importance of not only the teacher's pedagogical skills, but also her positive attitude and motivation for the success of a project. As she mentioned several times throughout the interview, she was convinced that a teacher's overall positive attitude toward opening the classroom and getting into contact with children in other parts of the world set a good example for the children. Simultaneously, she was aware that such action could result in unpredictability, but she said that "if one goes into the project with a positive attitude, I think it also reflects perhaps on the children as well." She underlined this point with various examples in which her positive attitude toward the exchange helped the children to overcome challenges and motivational problems. This observation goes hand in hand with the descriptors stating that a telecollaborative teacher is expected to believe that "culture plays an intrinsic role in foreign language education and online communication" (D1). This descriptor ended up being one of the main themes of the interview. For C, real communication with people from other cultural backgrounds was a strong motivator to learn languages, and it was also what she wanted to establish in her own teaching. She believed that in comparison to speaking practice, which usually happened within the four walls of the classroom, the authenticity of the communicative setting established through online links made telecollaboration an attractive teaching method. This potential, in her eyes, outweighed the fact that for teachers, exchanges might mean more work and taking a certain degree of risk, because they could no longer depend on their own planning and the comfort zone of their own school and classroom.

Even though C described the project as an overall success (which she demonstrated in her own research report), she kept getting back to the unexpected time constraints. She mentioned elements she had planned but was not able to implement in the project due to the fewer lessons she was able to cover with the project: "We didn't have the time to create posters, for example, with similarities and differences … or introduce all the pen pals. And that I thought was a bit sad or a pity that we couldn't do it." These limitations seemed to be a major regret in her experience as a teacher because they forced her to leave out what she saw as

important elements of the learning process and to compromise and lower her expectations for guiding the children's learning. On the other hand, the children's responses during and after the project showed her that some learning did take place regardless:

> I had only the oral feedback from them and the questionnaires, and then I think definitely the interest was awakened, especially by the English kids because the German kids I only saw once. I think it was at least an input and I hope that somehow the teachers perhaps take it up.

Finally, even though she was somewhat disappointed by the realities of her teaching context, the situation gave C the opportunity to show that she was not only able to plan a telecollaborative project, but also have the flexibility to change her original plans as needed (A7)—an issue that appears to be one of the major challenges novice teachers face in online exchanges (O'Dowd, 2015, p. 77).

Regarding Area C, our respondent showed that she "can choose the appropriate online communication tools" (C1). C considered various options and, together with her partner teacher, decided on using paper-and-pencil letters, mainly due to a lack of computers to use during her lesson time, but also to save time. Weighing her options, C saw that this gave the children possibilities to include drawings and other ways of expression. It also limited the direct contact, as the letters were scanned and emailed between the teachers only. In retrospect, she was also aware that the possibilities of using the computer might have added a motivational factor to the project. Regarding real-time student interaction (C5), she explained that she and her partner decided against it. In addition to the organisational issues, C's own experience in a Skype-based university class had shown her how important it was to prepare these sessions thoroughly to avoid awkwardness, prompting her not to include any live chats in the project.

As for the role of the 2016 KRK–FR exchange, C mentioned it as a blueprint for her project at various points of the interview, regarding the general outline, the choice of topics (see above), the follow-up discussions, and other technical and organisational aspects of the teacher role. However, she also talked about the limitations of university courses. When asked if the adaptability and flexibility which was demanded of the telecollaborative teachers (A7) could be learned at a university, she answered the following:

> I think perhaps, to a certain degree, but I think it also, a lot depends on the person, him or herself … how flexible he or she is altogether, because if you're very nervous and think I've just got to manage everything, then it won't work so easily.

At a later stage in the interview, C mentioned the relative scarcity of published literature about exchanges at the primary level, adding that it was "not quite so established in our curriculum either, so there's not much 'help' for the teachers and if one has never participated or done a project like that, why try it out?"

Discussion

The most salient results from the three studies are analysed below following the three RQs.

