Language Teaching (2026), **59**, 476–496
doi:10.1017/S026144482610113X

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH TIMELINE

Teaching additional languages to young learners through tasks

Yuko Goto Butler

Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, USA
Email: ybutler@gse.upenn.edu

(Received 16 March 2025; accepted 1 January 2026)
Keywords: additional language; age; tasks; TBLT; young learners

1. Introduction

Task-based language teaching (TBLT), an instructional approach for promoting real world communicative language use, has gained substantial attention among researchers and educators of additional languages, traditionally referred to as second languages (L2) and foreign languages (FL). Existing research on TBLT and tasks, predominantly conducted with adult learners, has primarily examined how meaning-focused tasks enhance (or do not enhance) learners' communicative abilities in the target language and how different task implementations yield different outcomes (Ellis, 2017).

As a growing number of children learn additional language(s) in instructional settings, research on TBLT and tasks targeted at them has gradually emerged over the last three decades, first in the L2 contexts, followed by the FL contexts. The central concern of such research is how *age* influences children's learning processes and outcomes when learning through tasks, as well as its implications for task design and implementation. As one can see from the *research timeline* below, existing studies on TBLT and tasks among children have largely applied theoretical frameworks and analytical approaches/tools adapted from adult-based research. Importantly, however, children are not merely younger versions of adult learners; specific considerations for working with children need to be more thoroughly addressed (Butler, 2025; Timpe-Laughlin & Butler, 2026).

In this timeline, I outline major studies on TBLT and tasks among young learners – defined as children aged 5–12 (kindergarten and primary school years)[1] who learn additional language(s) in instructional settings. This is by no means a comprehensive list. I selected major studies published in academic journals and books or book chapters in English. When multiple studies originated from a single project or involved relatively minor modifications, only representative studies were included. This decision was made to ensure the inclusion of studies conducted by diverse researchers and in different contexts. Studies that used tasks solely as a measure of students' learning outcomes were excluded. In other words, tasks were not included if they were considered *research tasks*, which are primarily used to elicit learners' language for research purposes, as opposed to *pedagogical tasks*, which are introduced for instructional purposes (Bygate et al., 2001). Moreover, common literacy-related activities in children's classrooms, such as storytelling and extensive reading, although they can be considered 'tasks', are not included, primarily due to space limitations in this review. There is substantial research on these topics, which would warrant independent reviews.

One of the critical issues in discussing the effectiveness of TBLT and tasks for children is the definition of tasks themselves. Tasks are traditionally conceptualized as meaning-focused, real life authentic

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original article is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press or the rights holder(s) must be obtained prior to any commercial use.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

language use with a clear communicative goal. Learners are expected to rely primarily on their own linguistic and non-linguistic resources to complete the task (Ellis, 2017). As Timpe-Laughlin et al.'s (2024*)[2] Delphi study indicated, however, experts do not necessarily agree on what constitutes tasks for young learners; they disagree on whether tasks for children should be conceptualized differently and, if so, how different they should be. Specifically, one of the key elements of tasks, authenticity, may be difficult to operationalize for children, as imagination plays a greater role in their lives (e.g. animals can talk), and they may not perceive reality in the same way as adults. On the other hand, one could also argue that the classroom itself creates 'authenticity', in that it is the real environment where children engage in real activities (Illés & Akcan, 2017). In any event, tasks for children need to be grounded in *their* life activities and reality (Cameron, 2001).

Some of the earlier studies on TBLT and tasks among young learners stemmed from French immersion programs in Canada (Harley, 1998*; Lyster, 2004*; Lyster et al., 2013*). Despite years of ample meaning-based input in the target language, young learners struggled to produce target-like forms for certain grammatical features. This observation led researchers to examine the role of form-focused instruction for children, who were often considered to acquire language primarily through implicit learning. The line of research concerning the role of focus on form (i.e. a type of form-focused instruction in which tasks are designed to draw learners' attention to specific linguistic forms while maintaining a primary emphasis on meaning, or sometimes referred to as *focused tasks*) has gradually expanded into FL contexts, where children have relatively less exposure to the target language (e.g. Calzada & García Mayo, 2021b*; Chung & Révész, 2025*; Gorman & Ellis, 2019*; Shak & Gardner, 2008*; Shintani, 2013*, 2016*). Compared to adult learners, young learners – particularly in FL contexts – appear to gain rather limited benefits from form-focused instruction or focused tasks in terms of noticing and acquiring target forms. It should be noted, however, that these effects may also depend on factors such as learners' age, proficiency level, amount of input, target forms, and feedback types during tasks, as well as potentially on the task implementation stage (e.g. pre-task, during-task, post-task, Ellis, 2017) and other variables (García Mayo, 2025).

One of the most productive lines of research to date has been the examination of interaction during tasks, drawing on (Long's 1983, 1996, 2015) interaction hypothesis. This hypothesis predicts that interactional modifications occurring during the negotiation of meaning should serve as comprehensible input, which, in turn, facilitates acquisition. Numerous studies have examined learners' interactions during paired tasks. Some compared interactions between adults and children (e.g. Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2019*; Mackey et al., 2003*; Oliver, 1998*, 2000*), while others explored how learner factors such as age (e.g. Azkarai & Imaz-Agirre, 2016*, 2017*; García Mayo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2015*; Oliver, 2009*), gender (e.g. Azkarai & Imaz-Agirre, 2017*; Oliver, 2002*), and proficiency level (e.g. Lázaro-Ibarrola & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2015*; Oliver, 2002*) influence child-child interactions. Other studies have focused on how task implementation strategies affect children's negotiation of meaning, including task type and modality (e.g. García Mayo & Imaz-Agirre, 2019*; Martínez Adrián et al., 2021*; Oliver, 2002*; Thorburn, 2022*), task repetition or familiarity (e.g. Lázaro-Ibarrola & Hidalgo, 2017*; Mackey et al., 2007*; Pinter, 2006*), and pairing (e.g. García Mayo & Imaz-Agirre, 2016*; Mackey et al., 2003*), as well as the impact of instructional contexts, such as content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programs (e.g. Azkarai & Imaz-Agirre, 2016*; García Mayo & Lázaro-Ibarrola, 2015*). Overall, studies indicate that young learners *can* engage in negotiation of meaning, but its frequency is relatively low and the types of negotiation vary depending on learner, instructional, and contextual factors. Critically, how the frequency and types of negotiation contribute to young learners' target language acquisition and how age-related factors interact with this process remain unclear.

Based on socio-cultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978), which views learning, including language learning, as fundamentally occurring through dialogic interactions, Storch (2002) proposed a model of dyadic international patterns, which predicts that collaborative and novice/expert patterns enhance learning. Several studies reviewed here also employed this model for their analyses to investigate the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

quality of interaction during tasks (e.g. Ahmadian & Tajabadi, 2017*; Butler & Zeng, 2011*; 2015*; Calzada & García Mayo, 2021a*; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2016*).

Motivated by the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985), which highlights the role of pushed output and noticing that results from it in language learning, language-related episodes (LREs) were proposed as a way to analyze such noticing moments. LREs were originally defined as 'any part of a dialogue where the students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others' (Swain & Lapkin, 1998, p. 326). LREs have been used as a means of investigating how the negotiation of form and meaning occurs during tasks among young learners (e.g. Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015*; Chung & Révész, 2025*; Gallardo-del-Puerto & Martínez-Adrián, 2022*; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2019*; Hidalgo & García Mayo, 2019*; Luquin & García Mayo, 2020*; Martínez-Adrían & Gutiérrez-Mangado, 2022*). It should be noted that Swain and Lapkin (2002) later emphasized the role of LREs not only as evidence of cognitive noticing but also as instances of learners' collaborative dialogues (concerning lexical, form, and discourse) that serve as scaffolding and mediation for language development, in light of Vygotskian socio-cultural theory.

