Developing Pedagogical Discourse Analysis through Project-Based Tasks

Marie Conceptia Girault, College of Education (CCLI), Rowan University and David Alberto Rivera Corredor, Universidad de la Sabana

Abstract

This article discusses why pedagogical discourse analysis (PDA) can be seen as the departure point to teach through discourse and how language teachers can efficaciously use it in order to bring discourse analysis into the language classroom. To make PDA feasible in language teaching, it requires to be coordinated with actual discourse-based approaches. This paper introduces a consolidated approach resulting of the strategic combination of task-based language teaching (TBLT) and project-based learning (PBL), named project-based task analysis (TBTA), in which discourse is the core component of teaching and learning.

Introduction

Discourse and discourse analysis are often absent from the language classroom, not because they remain unheard of, but because language teachers still do not know how to integrate them into their lessons (Cots, 1996; Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001). Discourse and discourse analysis (Cook, 1989; Flowerdew, 2013; Johnstone, 2008; McCarthy, 1991), are the definitive processes to achieve what a large number of language teachers and students could aim for in order to effectively communicate in the target language (Cots, 1996; Erton, 2000; Hughes & McCarthy, 1998; Kurovskaya, 2016; Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001; Pettela, Kandra & Palepu, 2017; Thi Hong Hai, 2004). It is by means of these processes students can understand how language is utilized in precise real-life situations taking into account its formal and functional aspects, causes of communication breakdowns as well as socio-cultural features. This understanding should lead learners to express themselves contextually and manage genuine communication that takes place outside of the classroom while closing the gap between language teaching and real analysis of discourse.

Language teachers, need to acknowledge the importance of discourse and discourse analysis, and are strongly recommended to incorporate them in their pedagogical practices. First, this is because discourse evidences authentic, instead of, artificial language use or isolated sentences (McCarthy, 1991). The following are considered discourse samples, *"No, thank you, I'm not interested",* a person refusing a proposal and "*Yuk!*, a girl expressing disgust after tasting some onion soup. Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2014) acknowledge these samples as authentically produced language stretches and not artificially formulated ones. This is because of the existence of both, a complete sentence and an exclamation belonging to an explicit situation that influences the speaker into saying them. Hence, they are not simply part of an exercise in which people just repeat and say a series of sentences out loud. Second, discourse analysis does not only study structural characteristics of the language, but also functional ones. On one hand, structural language features allude to the grammatical rules and formal properties of language in the sentence (Erton, 2000); therefore, language is seen as an independent system. On the other hand, functional language aspects make reference to the different ways language is used serving distinct communicative purposes, the relation between language and context, and how the context itself interprets the produced language. That is to say, functional aspects are concerned with how people utilize the

language in order to, for instance, make a complaint, apologize, write a summary, or to be polite, etc.

It may be claimed that both structural and functional aspects of the language have a complementary role in the classroom, but if language teachers do not pay attention to structural language features, they cannot expect their students to improve, for instance, their language accuracy. Nevertheless, this is not enough; students also need to be told about functional language characteristics. If not, for example, they will not be aware of possible bias language that can cause them problems when speaking or how to better persuade someone when making an invitation (Flowerdew, 2013).

Throughout this paper, language teachers will learn strategies for teaching through discourse and apply an actual united methodology for doing so; a strategy which combines Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) with Project Based Learning (PBL) to formulate a new approach called project-based task analysis (PBTA).

When teaching TBLT, there are five basic principles to consider. The first entails learning by doing whereby the learner has an active and dominant role in the language class and teaching time is dedicated to create opportunities for learners to actively practice the target language and to create their own knowledge (Nunan, 2004). The second is the principle of experiential learning (Nunan, 2004; Nunan, 2014) where students are immersed in the teaching and learning processes so their personal experiences are taken into account when designing tasks. Third, task authenticity alludes to the necessary connection between a task and a real-world action (Nunan, 2014). The more authentic a task is, the more outdoor the language classroom will be. To have a concise notion of how a task relates to the real-world, Willis &Willis (2007) proposes fulfilling the three levels of pedagogical tasks: 1) students should aim to produce useful and factual meaning, 2) students need to construct authentic discourse by agreeing, disagreeing, arguing, and interacting, and 3) the two previous levels need to be contextualized in an activity that happens in the real-world. The fourth is the application of authentic input that reflects naturally authentic spoken or written communication (Nunan, 2014). Finally, when applying TBLT, teachers should act like managers, motivators, facilitators and language advisers as part of their role; a process known as scaffolding (Willis & Willis, 2007). As Ellis (2012) suggests, educators are expected to scaffold their students so that they can internalize new linguistic forms in their discourse. PBL, an approach mainly associated with student collaboration and a complement to TBLT has three main focuses: input, processing, and output (Ribé & Vidal, 1993). These three elements are expected to take place throughout the whole project (Ribé & Vidal, 1993; Thi Van Lam, 2011). Moreover, PBL does not have a structured pathway to be executed but it rather requires constant feedback from diverse critique sessions in order to accomplish a final product that is to be presented publicly (Patton & Robin, 2012).

Review of literature
Discourse analysis

Despite what literature and research claim of discourse analysis, there is a certain amount of ambiguity in the term. Johnstone (2008) states that discourse can be understood as any form of written or spoken language employed as a communicative vehicle. This involves knowledge about language; background information about the context in order to conduct communicative activities

that take place in the real world, for instance: entertain others, make an excuse, express feelings, etc. Cook (1989) refers to discourse as meaningful, unified, and contextualized *stretches* of language deployed for communication. Nonetheless, the ambiguity resides in identifying what a stretch is because discourse can actually take several forms and can be considerably dissimilar in length, particularly when spoken (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014). A language stretch can be a unique word, an idiomatic expression, a pair of well-constructed sentences. In fact, sentences can have grammatical mistakes as well, especially in students' discourse. Because of this dissimilarity, there is some degree of subjectivity. Taking this variation into account, any of the following stretches can be considered a piece of discourse in a hypothetical communicative interaction; "*of course, I would like to order right now"*, a person in a restaurant expressing he/she is ready to make his/her order, "*Oh, wow!"*, a woman expressing surprise towards an unexpected news.

