sciendo

Online interaction descriptors:
A tool for the development of tasks
for language competences and language use

Jana Bérešová[1] & Alice Micallef[2]
[1] Trnava University, Slovakia
[2] Directorate for Learning and Assessment Programmes, Malta
jana.beresova@truni.sk; alice.micallef@ilearn.edu.mt

Abstract
The study focuses on a new scale of the framework introduced by the CEFR Companion Volume. Slovak and Maltese teachers were invited to participate in the training sessions in which they were exposed to lists of descriptors related to online interaction. The goal of familiarisation activities related to indicating reference levels was to prepare teachers for constructing tasks designed for practicing online communication in language classes, relevant to the proficiency levels of their students. The data on teachers' judgements are clearly displayed and analysed in order to find out similarities and differences between teachers' perceptions of language proficiency in two countries. Workshop sessions stimulated in-depth discussions the conclusions of which are reflected in the recommendations for language educators and teachers.
Keywords: CEFR descriptors, online interaction, familiarization, teachers' judgements, task construction

Introduction

There are several studies related to a new vision for education. A large number of them address competences and skills that learners require to succeed in the information age (Lamb, Marie, & Doecke, 2017; Bellanca & Brandt, 2010). Modern technologies have significantly changed both private and professional life in society. Following a detailed analysis of the research literature, the World Economic Forum (2015) defined the 16 most critical '21st century skills' that enable learners to acquire the knowledge they require to succeed in society. These include foundation literacies (how individuals apply core skills to everyday tasks), competencies (how individuals approach complex challenges) and character qualities (how individuals approach their changing environment). Language learning is considered as central in helping learners improve their reading literacy, scientific literacy, cultural and civic literacy (foundation literacies), critical

thinking/problem-solving, communication and collaboration (competencies), and curiosity, initiative, social and cultural awareness (character qualities). "Languages competence" is noted as one of the eight key competences for lifelong learning (Key Competencies for Lifelong Learning, 2018, p. 38).

Philosophies and concepts that underpin the CEFR embrace principles of social constructivism and active engagement in learning (Vygotsky, 1962). Social construction of knowledge implies that the learner is actively engaged in the construction of knowledge with others. The CEFR Companion Volume (2018) refers to an action-oriented approach or a learner-centred approach. While the former emphasises that learning a language focuses on what a learner is able to do with the language in real-life situations, the latter regards learners as individuals who have their own needs and aim at becoming autonomous in the development of communicative language competencies. The 'can do' statements present a 'clear shared roadmap for learning' (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 25). Furthermore, the CEFR draws attention to the various communicative needs and situations for language use through the focus on plurilingual competences.

The potential of modern technologies in language learning is unlimited. Currently, the access to the Internet provides language learners with a vast number of materials (either authentic or modified) and naturally enables learners to be exposed to one or several languages, which supports the development of plurilingualism and pluriculturalism. Language classes can be enriched by electronic discussion such as online forums (bulletin boards, lists, and real-time conversation) that provide a written record of all correspondents' contributions), which supports the development of electronic literacies such as reading and writing practices in online environments.

Consequently, it seems that the focus on online interaction requires specific attention due to the way it differs from face-to-face interaction. Great headway has been made by the authors of the CEFR Companion Volume (2018) recognising the necessity to highlight the main concepts and implication of the CEFR in relation to new situations of learning extending the CEFR illustrative descriptors. Apart from introducing new scales, presenting a completely new reference level (Pre-A1), mediation, online interaction, plurilingual and pluricultural repertoires were added as new descriptors, validated by several international institutions. The category of online interaction comprises two scales: online conversation and discussion and goal-oriented online transactions and collaboration. In these two scales the multimodal activity typical of web use, for example emailing, using chat, written contributions to discussion are concerned (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 51).

The new online interaction descriptors presented a challenge for both Slovak and Maltese teachers of foreign languages in view of implications for language teaching and appropriate levels of language use.