Both collaborative patterns and LREs appear to be influenced by multiple factors, such as learner, instructional, and contextual factors, similar to the studies on the negotiation of meaning discussed above. The critical question is whether the analytical tools designed for adult research, which are grounded in assumptions about adult learners, can validly be applied to children. The direct link between LREs and children's learning, however, has not been clearly established. For young learners, simply providing opportunities for collaborative tasks may not be sufficient; teacher guidance, additional support, and practice may also be necessary (Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015*; Luquin, 2025*). Moreover, due to the nature of children's utterances and communication styles (e.g. heavier reliance on non-verbal means such as gestures and body language among children), coding communication strategies is not always straightforward and can be challenging for researchers. Reflecting on their analyses, Lázaro-Ibarrola and Azpilicueta-Martinez (2019)* state that 'contextualised *flexibility* should not be overlooked by researchers in order to avoid too canonical transcription readings which could lead to inaccurate rates not reflecting the actual use of conversational adjustments displayed by participants' (p. 19, emphasis in original). Here again, age-related specific consideration is indispensable for researchers. This raises the question of how the nature of *age* should be understood.

Age is a multivariate concept. It relates to children's cognitive, sociocognitive, social, affective, and L1 development, all of which mutually influence one another in complex ways (Butler, 2025). However, little is understood about how these developmental factors interact with children's interactional behaviours and linguistic performance on tasks. A spot-the-difference task, a popular task for young learners, for example, requires a certain level of sociocognitive maturity (e.g. understanding the partner's perspective) as well as social maturity for successful collaboration and task completion. Dictogloss tasks (e.g. after listening to sentences, students collaboratively reconstruct the original texts) (Wajnryb, 1990) rely on children's memory capacity, which can also be influenced by affect and social maturity. Although there has been growing interest in affective factors[3] in recent years (e.g. Calzada & García Mayo, 2020*; Luquin, 2025*; Pladevall-Ballester & Vraciu, 2025*), the role of affect, such as enjoyment, motivation, and boredom, remains relatively underexplored in TBLT/task studies involving children. A low frequency of interactional strategies or LREs may reflect a lack of interest in the task itself, particularly when the task is repeated. Moreover, as Pinter (2006*) suggested, children and adults (teachers and researchers) may have different understandings of task goals. Greater effort is needed to consider children's perspectives when evaluating the effectiveness of TBLT and tasks for young learners.

Age is also situated within contexts. A review of existing studies reveals that most have been conducted in laboratory settings. While these studies have significantly contributed to understanding the effects of major variables (e.g. learner variables, instructional strategy, and program variables), they

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

may have limitations in terms of practical implications (Bygate, 2020). Notably, some evidence suggests that children engage less in the negotiation of meaning in actual classrooms than in laboratory settings (Van den Branden, 2008). In recent years, it is encouraging to see more studies conducted in classroom settings, including ethnographic/observational studies (e.g. Dreßler, 2018*; Oliver et al., 2025*; Oliver & Sato, 2021*; Thorburn, 2022*; Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015*; Zhu et al., 2025*), and such classroom-based studies (in addition to pioneering work such as Carless, 2002*, 2004*) should be further encouraged.

Finally, *age* is diachronic; nine-year-old children today may differ from those a decade ago in terms of preferred cognitive and social strategies, neurodevelopment, and language use due to rapidly changing learning environments (e.g. Arabiat et al., 2022). One of the most notable changes in these environments is the growing use of digital technology both inside and outside of the classroom. Accordingly, tasks can now be offered online or through digital devices. Various types of artificial intelligence (AI) are also expected to play an increasing role in children's language classrooms, at least in some regions. Some evidence suggests that children are fond of interacting with AI agents (e.g. Andries & Robertson, 2023), although one can also suspect that their experience with interacting with AI may also influence their interpersonal interaction (Xu et al., 2025). Research on TBLT and tasks through digital technology, particularly AI, is an exciting avenue for future inquiry. However, researchers working with children should critically examine *both* the potential benefits and drawbacks of these technologies with a long-term perspective.

In the following timeline, studies are characterized according to the following themes.

A. Research orientations
- A1. Theoretical
- A2. Experimental
- A3. Non-experimental, classroom observations
- A4. Reviews and others

B. Instructional contexts
- B1. Second language (L2) contexts
- B2. Foreign language (FL) contexts – regular
- B3. CLIL or bilingual immersion programs
- B4. Others

C. Task types[4]
- C1. Output-based tasks (dialogic; two-way interaction is required or expected)
- C2. Input-based tasks (focusing on comprehension; production is not required)
- C3. Others

D. Domains of investigation
- D1. Vocabulary and/or grammar
- D2. Comprehension
- D3. Production (speaking and writing)
- D4. Negotiation of meaning
- D5. Quality or patterns of interaction
- D6. Motivation and other affect
- D7. Teacher beliefs and classroom instruction
- D8. Others

E. Factors influencing the outcomes
- E1. Learner factors (age, proficiency levels, gender, etc.)
- E2. Instructional strategies (TBLT vs PPP; task repetition; the role of form-focused instruction; task familiarity; pairing; modality; modeling; feedback provision)
- E3. Program types (including online programs)
- E4. Others

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Year	Reference	Annotations	Theme
1998	Oliver, R. (1998). Negotiation of meaning in child interactions. *Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 372–386. https://doi.org/10.2307/329962	As one of the pioneering studies on tasks focusing on children, **Oliver** compared the use of negotiation of meaning (NoM) strategies during tasks among L2 learners of English and their native-speaking peers in Australia (ages 8–13, $N = 192$) with those of adults reported in Long (1983). The findings showed that children, both L2 learners (NNS) and native speakers (NS), could use a variety of NoM strategies similarly to adults. However, children used these strategies proportionally less frequently than adults, particularly comprehension checks. Oliver attributed this to children's egocentricity; children focus more on constructing meaning in their own utterances rather than ensuring others' comprehension.	A2, B1, C1, D4, E1
1998	Harley, B. (1998). The role of form-focused tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 156–174). Cambridge University Press.	Concerns were raised that students in French immersion programs in Canada, despite years of ample input in meaning-based instruction, often struggle to acquire certain grammatical features. In response, **Harley** investigated the effect of form-focused tasks designed to draw Grade 2[5] students' attention to noun endings that predict grammatical gender. The study found a limited effect. Form-focused tasks helped students acquire grammatical gender for familiar words but not for unfamiliar ones; the students could not generalize the knowledge to novel cases.	A2, B3, C3, D1, E2
2000	Oliver, R. (2000). Age difference in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair work. *Language Learning, 50*(1), 119–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00113	Following Oliver (1998)[6], this study compared the use of negative feedback (NF) during interaction based on learners' age (children vs adults) and context (teacher-fronted lessons vs paired tasks). Twenty teachers (10 from adult ESL classes and 10 from child ESL classes) and 32 NS-NNS dyads participated. The results indicated that while learners in both contexts received and used negative feedback, interaction patterns were influenced by both age and context.	A2, B1, C1, D4, E1, E2
2002	Oliver, R. (2002). The patterns of negotiation for meaning in child interactions. *Modern Language Journal, 86*(1), 97–111. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00138	Based on the same dataset as Oliver (1998) in Australia, **Oliver** investigated factors that influenced dyad interactions. L2 learner dyads (NNS-NNS) used the most NoM strategies, followed by NNS-NS dyads, while NS-NS dyads produced the fewest NoM, suggesting that proficiency level influenced interaction patterns. One should note, however, that proficiency level is often confounded with age. The study did not find significant effects by task types or gender.	A2, B1, C1, D4, E1, E2
2002	Carless, D. (2002). Implementing task-based learning with young learners. *ELT Journal, 56*, 389–396. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.4.389	This is one of the first studies to focus on the implementation of tasks in young learners' classrooms. Through observations of three primary school classes in Hong Kong (children ages 6–7) and interviews with the three teachers, **Carless** identified challenges teachers faced when using tasks with children: (1) maintaining discipline, (2) using the students' mother tongue effectively, (3) managing varying levels of student involvement in tasks, and (4) balancing enjoyment (e.g. drawing and colouring) with target language production.	A3, B2, C3, D7, E4