Discourse analysis also can be understood as a set of tools intended to describe and understand how language is employed according to a particular context (McCarthy, 1991). Similarly, Flowerdew (2013) defines discourse analysis as "the study of language in its contexts of use and above the level of the sentence" (p. 1). According to Cook (1989), both *coherence,* the language property of being meaningful, and *context, "*knowledge outside the language which we use to interpret it" (p.10), are necessary to understand what discourse analysis is, since it is the study of how discourse is coherent in proportion to a determined context.

Pedagogical discourse analysis (PDA)

It is important to clarify that discourse analysis is not a teaching method (McCarthy, 1991), but could be understood as a cover term that indicates how and why discourse analysis must be incorporated in our language teaching praxis. PDA does attempt to fulfill the need of connecting teaching with actual analysis of discourse. This necessity has been pointed out by authors such as (Cots, 1996; Olsten & Celce-Murcia, 2001). Cots (1996) argues that the main reason why discourse analysis is absent from the language class is because educators do not possess a systematic description for adapting pedagogical samples to these types of tools. Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) state that although discourse analysis is well-known, a large number of language educators lack training in both theoretical and practical foundations in this area. Therefore, PDA can certainly represent the departure point to teach through discourse because it occurs in language teaching settings. Evidently, this type of discourse analysis aims to analyze oral interactions that reflect contextualized and authentic communication between native and non-native speakers or just between non-native speakers in order to identify communicative problems that can occur. Therefore, teachers can design and apply pedagogical strategies and activities to help their learners to overcome possible communication breakdowns (See Table 1).

Even though oral interactions play a crucial role as a source of input, they are not the only instruments that language teachers can utilize to incorporate PDA into their lessons. Textbooks may be considered also a suitable source for discourse analysis. PDA can focus on diverse aspects of speech within a textbook such as: linguistic language features, participants' personalities, social roles, the communicative situation itself, genre of the source, cultural aspects, etc. Kurovskaya (2016) noted in her study that textbooks are seen as didactic tools for pedagogical discourse that present the world in different ways depending on the communicative situation in which they are

immersed. That is to say, through the use of written text, educators have access to "speech immersed in life" (Kurovskaya, 2016, p.2).

Language educators do need to rely on PDA because a large number of language learners do not have much experience in using the target language in multiple genuine scenarios (Thi Hong Hai, 2004). If PDA is conducted in the classroom, and the oral and/or written text to be analyzed are a sample of a telephone conversation in which a client ordered pizza for delivery, PDA could emphasize aspects of speech such as communication breakdown. If so, what caused it? How did the restaurant worker approach the client? How did the customer give information and make his order? Did he always use full sentences to do so? How did both the client and the hostess react to one another's responses?

Thi Hong Hai (2004) suggests, the incorporation and analysis of diversified discourse is crucial. Educators cannot expect their learners to communicate through a different language effectively if they do not understand how it works in relations to socio-cultural, linguistic, and functional features of a particular communicative situation. As Pettela, Kandra and Palepu (2017) affirm "discourse will help them (learners) to use their knowledge of the language and to transform it into acquired competence" (p.4). Following the previous example, once PDA has been applied, students can have a contextualized picture of how they can call a restaurant and order pizza in real life.

Pedagogy. Teaching through discourse may require language teachers to become researchers because they need to identify possible communication breakdowns from the discourse samples they choose. For example, communication can fail because of incorrect grammar choices or wrong pronunciation, which are structural language features (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014). However, communication can also break down due to functional aspects, as illustrated in the following exchange of words between an American speaker offering a cup of coffee to a foreign guest (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014).

> **Hostess:** (Holding a pot of coffee). Would you like a cup of coffee?
> **Guest:** I don't care.

The guest's answer was not pragmatically correct, so his message was not clear. Even when he wanted to accept the cup of coffee, his reply made the hostess feel confused. As a consequence, she just put the pot on the table. The guest's response could either be interpreted as 1) expression of indifference and the outcome of the situation has no significance to the guest or 2) rejection of an offer or refusal to do something, similar to "I don't mind" without bearing a negative connotation. Consequently, language teachers, could take this communication breakdown example and use it pedagogically to teach their learners how to accept an offer properly depending on the social context. If the hostess is, for instance, a well-known friend, learners may just say *Sure*, but if the social situation requires them to sound more formal, they might say *Yes, I'd love to.* As described, PDA serves as a worthwhile instrument to detect, understand and prevent future students 'communication breakdowns.

Relevance of grammar. Teaching through discourse does not necessarily mean that language teachers should forget their teaching practices; however, it does require the adoption of a new

perspective. For example, grammar and vocabulary still need to be included in the lesson plans; although, they are not necessarily the main learning goals. Instead, they are just resources to both interpret and create discourse since they must be related to a specific context and pragmatic purpose (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014). In a study of discourse grammar Hughes & McCarthy (1998) affirm that grammar in discourse is a vehicle that allows the speaker to make explicable and contextualized choices to express him/herself at the moment of interaction: "Grammatical phenomena require discoursal explanations" (p.268). Therefore, discourse analysis can help students to understand, for instance, why a person uses the modal verb "could", "might" or "may" when ordering food in a fancy restaurant while he/she uses the modal verbs "can" or just the imperative form to do the same action in a fast food restaurant. In other words, grammar and vocabulary gain a richer value in discourse analysis but they must be strategically exploited for coherence and collaboration of additional discourse. In American culture, it is not uncommon for one to use the term "can I" such as "Can I go to the restroom?" One can argue that the appropriate term is "'May I go to the restroom?" Focusing on the verb "can", the former often implies an ability rather than a request for permission as defined by the term "may". Contrarily, and although the terms literally translate into "Can I", among Spanish and French culture, "puedo" and "puis-je" respectively imply the polite forms of asking permission, hence "May I".

