Review article

ROLES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNERS AND TEACHERS IN CONTEXT OF DIGITALIZATION AND ONLINE INTERCULTURAL EXCHANGE

UDC 371.3:: 81'243; 37.018.43:004.738.5

Ivana Matović

GB School Požega, Serbia

Abstract. *Even though there have been discrepancies when it comes to the importance of intercultural competence development in foreign language learning, with the emergence of new generations of young technocrats growing up in the world of rapid globalization, it is becoming clear that intercultural awareness in this process cannot be disregarded, and the language itself out of its context cannot be fully comprehended. The aim of this piece of writing is to point to the fact that digital technologies in language classroom are therefore of paramount importance, since they enable us to overcome physical distances among cultures and stimulate the development of skills needed for every global citizen. The intention goes beyond this in a way that it shows how the enabled online intercultural communication affects the roles of language learners and teachers and move students to central position in foreign language learning. Furthermore, it underlines the need for teacher support in the development of all the necessary competences which would finally lead to promoting and fostering learner autonomy. It also observes that Online Intercultural Exchange cannot alone promote language and skill competence development, and calls for blended approach which comprises both online and offline sessions that allow for reflection crucial for foreign language acquisition..*

Key words: *foreign language teaching, language learning, education, online intercultural exchange, student and teacher roles*

1. IMPORTANCE OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION IN GLOBALIZED CONTEXT
AND ITS INCORPORATION IN EDUCATION

Over the last decade or two, the world we live in has been undergoing a major increase in exposure to digital technologies which have connected remote cultures and enabled intercultural communication on a daily basis. The context we have been placed into has only emphasized the need to educate 'global citizens', and set a priority on preparing students to interact and communicate with people from across the globe. Dooly (2016) mentions that UNESCO established the notion of a global citizen in 2014, and many people regard it as a means of interconnecting and internationalization, be it on individual, regional or national level, and multicultural-awareness raising (p. 192). Therefore, an emphasis has been added to political, economic and humanistic aspects in foreign language learning. We are witnesses that substantial efforts are being made in order to internationalize the curriculum and the content of English language course books. Whether to teach culture when teaching a foreign language is no longer subject to a debate, and even the Modern Language Association brought about a report accentuating the need to foster students' 'trans lingual and transcultural competence', and stated that 'it is one of five imperative needs to which higher education must respond in the next ten years if it is to remain relevant' (MLA, 2007).

It is paramount that a foreign language course dwells on the needs of a society going through a constant change. Nowadays, it is crucial that you are competent in at least one foreign language, and digital skills and their development have never been this relevant. Therefore, learning has become a lifelong journey. In light of this, a curriculum should be directed to building knowledge which would equip us with a deep understanding of cultural and communicative dimension that we experience every day through interaction with members of other communities via the Internet, collaborating in foreign languages, mostly English. What certainly made way to this goal is the advent of online communication tools; and the synergy between intercultural communication and the Internet allows our students to connect directly with their peers living in a culture of their target language, thus being given the opportunity to explore that foreign culture. Hence the desire to make understanding of a foreign culture the focal point of language classes on all levels. It seems no longer satisfactory to offer students authentic materials provided in their course books, no matter how innovative and competent they were. It is the involvement in first-hand contact with that other culture that can be incorporated into a traditional classroom where educators are allowed to engage their learners in interaction with the natives in distant locations, and also support that communication by giving the students the opportunity to learn from the outcomes; and all that within the sheltered environment that is their classroom, under the guidance of their facilitator or teacher – which Lewis and O'Dowd (2016) also call 'an informed linguacultural expert' (p. 5).

Online Intercultural exchange (OIE) is a term denoting 'the engagement of groups of students in online intercultural interaction and collaboration with partner classes from other cultural contexts or geographical locations under the guidance of educators and or expert facilitators' (Lewis and O'Dowd, 2016, p. 3). It is also referred to as tele collaboration or virtual exchange, and these nomenclatures will be used further in this piece of writing.

In the special edition of Language Learning & Technology (2003) in which Belz defined tele collaboration and identified the main characteristics of foreign language tele collaboration to be 'institutionalized, electronically mediated intercultural communication

under the guidance of a linguacultural expert (i.e. teacher) for the purposes of foreign language learning and the development of intercultural competence' (Belz, 2003, p. 2).