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2003	Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53*(1), 35–66. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467–9922.00210	Following Oliver (1998, 2000, 2002), this study examined the effect of pairing (12 NS-NNS vs 12 NNS-NNS dyads) on negative feedback, modified output, and the immediate incorporation of feedback among adults and children, using the same task as in Oliver (1998). Unlike adults, child NNS-NNS dyads produced more modified output in response to their NNS partners and made greater use of these opportunities compared to NNS-NS dyads. Based on these findings, the authors suggested potential mutual benefits of learners working together on tasks.	A2, B1, C1, D4, E2
2004	Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(3), 399–432. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104263021	Building on Harley (1998), **Lyster** examined the effect of form-focused instruction (FFI) using tasks, but this time with an older group, namely Grade 5 ($N = 179$, ages 10–11), in French immersion programs in Canada. The study found that FFI improved the correct use of grammatical gender in French in both written and oral tasks. Its effectiveness was greatest when combined with prompts (i.e. feedback strategies that push learners to self-repair) rather than with recasts (i.e. implicit reformulations of target forms) or no feedback.	A2, B3, C1, D1, E2
2004	Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' re-interpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(4), 639–662. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588283	This paper detailed the findings reported in Carless (2002). Based on his analysis of TBLT implementation in Hong Kong primary classrooms, **Carless** suggested a weaker form of task-based instruction for young learners (i.e. task-supported teaching), considering their age, relatively underdeveloped target language knowledge, and the socio-cultural context of schooling.	A3, B2, C3, D7, E4
2006	Pinter, A. (2006). Verbal evidence of task related strategies: Child versus adult interactions. *System, 34*(4), 615–630. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.09.005	This study compared the strategies used to complete a spot-the-difference task between adult and child learners (age 10) in an English-as-a-foreign language (EFL) context (Hungary). The results indicated that children and adults employed different cognitive, metacognitive, and social strategies. Adults produced more turns and language than children. **Pinter** suggested that children and adults interpreted the task's goal differently; children may have seen it as an extension of common naming activities in class, while adults viewed it as a problem-solving task (cf. Oliver, 1998, 2000, 2002).	A2, B2, C1, D4, E1
2007	Mackey, A., Kanganas, A. P., & Oliver, R. (2007). Task familiarity and interactional feedback in child ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 285–312. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40264354	**Mackey et al.** investigated the effect of task familiarity on L2 children's (ages 7–8) interaction during paired communicative tasks. It was found that, in unfamiliar tasks (both in terms of content and procedure), children produced more clarification requests and confirmation checks, and they provided more corrective feedback on non-target-like utterances. However, when working with familiar tasks, they had more opportunities to provide and actually used more negative feedback, suggesting different benefits of using familiar and unfamiliar tasks (cf. Oliver, 1998, 2000, 2002).	A2, B1, C1, D4, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2007	Pinter, A. (2007). Some benefits of peer-peer interaction: 10-year-old children practicing with a communication task. *Language Teaching Research, 11*(2), 189–207. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168807074	Building on **Pinter (2006)**, this study examined the effect of task repetition on Hungarian children's (age 10) paired task performance in an EFL context. After performing similar tasks a couple of times, the children were also invited to comment on their own recorded performances. In addition to the merit of fluency, task repetition helped children to pay greater attention to each other's utterances and better assist the partners' needs, by making use of clarification requests and verbal acknowledgments (cf. Mackey et al., 2007). Moreover, task repetition helped them become more confident and relaxed when engaging in the tasks.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, D6, E2
2008	Shak, J., & Gardner, S. (2008). Young learner perspectives on four focus-on-form tasks. *Language Teaching Research, 12*(3), 387–408. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089923	**Shak and Gardner** explored Bruneian children's ($N = 78$, ages 9–12) attitudes towards four tasks implemented as part of 'focus on form' (FonF) instruction – tasks designed to draw learners' attention to linguistic structures (e.g. grammar) while prioritizing meaning-making and communication. Analyses of an attitude questionnaire and group interviews revealed that, overall, the children perceived the FonF tasks as effective, enjoyable, and easy. They showed particularly favourable attitudes towards tasks that are cognitively stimulating but not overwhelming, as well as towards production tasks and pair/group tasks (cf. Harley, 1998; Lyster, 2004).	A2, B1, C1, C3, D6, E2
2009	Oliver, R. (2009). How young is too young? Investigating negotiation of meaning and corrective feedback in children aged five to seven years. In A. Mackey, & C. Polio (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction: Second language interaction research in honour of Sue M. Gass* (pp. 135–156). London: Routledge.	As an extension of Oliver (1998, 2000, 2002) and Mackey et al. (2007), this study examined whether younger L2 children (ages 5–8) could engage in the negotiation of meaning (NoM) and use feedback during tasks. The findings showed that, if tasks were modified to be age-appropriate, younger children, as well as older children and adults, could employ such interaction strategies, particularly when the NoM concerned the 'self' (e.g. self-repetition, clarification requests, and confirmation checks). However, when negotiation involved the 'other' (e.g. comprehension checks or repeating for others) (p. 152), younger learners made less use of these strategies, which the author attributed to children's egocentricity, as in Oliver (1998). The study also highlighted the importance of pairing patterns, consistent with her previous studies.	A2, B1, C1, D4, E1, E2
2010	Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2010). The incidental acquisition of English plural -s by Japanese children in comprehension-based and production-based lessons. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(4), 607–637. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263110000288	**Shintani and Ellis'** study was one of the first to focus on instruction based on input-based tasks among young learners. It compared the effects of comprehension-based instruction (CBI), which used input-based tasks, and production-based instruction (PBI), which used production-based tasks, on the acquisition of English plural *-s* by children aged 6–7 in Japan. Both CBI and PBI were effective, but the corrective feedback that children in CBI received on their comprehension errors appeared to help them understand the meaning of the target morpheme, whereas the recasts provided to children in PBI for their production errors did not lead to successful repairs.	A2, B2, C1, C2, D1, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2011	Butler, Y. G., & Zeng, W. (2011). The roles that teachers play in paired-assessments for young learners. In D. Tsagari, & I. Csepes (Eds.), *Classroom-based language assessment* (pp. 77–92). Peter Lang. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_180	**Butler and Zeng's** study is among the earliest to examine task-based assessment among young learners, focusing on differences between two assessment formats: paired assessment (PA), in which two children worked together, and individual assessment (IA), in which a child worked with a teacher. The study found that in the IA format, teachers predominantly asked questions, and students (ages 11–12, $N = 24$) responded, resulting in a relatively fixed interaction. In contrast, the PA format could elicit a variety of negotiation strategies (e.g. questions, clarifications, confirmations), and children, especially those who were at higher proficiency levels, tended to prefer this format over the IA as a formative assessment. However, this benefit was observed only when the dyads worked collaboratively (examined based on Storch's (2002) socio-cultural model of dyadic interaction). If they could not, greater teacher oversight and involvement were necessary.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D5, E2
2011	Shintani, N. (2011). A comparative study of the effects of input-based and production-based instruction on vocabulary acquisition by young EFL learners. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(2), 137–158. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810388692	Similar to Shintani and Ellis (2010), **Shintani** also examined the effect of comprehension-based instruction (CBI) using input-based tasks, but this time on children's (ages 6–8, $N = 36$) vocabulary learning. Although both instruction types were similarly effective, a discourse analysis of the interactions revealed that CBI contexts fostered greater interaction, leading to competitive performance in production tasks despite fewer opportunities to produce words.	A2, B2, C2, D1, E2
2013	Shintani, N. (2013). The effect of focus on form and focus on forms instruction on the acquisition of productive knowledge of L2 vocabulary by young beginning-level learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 36–62. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.54	Similar to Shintani and Ellis (2010) and Shintani (2011), **Shintani** explored the effectiveness of input-based tasks rather than form-focus PPP among beginning-level Japanese EFL children (age 6, $N = 45$). Although both types of instruction were effective with respect to noun learning, input-based tasks showed an advantage in adjective learning. This result was attributed to the contextualized input that input-based tasks could provide to the children.	A2, B2, C2, D1, E2
2013	Lyster, R., Quiroga, J., & Ballinger, S. (2013). The effects of biliteracy instruction on morphological awareness. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education, 1*(2), 169–197. https://doi.org/10.1075/jicb.1.2.02lys	Following Harley (1998) and Lyster (2004), **Lyster et al.'s** intervention study examined the effect of form-focused tasks within biliteracy instruction (French and English) on children's (ages 8–10) morphological awareness in both languages in an immersion program. Approximately 8–10 hours of intervention yielded a positive effect in French but not English overall. A closer examination revealed that English-dominant children benefited more than their French-dominant counterparts. The author attributed this result to English-dominant children's 'greater exposure to phonological shifts in English suffixation' (p. 192).	A2, B3, C3, D1, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2014	Butler, Y. G., & Zeng, W. (2014). Young foreign language learners' interactions during task-based paired assessment. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 11*(1), 45–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2013.869814	Following findings from Butler & Zeng (2011), **Butler and Zeng** further explored the possibilities and challenges of paired assessment in FL using tasks by comparing interactions between younger children (ages 9–10, $N = 32$) and older children (ages 11–12, $N = 32$) in China. Age effects were found; the older children exhibited a greater variety of interactional strategies, more mutual topic development, and increased turn-taking. However, since age was confounded with proficiency levels, the possibility remains that proficiency also played a role in the results.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D5, E1
2014	Sample, E., & Michel, M. (2014). An exploratory study into trade-off effects of complexity, accuracy, and fluency on young learners' oral task repetition. *TESL Canada Journal, 31*(8), 23–46. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v31i0.1185	**Sample and Michel** examined the effect of task repetition by analyzing the complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) of oral production, as well as task completion, among young EFL learners (ages 9, $N = 6$) in Hong Kong. Consistent with previous research mostly among adults, the children showed steady improvement in fluency across repetitions. Accuracy increased at the expense of complexity from the first to the second trial, supporting Skehan's (2009) trade-off hypothesis; however, this trade-off effect was not observed by the third trial (cf. Mackey et al., 2007; Pinter, 2007).	A2, B2, C1, D3, E2
2015	Butler, Y. G., & Zeng, W. (2015). Young learners' interactional development in task-based paired-assessment in their first and foreign languages: A case of English learners in China. *Education 3–13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education, 43*(3), 292–321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2013.813955	As a follow-up to Butler and Zeng (2014), **Butler and Zeng** examined the effect of age, independent of children's general proficiency in an FL, on their interaction during task-based paired assessment. Students from two age groups (9–10 and 11–12, $N = 48$) completed the same set of decision-making tasks in both their L1 and FL. Since the two age groups differed in their holistic interaction patterns, topic development, turn-taking patterns, and the use of communicative functions in *both* L1 and FL interactions, the authors attributed these differences primarily to age rather than proficiency level. The study also suggested that students might have different expectations regarding assessment tasks, as socialization into language tasks could influence their performance.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D5, E1
2015	Butler, Y. G. (2015). Task-based assessment for young learners: The role of teachers in changing cultures. In M. Thomas, & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Contemporary task-based language teaching in Asia* (pp. 348–365). London: Bloomsbury.	Building on Butler & Zeng (2011), this case study by **Butler** analyzed individual teachers' interactive and scaffolding styles during task-based formative assessment for children (ages 11–12, $N = 24$). The findings indicate that their three teachers' interactive and scaffolding styles not only varied substantially but also had significant and distinct impacts on students' performance in both paired and individual assessment formats. The study highlights the challenges teachers face in serving as both facilitators and evaluators in task-based formative assessment.	A2, B2, C1, D7, E4