Again, PDA should address these issues when analyzing authentic oral exchanges or texts because language teachers can prevent communication breakdowns and empower valuable top-down and bottom-up (Bailey & Curtis, 2015) resources that can be useful for the consequent construction of students' own discourse. According to Bailey and Curtis (2015), Top-down helps learners to understand the big picture, the social context where communication happens, and, Bottom-up tells learners about the small components of the language such as: grammar patterns, vocabulary, pronunciation. Furthermore, when applying PDA, language educators need to employ different samples of discourse, which can reflect real-life communication and contextualized use of the target language. This way, teachers and students can identify and analyze socio-cultural and language patterns as well as communication difficulties or even misunderstandings (Thi Hong Hai, 2004). Likewise, Loaiza, Madrigal and Vargas (2016) advocate these types of resources because "students learn how to appreciate and be aware of the discourse patterns associated within a particular context or situation" (p. 224). Highlighting and explained the causes of communication breakdowns, and how to employ the target language properly, teachers can better plan and put into practice subsequent interactive activities or tasks that lead students to produce actual discourse (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014).

Discourse communication breakdowns. Because language learners will probably continue to have misunderstandings leading to communication failures while producing in the target language, PDA should not be restricted to the analysis of the language sources brought into the classroom. Rather, it should be entirely incorporated in the language class by scrutinizing students' discourse so that they can be aware of their own breakdowns. After all, Olshtain and Celce-Murcia (2001) claim that one of the key characteristics of a *discourse community*, is feedback. Loaiza et al., (2016) even go further and recommend peer analysis and self-recording as strategies to increase discourse awareness.

Because language teachers must know and learn to vary discourse analysis, PDA can be conceived as the departure point for student assessment depending on their needs and communicative

problems. Needless to say, the critical reason for why one is required to do this process is to enhance students' communicative competence. In his book, McCarthy, (1991) presents a solid series of discourse analysis instruments intended to be employed by language teachers. These types of discourse assessment tools vary from each other depending on the language aspect to be analyzed, for example: regarding grammar, discourse analysis can concentrate on features like Ellipsis and Substitution or Conjunction. Flowerdew (2013) also addresses such diverse range of discourse analysis features in the English language teaching field, for instance: in terms of conversational analysis, teachers could focus on "turn-talking". Analyzing the following actual spontaneous role-play carried out by two novice former students, it is evident how the natural flow of the communication is interrupted because of pronunciation and grammar issues.

> **Student 1:** Good morning, how can I help you?
> **Student 2:** Oh! Good morning, I would like to order EICH sodas small.
> **Student 1:** What? Repeat? Please!
> **Student 2:** I WOULD like to order EICH sodas SMALL.
> **Student 1:** EIGHT small sodas?
> **Student 2:** YES! Yes! Right.

Nonetheless, it can be argued that student 1 was able to amend the communicative difficulty and continue with the conversation. In conversational discourse, this is known as "repair" (Flowerdew, 2013), a factor that is significant for helping to sustain a conversation. Therefore, analyzing an extract like this from students does help to reinforce pronunciation and grammar as causes of misunderstandings. Moreover, detachment is fostered because students can be taught to use repairs as a discourse strategy that can be employed in order to avoid communication failure by themselves and to improve their communicative competence instead of asking the teacher for help.

As evidenced in the aforementioned paragraphs, there are key strategies, such as real-world activities, application of contextualized and authentic language, aspects of functional language, and communication purposes that are part of the principles of communicative language teaching (CLT) (Richards, 2006). These components demonstrate a clear connection between discourse analysis and pedagogy, which can prevent communication failures within the context of a project-based tasks and task-based activities.

Task-based language teaching vs. Project-based tasks

Discourse is "the core organizer for language teaching and learning" (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014, p 427), and requires alignment with teaching approaches that can be fully incorporated into their praxis, while infusing two highly effective methodologies into the discourse process: 1) task-based language teaching and 2) project-based learning (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2014). Richards and Rodgers (2001) posit "An approach refers to theories about the nature of language and language learning that serve as the source of practices and principles in language teaching" (p. 20). In support of these theories, an effective consolidated approach combining, task-based and project-based analysis can help language educators to teach through discourse. Before addressing project-based tasks, the most important foundations of each approach are highlighted separately so that the combination of these approaches alongside pedagogical discourse analysis can be more comprehensible.

Task-based language teaching (TBLT). Task-based language teaching (TBLT) has remarkably taken an authoritative place in the second language acquisition field for the past 20 years (Van Den Branden, 2006). In fact, TBLT has gained worldwide recognition because it has become the primary teaching approach adopted in official curricula by several ministries of education (Nunan, 2004). The main reason for why TBLT has had such a growing impact is because most of the modern language courses aim to settle communication as their pedagogical outcome (Van Den Branden, 2006), which shows the imminent connection between TBLT and communicative language teaching (CLT) (Nunan, 2014).