Project Description

The project was implemented in two countries that followed similar procedures, although working with different groups of teachers. In Slovakia, the participants were teachers of English as it is the first foreign language learned in the third year of primary education. In some schools, the foreign language is offered at an earlier stage however the official curricula do not focus on earlier stages of foreign language learning. In Malta, the project was presented to teachers of German as a foreign language. Students choose their first foreign language at age 11 in their first year of secondary education. Italian is the most selected language option followed by French. German and Spanish are selected by a smaller cohort of learners. Alongside Maltese, the mother tongue, English is the language of schooling.

In the Slovak education context, the focus was placed on B and C levels. The former levels refer to what learners are expected to reach by the end of secondary education while the latter indicate the obligatory C1 level for those studying within bilingual secondary school institutions. In the Maltese context the focus lay on A and B1 levels that teachers work on during the five years at secondary level. The focus is mainly on the A2 plus to B1 levels that learners are expected to reach by the end of secondary education at age 16. Learners who find difficulty with the foreign language in their first years of schooling may shift to a proficiency course and sit for A1 and A2 levels. They may continue learning the language at the next level of proficiency in a post-secondary institution.

The project was implemented in two stages. In the first stage (September 2018–February 2019), the teachers were familiarised with the descriptors concerning online conversation and discussion. The second stage (February 2019–May 2019) was focused on searching for tasks that match the description provided by descriptors for each level in the CEFR Companion Volume. At this stage, teachers discussed a number of tasks that were related to a specific scale of the CEFR online conversation and discussion grid and were asked to indicate a level at which the students might achieve the task according to CEFR descriptors. In the Slovak context, tasks were selected from teachers' course books that contained officially claimed and aligned CEFR levels. In the Maltese context teachers do not necessarily follow a text book and thus discussed according to material they used in class.

The second phase of the project will commence in October 2019, during which time teachers will be presented with feedback obtained in this first part of the project and will initiate the inquiry into the implementation phase with students.

Results from the Slovak context

As far as the online conversation and discussion scale is concerned, teachers in both countries were given a table that presented 15 bands taken from the CEFR

Companion Volume (2018, p. 97) in a jumbled order. Since one band in the original table is comprised of several descriptors, some levels were represented by more than one descriptor. The idea behind this decision was to let teachers think that there might be more than one description related to the same level. During this sorting exercise, requiring the indication of a specific level, teachers underlined key words and compared them with generic CEFR scales. Most teachers followed the instructions properly and indicated the levels they were most familiar with according to their teaching experiences.

The following tables and comments on the data results reflect which phrases from the descriptors presented in the CEFR Companion Volume influenced teachers in their indication of respective level.

Key words, terms and phrases quoted in the sections below refer to descriptors for Online conversation and discussion in the CEFR Companion Volume (2018, p. 97).

A1	A2	A2+	**B1**	B1+	B2	B2+	C1
3	4	-	**7**	3	3	-	1

Tab. 1: Online conversation and discussion for level B1

As noted earlier, B1 is a level required by Slovak legislation from students who complete their secondary technical school education. Most teachers recognised B1 (33%) when presented with the sorting exercise, however other levels assigned ranged from A1 (14%) up to C1 (5%). Key words such as *a comprehensible contribution in an online discussion on a familiar topic of interest, the text prepared beforehand and using online tools to fill gaps in language* influenced teachers in selecting lower-proficiency levels, while key words focusing on *postings about experiences, feeling and events* affected their choice for higher levels. For B1 only one set of two descriptions were used as the upper one is considered a plus level. Despite the fact that the CEFR Companion Volume makes a clear and precise distinction between the descriptor at a specific level and its plus level, teachers noted that this distinction is not kept in Appendix 5 (CEFR CV, 2018) as B1 is not divided into one main level and one plus level.