There is a need to underline that the rapid expansion of communication channels via electronic devices and the Internet as Dolly (2016) says 'may render "traditional" categorizations of culture less salient to participants when engaged in "emergent" cultures such as virtual communities' (p. 194). Also, since 'hypermobility leads to unprecedented encounters between people from different countries, whereas on the other, forms of rejection of and attacks on the "Other" increase on a daily basis' (Dervin & Liddlecoat, 2013, p. 1), instead of allowing students to fall back on assumptions that everyone is deep down the same and that everyone communicates online in the same way, tele collaborative practitioners have to push their students to 'imagine another person as different from oneself, to recognize the other in his or her historicity and subjectivity, to see ourselves through the eyes of others' (Ware & Kramsch, 2005, p. 202).

In the west, the use of Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) in promotion of foreign language learning is being accepted in linguistic circles as well as the general public, and tele collaboration being included in The Chronicle of Higher Education as an emerging practice according to Dooly (2016) serves as a proof for this (p. 192). This can be helpful in terms of meaningful language use and creating challenging and motivating activities for the learners, but is also crucial in acquiring skills needed for the future. Perhaps no one can turn their eyes to the fact that there is a widespread need to develop abilities for coping with the challenges set up through the context of constant communication and 'living' with others online, so all those enrolled in either primary or secondary schools are likely to demonstrate these abilities on both personal and professional levels.

There is a notion that 21st-century communities will 'hinge on collaborative relationships and social networking', and a successful workforce will have individuals who can 'offer cross-border perspectives and solutions' and 'apply tangible skills such as language proficiency' including 'greater sensitivity to cultural differences, openness to new and different ideas, and the ability to adapt to change' (Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2008, p. 7). Therefore in terms of this Dooly relies on Pellegrino and Hilton when stating that 'Future skills can be divided into three principle domains: cognitive, intrapersonal and interpersonal; the latter include two clusters of competences – teamwork and collaboration and leadership – which are then subcategorized to include competences such as communication, collaboration, responsibility and conflict resolution (Pellegrino & Hilton, 2013; Dooly, 2016, p. 193).

2. ROLE OF OIE IN LEARNER AUTONOMY FORMATION

Active participation of digital natives on the Internet that is being transferred into language classroom calls for a new form of pedagogy, where foreign language learners are put at center stage, where they are the ones who grasp and figure things out, pose questions and find solutions. They are put into position where they constantly collaborate and inquire into things anew, with the aid and support of their teachers, classmates and peers that live abroad. Constant exposure to new materials teaches them to regard nothing as definite but prone to change and reconsideration in the light of that inflow of new information.

Kaur, Singh and Amin Embi have no doubts about information technology literacy being the integral element of online learner autonomy and argue that:

'Learning how to learn means to build up learners' capabilities to learn independently (e.g. creative and critical thinking, mastering of Information Technology, Communication), to become self-reflective on how to learn and to be able to use different ways of learning…' (Curriculum Development Council, 2000, p. 3). All these skills have been identified as components of autonomy. One tool that has been closely linked with aiding the development of learner autonomy is CMC' (Kaur, Singh, and Amin Embi, 2007, p. 101).

A question that springs to mind here is whether participation in online exchange can actually trigger the development of learner autonomy. The literature offers some evidence that collaborating in online environments can help learners to become more autonomous .On the other hand, definitions of learner autonomy remain highly variable and to some extent problematical in articles seeking to relate autonomy to OIE: Kessler and Bikowski (2010) define learner autonomy as 'whatever an autonomous person thinks it is' (p. 42), whereas Fuchs, Hauck, and Muller-Hartmann (2012) seek to characterize it as 'the informed use of a range of interacting resources in context' (p. 82), which would regard learner autonomy the same as digital literacy, not something that can be applied to a wider scope of activity.