As it may be deduced from its name, CLT embraces the teaching of communicative competence as its primordial goal (Richards, 2006). That is, the student's capacity to employ the language for meaningful communication. Richards argues that CLT does not intend for learners to memorize dialogs or construct blocks of sentences in the target language. Communicative competence demands students to be able to; keep communication despite possible language constraints, use the language to achieve different functions, modify the language according to the context where communication happens and the people involved, create and understand diverse types of texts (Richards, 2006).

According to Willis and Willis (2007), all the approaches that do intend to embrace communication in the classroom, for example TBLT and CLT, are called meaning-based approaches because students' opportunities to use the language are maximized in order to promote as much communication as possible (Willis & Willis, 2007). This discussion of the relationship between TBLT and CLT is also supported. Ellis (2012) affirms that "TBLT is an approach that emphasizes holistic learning, it is learner-driven and it entails communication-based instruction" (p.150).

Despite these similarities between TBLT and CLT, the former is more specific than the latter. Nunan (2004) claims that CLT cannot be seen as a unique instructional design, instead, it is composed of a family of approaches. Therefore, it could be stated that TBLT falls under the umbrella of the CLT approaches; however, it breaks down the general objective of real-communication into more explicit methodological goals (Van Den Branden, 2006). Nunan (2014) postulates that TBLT is the realization of CLT respecting methodology and syllabus design, which the author claims is "At the risk of oversimplifying a complex relationship. One would argue that CLT addresses the question *why?* TBLT answers the question *how?"* (p.458).

Task. Having presented what TBLT is, what language teachers need to understand is the concept of task itself, and how it differs from an exercise and an activity. Tasks are the methodological heart of TBLT. Nunan (2004) proposes two general types of tasks: real-world or target tasks and pedagogical tasks; the former makes reference to the multiple ways the language is used outside the classroom and the latter alludes to language that takes place inside the classroom. Nonetheless, tasks differ from language exercises because they do not have linguistic outcomes (Nunan, 2004; Ellis, 2012). In this sense, linguistic resources, for instance: grammar, and pronunciation are utilized by students in order to achieve the non-linguistic goal of the task (Nunan, 2014). Taking into account what Nunan argues, learners could self-assess their own progress in a hypothetical task in this way; *"I can write an email to my best friend telling him/her what I did on my last vacation"* or *"I can participate in an informal conversation with my classmates in which everyone*

talks about our favorite videogames" but not *"I can use the past simple form"* which simply references a linguistic feature, grammar, and does not truly address a task. Due to this focus on the functional aspects of the language, pedagogical tasks do have a connection with the real world. That is, real-world tasks become pedagogical tasks when they are adapted to the language classroom (Nunan, 2004). To complete a task, learners could be required to comprehend, manipulate, produce and interact with the target language from the beginning to the end of the task development.

Task vs. Activity. The other distinction to draw upon is the difference between task and activity. Considering the ensuing definition of task "A task is an activity in which a person engages in order to attain an objective, and which necessitates the use of language" (Van den Branden, 2006, p.4), one could infer that a task and an activity are literally synonymous with one another. Nevertheless, the former is usually more complex than the latter because a single task can definitely require more than a single activity in order to be completed. For example, if students are to take place in an informal conversation such as classmates' engagement in a group dialogue where everyone talks about their favorite videogames, they would probably, need to do the following; a) listen to and/or read authentic samples alongside the teacher b) apply PDA so learners could organize their ideas and search for extra vocabulary, c) share their preliminary ideas with a classmate to gain experience in their discourse and have the final conversation in groups. Consequently, it is preferred not to call a task an "activity", instead, refer to it as "a piece of classroom work" (Nunan, 2004, p 4).

Before continuing with the main principles of TBLT, it is necessary to focus on another key aspect of this teaching approach that is directly concerned with the purpose of teaching through discourse. Some language teachers might estimate that the ideal language class is the one in which a topic is proposed, and students automatically feel engaged, so they start giving their opinions presuming that meaningful discussion is constructed . Even if students are or were linguistically proficient, TBLT does not rely on spontaneous task development because of some pedagogical reasons. First and foremost, one cannot assure that all learners are skilled enough to participate immediately in a discussion. Moreover, students' participation can be affected by the background knowledge they have on the topic to be argued, so there are no opportunities to be exposed to rich language input, and activate top-down and/or bottom-up processes. Ultimately, through unstructured procedures, one cannot guarantee that all of students are effectively involved in the task; there is not enough time to provide feedback to students, and tasks cannot be scaffolded. Therefore, Willis and Willis (2007) recommend planning a sequence of activities in order to maximize not only the task outcome but also students' learning. Again, taking the previous example of task, in which students can participate in an informal conversation with their classmates during which everyone talks about their favorite videogames, there is a structure that intends to guide students to achieve such an outcome.

It can be deduced from what Willis and Willis (2007) advocate in instructing students in discourse production, a structured plan is necessary. As a result, students can have more significant opportunities to employ the language for communication, which is the purpose of a meaning-based approach. Therefore, it can be concluded that students' efficient use of discourse may not be shaped spontaneously; on the contrary, it may need to be constructed progressively. Hence, taking on a project-based approach will give learners the opportunity to see their progress.

Project-based learning (PBL). Although PBL is not considered a contemporary instructional model, it has had such a recent resurgence, mainly, because of two reasons. First, the influential role of technology, which allows students and teachers to research and share information more easily. Second, the strategies to plan, implement, and evaluate projects have been redefined and generalized for teachers' proper use (Patton & Robin, 2012)..It may be claimed that PBL is intrinsically allied to TBLT because "projects are super-tasks that incorporate a number of self-contained but interrelated subsidiary tasks" (Nunan, 2014, p 463). Therefore, one can infer that a PBL is a longer and more complex piece of work that is composed of a sequence of connected tasks, which explore the same topic or problem (Willis & Willis, 2007). Consequently, it can be argued that it is not possible to complete or even to propose a project without "understanding" what TBLT is. Nonetheless, there is more of a difference between TBLT and PBL than the notoriously longer life-span that a project consumes in order to be completed. On the contrary, it has its own complementary pedagogical foundations that language teachers need to take into consideration.