RQ1. Student Perceptions of Telecollaborative Competences Learned

Overall, competences in Areas A and D were most frequently addressed in students' post-survey answers and reflections.

The relative dominance of statements belonging to Area A, which referred to the teacher's organisational competences, might be due to the fact that only very few of the participants had been involved in an online project before. For them, the exchange modelled the step-by-step process, and the discussions and readings helped turn their experience into learning. In their statements, the students frequently emphasised the importance of getting in touch with people from another country as an asset. They also underscored the value of compromise, a good working relationship, and the importance of designing the structure of the exchange, showing that the telecollaboration was seen, above all, as a social encounter.

Similar sentiments are reflected in the scores in Area D (attitudes and beliefs), indicating the strong emotional involvement of the project experience (see the above-mentioned holistic aspect of experiential learning, i.e., the *here-and-now*). This is likely one of the reasons why the largest number of tokens were identified in this part, triggered by both positive moments, or expectations which either did not come true or had to be strongly revised during the course of the exchange.

Area B, pedagogical competences, was not covered as much by the students. This part of the teacher's role might have been hard to imagine for a university student who was not teaching children or teenagers. In addition, competences belonging to this area were not as strongly and immediately relevant in the main telecollaborative task, which was more culture-centred. Nevertheless, the responses did include some thoughts about classroom pedagogy, for example, the need for much stricter rules and more detailed task descriptions and a higher level of supervision and support in the case of a project in schools.

Area C was the least represented area in the post-project surveys and reflections, even though technology was important in the exchange, both as a medium of communication and as part of the main task requiring the recording of a video clip. Discussions in class pointed toward several reasons for the students' apparent low interest in this area. For communication purposes, popular social media were used. In clip-making, most groups relied on their KRK members, who were more tech-savvy due to the nature of their study programme. As a result, both partner groups might have had a feeling that they did not learn much regarding the use of technology in VE.

It is also important to note that the data in this study were self-reported and, in most cases, subject to the coders' interpretation. This is why it was difficult to determine how deep the learning actually was. Yet, the very fact that the students chose to mention some aspects of the exchange in their responses may indicate their increased awareness of these aspects. In other words, as shown in the advantages and challenges column of the data table, some issues in telecollaboration have been noted, either as assets or as likely difficulties; but it is important that students made note of these things.

Overall, Study 1 shows that the students perceived learning an array of competences. This is in line with similar studies quoted earlier in this article, especially those by Fierros and Foley (2014) and Waldman et al. (2016). The results likely confirm O'Dowd's claim that "teachers are quick to learn from previous experiences in other telecollaborative exchanges" (2015, p. 75).

RQ2. Student Attitudes and Beliefs About the Teacher's Role

Based on the data, we can observe a shift toward a more distributed teaching presence, in which the learners take on some of the responsibility originally ascribed to teachers (a tendency also observed by Kurek & Müller-Hartmann, 2016; Shea & Bidjerano, 2010). The respondents seemed to place more emphasis on the instructor's role in the pre-test. In the post-test, that had shifted to *students* and *teachers and students together*. This particularly applied to *diagnosing and resolving misunderstanding and communication problems* and *providing cognitive challenges* ($p < .05$), as well as *giving instructions*, *providing feedback*, and *taking care of the social presence in the exchange* (in which the change of attitude was visible but not significant). The shift might have been the result of the VE design, which provided for increased learner autonomy and ample time for international group work. As a result, the students frequently had to take on the responsibility for the course of action, recreating what Shea et al. called an "instructional equilibrium" (2010, p. 137) in the teacher's absence. This might have been reinforced by the peer-to-peer mode (rather than the teacher-reliant mode). As reported in class discussions, the peer-to-peer mode was strongly preferred by both groups, especially in the area of conflict resolution.

There was also a discernible and statistically significant change of attitude regarding strong teacher presence in the goal-setting of the exchange (for example, there were much higher scores for this descriptor on the post-test). In-class reports by students pointed toward their growing belief in the importance of the persons in charge (the teachers) effectively navigating the experience.