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2015	García Mayo, M. P., & Lázaro Ibarrola, A. (2015). Do children negotiate for meaning in task-based interaction? Evidence from CLIL and EFL settings. *System, 54*, 40–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.12.001	Children's interaction during tasks was compared between regular EFL and content-and-language-integrated learning (CLIL) settings across two age groups (8–9 and 10–11 years, $N = 80$ altogether). The effects of both program type and age were found. CLIL students used more negotiation of meaning strategies but less L1 than those in the regular EFL program. **García Mayo and Lázaro Ibarrola** attributed this finding to CLIL students' greater opportunities to use English for meaningful purposes in class and their higher proficiency. Moreover, regardless of the program type, older children negotiated less and used more L1 than younger ones (cf. Oliver, 1998, 2000, 2002).	A2, B2, B3, C1, D4, E1, E3
2015	Lázaro Ibarrola, A., & Azpilicueta-Martinez, R. (2015). Investigating negotiation of meaning in EFL children with very low levels of proficiency. *International Journal of English Studies, 15*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2015/1/203751	Building on studies by Oliver (1998, 2000, 2002) and Mackey et al. (2007) conducted in L2 contexts, **Lázaro Ibarrola and Azpilicueta-Martinez** explored interaction during a paired task among beginning-level, low proficiency children (ages 7–8, $N = 16$) in an FL context. The participating children used a variety of negotiation strategies but far less frequently than children in L2 contexts in previous studies. They also relied more on L1 and often used explicit corrections.	A2, B2, C1, D4, E1
2015	Cánovas Guirao, J. C., de Larios, J. R., & Coyle, Y. (2015). The use of models as a written feedback technique with young EFL learners. *System, 52*, 63–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.04.002	**Cánovas Guirao et al.** examined the effect of feedback (i.e. comparing and discussing one's own writing in light of a model) as part of a collaborative writing task among FL-learning children (ages 10–11, $N = 20$). Similar changes were made by children in both the intervention and control groups, suggesting a minimal effect of modeling. Analyses of children's dialogues, based on language-related episodes (LREs) (Swain & Lapkin, 2002), revealed that they primarily noticed lexical items but struggled with both 'the scope and quality' of noticing (p. 73), indicating the need for support and practice to improve their writing in such an activity.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, E2
2015	Van Gorp, K., & Van den Branden, K. (2015). Teachers, pupils and tasks: The genesis of dynamic learning opportunities. *System, 54*, 28–39. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.04.018	As part of a larger project on the effect of TBLT implemented in content-based instruction (CBI, similar to CLIL but in an L2 context), **Van Gorp and Van den Branden** focused on two successful Dutch-as-an-L2 learners (ages 11–12) and examined their interaction with teachers to better understand the link between interaction and learning (specifically, of a science topic). A discourse analysis did not reveal a clear picture of this linkage; the link appeared to be mediated by classroom climate, the socio-affective relationship between student and teacher, students' interest in the topic, and other factors (cf. Carless, 2002, 2004).	A3, B1, C3, D5, E4

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued*.)