In the educational field, PBL could be considered as the abbreviation for either problem-based learning or project-based learning (Hong, 2007). While both approaches share some pedagogic principles that may lead learners to enhance, for example, teamwork or real-world application of knowledge, project-based learning differs from problem-based learning in terms of outcome. On the one hand, the former does not involve any fixed final product to present. On the other hand, the latter requires students to develop precise skills or knowledge to hand in the final product of the project, which usually reflects real-world activities (Hong, 2007). Moreover, problem-based tasks usually addresses what its name denotes- a "problem" to which a solution must be explored.

There are three essential elements that a project must contain within its different tasks, that is to say, throughout its entire development: input, processing and output. Regarding input, it is recommended to take both oral and written forms. Actually, input is so important that Ribé and Vidal (1993) suggest making a bank of self-access samples of discourse so that students can do autonomous work, especially outside the classroom, such as: dictionaries, grammar references, reading and listening sources, etc. Processing involves cognitive strategies to understand and produce authentic language. Last but not least, students, individually and in groups, are intended to produce comprehensible oral and written output. Output (Thi Van Lam, 2011), is one of the main goals of PBL, and must be present throughout the entire developmental process as well as in the final product of the project.

Despite its various configurations depending on, for example, students' linguistic level, course interests, curricular objectives or time (Stoller, 2002), PBL is usually associated with collaborative work, enriched by administrators' visits to the classroom or data collected by means of questionnaires or interviews. This outdoor component makes students feel more responsible and facilitates language acquisition (Raof & Alauyah, 2006). If it is really difficult to find fluent or native English speakers, students can conduct questionnaires or interviews in their mother tongue, and then, report the results in the target language.

Patton and Robin (2012) established three key elements to successful projects: exhibition, multiple drafts, and critiques. The first element, exhibition, indicates that projects require a final product,

which can be a debate, a radio program, a television show, an art gallery, a newspaper, a series of oral presentations, etc. Displaying their work publicly raises students' commitment and quality standards. The second key element, multiple drafts, denotes that assessment is necessary to be held at several phases of the project and not just at the end when the final product is presented. Patton and Robin (2012) claim that constant assessment helps to supervise students' progress and lead them to improve their projects. Finally, critique, the third key element, alludes to the practice of receiving and giving feedback throughout the project. Not only do Patton and Robbin (2012) recommend instructional feedback, which is led by the teacher, but also peer critique so that students can give comments on their classmates' works and learn from each other at the same time.

To execute a project, first, it is necessary to follow an outline that can conduct teaching practices from beginning to end; however, PBL does not possess a unique or unified series of steps, instead, they seem to change somewhat. Patton and Robin (2012) introduced a list of five steps; a) get an idea, b) design the project, c) tune the project, d) do the project, and e) exhibit the project. Patton and Robin (2012) state that teachers are highly recommended to take students' ideas into account when agreeing on the topic, designing the project and deciding on how the final product will be presented. Moreover, teachers must carefully plan the diverse critique sessions, the ways to assess and how students can gather data, if necessary. When tuning the project, teachers present the project to other co-workers in order to get professional feedback and to make changes if needed before its actual implementation in the classroom.

Analysis

Project Based-Task Analysis (PBTA)

Having examined TBLT and PBL, both approaches can be applied to explain what PBTs are and how they are employed to teach through discourse. First and foremost, PBTs are tasks that are not isolated, but they belong to a specific chain of tasks around the same topic that will ultimately direct students to present a final product publicly. Consequently, PBTs can help language teachers tackle one of the main potential challenges when working on TBLT: task chaining (Nunan, 2004). According to Nunan, task chaining fails when teachers do not know how to tie tasks together; as a consequence, tasks can seem to be randomly selected. Because of this unified task sequence, students can have access to what Nunan (2004) calls naturalistic recycling. That is, students are suggested to retake formal and functional aspects of the language and practice these aspects in different settings because their language mastery is not linear (Nunan, 2004).

PBTs give teachers and students the opportunity to maximize both PDA as well as discourse production. It is recommended that each of these PBTs have both analysis and production of discourse. Concerning the use of analysis, PBTs allow language teachers to utilize multiple written and oral authentic language sources throughout the project to apply PDA. However, as PBTs allow diverse critique sessions, PDA should also be incorporated when analyzing learners' discourse, and this should not only be conducted by the teacher, but also by students who need to be encouraged to analyze each other's discourse, which strengthen communication among students and teacher detachment. When analyzing students' discourse, diverse types of communication breakdowns, misunderstandings, and problems related to functional and formal language features might appear. Therefore, it may not be possible to cover them all at once. It would be best to

concentrate on the most persistent aspects of discourse that seem to be affecting students' language production and communication necessary to accomplish the project, which can vary considerably depending on, for instance, our learners' proficiency level. Regarding discourse production, is also beneficial in PBTs because it is promoted constantly and not only at the end of the project. Also, as the final product of a project is expected to witness the sum of all the PBTs language production, it can be stated that discourse is truly constructed progressively through the different PBTs. In addition to the three levels of how tasks are related to the real world (Willis & Willis, 2007), PBTs offer a deeper degree of authentic discourse production because students can also put their target language into practice in order to collect, analyze and report valuable data from people or experts outside their class. In summary, although they belong to a single project, language teachers should see the individual potential of each PBT and consider it as an opportunity to apply PDA and its production so that discourse can really take the principal role in teaching. To illustrate this discussion on PBTs, the following exemplifies an entire project that was once assigned to university students of English as a foreign language. It was divided into three principal PBTs in order to accomplish its final product. To clarify, developmental procedures such as, how students decided upon and received approval for the topic or the ways they were assessed throughout the different PBTs, will not be described since these issues do not focus on the main skeleton of the project and can vary significantly. Revisiting the idea of wanting students to participate in an informal conversation with their classmates, in which everyone talks about their favorite video games, one can simply go further and design a complete project like the one below.