Overall, the results summarised above are in line with the teacher and learner roles in an experiential

learning approach, enabling the learning process to be actively experienced rather than teacher-transmitted. Given that our VE involved a considerable degree of autonomy, it left room for active experimentation. As such, it was different from the more transmissive learning format traditionally used at universities. This seems to point to the conclusion that the shift in attitude regarding the distribution of teaching presence was the result of the students' unique experience in our telecollaborative course.

RQ3. Transfer of Training

The subject of our case study reported a significant transfer of training between her participation in a university-based VE and her own exchange in the teacher role. Specifically, she saw the competences in Area B gained during the university telecollaborative experience as the most relevant to her own exchange. The prominence of Area D (i.e., attitudes and beliefs) was consistent with the results mentioned earlier, pointing toward the holistic and emotionally charged nature of a telecollaborative project. C saw this both from the participants' and the teacher's points of view. In addition to her attitudes, her pedagogical competences (Area B) were clearly among the most relevant in C's classroom. This observation is in line with other studies of the teacher's role in telecollaboration (Müller-Hartmann, 2007, p. 169). C sees herself as a facilitator of learning through setting suitable tasks, guiding and motivating the students, and supporting their learning process throughout the project, and reports how taking part in a VE and reflecting upon it together in class has helped her in this role. In contrast, the organisational (Area A) and digital (Area C) competences were mentioned more as background knowledge to set the scene for the project. They were not as important for the success of her exchange as other parts of her teacher role. Regarding her learning of VE organisation and the knowledge of pedagogy gained at university, C distinguishes between learnable elements through in-class experience, reflection and reading (structure, task setting, choice of topics, technology options), and aspects belonging to a teacher's personality. She believes, and we agree, that most of these go beyond the descriptors of competences and attitudes and include confidence, flexibility, and a willingness to take risks.

In summary, we can conclude that, in the case of the teacher trainee studied, there is transfer of training between VE experiences at the university and personal telecollaborative classroom practices, especially in the areas of pedagogical competences and attitudes and beliefs. The data provided by C show that important aspects of VE pedagogy were internalised and surfaced when needed in her own classroom practice. While it is impossible to generalise from one case study, we see the results as promising and as a good starting point for further research in this area.

At the same time, it may be important to point out that in addition to pinpointing areas of competence transfer, the interview showed that a number of the descriptors used in it, having originally been written for exchanges at university level, did not apply in the context of teachers such as C or were not clear enough without the explanation provided in the corresponding text (O'Dowd, 2015). The former mostly applies to Area C, where digital competences are mentioned. Some of the competences would need to be adapted to a primary context (e.g., C9: *instruct learners on how to use online tools autonomously—tools which help them resolve language difficulties*). This ties in with other reports on VEs with young learners (e.g., Gruson & Barnes, 2012). The lack of clarity of some descriptors for our respondent emerged at several points in the interview (e.g., A7: *alter the logistics of the exchange to adapt to developments and problems as they arise*). A7 was one of the key competences that C clearly showed in her project management, but it was interpreted in a different way when going through the questionnaire. Finally, some of C's remarks concerning the importance of a teacher's attitudes were difficult to place in Area D, as they were on a more general level, identifying the teacher's positive attitudes toward the exchange and her motivation to carry it out as one of the most important factors for a successful project. This example may indicate that the list of descriptors could still be open to additions and modifications, especially regarding the telecollaborative teacher's competences and attitudes in school contexts.

Conclusions and Implications

In this article, we have built upon and added to the growing number of studies on telecollaborative exchanges in pre-service teacher education. Our data collected in Studies 1 and 2 confirm results of similar studies to-date, reporting on prospective teachers' perceptions that basic elements of setting up and running VEs can be learned experientially at the university level. Our data from these studies also point to the suitability of the experiential approach (i.e., teaching telecollaboration through telecollaboration), including the key elements of learning in the here-and-now as well as through experimentation and reflection. Our research aims to demonstrate that the three elements successfully trigger a learning process that is based on the individual's construction of knowledge and that is supported by the teacher, the responsibility for which is distributed between all those participating in the process.