2016	García Mayo, M. P., & Imaz Agirre, A. I. (2016). Task repetition and its impact on EFL children's negotiation of meaning strategies and pair dynamics: an exploratory study. *The Language Learning Journal, 44*(4), 451–466. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1185799	**García Mayo and Imaz Agirre** examined the effect of two types of dyad task repetition on EFL learners' negotiation of meaning (NoM): exact repletion, which involves repeating the exact same task, and procedural repletion, which involves repeating a similar task with the same procedure ($N = 120$) (cf. Pinter, 2007). Although students' NoM did not differ, procedural repetition had positive effects, reducing L1 use and increasing collaboration (i.e. more dyads were collaborative). Interestingly, younger dyads (ages 8–9) were more collaborative than older dyads (ages 9–10) (cf. Butler & Zeng, 2015).	A2, B2, C1, D4, D5, E1, E2
2016	Azkarai, A., & Imaz-Agirre, A. (2016). Negotiation of meaning strategies in child EFL mainstream and CLIL settings. *TESOL Quarterly, 50*(4), 844–870. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.249	**Azkarai and Imaz-Agirre** further explored the same topic examined in García Mayo & Lázaro Ibarrola (2015): children's NoM in CLIL contexts, while also considering the effects of task types (one-way vs two-way) and age (ages 9–10 vs 11–12, $N = 72$). The study found that the participants used various NoM, but not comprehension checks, consistent with Oliver (1998) in an L2 setting. However, contrary to García Mayo & Lázaro Ibarrola (2015), CLIL students used NoM *less* than regular FL students. The authors attributed the result to higher proficiency among CLIL students, suggesting that the tasks might have been easier for them. The study also indicated that both age and task types influenced the participants' NoM.	A2, B2, B3, C1, D4, E1, E3
2016	Shintani, N. (2016). *Input-based tasks in foreign language instruction for young learners*. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.9	This book is a collection of **Shintani's** previous studies on the effects of TBLT over Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP), including Shintani & Ellis (2010) and Shintani (2010, 2013). It also includes a study examining the effect of TBLT on incidental grammar acquisition in EFL children (ages 6–7). While the TBLT was effective in facilitating the acquisition of the plural morpheme *-s*, it was not effective for the copula verb *be* in English, which the author attributes to the greater semantic saliency of *-s*.	A2, B2, C2, D1, E2
2017	Ahmadian, M., & Tajabadi, A. (2017). Patterns of interaction in young EFL learners' pair work: The relationship between pair dynamics and vocabulary acquisition. *The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 22*(3), 98–114. http://doi.org/10.17576/3L–2017–2301–08	Based on Storch's (2002) socio-cultural model of dyadic interaction, **Ahmadian and Tajabadi** examined the relationship between the interaction patterns of pre-primary Iranian EFL children (age 6, $N = 18$) and their vocabulary learning. Most dyads exhibited collaborative and dominant/dominant patterns. (Note that socio-cultural theory predicts that collaborative and expert/novice patterns promote learning more effectively than others.) Importantly, such interaction patterns do not necessarily correlate with vocabulary learning in very young children (cf. Butler & Zeng, 2011; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2016).	A2, B2, C1, C2, D1, D5, E1
2017	Azkarai, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2017). Task repetition effects of L1 use in EFL child task-based interaction. *Language Teaching Research, 21*(4), 480–495. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816654169	**Azkarai and García Mayo** investigated the effect of task repetitions while focusing on the children's use of L1. Compared with previous studies among adults, children (ages 9–10, $N = 42$) used L1 more frequently, but similar to adults, they used L1 mostly when they requested help and borrowings. Consistent with García Mayo & Imaz Agirre (2016), L1 use decreased with task repetition, regardless of the repetition type (exact and procedural repetitions).	A2, B2, C1, D3, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2017	Azkarai, A., & Imaz-Agirre, A. I. (2017). Gender and age in child interaction in an EFL CLIL contexts: An exploratory study. In M. P. García Mayo (Ed.), *Learning foreign languages in primary school: Research insights* (pp. 103–123). Multilingual Matters.	This study aligns with previous studies, including García Mayo & Lázaro Ibarrola (2015) and Azkarai & Imaz-Agirre (2016), which were conducted in CLIL contexts. However, **Azkarai and Imaz-Agirre** extended previous research by introducing gender, along with age, as a focus in examining children's NoM ($N = 42$). Unlike the studies mentioned above, this study found that older dyads (ages 8–9) used more NoM than younger dyads (ages 7–8). The gender effect was minimal.	A2, B3, C1, D4, E1
2017	García Mayo, M. P., & Hidalgo, M. A. (2017). L1 use among young EFL mainstream and CLIL learners in task-supported interaction. *System, 67*, 132–145. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.05.004	**García Mayo and Hidalgo** expanded on the topic of L1 use during tasks examined in previous studies (e.g. Azkarai & García Mayo, 2017; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2016; García Mayo & Lázaro Ibarrola, 2015; Lázaro & Azpilicueta-Martinez, 2015). Children, tested twice at ages 8–9 and 9–10 ($N = 32$), primarily use L1 as a substitute for unknown target vocabulary. CLIL students used less L1 compared with regular EFL students.	A2, B2, B3, C1, D3, E3
2017	Lázaro-Ibarrola, A., & Hidalgo, M. A. (2017). Procedural repetition in task-based interaction among young EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 168*(2), 183–202. https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.16024.laz	Following Sample & Michel (2014), this intervention study by **Lázaro-Ibarrola and Hidalgo** examined the effect of task procedural repetition on EFL learners' (age 11, $N = 20$, in a CLIL program) oral production in Spain, while focusing on both NoM and CAF. As the children repeated tasks, their frequency of using NoM decreased. While the accuracy slightly improved over time, no change was observed in fluency and complexity.	A2, B3, C1, D3, D4, E2
2018	García Mayo, M. P., Imaz Agirre, A., & Azkarai, A. (2018). Task repetition effects on CAF in EFL child task-based oral interaction In M. Ahmadian, & M. P. García Mayo (Eds.), *Recent perspectives on task-based language learning and teaching* (pp. 11–28). De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501503399	Similar to Sample & Michel (2014) and Lázaro-Ibarrola & Hidalgo (2017), **García Mayo et al.** examined the effect of task repetition on children's CAF but with a larger sample ($N = 54$). The findings showed that procedural task repetition promoted fluency in younger learners (ages 8–9) and accuracy in older learners (ages 9–10), while complexity decreased among younger learners. The authors interpreted the results as supporting evidence for Skehan's Trade-Off Hypothesis (2009). However, the reason for the interaction between task repetition and age was not clearly explained, and the authors speculated that motivation might have played a role.	A2, B3, C1, D1, D3, E1, E2
2018	Butler, Y. G., Kang, K. I., Kim, H., & Liu, Y. (2018). Tasks' appearing in primary school textbooks. *ELT Journal*, 72(3), 285–295. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx056	**Butler et al.'s** textbook analysis aimed to understand how 'tasks' for young learners were conceptualized and incorporated into primary school textbooks ($k = 6$ from China and South Korea) that claimed to employ tasks in their instructional approach. Most activities in the textbooks were classified as non-tasks based on the field's accepted definition, although the authors also noted challenges in making decisions due to ambiguities in the concept of tasks for young learners. Tasks were sequenced primarily by linguistic targets, with insufficient consideration of age appropriateness.	A4, B2, C1, C2, D8