Now that online learning has been integrated into education, we cannot see students as unconnected individuals whose sole concern is to 'take charge of one's own learning' (Holec, 1981, p. 3). More recently, Toyoda (2001), talking about the social dimension of such autonomy regards the role of digital technologies in shaping it as 'an ability and a willingness to learn both independently and in cooperation with others as a responsible learner' (p. 2). She reckons that information technology literacy actually is a necessary precondition for learner autonomy, as there is a correlation between information technology literacy levels and favourable perceptions of technology and development as an autonomous online learner. Basing her view on extensive student interviews, she comes to a conclusion that successful autonomous learning calls for three prerequisites: accessible and reliable technology, sufficient computer literacy in students, and good communication with and support from peers (Toyoda, 2002, p. 1).

Furthermore, Schweinhorst sees collaborative social interaction as one of the main factors in development of learner autonomy, in regard of online environments, stating the following:

'Learners need to become communicators and collaborators with other learners, teachers and native speakers when they are learning a second language. They need to understand that actively seeking opportunities for collaboration and interaction will not only help them as language users, but also as language learners who progress through meaningful contact with more knowledgeable learning partners. This capacity and goal can thus be summarized as interaction' (Schweinhorst, 2008, p. 9).

Schweinhorst pinpoints the importance of online exchange in this aspect, and contends that such immersive environments are fertile ground for the development of learner autonomy, not seeing digital literacy as an aspect of it. There is a mention of eight conditions for this, and he notes that virtual environments:

Provide space for increased self-awareness and propel language learners to engage in experiments by assuming different roles through virtual representations, which actually reduces the affective filter. Then, it may overcome face-to-face communication when it comes to raising linguistic and cognitive awareness of the language learning process. They also assist

interaction in a way that they enable a common linguistic reference pint by setting up a shared environment. Furthermore, Schweinhorst (2008) underlines that they allows for enhanced conversation management and team work, as well as that the spatial metaphors they are based on contribute to a more natural way of organizing information resources. He states that they enable language learners to collaborate on resources in real time contexts, encourage learners to take over an active role in the design and organization of the learning environment. The last but not the least, according to Schweinhorst, virtual environments are a perfect support for any teacher assuming the role of a facilitator, counselor, and resource, adding that they also offer teachers ample research tools (p. 59).

There are four behaviours that are manifestations of online learner autonomy in MOO context according to Schweinhorst (2008), and the emphasis is put on preparedness to throw oneself into experiments. It is revealed through creating objects, manipulating online and offline identities, using indexical language and expressing a sense of being in control, for which he offers transcript material (pp. 124-133) as a support.

It is important also to mention Eneau and Develotte who stress 'the importance of the role that peers play… in the construction of… autonomy' (2012, p. 2) and claim that 'in online distance learning, individual and group autonomy develop together' (2012, p. 14), as peer corrective feedback plays a crucial role in virtual exchange sessions. Overall, 'the ability to take charge of one's own learning' (Holec, 1981, p. 3) cannot be separated from a capacity for social and cognitive interaction.

3. CENTRAL ROLE OF PEER FEEDBACK

Numerous researchers have delved into question of appropriateness of OIE as a learning activity which would make a substantial impact on linguistic development of language learners. Trying to provide a fitting answer, many of them have pointed out to the fact that when feedback is received from peers and not from teachers, students show greater progress in competences such as linguistic form, accuracy and appropriateness. For instance, this is supported by Ware and O'Dowd (2008) who noticed in their project that peer correction feedback had far-reaching effects as the commentary received from American peers was regarded as more personalized and was not making their partners feel vulnerable or at risk. When it comes to help provided by the peers in OIE, Thorne (2003) touches on a certain aspect of pragmatic competence, saying that peer interaction has a crucial role in successful language acquisition 'because students are engaging in age-peer contact under less controlled conditions that would normally be the case in intra-class small group or class discussion' (p. 50). This leads us to the suggestion that OIE that is peer-based can propel advancement in certain aspects of the target language competence, difficult to reproduce in the traditional language classroom.