B1	B1+	**B2**	B2+	C1
1	1	**15**	2	2

Tab. 2: Online conversation and discussion for level B2

Level B2 is expected to be achieved by students who study at secondary grammar schools and most teachers (71%) voted for B2. Teachers underlined the following phrases they considered important for their judgements; *can engage in online exchanges between several participants, effectively linking his/her*

contributions to previous ones in the thread and *can recognise misunderstandings and disagreements that arise in an online interaction and can deal with them, provided that the interlocutor(s) are willing to cooperate.*

A1	A2	A2+	B1	B1+	**B2**
1	3	4	9	1	**3**

Tab. 3: Online conversation and discussion for level B2 – other descriptors

Since every band can include more than one descriptor, our task concerning the indication of a proper level contained another description related to level B2. This time teachers focused on words such as *avoidance of unusual and complex language and allowing time for responses* and therefore they did not notice more important key words such as *active participation, stating and responding to opinions on topics of interest at some length* (Bérešová, 2019, p. 1797), which clearly state that such a language user should be able to participate in conversation and discussion actively and on their own initiative, being able to express his/her opinions. Most teachers underlined *avoid unusual or complex language and allow time for responses,* the phrases which according to them represented lower levels. Therefore, only 14% estimated the right level.

C1	C2
11	10

Tab. 4: Online conversation and discussion for level C1

The number of teachers who were engaged in teaching at bilingual schools was only five. However, all the teachers involved were expected to judge all the levels. Their judgment (48%) for level C2 was influenced by the expressions with the notion of effectiveness and academic language, e.g. *can participate effectively, in online academic discussion, giving further clarification of complex, abstract issues,* which stimulated an idea that this can be done only at the highest level.

A2	B1	B1+	B2	B2+	**C1**	C2
1	4	4	9	2	**-**	1

Tab. 5: Online conversation and discussion for level C1 – other descriptors

Despite the fact that teachers were quite successful in indicating C1 in the first example, none of the teachers recognised the level when being provided with the second example. Key words such as *several participants exchanging their opinions in real time, understanding the communicative intentions and cultural implication of the various contributions* led most teachers to indicate B2 (43%), two teachers

voted for B2+ and one participant judged can-do statements to be relevant for level C2. The option for A2 was irrelevant as descriptors clearly indicate that A2 users can be engaged only in basic social communication due to their limited vocabulary and grammar (Bérešová, 2019, p. 1797).

Results from the Maltese context

Similar to their Slovak counterparts, teachers highlighted key words on the grid that presented CEFR descriptors ranging from Pre A1 to C1 levels and indicated their judgements according to their knowledge of CEFR levels and their teaching experiences. Only the results of data gathered on A and B levels will be presented in the following section.

A2	A2+	**B1**	B1+
2	2	**10**	4

Tab. 6: Online conversation and discussion for level B1

B1 is considered a high level of achievement in Maltese secondary classrooms. 56% of teachers recognised the B1 descriptor. Key terms that pointed at *a comprehensible contribution in an online discussion on a familiar topic of interest* and reference to the fact that the text may be *prepared beforehand* led teachers to select the B1 level*.* Others argued that such key terms were misleading and led them to select a lower proficiency level. 22% were concerned that this was a higher level due to the reference to *postings about experiences, feeling and events*. The same concern was evident amongst Slovak teachers.

Teachers were also asked to focus on the plus levels. The following table focuses on how they addressed the B1 plus level.

A2	A2+	B1	**B1+**	B2
2	-	8	**5**	3

Tab. 7: Online conversation and discussion for level B1+

Teachers' judgment (28%) for the higher level of competence at B1+ level was impacted upon by the reference in the descriptor to real time online interaction *with more than one participant*. Key words such as *lexical limitations sometimes cause repetition* and *inappropriate formulation* led 44% to indicate a lower B1 level.

A2	A2+	B1
12	2	4

Tab. 8: Online conversation and discussion for level A2

A2 is the level that most teachers were familiar with. The vast majority (67%) linked terms such as *sharing news, as well as making/confirming arrangements to meet* to the A2 level, and they all noted that this was clearly done *using a repertoire of basic language*.