Study 3 elaborates on these results and takes them a step further in several ways. The data showing the perspective of a trainee teacher who had organised and researched her own VE demonstrate that the telecollaborative teacher can indeed be educated through experiential learning in university classes. However, the case study also points toward the uniqueness of each context, especially regarding exchanges between groups of young learners. Another important observation pertains to the fact that learning to telecollaborate in a teacher training course at university can never fully prepare future educators for the complexity of the actual telecollaborative classroom. This limitation is frequently mentioned in reports on studies of transfer of learning from university-based teacher training to school settings (Farrell, 2009). This is even more conspicuous in VEs, as the teacher has not only her own students to consider, but also the partner class and its teacher. Telecollaborative teaching contexts therefore go beyond the regular level of complexity, constituting a setting in which decisions can only be taken in close cooperation with all the parties involved. This also refers to transfer of training in such settings.

The above-mentioned complexity and context-dependence of VE, together with the fact that our results come from small-scale investigations are reasons why further studies from different educational settings are needed to confirm and re-contextualise what we have discovered. Moreover, given the still under-represented area of primary education in publications on VEs (Dooly & Sadler, 2016; Gruson & Barnes, 2012; Milton & Garbi, 2000), we would like to emphasise the need for further development of relevant pedagogy for this important context and, consequentially, for including elements of said pedagogy in pre-service education classes focusing on telecollaboration.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the students participating in the exchange. A special thank you goes to C for the time she spared filling in the survey and answering the interview questions.

Notes

1. Although there can be slight differences in the terminology, in this paper, 'telecollaboration,' VE and 'online intercultural exchange' (OIE) are used interchangeably.
2. In several cases (e.g., when students reported that they "learned to compromise" or that "communication was important"), which competence the respondents had in mind was subject to interpretation. This is why categories such as A4 (*negotiating effectively*), A6 (*maintaining a good working relationship*), D2 (*openness to alternative beliefs*), D3 (*willingness to compromise*), and C8 (*creating online community for trust and learning*) were collectively chosen in both cases.
3. The same procedure was used in the analysis of the interview data.
4. For descriptors of the categories in Areas A–D, see the Appendix.
5. It is important to note here that *language* means English as a lingua franca and not the partners' native

tongue.

References

Allan, C. (2017). *The potential of an email exchange to support intercultural communicative competence in the primary classroom: A case study* (Unpublished thesis). University of Education, Freiburg, Germany.

Anderson, T., Rourke, L., Garrison, D. R., & Archer, W. (2001). Assessing teaching presence in a computer conferencing context. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *5*(2), 1–17.

Belz, J. A. (2002). Social dimensions of telecollaborative foreign language study. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 60–81.

Belz, J. A., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2003). Teachers negotiating German–American telecollaboration: Between a rock and an institutional hard place. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(1), 71–89.

Dooly, M. (Ed.). (2008). *Telecollaborative Language Learning: A guidebook to moderating intercultural collaboration online*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Dooly, M. (2010). Teacher 2.0. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0: Language and intercultural learning in the 21st century* (pp. 277–304). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Dooly, M., & O'Dowd, R. (2018). Telecollaboration in the foreign language classroom: A review of its origins and its application to language teaching practices. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.), *In this together: Teachers' experiences with transnational, telecollaborative language learning projects*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Dooly, M., & Sadler, R. (2016). Becoming little scientists: Technologically-enhanced project-based language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, *20*(1), 54–78.

Dowling, S. (2010). *Using online communities of practice for EFL teacher development*. Retrieved from https://web4learning.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/ocop_essay.pdf

Ellis, R. (1986). Activities and procedures for teacher training. *ELT Journal*, 40(2), 91–99.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2009). The novice teacher experience. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 182–189). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fierros, F. G., & Foley, J. A. (2014). Examining the role of technology to create a safe haven for student teachers. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, *22*(2), 57–65.

