

 Castledown



This work is licensed
under a Creative
Commons Attribution
4.0 International
License.

Tasks, self-efficacy, and L2 motivational self system in an online emergency EFL speaking class: A mixed-methods study

Nguyễn Nhật Quang

nhatquang.ed@gmail.com

Phạm Nhật Linh

nhatlinhpham2017@gmail.com

HQT Education Co. Ltd, VIETNAM

Nguyễn Thị Thu Hiền

hiennnguyen1211@gmail.com

Hanoi University of Industry, VIETNAM

Since the World Health Organization initially declared the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, new issues have arisen in English language teaching (ELT). Although task-based language teaching (TBLT) and task-supported language teaching (TSLT) have received significant academic attention and recognition in traditional classroom settings, there is insufficient research on their effects on students' L2 motivational self system and speaking self-efficacy in an online emergency EFL classroom. Therefore, this mixed-methods study aims at investigating the impacts of TBLT, TSLT, and PPP on the L2 motivational self system and speaking self-efficacy of students at Hanoi University (HANU). After collecting 117 questionnaires from three English-major speaking courses and performing a group interview with 12 students, the researchers examined the quantitative and qualitative data using one-way ANOVA, sentiment analysis, and content analysis. The findings revealed that task-based instruction was more successful than the PPP approach in increasing student speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system in the online emergency EFL speaking classroom. Moreover, teachers should pay attention to five elements related to the application of PPP, TBLT, and TSLT, including the teacher's role, time allocation, content, group work and peer support, and pre-task/activity preparation, which influence learners' perceived motivation and speaking self-efficacy.

Keywords: emergency online ELT; L2 motivational self-system; self-efficacy; TBLT; TSLT



The
JALT CALL
Journal
vol. 18 no.1

Introduction

With the rise of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), many approaches have appeared to facilitate language learning and teaching efforts. Among these approaches, Task-based language teaching (TBLT) and Task-supported language teaching (TSLT) have received great research attention and recognition. Studies in the last decades about the effects of TBLT and TSLT on language acquisition have proved that the two approaches can develop the learners' linguistic complexity, fluency, and accuracy, particularly oral skills (Albino, 2017; Bava Harji & Gheitanchian, 2017). Additionally, research also confirms the impacts of TBLT and TSLT on students' psychological factors, including motivation (Huang, 2016), enjoyment, and anxiety (Bao & Du, 2015).

However, new problems have arisen in ELT since the first declaration of the COVID-19 outbreak by the World Health Organization in 2020. Many public and private educational institutions have been severely affected due to lockdown and social distancing policies. Although some places have smoothly transitioned to online communication in response to this disaster, many schools and universities do not have a sophisticated and built-up system to conduct online lessons. Many teachers have to activate the online emergency classrooms using free and readily available online conference applications like Zoom or Google Meets to adapt to the current situation and maintain the educational process. The emergency teaching system, in this case, is usually run by the teacher in reaction to emergencies rather than an institutional platform that has been carefully designed and monitored by a technical expert. Admittedly, the new learning and teaching context creates several challenges, particularly in speaking classes, such as multitasking, distraction, and low levels of interaction between teachers and students (Kear *et al.*, 2012; Lowenthal *et al.*, 2017). In addition, teachers also report having difficulties with the virtual environment despite their extended teaching experience (Awang *et al.*, 2018; Rashid *et al.*, 2021).

Although an extensive body of literature is dedicated to TBLT and TSLT, most studies only focus on the effects of tasks in the traditional face-to-face classroom. Since early 2020, there has been a need for teachers to conduct effective emergency classes, urging them to find out suitable teaching techniques, online materials, and platforms (González-Lloret, 2020). However, little attention is paid to the significance of designing pedagogical tools and tasks in those classes to encourage students' language production (González-Lloret, 2020). Questions are raised as to whether the teaching approaches that are highly successful in traditional face-to-face contexts are still applicable to the online emergency classroom. A wide variety of online platforms may adequately fulfill educational purposes during this challenging period, but they are not without limitations, ranging from unstable video transmission to poor call quality. Therefore, more attention should be paid to the implementation of teaching approaches

in the online emergency classroom where teachers and learners have neither been appropriately trained nor provided proper guidelines for working and studying. Because teaching and learning online can create an unfamiliar atmosphere compared to the traditional face-to-face class, it is important to examine the effects of TBLT and TSLT on the psychological variables of the students. This mixed-methods study investigates the effects of TBLT and TSLT on learners' motivation and speaking self-efficacy to bridge the gaps in the literature. The first part of this article is to contextualize and signify the theoretical and practical importance of our research in the new ELT era, followed by an in-depth overview of the literature on emergency language teaching, computer-assisted tasks, TBLT, TSLT, self-efficacy, and motivation. The authors also propose a theoretical and conceptual framework on which this study is based. Next, the authors elucidate the research methodology, data collection, and data analysis. The next part of this article discusses our findings and suggests pedagogical implications. Finally, the authors summarize the main points, consider some limitations, and suggest future research directions.