Other levels assigned to this band of the descriptor were the A2+ (11%) and B1 levels (22%). In the case of both categories, teachers referred to the term *sharing news* as a determinant for their choice of level*.*

A2	**A2+**	B1
12	**2**	4

Tab. 9: Online conversation and discussion for level A2+

The main difference between A2 and A2+ was clearly not noted by teachers. A2 is considered a high level in the Maltese context due to reputation afforded by international examinations at this level. The focus on exchange of ideas was noted as quite challenging at A2, however, teachers still thought that it referred to the same level. Same was the case with the key words *commenting on others' postings and reacting to embedded media*.

A1	A2
10	8

Tab.10: Online conversation and discussion for level A1

Teachers found it difficult to gauge between A1 and A2 and were divided on some aspects related to reactions to embedded links and media and responding to comments. However, 56 % indicated *simple messages as a series of short sentences with the aid of a translation tool* as the basis of the A1 level. Teachers moreover linked the Pre A1 descriptor to the initial stages of language learning rather than to an A1 level.

Second stage of the project

During the second stage of the project, Slovak teachers worked on tasks taken from their coursebooks and supplementary materials, indicating the reference levels on the basis of key words in the descriptors in order to be prepared for task design in the next workshop. Their Maltese counterparts could only afford two workshops since the project was linked to professional development sessions in schools that only afforded two sessions.

Feedback from Slovak teachers:

The second stage was based on judging a list of tasks presented to teachers. This time they were given the scale concerning online conversation and discussion

from Appendix 6, where the descriptors were supported by example of use in different domains (CEFR CV, 2018, pp. 185-187). Participating teachers were given 20 minutes to discuss the material and were asked to judge the level of the tasks provided. The table below summarises teachers' estimations.

Texts	A2+	B1	B1+	B2	B2+	C1
1 – B1		50.00%	16.66%	33.33%		
2 – B1	16.66%	33.33%		50.00%		
3 – B2			16.66%	16.66%	16.66%	50.00%
4 – B2	16.66%			50.00%	33.33%	
5 – C1		16.66%		16..66%	33.33%	33.33%
6 – C1				33.33%	50.00%	16.66%

Tab. 11: Teachers' judgements concerning the presented tasks – Round 1

The number of the participants in this workshop was only 18 as three teachers apologised for being engaged in school-leaving examinations. After the first round of voting, they were asked to present concrete descriptors that influenced their judgements.

While the first text (a model informal email) was supported preferably by the descriptor – *can make personal online postings about experiences, feeling and events and respond individually to the comments of others in some detail, etc.* (CEFR CV 2018: 187), the second text (also a model information email) which the publishers officially claimed at B1 level, was considered appropriate for a higher level due to the descriptor *can participate actively in an online discussion, stating and responding to opinions on topics of interest at some length, etc.* (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 186).

The similar result can be seen in the estimation of two texts referring to level B2. One of them (a model informal email) was estimated as B2 (50%) due to the descriptor – *can recognise misunderstandings and disagreements that arise in an online interaction and can deal with them, etc.* (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 186). However, the second text (a formal email) was linked to C1, represented by the descriptor – *can adapt his/her register according to the context of online interaction, moving from one register to the other within the same exchange if necessary* (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 185).

Before commenting on two more tasks, it is necessary to emphasise that teachers were not given the tasks in the level order as they are presented statistically. As far as C1 is concerned, teachers did not convincingly judge them and the range of their judgements were B2-C1. Both presented texts were taken from the course books labelled as C1. One text (an example of a covering letter) was judged between B2+ and C1 by most teachers while another one (a contribution to a wiki guide) was estimated as B2+ (50%). Teachers admitted

that they had been influenced by descriptors referring to *linking his/her contributions to previous ones in the thread, understanding cultural implications and reacting appropriately* (CEFR CV, 2018, p. 186)*.*

The workshop continued by a vivid discussion and teachers worked in groups. They tried to use descriptors that are presented in four domains to become more aware of what is precisely stated in the descriptors. After an intensive discussion, the second round of voting was carried out. The results are presented in the table below.