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2018	Dreßler, C. (2018). *Nature and enactment of tasks for early English as a foreign language teaching: A collaborative research project with teachers*. Giessener Beiträge zur Fremdsprachendidaktik	**Dreßler's** longitudinal case study, by employing an ethnographic approach, explored the nature of tasks and teachers' actual implementation of tasks in primary school classrooms (Grades 1–4, aged 6–10) in Germany. The study highlighted the role of children's personal interests in making the tasks meaningful communication experiences in the target language. There was indeed a gap between actual implementation (task-as-action) and plans (task-as-workplan) in children's classrooms, emphasizing the importance of situating tasks in local teaching contexts (cf. Carless, 2002, 2004; Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015).	A3, B2, D6, D7, E4
2018	Riestenberg, K., & Sherris, A. (2018). Task-based teaching of Indigenous languages: Investment and methodological principles in Macuiltianguis Zapotec and Salish Qlispe revitalization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 74*(3), 434–459. https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.4051	Using Long's (2015) methodological principles (MPs) for TBLT as an analytical framework, **Riestenberg and Sherris** examined the implementation of TBLT in two Indigenous language teaching contexts with differing community support: Macuiltianguis Zapotec in Oaxaca, Mexico (without formal school support) and Salish Qlipse in Montana (with formal school support). Distinct interpretations of MPs were observed across the two contexts. The authors argued that teachers' roles, community investment, and revitalization efforts were essential when implementing TBLT in Indigenous language contexts (cf. Carless, 2002, 2004; Dreßler, 2018; Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015).	A3, B4, C3, D8, E3, E4
2019	García Mayo, M. P., & Imaz Agirre, A. I. (2019). Task modality and pair formation method: Their impact on patterns of interaction and LREs among EFL primary school children. *System, 80*, 165–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.11.011	**García Mayo and Imaz Agirre** examined the effects of task modality (oral vs oral + written) and pairing type (proficiency-based, teacher-selected, and self-selected) on the interaction of Spanish EFL learners (ages 11–12, $N = 32$). The results indicated that the proficiency-paired group produced more LREs in both task modalities, followed by the teacher-selected group, while the self-selected group did not engage in the tasks to the same extent as the other groups (cf. Cánovas Guirao et al., 2015).	A2, B2, C1, D4, E2
2019	Lázaro-Ibarrola, A., & Azpilicueta-Martinez, R. (2019). Negotiation of meaning in child-child vs adult-adult interactions: Evidence from low proficiency EFL learners. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 60*(2). https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2019-0013	Building on previous studies such as Mackey et al. (2003), Oliver (1998, 2000) and Pinter (2006), **Lázaro-Ibarrola and Azpilicueta-Martinez** re-examined and compared interaction between adult and child learners, while controlling for proficiency levels in FL, tasks, learning contexts, and L1 background. Unlike previous studies, children (age 8, $N = 20$) produced more NoM than their adult counterparts (ages 31 to 69, $N = 14$). The two groups differed in the types of strategies used. The authors argued that children were fully capable of negotiating meaning with their partners, underscoring the need for flexibility in codifying strategies when working with children.	A2, B2, C1, D4, E1

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued*.)

2019	Hidalgo, M. A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2019). The influence of task repetition type on young EFL learners' attention to form. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(4), 565–586. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688198655	**Hidalgo and García Mayo** also examined the effects of two types of task repetition on children's LREs during a collaborative writing task (cf. García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2016; García Mayo et al., 2018; Lázaro-Ibarrola & Hidalgo, 2017; Sample & Michel, 2014). The findings indicate that EFL learners in Spain (ages 11–12, $N = 40$) produced more LREs in procedural task repetition than in exact repetition, suggesting that this type of repetition may better sustain children's motivation. Their LREs primarily focused on form.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, E2
2019	Pinter, A. (2019). Agency and technology-mediated task repetition with young learners: Research and implications for primary classroom practice. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 1*(2), 139–160. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.00010.pin	**Pinter's** review paper, focusing on task repetition among young learners, highlighted potential advantages in the affective domain beyond linguistic gains. The author advocated granting children agency in task content, structure, and procedure and emphasized the importance of exploring their perspectives (cf. Pinter, 2009).	A4, E2
2019	Gorman, M., & Ellis, R. (2019). The relative effects of metalinguistic explanation and direct written corrective feedback on children's grammatical accuracy in new writing. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 1*(1), 57–81. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.00005.gor	Following a series of studies conducted in the Canadian immersion context (e.g. Harley, 1998; Lyster 2004; Lyster et al., 2013), **Gorman and Ellis** re-examined the effect of form-focused instruction among children (ages 9–12, $N = 33$) in Malaysia. Unlike previous studies, neither explicit metalinguistic grammatical explanations nor direct written correction contributed to children's use of a difficult target form (the present perfect simple tense) in their written dictogloss tasks. The results led the authors to conclude that form-focused instruction has limited applicability for children, but the cause of the discrepancy with previous findings remained unclear.	A2, B1, C1, C3, D1, D3, E2
2020	Luquin, M., & García Mayo, M. P. (2020). Collaborative writing and feedback: An exploratory study of the potential of models in primary EFL students' writing performance. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 2*(1), 73–100. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.19007.luq	Similar to Cánovas Guirao et al. (2015), **Luquin and García Mayo** explored what EFL children (ages 11–12, $N = 12$) noticed and incorporated into their writing during a collaborative three-stage task with or without a model. LREs showed that children, regardless of modeling availability, initially tended to focus on grammatical items. When a model was provided, they mentioned content and vocabulary and incorporated noticed lexis into their writing in the final stage. However, the model (i.e. feedback) had a limited effect on grammar and content.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2020	Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2020). Child EFL learners' attitudes towards a collaborative writing task: An exploratory study. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 2*(1), 52–72. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.19008.cal	**Calzada and García Mayo's** study examined EFL children's (ages 11–12, $N = 32$ in Spain) attitudes towards writing and a collaborative dictogloss task. An attitudinal questionnaire revealed that the children had positive attitudes towards writing in both their L1 and L2, as well as towards the collaborative writing tasks implemented in the study, irrespective of the pairing pattern they experienced. In particular, combining written and oral modes and having opportunities to receive peer feedback were perceived as helpful (Cf. García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2019).	A2, B2, C1, D6, E2
2020	Kim, H., Sung, M. -C., & Kim, H. (2020). Input-based instruction of English personal pronouns to young Korean learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 17*(1), 18–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.1.2.18	**Kim et al.** examined the effects of visual enhancement (VE) and a task designed to connect meaning and form (referred to as a meaning-oriented task, MT, in the study) on English personal pronoun acquisition in input-based instruction among Korean EFL children (ages 11–12, $N = 87$). As expected, the students who received both VE and MT performed the best compared with those who received input alone or either VE or MT in addition to the input (cf. Shintani & Ellis, 2010; Shintani, 2011, 2013, 2016).	A2, B2, C2, D1, E2
2021	Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2021a). Effects of proficiency and collaborative word on child EFL individual dictogloss writing. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 3*(2), 246–274. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.20003.cal	Building on Cánovas Guirao et al. (2015) and Luquin & García Mayo (2020), **Calzada and García Mayo** examined the effects of proficiency levels on a three-stage dictogloss writing task completed by EFL children in Spain (ages 11–12, $N = 30$). The children engaged in procedural task repetition: first individually, then collaboratively, and finally individually. Partners' proficiency levels did not impact the children's collaborative patterns. Higher-proficiency students detected lower-proficiency partners' errors and provided feedback without compromising their own accuracy. The results confirmed the merits of expert-novice interaction patterns predicted by socio-cultural theory.	A2, B2, C1, D3, D5, E2
2021	Calzada, A., & García Mayo, M. P. (2021b). Child learners' reflections about EFL grammar in a collaborative writing task: When form is not at odds with communication. *Language Awareness, 30*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2020.1751178	This is another study concerning the effect of collaborative dictogloss on children's noticing of form (e.g. Calzada & Garćia Mayo, 2021a). **Calzada and García Mayo** focused on a specific form, the third person singular *-s*, among children in Spain (ages 11–12, $N = 62$). LREs showed that the task facilitated form noticing but not the target form, indicating the gaps between researchers' intentions and children's perceptions. One can argue that this result confirmed the importance of listening to children's voices (cf. Pinter, 2019).	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, E2
2021	Martínez Adrián, M., Gutiérrez Mangado, M. J., Gallardo del Puerto, F., & Basterrechea, M. (2021). Language-related episodes by young CLIL learners: A review of task modality effects. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 3*(2), 214–245. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.20005.mar	Concerning the effect of task modality on children's LREs (both the frequency and the nature of LREs), **Martínez Adrián et al.** reviewed a series of papers stemming from a project involving the same cohorts of Basque-Spanish bilingual children learning English as their third language in a CLIL context (aged 10–12, $N = 59$). Their findings included: (1) tasks combining oral and written modalities had superior effects; (2) task modality had limited effects on the children's use of previously known languages; (3) same-gender dyads showed greater advantages than different-gender dyads; and (4) no modality effect was found on motivation (cf. Calzada & García Mayo, 2020; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2019).	A4, B3, C1, D4, E1, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2021	Oliver, R., & Sato, M. (2021). Tasks for children: Using mainstream content to learn a language. In M. J. Ahmadian, & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of task-based language teaching* (pp. 416–431). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108868327	**Oliver and Sato's** case study examined four teachers' interactional moves (i.e. meaning-focused input, input-providing corrective feedback [CF], output-prompting CF, form-focused episodes, and L1 use) during pedagogic tasks introduced as part of a Mandarin-medium CLIL program for primary school students in Australia. Classroom interactions and teacher interviews indicated that the teachers' use of interactional strategies varied according to children's grade levels, tasks, curriculum content, and the time of the academic year (cf. Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015).	A3, B3, C3, D4, D7, E1, E4
2021	Van den Branden, K., & Van Gorp, K. (2021). Implementing task-based language education in primary education: Lessons learnt from the Flemish experience. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 3*(1), 3–27. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.20013.bra	This policy analysis by **Van den Branden and Van Gorp** critically examined a large-scale TBLT initiative implemented by the Flemish government in Belgium, spanning primary to adult education, to improve the teaching of Dutch. Following up on the initial implementation report published in 2006, this study focused on the policy's effect at the primary school level and described shifts in implementation focus over time. The study also identified key factors influencing outcomes as student demographics changed (i.e. an increasing number of students had Dutch as their L2). Such factors included adopting bottom-up, strategic approaches at the school level, creating on-the-job coaching opportunities, engaging in continuous reevaluation and adaptation, and so forth (cf. Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015).	A3, B1, C3, D7, E4
2021	Kurt, G. (2021). Technology-mediated tasks in the young learners' EFL classroom. *Elementary Education Online, 20*(1), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.01.031	**Kurt** is one of the first studies to examine the effect of technology-mediated tasks on the listening, reading, and writing performance of EFL-learning children (age 4, $N = 43$, Turkey). After completing six tasks, the children in the treatment group did not perform significantly differently from the control group in English. However, interviews with a select group of children ($N = 5$) revealed that they had positive attitudes toward completing the tasks.	A2, B2, C1, D2, D3, D6, E3
2022	Gallardo-del-Puerto, F., & Martínez-Adrián, M. (2022). Task modality effects on the production and elaboration of language-related episodes: A study on schoolchildren's interactions in a foreign language. *Languages, 7*. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7040306	Similar to García Mayo & Imaz Agirre (2019), **Gallardo-del-Puerto and Martínez-Adrián** investigated the effect of different task modalities on the LREs of children (age 12, $N = 24$) in Spain during collaboration. The students who worked on an oral- and written-combined task (OW task) showed greater engagement and produced more meaning-focused LREs (as opposed to form-focused LREs) compared to those who completed an oral-only task with an opportunity for oral editing (OE task). A detailed analysis revealed that the OW task encouraged children to focus more on word choice, whereas the OE task directed their attention to word meaning.	A2, B2, C1, D4, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued*.)