Foley, J. A., & McAllister, G. (2005). Making it real: Sim-school A backdrop for contextualizing teacher preparation. *AACE Journal*, *13*(2), 159–177.

Fuchs, C., Hauck, M., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2012). Promoting learner autonomy through multiliteracy skills development in cross-institutional exchanges. *Language Learning & Technology*, *16*(3), 82–102.

Fuchs, C. (2016). "Are you able to access this website at all?" Team negotiations and macro-level challenges in telecollaboration. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *29*(7), 1152–1168.

Garrison, D. R. (2011). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Golombek, P. (2009). Personal practical knowledge in L2 teacher education. In Burns, A. & Richards, J. C. (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 155-162). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gruson, B., & Barnes, F. (2012). Case study investigation of CMC with young language learners. *Journal of E-Learning and Knowledge Society*, *8*(3), 79–90.

Guichon, N., & Hauck, M. (2011). Teacher education research in CALL and CMC: More in demand than ever. *ReCALL*, *23*(3), 187–199.

Guth, S., & Helm, F. (Eds.). (2010). *Telecollaboration 2.0. Language, literacies, and intercultural learning in the 21st Century*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Hauck, M. (2010). Telecollaboration: At the interface between multimodal and intercultural communicative competence. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0. Language, literacies, and intercultural learning in the 21st century* (pp. 219–248). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Hockly, N. (2015). Online intercultural exchange. *ELT Journal*, *69*(1), 81–85.

Kohonen, V., Jaatinen, R., Kaikkonen, P., & Lehtovaara, J. (2001). *Experiential learning in foreign language education*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kurek, M. (2015). Designing tasks for complex virtual learning environments. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, *8*(2), 13–32.

Kurek, M., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2016). *Should I tell my partners or should my teacher do it? Group formation processes in telecollaborative projects*. Paper presented at New directions in telecollaborative research and practice: The second conference on telecollaboration in university education, Dublin, Ireland.

Kurek, M., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2017). Task design for telecollaborative exchanges: In search of new criteria. *System*, *64*, 7–20.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Lawrence, G., & Spector-Cohen, E. (2018). Examining international telecollaboration in language teacher education. In D. Tafazoli, M. Gomez Parra, & C. Huertas-Abril (Eds.), *Cross-cultural perspectives on technology-enhanced language learning* (pp. 322–345). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Legutke, M. & Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and experience in the language classroom*. Harlow: Longman.

Melchor-Couto, S., & Jauregi, K. (2016). Teacher competences for telecollaboration: The role of coaching. In S. Jager, M. Kurek, & B. O'Rourke (Eds.), *New directions in telecollaborative research and practice: Selected papers from the second conference on telecollaboration in higher education* (pp. 185–192). Dublin, Ireland: Research-publishing.net.

Meskill, C., Anthony, N., Hilliker-Van Strander, S., Tseng, C. & You, J. (2006). Expert–novice teacher mentoring in language learning technology. In P. Hubbard & M. Levy (Eds.), *Teacher education and CALL* (pp. 283–300). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Milton, J., & Garbi, A. (2000). VIRLAN: Collaborative foreign language learning on the internet for primary age children: Problems and a solution. *Educational Technology & Society*, *3*(3), 286–292.

Müller-Hartmann, A. (2007). Teacher role in telecollaboration: Setting up and managing exchanges. In R. O'Dowd (Ed.), *Online intercultural exchange* (pp. 167–193). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Müller-Hartmann, A. (2012). The classroom-based action research paradigm in telecollaboration. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Research methods for online interaction and exchange* (pp. 56–192). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.

Müller-Hartmann, A., & Schocker, M. (2013). Developing teachers' intercultural communicative competences for task-supported language classrooms. *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen*, *42*(2), 85–98.