Texts	A2+	B1	B1+	B2	B2+	C1
1 – B1		66.66%	16.66%	16.66%		
2 – B1		50.00%	33.33%	16.66%		
3 – B2			16.66%	50.00%	33.33%	
4 – B2				66.66%	33.33%	
5 – C1				16..66%	50.00%	33.33%
6 – C1					50.00%	50.00%

Tab. 12: Teachers' judgements concerning the presented tasks – Round 2

Teachers still considered some descriptors quite generic since they are influenced by teaching practice where linguistic competence is given more importance than language use. Since many course books still focus on grammar and vocabulary, teachers prefer being given the type of target language content learners are expected to use at specific levels. Some teachers do not have enough experience of using English in everyday contexts as Slovakia is still a country where English is used mostly in big international companies rather than in everyday life, except for those living in the capital city.

Task design

In the Slovak context, the third workshop was aimed at producing tasks that may help teachers either practice or assess students' abilities to use language in online conversation or discussion. Teachers produced 21 tasks that equalled the number of workshop participants and were then asked to read them and discuss them in groups of three. Following a voting session, participants agreed on three tasks for each level, using descriptors that reflect what the learners are expected to do at three chosen levels. While discussing the tasks teachers realised that each task could be used for several levels since it is only while learners are engaged with the task that level may be determined.

As previously noted, Maltese teachers did not spend time on tasks to determine levels and moved on to the analysis and discussion of descriptors in relation to creation of tasks according to key words and their descriptions of language use. They were asked to look at the descriptors and to discuss what task

they would link to this level. Teachers focused on different aspects of the same descriptor at A2 to B1 levels. The following are a selection of ideas of tasks teachers will develop with their leaners in the implementation phase of the project. Maltese teachers decided to focus on A2 and B1 descriptors at this stage.

The following table provides a picture of what teachers came up with during the first task design exercise in this first phase of the study. The tables below indicate type of tasks that will serve for discussion during the implementation phase of the study (October 2019–May 2020). During this phase, teachers will be encouraged to discuss tasks with students and to select and design own tasks for online practice.

A2 tasks	B1 tasks
Task 1 (M) Posting an event We are organising a picknick: Would you like to join? You need to confirm if you are coming and tell us what you are going to get with you (e.g. food item or game).	*Task 1 (M)* Provide a text that may be posted for comments: e.g. Mobile phones in class Note down advantages and disadvantage after you have read this article so that others may react to them. Post your own ideas and comment on the posts of your classmates.
Task 2 (M) Sharing news: Create a blog page on the class website. Discussion of the month: What would you like to share on the theme that we are discussing in class? Theme example: My city/where I live Share news on an event or activity that is happening.	*Task 2 (M)* We would like to start a blog page on various themes that are of interest to you: Post a contribution on a free-time activity or a favourite TV programme. You may also wish to write about a place you have visited and compare it with where you live in Malta. Invite others to comment on your post.
Task 3 (M) Teachers are to collect short texts / a video clip to embed as a link for learners to read and comment on school in different countries. Post a brief comment on: duration of school day, break time, uniform, activities offered in school and school subjects.	*Task 3 (S)* Write a short online news report about something interesting/important that happened in your school recently. Your report should answer the five 'Ws' (Who?

Task 4 (M) Online Poll: Participate in the online form on the theme 'School uniforms'. Vote and leave a comment under the text that best matches your ideas. Do not forget to comment on the posts made by your classmates. Do you wear a school uniform? Do you like it? Do you prefer to go to school in your favourite clothes?	What? Where? When? and Why?) and the 'H' (How?). *Task 4 (S)* You play basketball for a school team. A friend of yours has told you that your basketball club is going to be closed down. Write an email to your coach to find out: why the decision has been taken, and what is going to happen to the players in your team as they are proud of representing the school.