Title: News report project.
Final product: To make a 5-7 minute TV news report video clip in which students discuss videogames. The news report must consist of introduction, interviews, reporting statistics and conclusion. Students' discourse must come together systematically.
Before the first PBT: The teacher and students had to agree on the topic. Students were told to participate in a free discussion on which they could have shared their initial thoughts while discussing the videogames they play and why, etc. Students organized themselves into groups of three.

PBT 1. Students constructed what they were going to say on the news report: in the introduction as well as in the conclusion. First, they were given four options from which to choose two sub-topics a) advantages of playing videogames, b) disadvantages of playing videogames, c) favorite videogames, and d) why are videogames so popular? Once the groups selected their subtopics, the teacher provided students with authentic reading samples about the two subtopics as well as authentic TV news reports. Then, the teacher applied PDA to scrutinize the type of language employed to report the news. Thus, the teacher and students could highlight discourse features such as: the type of grammar tenses employed to report news, the way the hosts interacted with each other, their speaking rate and key words, for instance, precise linking words. In groups, students analyzed the readings seeking worthwhile information and gathered ideas about their two previously selected subtopics to be discussed, and complemented them by giving their own examples. Students helped one another, shared their thoughts and organized their initial interventions. Once the groups prepared what they had to say, they were encouraged to form a round table and share their ideas with one another by listening carefully and asking questions that were built upon one another's interactions. This round table session did contribute to students'

discourse construction in two ways. On one hand, students had their first opportunity to express their points of view towards their two subtopics. On the other hand, they managed to appreciate other views and considered developing them further in their own discourse. The teacher displayed some communicative breakdowns detected during the round table to be surpassed. In this case, pronunciation was found to be the most repetitive cause of misunderstandings while students were communicating. In order not to forget what undergraduates had already discussed; because it would have been the basis for their introduction and conclusion on their actual report, students were asked to write two texts, one for each subtopic, on which they could have expressed their thoughts. The teacher gave learners constructive feedback after reviewing their writings.

PBT 2. Students designed, practiced, conducted interviews and told the class about their experience. As part of their news report, students were encouraged to include interview footage with guests who contributed to the topic discussion. Firstly, the teacher and students watched more samples of real news reports that contained short interviews, and applied PDA. Students were encouraged to reflect on how the journalists approached the interviewees and managed the interview. After watching the videos three times, the teacher and students concentrated on issues like: communication breakdowns, politeness, type of questions, grammar structures contained in the questions, tone of voice, pauses and reactions to answers. These structural, functional and socio-cultural characteristics pointed out in PDA helped students have a clearer picture of how to conduct their own interviews in real life.

Students designed an interview schedule; they followed an example given by the teacher, and formulated two or three questions related to the subtopics. Next, the teacher supervised all the interview schedules, and gave feedback. Afterwards, students conducted trial interviews by asking the questions to a person in a different group in order to gain experience. Later, students contacted an expert of videogames who spoke English, conducted and videotaped the interviews; this footage was used in their actual report. Finally, in a critique session, students were told to share their experience with the other groups and report some of the results they had obtained. They were encouraged to analyze their partners' discourse and give them feedback. The teacher also gave his commentaries.

PBT 3. Students designed, practiced, conducted surveys and made a presentation on the results. This third task was similar to PBT2. In brief, the teacher and students analyzed how statistical information was reported, then, PDA was applied. Since the discourse type of this task was more academic, undergraduates were asked to listen to the teacher and take notes while he gave a short presentation reporting findings from some graphs, for instance pie or bar charts. Then, students shared what they understood with the rest of the class. The teacher also asked students some precise questions, for example: how do you say 79% in English? How did I start talking about a graph? Subsequently, students were given with original written samples of description and analysis of graphs, they separated useful expressions, grammar features, key vocabulary, sequence of ideas, etc.

Students designed a 5 or 6 closed question survey; they received feedback from the teacher and made changes if necessary. They surveyed 15 or 20 people, tabulated and graphed the resulting data. Afterwards, every group presented visually and explained their findings orally to the entire class. Next, the teacher and students conducted PDA and gave feedback on their discourse (See

table 1). Again, some pronunciation and grammar issues were stressed but also some new elements like: repetition of ideas and/or excessive hesitation.

As it may be deduced, each PBT did take more than a class session to be completed. This signifies that there was a capital emphasis on the diverse processes of each PBT.

Last critique session. Before students began to videotape and edit their news reports, they shared their ideas with the teacher. They discussed the decoration that they were going to use, the name of the news, the roles each person was going to play. They also shared the doubts they still had and asked for the teacher's advice. This conversation was encouraged to be held in the target language as well.

Presentation. Thus far students have applied everything they had developed and had already practiced so far, the interview footage, the statistical results as well as the way to explain them, their authentic ideas of how to introduce and conclude the topic, etc., in order to create and tape their television news report. Consequently, it could be assured that every single news report was genuine. Naturally, students borrowed ideas from authentic real-.life news reports, for example, to have a clearer notion of how to edit their videos. The teacher and students decided on when, where, and how to present the news reports in a public way. So, undergraduates' partners from other semesters were invited to watch the video clips, and give their impressions and comments about them. Students also told the guests about the developmental process and shared what they had learned from the project.