However, apparently, the researchers are very like-minded that corrective feedback, as well as opportunities to focus on linguistic forms and conveying the meaning will not happen naturally in OIE, and therefore certain training is necessary for the learners to work as linguistic tutors for their peer partners. Some research projects have recorded students being explicitly instructed on how to provide feedback to their partners in OIE. For instance, Vinagre and Munoz (2011) supplied their e-tandem students with 'specific guidelines with regard to error correction which included and error classification table' (p. 75). Furthermore, Ware and O'Dowd (2009) noticed in their study that language-

related episodes (LREs) in conditions where trained 'e-tutors' provided feedback was notably higher than in conditions where language students received feedback from their 'e-partners', who were untrained. Another point made was that those students had a very positive response to OIE and all the corrective feedback received, so the impact on language learning process was more valuable than that provided in a regular classroom (Ware and O'Dowd, 2016, p. 53). There is a clear suggestion that OIE participants when they work in immersive environments can be propelled to construct such identities and see themselves as teachers within a virtual community, and tend to disregard their offline sociocultural background.

In order to ensure language acquisition in this context, yet another thing should be carefully thought-out, and that is task design. In these terms, Sauro (2009) in her LRE gets her students to focus on specific forms from OIE by requiring them to incorporate lexical items such as words and phrases into their written assignments (pp. 114-115). The general trend in the literature would appear to suggest that when tasks are carefully designed to require linguistic accuracy and when students are aware of their role as language expert or tutor, then collaboration has strong potential as a tool for linguistic development.

Nonetheless, a large number of studies have pointed out to certain examples of students showing unwillingness when it comes to assuming the role of 'e-tutor'. Diez-Bedmar and Perez-Paredes (2012), declare that 'participants failed to comply with instructions' (p. 71), even when required to give relevant linguistic feedback.

The reasons for this reluctance can be seen from two perspectives proposed in the literature. The first is that there is likely to be a clash between the pedagogic aims for OIE and the way students perceive it as a communicative activity and bringing into play cross-cultural friendship making (Schweinhorst, 2000). As we talk about language acquisition, it should be clear that here pedagogical aspect aims at linguistic development through peer corrective feedback or conveying of meaning. Therefore, it can be concluded that students need to be clear about the function of OIE, and that is peer-feedback production on a regular basis. Diez-Bedmar and Perez-Parades (2012) note that in their wiki-based task, where students clearly understood that their function was to provide linguistic feedback on their international partners' drafts of tourist brochures, the amount of LREs increased significantly in comparison to other tasks which had more communicative goals.

On the other hand, Ware and O'Dowd suggest that culturally divergent perspectives of students were to blame for affecting students' attitudes in terms of either providing or receiving peer corrective feedback, as they regarded what appropriate online behavior should be like in a very different manner. In contrast to the Spanish students who have taken part in the exchange, American students felt rather uncomfortable about correcting their partners' mistakes. What the authors suggest is that American culture links online communication to 'informal spaces for sharing ideas, and most evaluative feedback remains the role of the course instructor, so the US student's concerns centered mainly on fears of transforming their online conversations into less informal sessions' (Ware and O'Dowd, 2008, p. 52).

4. TEACHER SUPPORT OIE IN LANGUAGE LEARNING

As we can see, OIE should be based on certain principles, such as flexibility, reciprocity, collaboration and autonomy. Mediator teachers develop their own pedagogical strategies which can vary to a certain extent, but these principles are to guide not only language learners, but also language instructors, researchers and projects and activities in OIE. Kern, Ware, and Warschauer (2004) advocate that online intercultural collaboration provides language teachers with the opportunity to exercise innovative approaches in language learning since virtual environments enable them 'use the Internet not so much to teach the same thing in a different way, but rather to help students enter into a new realm of collaborative enquiry and construction of knowledge, viewing their expanding repertoire of identities and communication strategies as resources in the process' (p. 21).

It is clear to every foreign language teacher that language classes, even those combined with OIE, cannot be expected to cover all potential communicative environments or all the pragmatic features that and individual might need for the increasingly multilingual, multicultural Internet. Nonetheless, with the right knowledge – what one might call 'techno pedagogical' knowledge – teachers can support students' awareness of the importance of sociopragmatics in online exchanges, provide them with a basis for understanding its role in effective online communication and promote learner autonomy to continue exploring the interdependence between linguistic forms and the sociocultural context they are functioning in. Therefore, the role of a teacher, facilitator or language instruction is of utmost importance in developing these competences in students.