Tab. 13: Selected tasks by Slovak (S) and Maltese (M) teachers

B2 and C1

Tasks B2 (S)
    You have been away from your school for some time. Write an email (220-240 words) to your classmate to ask him/her for news from school and to give him/her your news.
    Write a brief personalised online review of the film you have recently seen and enjoyed. Address your classmates to contribute to your review.
    You are about to go on a trip to a country that you have never visited before. You would like to know about the customs there. Write an email to your host family asking for some advice to prepare yourself for the visit to the country.
Tasks C1 (S)
    Write a blog post about an event when something unusual happened. Present background information to make it as interesting as possible.
    Write an eBay advert for something you would like to sell. Give as much information about the item as possible.
    Write a website article (160-180 words) for students coming to study in your country. Choose three things you find unique or different in your country.

Discussion

   21 teachers of English applied for the participation in the project in Slovakia. They represented different kinds of secondary schools: 7 from secondary technical schools (their focus was B1), 9 from the secondary grammar schools (B2 in focus) and 5 teachers from bilingual schools (focusing on C1). All schools are located in

southwest Slovakia. The project was divided in three sessions. Teachers were informed prior to the sessions about the project implementation. Once they applied for the first workshop they were expected to attend all three workshops.

18 teachers of German applied for participation in the project in Malta. All teachers work in secondary schools and teach levels A1 to B1 to students aged 11 to 16. 10 teachers from the state school sector, seven from the church school sector and one from the independent sector attended the sessions. The project in Malta was conducted over two sessions. As from this year teachers could select sessions as part of the hours allocated for CoPE professional development (Community of Professional Educators). A number of hours were set aside within this CoPE framework for teachers to be able to attend the sessions within their school working hours. Teachers received information about the online interaction sessions and the project alongside other options.

The programme of the first workshop was comprised of several activities of intensive training spread over 8 hours. The first part was devoted to a thorough explanation of the concepts underlying the CEFR, introducing the CEFR Companion Volume (2018) at the end of the first session and emphasising its significance for language education. Since three new categories are introduced in the CEFR Companion Volume, two of them (mediation scales and plurilingual and pluricultural scales) were briefly mentioned to allow time for a proper presentation of online communication and its typical features. Focus lay on how the latter differs from face-to-face interaction and traditional writing. A short discussion revealed that teachers were open to introducing other forms of interaction as they were aware of their students' needs in real life, outside the classroom.

The first familiarisation activity was based on general scales taken from the CEFR (2001, p. 24; pp. 26-27; pp. 28-29) and overall scales referring to reading, listening and spoken and written production, later narrowing the focus on written interaction, completed by spoken interaction. In general, teachers were aware of particular key words used in the presented descriptors and indicated the particular levels to descriptors correctly.

The second task required teachers to indicate all the ten levels (six basic levels, three plus levels and Pre-A1), using the common reference levels descriptions from the CEFR (2001, pp. 33-36), completed by the description of Pre-A1, presented in the CEFR Companion Volume (2018, p. 46). It was necessary to explain the reasons for introducing the tenth level as teachers from secondary schools in Slovakia had never heard of it before and wanted to understand why the range of levels had been expanded upon. Since the plus levels are clearly marked in the CEFR Companion Volume (2018), it was useful for teachers to become familiar with them. Teachers in both countries considered recognising slight differences between a basic level and a plus level essential because many times

they have higher expectations about their learners, either due to the influence of performances by better students or as a result of course books used. Following a task where they were asked to indicate the level to a set of descriptors, teachers' judgements were drawn together in a table. A short discussion enabled teachers to compile a list of key words and phrases that indicate different shades of descriptions for levels.