2022	Martínez-Adrián, M., & Gutiérrez-Mangado, M. J. (2022). Gender pairings in EFL child task-based interaction. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19*, 103–128. https://doi.org/10.35869/vial.v0i19.3761	**Martínez-Adrían and Gutiérrez-Mangado** examined the effect of gender pairing (matched-gender vs mixed-gender) on LREs and performance in collaborative tasks among EFL-learning children (ages 10–12, $N = 56$, Spain). It showed that although different gender pairings yielded different LREs, there was no significant effect on performance, consistent with previous studies such as Azkarai & Imaz-Agirre (2017) and Oliver (2002).	A2, B2, C1, D3, D4, E1, E2
2022	Thorburn, R. (2022). Task design in online one-to-one classes with young learners. *Language Teaching for Young Learners, 4*(1), 92–117. https://doi.org/10.1075/ltyl.21002.tho	**Thorburn** examined the effectiveness of four tasks implemented in online one-to-one lessons by analyzing discourse between child-teacher exchanges (17 teachers and primary school children) (cf. Kurt, 2021). The frequencies of NoM and pushed output showed greater variation within tasks (among different teacher-student dyads) than across tasks. An open-ended task appeared to motivate children, and task familiarity and its location in lessons also influenced meaningful communication. The author highlighted the importance of specific considerations for developing and implementing tasks for virtual contexts (cf. Oliver & Sato, 2021).	A3, B2, C1, D4, E2, E3
2022	Zhu, Y. (2022). Implementing tasks in young learners' language classrooms: A collaborative teacher education initiative through task. *Language Teaching Research, 26*(3), 530–551. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819894706	In this action research, **Zhu**, a teacher educator, documented a six-week TBLT implementation in a Grade 2 classroom in China (the students' exact ages were not specified) with a novice English teacher. Despite challenges commonly noted in previous research (e.g. anxiety, classroom management), consistent practice-based support from the teacher educator and community-based feedback from fellow teachers helped the teacher address these issues and deepen her reflective practice (cf. Carless, 2002, 2004; Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2015)	A3, B2, C3, D7, E2
2023	Kos, T. (2023). Exploring peer support among young learners during regular EFL classroom lessons. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33*(2), 169–189. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12456	Drawing on socio-cultural theory, **Kos** investigated how 11-year-old children in Germany ($N = 12$) with similar proficiency levels supported each other during EFL classroom tasks. Analyses of task-related episodes (TREs) and language-related episodes (LREs) showed that cognitive and linguistic support was most common, particularly through resources and suggestions. In contrast, socio-emotional support was less frequent, likely due to the children's ongoing social-emotional development. The study also underscores the need to examine support strategies not only among peers but also from other sources, such as teachers, in fostering children's language learning (cf. Ahmadian & Tajabadi, 2017; Butler & Zeng, 2011, 2014, 2015; García Mayo & Imaz Agirre, 2016).	A3, B2, C1, D5, E1

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued.*)

2024	Timpe-Laughlin, V., Roters, B., & Butler, Y. G. (2024). *Exploring the idea of a 'task' in the context of the young language learner classroom.* ETS Research Report Series. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12389	**Timpe-Laughlin et al.** aimed to better understand how 'tasks' are conceptualized for teaching and learning with young learners. Employing a Delphi method, 16 experts exchanged ideas on tasks over a couple of rounds, followed by interviews with select participants to further explore the notion of 'authenticity' in tasks. The experts particularly emphasized the importance of age appropriateness in developing and implementing tasks for children, as well as the role of imagination (rather than congruence with the real world) as part of 'authenticity' in tasks (cf. Butler et al., 2018).	A1
2024	Pladevall-Ballester, E., Puig-Mayenco, E., & Capdevila, M. (2024). The effect of task-based peer interaction and pre-task instruction on young EFL learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of past tense: An intervention study. *Language Teaching Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688241267367	This eight-week intervention study by **Pladevall-Ballester et al.** examined whether focused task-based instruction led to gains in EFL-learning children's (ages 11–12, $N = 136$, Spain) implicit and explicit grammatical knowledge of the past tense. The intervention group which received both explicit grammar instruction and interactional strategies prior to the task showed the greatest gain in explicit knowledge (measured by a grammaticality judgement test) but not in implicit knowledge (measured by a self-paced reading task) (cf. Gorman & Ellis, 2019; Shintani, 2011, 2013).	A2, B2, C1, C3, D1, E2
2025	Chung, Y., & Révész, A. (2025). Impact of post-task explicit instruction on the interaction among child EFL learners in online task-based reading lessons. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0168	**Chung and Révész** concerned the timing of explicit instruction of forms and examined its effect provided before post-reading tasks on the acquisition of the third-person singular *-s* among children (ages 7–11, $N = 33$, South Korea) learning English online. The explicit form-focused explanation had no effect on their reading comprehension. LREs during post-reading tasks (i.e. collaboratively writing an ending to the story) revealed that few LREs related to the target form were observed in both the treatment and control groups. The authors attributed this result to the meaning-focused nature of the post-task implemented in the study (cf. Gorman & Ellis, 2019; Pladevall-Ballester, Puig-Mayenco, & Capdevila, 2024).	A2, B2, C1, D2, D4, E2, E3
2025	Zhu, Y., Newton, J., Liu, Y., & Shu, D. (2025). Exploring teacher-student interaction in task and non-task sequences. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0164	**Zhu et al.'s** classroom observation study explored teacher-child interaction in task and non-task contexts. Sixteen EFL lessons for Grades 1 to 5 (ages were not specified), taught by five teachers, were recorded in China. Tasks accounted for less than half of the class sequences in both frequency and duration. Distinct features of teacher-child interaction emerged in both task and non-task contexts, including differences in the teacher-child talk ratio, frequency of Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) sequences, types of teacher talk, and so forth (cf. Oliver & Sato, 2021).	A3, B2, C3, D7, E2