Liddicoat and Scarino dedicate a lot of attention to the ways how online exchange initiative can make a contribution to intercultural and language learning, and display a certain dose of skepticism in this aspect. Presumably one of the most important points they make is that one should not presuppose that online interaction automatically leads to learning by saying:

'The problem is that exposure to interaction of itself does not necessarily equate with intercultural learning… To be able to contribute to learning, the interaction must first become available in some way for students to reflect on and interpret. It is therefore necessary to consider not only what these technologies permit students to do, but also consider how their experiences may contribute to learning' (Liddicoat and Scarino, 2013, p. 117).

Intercultural learning and target language competence in OIE will not develop on their own, however, and that is where the role of the teacher is paramount in leading students through discovery, exploration and inquiry. The main role of the teacher is to scaffold the learning process through a series of tasks that will build upon each other and gradually move students to an increasingly more complex and refined understanding of the other's culture.

So one cannot help but argue that OIE should be integrated into a language classroom context, because only in such environment can language learners receive aid from a teacher in online communication with partners from abroad. For example, Chun (2015) urges that 'it is essential for teachers to help students to go beyond comprehending the surface meaning of words and sentences in order to understand what their intercultural partners are writing' (p. 13), and Muller-Hartmann (2021) argues that 'the role of the teacher is crucial in initiating, developing and monitoring tele collaborative exchanges for language learning' (p. 172).

This all actually points to the alteration in conditions for foreign language teaching, learning and changing contexts in which they are utilized. Claire Kramsch wrote about this fact in her introduction to an issue of the Modern Language Journal, where she states that these changes "call for a more reflective, interpretative, historically grounded, and politically engaged pedagogy than was called for by the communicative language teaching of the eighties' (Kramsch, 2014, p. 269). She also emphasizes that 'while it is not the role of FL teachers to impose on their students their views on events, it is their responsibility to expose them to various perspectives (even controversial ones) and to help them discuss the points of view adopted by speakers, writers, and bloggers on these events' (Kramsch, 2014, p. 307). This means that in communicative exchanges, there is a need of support provided by facilitators whose role is to guide language learners in their participation and to make sure that there are no missed opportunities in dialogue and some contribution on the students' part is made.

5. NEED FOR BLENDED APPROACH

In the previous section is has been made clear that for the learning experience to be successful, learners have to be engaged in a communicative experience which will shine light on different linguacultural rules and assumptions that are carried by the participants involved. Numerous authors underline that this is not enough, but such learning calls for reflection and learning from students' experiences. Therefore, as it can be observed in the literature, most OIE practitioners have taken a blended approach where certain aspects and features of the interaction are discussed, analyzed and shaped with the aid of the teacher. The vast majority of researches display methodology of combining online interaction with pre- and post-exchange sessions, also called 'mediated sessions'.

In preparatory face-to-face sessions communicative approach is taken, where there is space for a student to take the central role in developing required competences. There are numerous interactive learning activities that can be included in these sessions, such as brainstorming, comparing ideas, negotiating and collaborating, and the interactivity of these face-to-face sessions can be illustrated by the following:

'In class, [students] spend most of the time negotiating what they are going to use [within their collective task]. The classroom is a highly interactive place where students, taking center stage and interacting with their classmates, develop insights and co-construct and expand their own knowledge and understanding of the subject matter' (Furstenberg & Levet, 2010, p. 333).

Mediated sessions are face-to-face modes which are in indissoluble connection with OIE. Their functions are to prepare for the central tele collaborative sessions, and to analyze the virtual collaboration. In both preparative and reflective sessions, the main aim of the course is the one to define what aspects should be covered. Those could be language skills such as inter comprehension skills and strategies, certain discourse, or vocabulary or form, etc., or perhaps intercultural awareness. As Telles (2016) in collaboration with Leone quotes herself:

'Mediation sessions are moments that follow interactions in tele tandem. During these sessions, students have the opportunity to dialogue and exchange experiences with a mediator – a teacher of foreign languages. These discussions focus on (a) aspects of language, (b) culture and (c) partner's relationship. The mediation activity aims at giving

students a teacher supported context (scaffolding) to reflect on the teaching and the learning experiencing during the tele tandem sessions' (p. 244).