Recommendations

The following recommendations emanate from analysis and reflection on how CEFR online interaction descriptors may provide insight into type of tasks that are conducive for language development at different stages of language use.

- Inquiry with learners is required on the type of tasks that learners are able to conduct at a particular level. Learners may be asked to provide feedback on their reactions to the descriptor and what they are able to do with and without support at that level.
- Collection of excerpts of learners' online postings may help teachers analyse the development of language through online interaction tasks if conducted systematically throughout the scholastic year.
- Inquiry into the type of tasks proposed by teachers in the first part of the project requires teachers to reassess what may be understood by key phrases that denote interdependence with others and use of online tools to support language use. Learners need to be actively involved in this phase of inquiry since the descriptors clearly denote use of online tools to support gaps in learning and checking of own work at specific levels of language competence.
- Further insight needs to be gathered in relation to the question - what kind of task is most conducive for the type of descriptor it represents? If tasks are to help learners become more active in the learning process, teachers need to allow learners to discuss and propose own tasks. Tasks created by the teacher may however serve as an impetus for further interaction amongst learners especially at beginner levels.

Conclusions

Awareness was raised through the project on the nature of tasks that clearly support co-construction of knowledge and language development through affordances facilitated by synchronous and asynchronous modes of online interaction. Conclusions for the study relate to active engagement with language, awareness of type of task in view of language competence, and the integration of skills required for effective online interaction.

DESCRIPTORS AND LANGUAGE USE: The CEFR focus on online interaction provides a further dimension to former understanding of active language use that tally with the social reality learners are immersed in. It provides a myriad of

possibilities for the development of plurilingual and pluricultural competences as it extends the possibilities learners may be exposed to within the classroom walls. The level descriptors helped teachers reflect on the need for tasks that enable basic social interactions as well as more complex situations that require more complex language use.

DESCRIPTORS AND LANGUAGE COMPETENCE: The descriptors define what the learner can do with the language and enable teachers to analyse and draft possible tasks at the level learners are presently at. This will help teachers and learners avoid unnecessary disheartening scenarios where tasks are set beyond the level of language competence. It is only through tasks where learners are enabled to take control of their learning that they may be able to move to higher competence levels. The descriptors are instrumental in this respect since they help teacher and learner distinguish the different levels of competence within the same descriptor and determine what is required at the next level of language competence.

DESCRIPTORS AND INTEGRATION OF SKILLS: The scales indicate a broader view of language use that is at times compartmentalised through the focus of work on separate skills. During the analysis of descriptors and levels, teachers reflected on the multitude of skills involved in task accomplishment. It is in this respect that the descriptors may offer the opportunities required for a more realistic process conducive to language development.

References

Bellanca, J. and Brandt, R. (Eds.). (2010). *21st Century Skills: Rethinking How Students Learn (Leading Edge).* Solution Tree Press, Bloomington.

Bérešová, J. (2019). Online Interaction - A New Scale of the Common European Framework of Reference. In *Proceedings EDULEARN19 Conference* (pp. 1794-1798), Barcelona: IATED Academy.

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on Key Competences for Life-Long Learning. (2018). Brussels: European Commission, Brussels.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment. (2001). Strasbourg: Council of Europe & Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment, Companion Volume with New Descriptors. (2018). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Lamb, S., Maire, Q., & Doecke, E. (2017). *Key Skills for the 21st Century: an evidence-based review.* Melbourne: Victoria University.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, M.A: MIT Press.

World Economic Forum. (2015). *New Vision for Education: Unlocking the Potential of Technology.* Available at http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEFUSA_NewVisionforEducation_Report 2.

Contacts
Jana Bérešová
Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Trnava University
Priemyselná 4
918 43 Trnava
Slovak Republic
jana.beresova@truni.sk

Alice Micallef
Directorate for Learning and Assessment Programmes
Rm 19, Curriculum Centre
The Mall
Sarria Street
Floriana FRN 1460
Malta
alice.micallef@ilearn.edu.mt