O'Dowd, R. (2007). Evaluating the outcomes of online intercultural exchange. *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 144–152.

O'Dowd, R. (2015). Supporting in-service language educators in learning to telecollaborate. *Language Learning & Technology*, 19 (1), 63-82. Retrieved from http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2015/odowd.pdf

Sadler, R., & Dooly, M. (2016). Twelve years of telecollaboration: What we have learnt. *ELT Journal*, *70*(4), 401–413.

Schocker-von Ditfurth, M., & Legutke, M. K. (2002). Visions of what is possible in teacher education—or lost in complexity? *ELT Journal*, *56*(2), 162–171.

Shea, P., & Bidjerano, T. (2010). Learning presence: Towards a theory of self-efficacy, self-regulation, and the development of a communities of inquiry in online and blended learning environments. *Computers & Education*, *55*(1), 1721–1731.

Shea, P., Vickers, J., & Hayes, S. (2010). Online instructional effort measured through the lens of teaching presence in the community of inquiry framework: A re-examination of measures and approach. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, *11*(3), 127–154.

Strauss, A., & Juliet, C. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 273–284). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Turula, A., & Grau, M. (2018). Distributed teaching presence in a telecollaborative project. In J. Pitura & S. Sauro (Eds.), *CALL for mobility* (pp. 29–47). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.

Vinagre, M. (2016). Training teachers for virtual collaboration. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *47*, 787–802.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Waldman, T., Harel, E. & Schwab, G. (2016). Getting their feet wet: Trainee EFL teachers in Germany and Israel collaborate online to promote their telecollaboration competence through experiential learning. In S. Jager, M. Kurek, & B. O'Rourke (Eds.), *New directions in telecollaborative research and practice: Selected papers from the second conference on telecollaboration in higher education* (pp. 179–184). Dublin, Ireland: Research-publishing.net.

Appendix: Survey for C

Please tick off the statements that are true for you (column B). Then decide how much the Freiburg—Krakow telecollaboration helped in each respect (columns C—G / 1=not at all; 5=very much

	A. Organisational competences The telecollaborative teacher can:	B v	C 1	D 2	E 3	F 4	G 5
1	use online networks and his/her own professional contacts to locate possible partner-teachers in distant locations						5
2	explain clearly to possible partner-teachers his/her plans and expectations related to a possible exchange	V				4	
3	design the structure of an exchange (i.e. aims minimum participation requirements , language use) which reflects the interests, L2 proficiency, and level of electronic literacy of his/her own students	V					5
4	negotiate effectively with the partner teacher the structure and organisational technicalities of the exchange which take into account both institutional contexts (calendars, etc.) as well as the needs and interests of both sets of participants	V					5
5	employ various strategies to 'match' learners from the different institutions and to create effective partnerships and exchange groups			2			
6	maintain a good working relationship with the partner teacher throughout the exchange identifying problems as they arise	V					5
7	alter the logistics of the exchange to adapt to developments and problems as they arise (e.g., low levels of participation, access to technology problems, etc.)	V			3		
8	articulate to his/her virtual partner teachers the learning objectives and pedagogical beliefs that lie behind his/her proposed tasks	V				4	
9	apply his/her experiences of previous online exchanges in order to avoid repeating mistakes and to innovate his/her practice	V					5
10	apply his/her knowledge of the educational context in which the partner class is working in order to structure the exchange and avoid problems						
11	use knowledge of the common causes of organisational and intercultural problems in online exchanges and can apply a series of techniques and strategies to deal with these problems						
12	evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of his/her online exchange based on awareness of action research methodology	V					5
13	ensure that the exchange receives appropriate academic recognition within the home institution						
14	articulate the relevance and the added pedagogical value of telecollaborative exchanges to colleagues and superiors in order to support their use throughout the institution	V					