Since, as it has been previously discussed, exposure of students to copious foreign language input will not inevitably lead to the language competence development, 'noticing' and more effective focus on certain linguistic aspects need to be supported by regularly downloaded and recorded online intercultural interactions, so that this data can be further exploited in the language classroom. In accordance with this, when regarding students' linguistic development, it is recommended that students' online interaction be combined with either reflective reviews of transcripts or recordings of the online interactions. Belz (2006) refers to this as 'the alternation of Internet-mediated intercultural sessions with face-to-face intracultural sessions' (p. 214). In such pedagogic interventions, teachers usually transcribed and coded relevant extracts requiring the language learners to review the given materials.

Application of other methods of trying to combine online interaction with offline focus on linguistic and intercultural aspects has been noticed. Evidence can be stored in various online repositories (e.g. cloud storage spaces such as Dropbox, YouTube, video blogs, etc.) and numerous documentation modes are available, such as blog or forum entries, screen captures, etc. Bower and Kawaguchi (2016), for instance, demanded from their Australian and Japanese students to language corrective feedback to their partners using email that they had previously derived from the transcripts of their synchronous online interactions (p. 123). There are certain records where instructors noted by Lewis and O'Dowd who suggest an example of Vinagre and Munoz (2011) who wanted language learners to keep a diary in which they could keep notes on new vocabulary items they had encountered and also to carry out error recycling exercises. It could be argued here that the very method of propelling students to notice chief linguistic features and errors is not as important as the processes that are triggered by it, one of them being active reflection, which inevitably leads to foreign language development (Lewis and O'Dowd, 2016, p. 53).

These samples from OIE are desirably coupled with students' personal collection of learning evidence, as they ought to be encouraged to record their thoughts and impressions so they could return to the events when required. This compendium is a display of the learning process and it serves as a mechanism demonstrating that the students are capable of making lings between theory and practice, or in other words, competences and the online exchange, and can then reflect on their own progress.

6. CONCLUSION

This, of course, is not the first time that someone has conducted an inquiry into comprehensive impact of OIE to foreign language education. Thorne (2003), for instance, examined the presence of language development when it comes to both linguistic and pragmatic performance (p. 39), while Schweinhorst (2008) actually claimed that OIE fostered learner autonomy development under the framework of fitting pedagogy (pp. 166-168). Later, there emerged a proposition that autonomy in OIE has close links to e-literacy acquisition (Fuchs, Hauck, & Muller-Hartmann, 2012, p. 95). However, there is obvious lack of initiative in language educators to incorporate OIE into curriculum on national level.

I would dare say that the COVID-19 breakout has brought OIE closer to smaller and underdeveloped communities across the world, and be that only a hypothesis or not, constant involvement of citizens of the global village have appointed to the need for more profound cross-cultural understanding that can be brought closer via telecollaborative communication practices. Whereas individual foreign language learners are still rooted in their local and national cultures, 'today's constant global and transnational cultural flows… have meant that language learners have become sophisticated "cultural mediators" '(Ros i Sole, 2013, p. 327). Byram (1997) established a notion of 'intercultural speaker' (pp. 32-33), but Ros and Sole (2013) names such a speaker a 'cosmopolitan speaker… who is defined by their multiple cultural alliances' (p. 327).

Needless to say, interaction is a complex social and psychological activity; computer-mediated interaction should not be seen as different in this aspect, not even when all the possible barriers to access are reduced to a minimum. Participants themselves bring their own characteristics into OIE and find their own ways of managing their online presence, so there are fluctuations in individual impact is such virtual exchanges. An individual can be anxious about how others might feel or react when they contribute to the dialog or a collaborative task, some other could find themselves discouraged by absence of immediate response. On the other hand, many of such individuals are actually ready to overcome those feelings and find original methods for interaction navigation. Therefore, there is a feeling of urgent need for intercultural communication competence development in foreign language learning.

OIE makes language learners question and change perspectives of both their own and other cultural contexts, and such a process includes not only affective and cognitive changes, but also require 'understanding the very historical and social conditions that make this savoir possible for some and not for others, and other saviors impossible' (Kramsch, 2009, pp. 117-118). Therefore, one needs to consider many aspects and pose numerous questions such as: 'Who is speaking, for whose benefit, within which frame, on which timescale, to achieve what effect? What are the ideological value and the historical density of words? (Kramsch, 2009, pp. 117-118). In this increasingly interconnected world, learners have to be able to guess and gamble a bit, to show willingness to try out hunches about the language and take the risk of not being right. Such risk-taking and discovery-learning procedures are necessary in order to develop independence, autonomy, and responsibility – some of the crucial skills of the 21st century, and the aim of foreign language educators should undoubtedly be raising academic citizens capable of coping with all the cross-communicative obstacles and challenges they may encounter.