(*Continued*)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

(*Continued*.)

2025	Oliver, R., Bogachenko, T., & Dovchin, S. (2025). Children learning Mongolian as an additional language through the implementation of a task-based approach. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2024-0157	**Oliver et al.'s** classroom-based case study described the implementation of TBLT and examined its effect on Mongolian heritage language-learning children (ages 4–15) in Australia. The paper began with a needs analysis and detailed the development of tasks, implementation processes, and outcomes based on classroom interactions (e.g. facilitating various instructional strategies, translanguaging, etc.), as well as stakeholders' perspectives on their experiences with TBLT (cf. Oliver & Sato, 2021; Riestenberg & Sherris, 2018; Van den Branden & Van Gorp, 2021).	A3, B4, C3, D6, E4
2025	Luquin, M. (2025). *Tracking language growth in child English learners: The role of model texts*. De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111563442	As an extension to Cánovas Guirao et al. (2015) and Luquin & García Mayo (2020), **Luquin** investigated the effect of repeated exposure to model texts on Basque-Spanish bilingual children's (aged 11–12, $N = 60$) development of English writing, while focusing on its longitudinal effect. The study found positive effects of sustained exposure to model texts, especially if it was combined with form-focused instruction. The study also found that children exhibited an increased motivation and positive perception towards writing tasks with modeling (cf. Calzada & García Mayo, 2021a).	A2, B2, C1, D3, D6, E2
2025	Pladevall-Ballester, E., & Vraciu, A. (2025). Young learners' attitudes towards oral peer interaction and interactional feedback: Insights from a pedagogical intervention in the EFL classroom. *Language Awareness*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2025.2471839	**Pladevall-Ballester et al.** examined Catalan–Spanish bilingual children (ages 9–10, $N = 90$) and found that their already positive attitudes towards peer interaction and interactional feedback in English oral tasks remained stable after an eight-week task-supported intervention. However, since the task-only group without pre-task training reported less positive attitudes than groups receiving such training, the authors suggested that 'linguistic and interactional strategy training' (p. 18), offered prior to tasks, might have contributed to maintaining these positive attitudes (cf. Calzada & García Mayo, 2020).	A2, B2, C1, D6, E2
2025	Kopinska, M., Guerrero Gómez, J., & Orcasitas-Vicandi, M. (2025). Exploring the role of young learners' individual differences in colloborative writing. In M. P. García-Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating attention to form and individual difference: Research with EFL children* (pp. 215–232). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-80924-8	**Kopinska et al.** focused on learners' individual differences (i.e. willingness to communicate [WTC], engagement in collaborative writing tasks, and language analytical ability) among EFL learners in Spain (aged 11–12, $N = 67$). The target forms included (1) the third-person singular *-s*; (2) the third-person singular pronouns (*he/she*) and (3) their possessive forms (*his/her*). While WTC did not have a direct impact on the children's written production in tasks, children with higher engagement and stronger language analytical abilities exhibited better outcomes. Given that WTC was significantly correlated with engagement, the authors suggested its mediating role (cf. Gallardo-del-Puerto & Martínez-Adrián, 2022).	A2, B2, C1, D1, E1

Notes

1. This decision was made because it corresponds to the beginning of formal schooling in many regions and to key stages of cognitive and literacy development that influence one's approach to learning an additional language.
2. The asterisk (*) denotes that the study's full reference is provided in the subsequent timeline.
3. It should also be noted that task engagement research, which has received increasing attention, includes affect as one of its dimensions. For example, see Kopinska et al. (2025*).
4. There are multiple ways to classify tasks depending on the researcher's purposes. In this paper, I focus on the distinction between 'output-based' and 'input-based' tasks because the importance of input-based tasks for young beginning learners has been highlighted, while a common misconception is that tasks only concern production (Ellis & Shintani, 2014).
5. The participants' ages are not specified in this timeline if the original study mentioned only the grade levels.
6. Authors' names are shown in small capitals when the study referred to appears elsewhere in the timeline.

References

Andries, V., & Robertson, J. (2023). Alexa doesn't have that many feelings: Children's understanding of AI through interactions with smart speakers in their homes. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *5*, 100176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100176

Arabiat, D., Jabery, M. A., Robinson, S., Whitehead, L., & Mörelius, E. (2022). Interactive technology use and child development: A systematic review. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, *49*(4), 679–715. https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.13082

Butler, Y. G. (2025). *Children's additional language learning in instructional settings: Implications for teaching and future research*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/BUTLER3788

Bygate, M. (2020). Some directions for the possible survival of TBLT as a real world project. *Language Teaching*, *53*, 275–288. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000014

Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing*. Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315838267

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109

Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching. In S. Loewen, & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108–125). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580

García Mayo, M. P. (2025) (Ed.) *Investigating attention to form and individual differences: Research with EFL children*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-80924-8

Illés, É., & Akcan, S. (2017). Bringing real-life language use into EFL classrooms. *ELT Journal*, *71*(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccw049

Long, M. H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to nonnative speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *5*, 177–193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100004848

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756492

Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. John Wiley and Sons.

Skehan, P. (2009). Modeling second language performance: Integrating complexity, accuracy, fluency, and lexis. *Applied Linguistics*, *30*(4), 510–532. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp047 The timeline includes a description that cites Skehan (2009)

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, *52*(1), 119–158. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00179

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, *82*(3), 320–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb01209.x

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2002). Talking it through: Two French immersion learners' response to reformulation. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *37*(3–4), 285–304. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(03)00006-5

Timpe-Laughlin, V., & Butler, Y. G. (2026). *Task-based approaches to teaching additional language in primary school*. John Benjamins.

Van den Branden, K. (2008). Negotiation of meaning in the classroom: Does it enhance reading comprehension? In J. Philp, R. Oliver, & A. Mackey (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and the young learners: Child's play?* John Benjamins, (pp. 149–169). https://doi.org/10.1075/lllt.23

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvjf9vz4

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford University Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Xu, Y., Prado, Y., Severson, R., Lovato, S., & Cassell, J. (2025). Growing up with artificial intelligence: Implications for child development. In D. A. Christakis, & L. Hale (Eds.), *Handbook of children and screens* (pp. 611–617). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69362-5

Yuko Goto Butler is a Professor of Educational Linguistics at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. She is also the director of the Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) program at Penn. Her research primarily focuses on improving language education for young learners to address the needs of an increasingly globalized world. She also examines effective language teaching strategies and assessment methods that account for the linguistic and cultural contexts of instruction in the digital era.

Cite this article: Butler, Y. G. (2026). Teaching additional languages to young learners through tasks. *Language Teaching*, 59(4), 476–496. https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X

https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144482610113X Published online by Cambridge University Press