	B. Pedagogical competences The telecollaborative teacher can:	B v	C 1	D 2	E 3	F 4	G 5
1	identify tasks for the online exchange which meet at least some of the objectives of the participating classes' curricula	V				4	
2	support students in discerning and reflecting upon culturally-contingent patterns of interaction in follow-up classroom discussions	V					5
3	apply his/her knowledge of the culture and language of the partner class to organise culturally and linguistically rich tasks for the exchange	V				4	
4	design tasks which are attractive and relevant for students and which develop culturally and linguistically rich interaction	V					5
5	design tasks which support the activities of collaborative inquiry and the construction of the knowledge	V					5
6	integrate appropriate assessment procedures and rubrics which accurately reflect the activities which students carried out during their exchange						5
7	explain clearly to students what is expected from them during an exchange: deadlines, performance objectives, learning outcomes, etc.	V					5
8	integrate seamlessly and effectively the content and themes of the telecollaborative exchange into his/her contact classes (when they exist)before, during and after the exchange itself					4	
9	provide learning support for learners either through scaffolded guidance (in the classroom or in online tutorials) or through the provision of reflective tools, such as learning logs or journals	V					5

	C. Digital competences The telecollaborative teacher can:	B v	C 1	D 2	E 3	F 4	G 5
1	choose the appropriate online communication tools (e.g. email, blogs, wikis, skype) to fit both the everyday online practices of the students as well as the project's aims	v					5
2	demonstrate a basic working knowledge of current (e.g. Web 2.0) communication tools and their pedagogic affordances and constraints						
3	explain the use of the chosen tools to his/her students or can provide them with online or third-party support for learning how to use them	v			3		
4	locate and run his/her online exchanges based on basic working knowledge of web management systems (e.g. Moodle) or exchange platforms (e.g. ePals, e-Twinning)	v				4	
5	organise and structure real-time student interaction taking into account the particular affordances and technicalities of synchronous tools such as videoconferencing, chat etc.	v			3		
6	interact appropriately online with his/her partner-teacher and, if necessary, with the participating students, attending to online communication norms (e.g. responding to emails in a timely manner, using appropriate register , etc.)	v					
7	organise the online exchange in a manner which protects students' safety and respects privacy issues related to students' work	v					5
8	model social presence and online identify for his/her students and help to create an online community of trust and learning	v					5
9	instruct learners on how to use online tools autonomously tools which help them resolve language difficulties (e.g. online dictionaries, Google translator, multimedia authoring tools)	v				4	
10	develop in students a critical understanding of online tools such as the interests of the tools serve, the type of communication they promote, etc.	v				4	

	D. Attitudes and beliefs The telecollaborative teacher has:	B v	C 1	D 2	E 3	F 4	G 5
1	a belief that culture plays an intrinsic role in foreign language education and online communication	V					5
2	an openness to partner teachers' alternative pedagogical beliefs and aims	V					5
3	a willingness to look for compromise with the partner-teacher in relation to task design exchange structure, and other issues	V					5
4	an interest in trying new telecollaborative tasks and new online tools which may be proposed by students or partner-teachers	V					5
5	a willingness to deal with new messages, texts, and questions in contact classes or tutorials as they emerge during the online exchange	V					5
6	a willingness to accept that the teacher is not the sole authority on the target culture and language	V					5
7	an interest in learning with students about new aspects of L2 language use and cultural products and practices from their exchange partners	V					5

About the Authors

Maike Korinna Grau teaches Applied Linguistics and TEFL at the University of Education in Freiburg, Germany. Previously, she worked as a language teacher in Germany, the UK, Brazil, and Spain. Her research interests include online and other intercultural exchanges in teacher education, cultural studies in TEFL, and drama in language education.

E-mail: maike.grau@ph-freiburg.de

Anna Turula is currently based at the Pedagogical University in Krakow, Poland, where she is Head of the Technology Enhanced Language Education department. Her research interests include new technologies in language learning and teacher training, online intercultural exchanges in language learning and teacher training, cognitive and affective factors in CALL, and e-classroom dynamics.

E-mail: anna.turula@up.krakow.pl