REFERENCES

Abrams, Z. I. (2008). Sociopragmatic features of learner-to-learner computer-mediated communication. *CALICO Journal, 26*(1), 1-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1558/CJ.V26I1.1-27

Belz, J. (2003). Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(2), 68-99. http://dx.doi.org/10125/25201

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*, CLevdon, GB: Multilingual Matters.

Chun, D. M. (2015). Language and culture learning in higher education via telecollaboration. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *20*(1), 37-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0957136.2011.642528

Curriculum Development Council. (2000). Learning to Learn: The Way Forward in Curriculum Development. Consultation Document. In Benson, P. (Ed.) *Autonomy and Information Technology in the Educational Discourse of the Information Age*. University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong: Government Printing Department.

Dervin, F., & Liddicoat, A. (2013). Introduction. Linguistics of intercultural education. In F. Dervin & A. Liddicoat (Eds.), *Linguistics for intercultural education* (pp. 1-25). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diez-Bedmar, M. B., & Perez-Paredes, P. (2012). The types and effects of native speakers' feedback on CMC. *Language, Learning and Technology, 16*(1), 62-90.

Dooly, M. A. (2011). Crossing the Intercultural borders into 3rd space culture(s): Implication for teacher education in the twenty-first century. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 11*(4), 319-337. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2011.599390

Dooly, M. (2016). 'Please Remove Your Avatar From My Personal Space': Competences of the Telecollaboratively Efficient Person. In R. O'Dowd & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Online Intercultural Exhchange: Policy, Pedagogy, Prectice* (pp. 192-208). New York/London: Routledge.

Eneau, J., & Develotte, C. (2012). Working online together to enhance learner autonomy. *ReCALL, 24*(1), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344011000267

Frustenbergm G., & Levet, S. (2010). Integrating telecollaboration into the language classroom: Some insights. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0* (pp. 305-336). Bern: Peter Lang.

Furstenberg, G. (2016). The Cultura Exchange Programme. In R. O'Dowd & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Online Intercultural Exhchange: Policy, Pedagogy, Practice* (pp. 3-22). New York/London: Routledge.

Fuchs, C., Hauck, M., & Muller-Hartmann, A. (2012). Promoting learner autonomy through multiliteracy skills development in cross-institutional exchanges. *Language, Learning and Technology, 16*(3), 82-102. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44301

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Kaur, R., Singh, G., and Amin Embi, M. (2007). Learner autonomy through computer mediated communication (CMC). *Jurnal Teknologi, 46*, 99-112. http://dx.doi.org/10.11113/JT.V46.311

Kern, R., Ware, P., & Warschauer, M. (2004). Crossing frontiers: New directions in online pedagogy and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 243-260.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000091

Kessler, G., & Bikowski, D. (2010). Developing collaborative autonomous learning abilities in computer mediated language learning: Attention to meaning among students in wiki space. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 23*(1), 41-58. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588220903467335

Kramsch, C. (2009). Discourse, the symbolic dimension of Intercultural Competence. In A. Hu & M. Byram (Eds.), *Intercultural competence and foreign language learning* (pp. 107-121). Tubingen: Narr.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization. Introduction. *The Modern Language Journal, 98*(1), 296-311. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2014.12057.x

Kramsch, C. & Ware. P. (2005). Toward and intercultural stance: Teaching German and English through telecollaboration. *Modern Language Journal. 89,* 190-205. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2005.00274.x

Lewis, J. R., & Sauro, J. (2009) The Factor Structure of the System Usability Scale. In: Kurosu M. (Ed.) Human Centered Design. HCD 2009. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 5619 (pp. 94-103). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02806-9_12

Liddicoat, D., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

O'Dowd, R., & Lewis, T. (2016). Introduction to Online Intercultural Exhchange and This Volume. In R. O'Dowd & T. Lewis (Eds.), *Online Intercultural Exhchange: Policy, Pedagogy, Practice* (pp. 3-22). New York/London: Routledge.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (2008). *21st century skills, education and competitiveness: A resource and policy guide.* Tucson, AZ: 21st century skills. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED519337.pdf

Pallegrino, J. W., & Hilton, M. L. (2013). *Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. Committee on defining deeper learning and 21st century skills.* Washington, DC: National Research Council of the National Academies.