Hence, the principal aspects of PBTs evidenced in the prior project example will be displayed through the following chart. Thus, language teachers can compare praxis with the multiple theoretical foundations of both TBLT and PBL that were employed to formulate this consolidated approach, PBTA, to teach through discourse.

Table 1
Principals aspects of PBTs evidenced in the News report project

Instructional characteristic	Application
Pedagogical discourse analysis	In each PBTs, both, authentic language sources as well as students' own discourse were analyzed to enhance their communicative competence. Peer discourse analysis was also included in PBTs 2 and 3.
Discourse production	Students produced output in each PBTs, this sequential discourse creation allowed learners to perform the final product.
Scaffolding	The teacher served as a guide and facilitator throughout the whole project.

Experiential learning	Learners decided on the general topic as well as the subtopics to be discussed based on prior learning and exposure to their surroundings.
Learning by doing	Students' opportunities to use the target language were maximized in each PBTs, for instance, they participated in discussions, shared ideas and results, designed their own surveys, etc.
Authentic input	Diverse audio-visual samples and texts, on which pedagogical discourse analysis were founded, were brought into class and shared among students.
Task authenticity	PBTs reflected the outside world and language use in a specific context. In this case, videogames, a topic students' actually liked to discuss among them, were the basis for making a journalistic piece of work.
Data collection outside the classroom	Students designed and conducted a closed-ended question survey to gather relevant information about people's opinions about videogames. An expert in videogames was also interviewed.
A structured procedure	Each PBT relied on a predetermined series of activities to be completed. As such, PBT # 1 was composed of selection of the two subtopics, pedagogical discourse analysis of the authentic language samples, negotiation and construction of the initial interventions, discussion in a round table, pedagogical discourse analysis of students' output, composition of the two texts.
Student's autonomous work	Work was developed on their own inside, for instance when designing the interview schedule, and outside the classroom, for example when videotaping and editing the final news reports video clips.
Multiple drafts	Feedback was also given during the different formal and casual critique sessions. Oral feedback too place, for instance, in the last critique session, but also written feedback was given, for example, when correcting the questions in the surveys.
Final product	All the TV report news video clips were exhibited publicly. Other undergraduates attended the presentation, gave comments and learned about how the project was developed.

So, as it may be deduced, PBTA gathers a meticulous series of principles and refines them in order to make teaching through discourse a feasible act to implement in the language classroom. Then, PDA can be seen as the trigger with which language teachers need to be equipped with for actual discourse analysis of, first, diverse authentic spoken and written language samples, and then,

students' resulting discourse. The discourse produced in each PBTs is recycled to achieve the final product of the project.

Conclusion

To effectively achieve students' communication in the target language, language educators must incorporate discourse and discourse analysis into their pedagogy. Because language teachers lack understanding and training in discourse analysis, they often fail to integrate them into their lessons (Cots, 1996; Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001). Discourse and discourse analysis (Cook, 1989; Flowerdew, 2013; Johnstone, 2008; McCarthy, 1991), are the definitive processes by which students can understand the utilization of language in precise real-life situations and determined context while taking into account its formal and functional aspects, causes of communication breakdowns and socio-cultural features. As a result, learners are able to express themselves contextually to manage genuine communication that takes place outside of the classroom.

Applying PDA via PBTs can prevent communication breakdowns, enrich trustworthy discourse production, establish accurate communication and learn strategies to keep it while learners interact with one another. This paper presents PBTs as an alternative approach to teach through discourse; it takes advantage of the principles of TBLT and PBL and provides language teachers with a structured instructional design and close the gap between language teaching and real analysis of discourse.

At this point, we would like to acknowledge that further empirical research remains to be done on these two variables of PBTs and PDA, so that we may start gaining additional insight into instructional and linguistic matters like; students' reactions towards this methodology, teachers' challenges when applying PBTs, principal students' communication breakdowns when producing oral dialogue, and so forth. We would also like to encourage language teachers to adopt PBTs and PDA to teach through discourse. It is through discourse that learners can fully understand how they and others can manipulate the language in different ways outside of the classroom. For those who are not very familiar with tasks or projects, they can start by asking their students what their personal and language interests are, and what they would like to learn so that they can begin designing and developing their own PBTs alongside their students. As Ribé and Vidal (1993) suggested "Develop your personal way of doing things. Develop! Experiment!" (p.10).

To effectively achieve students' communication in the target language, language educators must incorporate discourse and discourse analysis into their pedagogy. Because language teachers lack understanding and training in discourse analysis, they often fail to integrate them into their lessons (Cots, 1996; Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001). Discourse and discourse analysis (Cook, 1989; Flowerdew, 2013; Johnstone, 2008; McCarthy, 1991) are the definitive processes by which students can understand how to use the language in explicit real-life situations while taking into account its formal and functional aspects, causes of communication breakdowns, and socio-cultural features. As a result, learners are able to express themselves contextually and to manage genuine communication that takes place outside of the classroom.

Applying PDA via PBTA can prevent communication breakdowns, enrich trustworthy discourse production, establish accurate communication, and learn strategies to keep communication while

learners interact with one another. As evidenced through the different PBTs of the News report project, PDA was founded on both authentic language sources and students' own output. On one hand, upon analyzing TV news reports, short interview footage, reading samples as well as a teacher's oral presentation, students could perceive and identify; how to report findings from graphs, how to approach an interviewee and how to formulate various types of questions, how to overcome possible misunderstandings, useful linking words and grammar patterns, and politeness, as well as, other precise reactions that take place when interacting with others. On the other hand, analyzing learners' ongoing discourse, for example pronunciation and grammar, and functional causes, such as, repetition and excessive hesitation are examples of communication breakdowns needing to be overcome. Because of this formative analysis and production of discourse on reporting news, students' final product may have been refined (Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001).

This paper presents PBTA as an alternative approach to teaching through discourse. PBTs take advantage of the principles of TBLT and PBL and provides language teachers with a structured instructional design in order to close the gap between language teaching and real analysis and production of discourse. During the development of the News report project, students realized how they would reach the proposed final product if they achieved each non-linguistic outcome of each task since a logical sequence has been established from the beginning (Nunan, 2004; Ellis 2012). Furthermore, students seemed more motivated and engaged because of the outdoor components contained in the project, for instance: gathering data via questionnaires, interviewing an expert and/or presenting their final products publically, (Raof & Alauyah, 2006; Patton & Robin, 2012), which may have pushed them out of their comfort zone giving them the opportunity to put into practice what they were studying from inside the classroom to outside the classroom.

This study is limited to authors Celce-Murcia, Olshtain, and Kurovskaya, as there are very few researchers on PDA. Consequently, we would like to acknowledge that further empirical research remains to be done on both PBTA and PDA, to gain additional insight into instructional and linguistic matters such as students' reactions towards this methodology, teachers' challenges when applying PBTs, main students' communication breakdowns when producing oral dialogues. We would also like to encourage language teachers to adopt PBTs and PDA to teach through discourse. It is through discourse that learners can fully understand how they and others can manipulate the language in different ways outside of the classroom. For those who are not very familiar with tasks or projects, they can start by asking their students what their personal and language interests are, and what they would like to learn so that they can begin designing and developing their own PBTs alongside their students. In fact, this is exactly how the News report project started, that is to say, by asking students what topic they would love to work on, videogames, and later, by letting them decide on which subtopics their reports would cover. As Ribé and Vidal (1993) suggested, "Develop your personal way of doing things. Develop! Experiment!" (p.10).

References

Raof, A., & Alauyah, M. (2006). English for Specific Purposes (EAP) project work: Preparing learners for the workplace. *Asian-EFL Journal, 8(1), 144-154.* Retrieved from http://70.40.196.162/March_06.pdf# page=144

Bailey, K. M., & Curtis, A. (2015). *Learning about language assessment: dilemmas, decisions, and directions*. Boston: National Geographic Learning/Heinle, Cengage, Learning.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2014). Teaching language through discourse. In Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M. & Snow, M.A. (eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (4rd edition)* (pp. 424-437). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Cook,G. (1989). *Discourse.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cots, J. M. (1996). Bringing discourse analysis into the language classroom'. *Links & Letters*, *3*, 77–101.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Erton, I. (2000). Contributions of discourse analysis to language teaching. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,19,* 201-211.

Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in english language education.* New York: Routledge.

Hong, J. C. (2007). The comparison of problem-based learning (PmBL) model and project-based learning (PtBL) model. International Conference on Engineering Education (ICEE) 2007, Coibra, Portugal.

Hughes, R., & McCarthy, M. (1998). From Sentence to Discourse: Discourse Grammar and English Language Teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*, *32*(2), 263- 287. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587584

Kurovskaya, Y. G. (2016). Linguistics and cognitive linguistics as tools of pedagogical discourse analysis. *SHS Web of Conferences, 29, 01039. doi: 10.1051/ shsconf/2016*

Johnstone,B. (2008). *Discourse analysis.* Malden, MA:Blackwell.
Loaiza, M., Madrigal, V., & Vargas, V. (2016). Bringing critical discourse analysis into the foreign language classroom: A case study of a Taiwanese learner of spanish in Costa Rica. *Revista de lenguas modernas, 24*, 215-226.

McCarthy,M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for teachers.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge
University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2014). Task-based teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D.M. Brinton,
& M.A. Snow (eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (4rd
edition)* (pp. 455-470). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Thi Hong Hai, N. (2004). The importance of discourse analysis in teaching oral english.
The New Zealand digital library: the University of Walkato. Retrieved from
http://www.nzdl.org/gsdl/collect/literatu/index/assoc/HASH01d8/
bd923e3c.dir/doc.pdf

Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse analysis and language teaching. In D.

Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton, *The handbook of discourse
analysis* (pp. 707-724). Malden,MA: Blackwell.

Patton, A. & Robin, G. (2012). *Work That Matters: The Teacher's Guide to Project
Based Learning.* London: The Paul Hamlyn Foundation.

Pettela, R., Kandra, C., & Palepu, S. (2017). Discourse analysis and language teaching.
Research journal of english language and literature,5, 658-652. Retrieved from
http://www.rjelal.com/5.2.17c/648-652%20CHANDRIKA%20KANDRA.pdf

Ribé, R., & Vidal, N. (1993). *Project work step by step*. Oxford, UK: Heineman.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). Approaches and methods in language teaching
(2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Retrieved from
https://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/Richards-
Communicative-Language.pdf

Stoller, F. (2002). Project work: A means to promote language and content. In J. C.
Richards & W. A. Renandya (eds*.), Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of
current practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 107–119.

Thi Van Lam, N. (2011). Project-based learning in teaching English as a foreign
language. *VNU Journal of Science, Foreign Languages, 27,* 140-146.

Van den Branden, K. (2006). Introduction: Task-based language-teaching in a nutshell. In
K.Van den Branden (Ed.), *Task-based language education: From theory to
practice* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task based teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.