Perez-Hernandez, D. (2014, May 5). Technology provides foreign-language immersion at a distance. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Technology-Provides/146369

Ros i Sole, C. (2013). Cosmopolitan speakers and their cultural cartographies. *The Language Learning Journal, 41*(3), 326-339. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2013.836349

Schwienhorst, K. (2000). *Virtual reality and learner autonomy in second language acquisition* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Trinity College Dublin. http://hdl.handle.net/2262/78619

Schwienhorst, K. (2008). *Learner Autonomy and CALL Environments.* London, UK: Routledge.

Telles, J. A. (2015). Teletandem and performativity. *Revista Brasileira de Linguistica Aplicada, 15*(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1590/1984-639820155536

Thorne, K. (2003). *Blended Learning: How to integrate Online and Traditional Learning.* London, UK: Kogan Page Ltd.

Toyota, E. (2002). Categorization of text chat communication between learners and native speakers of Japanese. *Language Learning & Technology*, 6(1), 82-99.

Thorne, S. (2010). The "Intercultural Turn" and language learning in the crucible of the new media. In S. Guth and F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0: Language, literacies and intercultural learning in the 21ˢᵗ century* (pp. 139-164). Berne: Peter Lang.

UNESCO. (2014). *Global citizenship education. Preparing learners for the challenges of the twenty-first century.* United Nations Educational, Scientific, Education Sector. Paris: UNESCO. https://www.seameo.org/img/ Programmes_Projects/Competition/SEAMEOJapanESD_Award/2014_SEAMEOJapanESD_Award/pub/Global %20Citizenship_UNESCO%20Publication_July2014.pdf

Vinagre, M., & Muñoz, B. (2011). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and language accuracy in telecollaborative exchanges. *Language Learning & Technology, (15)*1, 72-103. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44238

Ware, P., & O'Dowd, R. (2008). Peer feedback on language form in telecollaboration. *Language, Learning and Technology, 12*(1), 43-63. http://dx.doi.org/10125/44130

ULOGE UČENIKA I NASTAVNIKA STRANOG JEZIKA U KONTEKSTU DIGITALIZACIJE I ONLAJN INTERKULTURALNE RAZMENE

Premda postoje razmimoilaženja kada govorimo o značaju razvoja interkulturalnih kompetenci kod učenja stranog jezika, sa dolaskom novih generacija mladih tehnokrata koji odrastaju u svetu rapidne globaalizacije, postaje jasno da interkulturalna svest u ovom procesu ne može da se zanemari, i da jezik sam po sebi izvađen iz konteksta ne može u potpunosti da se shvati. Cilj ovog rada je da ukaže na činjenicu da digitalne tehnologije u jezičkoj učionici stoga imaju ključni značaj, s obzirom na to da nam omogućavaju da prevaziđemo fizičke distance među kulturama i stimulišemo razvoj veština neophodnih za svakog „globalnog" građanina. Povrh toga, zamisao je da se prikaže kako omogućavanje onlajn interkulturalne komunikacije utiče na uloge učenika i nastavnika jezika i stavlja učenika u cetralnu poziciju učenja stranog jezika. Dalje, ističe potrebu potpore nastavnika u razvoju svih neophodnih kompetenci koje na kraju vode do podsticanja i negovanja autonomije učenja. Takođe zapaža da onlajn interkulturalna komunikacija ne može sama po sebi podstaći razvoj jezičkih kompetenci i veština, te se poziva na mešani pristup koji sadrži kako sesije na mreži tako i van nje, što daje prostora za refleksiju kricijalnu za usvajanje stranog jezika.

Ključne reči: *nastava stranog jezika, učenje jezika, obrazovanje, onlajn interkulturalna razmena, uloga učenika i nastavnika*