Literature review

The conceptualization of online language learning and emergency language learning

Online learning has become part and parcel of the educational system in many developed countries. For example, in the United States, where online learning has been developed for decades, nearly 33% of higher education students attended online education (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Online courses are also effectively conducted in European countries thanks to their well-established Learning Management System (LMS). Paulsen (2003) concludes that almost all LMSs in 113 European schools across 11 countries were well developed, enabling an increasing number of newly opened online classes. Likewise, China has comprehensively developed its online learning facilities, resource building, and academic training (Wang *et al.*, 2018). Nonetheless, according to Venkatesh and Sykes (2013), online learning is not popular in developing countries, as the citizens do not have access to information and communications technology, such as computers, laptops, or the Internet. For example, in Vietnam, a developing nation, online learning is inevitably not the top priority of educators. According to Pham *et al.* (2019), only 20 out of 278 higher educational institutions in Vietnam have an online learning system, and a majority of universities still maintain their physical classrooms as the only mode of course delivery.

Although emergency remote teaching (ERT) has existed for more than thirty years to sustain education in times of wars (Davies & Bentrovato, 2011) and natural disasters (Baytiyeh, 2018), this educational model has only been adopted as an urgent solution on a global scale during the COVID-19 pandemic since 2020. The pandemic has caused both developing and developed countries to move to online classes. Unlike carefully crafted online courses, these emergency



classrooms are established under time pressure as a temporary response to crises (Hodges *et al.*, 2020) when the brick-and-mortar classrooms cannot be maintained. For developed countries with well-constructed LMS, the shifts are much easier (Vuorikari *et al.*, 2020). By contrast, developing countries may have tremendous difficulty transforming their physical classrooms to the virtual environment, particularly when a well-established e-learning curriculum and LMS systems are missing. The purpose of online classrooms in underprivileged countries is not to create a rigorous learning system but rather to resume educational opportunities in the shortest time with readily available materials and infrastructures (Hodges *et al.*, 2020). The purpose and features of ERT, therefore, can separate it from traditional online learning. In this article, the authors will regard ERT as a form of online classes carried out in crises without proactive planning and preparation.

The difference between online learning and ERT is evident in language learning and teaching. In developed countries, online language teaching has been established for decades. A study about European countries over seven years has indicated the potentials of information and communications technology in language teaching (Germain-Rutherford & Ernest, 2015). Many types of English training programs have been developed by both universities and private companies in the form of online courses or self-study courses (Bing, 2017; Manegre & Sabiri, 2020). In China, for example, English online courses are in great demand, building a billion-dollar industry (Manegre & Sabiri, 2020). However, these carefully planned courses are absent in emergency language classrooms. Instead of a carefully planned online course, emergency online language teaching usually serves as the mere transference and continuity of the offline courses' "leftovers." Acknowledging the distinctive features of ERT, the authors suggest four characteristics that can differentiate emergency language teaching from online education. First, emergency language teaching is considered an immediate and temporary solution, so it has to be flexible and user-friendly with minimum technical support from institutional technology specialists. Second, as some offline language materials cannot be applied directly to online courses (Hodges *et al.*, 2020; Turchi *et al.*, 2020), online learning materials should be among the priorities of teachers and educators. Third, teachers should combine asynchronous and synchronous lessons depending on students' real-time situations to enhance interactivity and communication among learners (Turchi *et al.*, 2020). Fourth, instead of summative tests, which can be interrupted in case of medical quarantine, medical check-up, or evacuation, there is a need to entail a formative assessment. For example, the ongoing assessment in an emergency ELT class can include daily activities or discussions on forums that students can report at home, while the final test can be replaced with a portfolio, a take-home essay, or a mini-project. The four characteristics above can fundamentally distinguish emergency language teaching from other online language classes that have been well-established with long-term preparation.

Tasks and computer-assisted language tasks

Ellis (2003, p.16) defines a *task* as “a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome.” According to Ellis (2003), a task should include four characteristics. First, the task should be primarily dedicated to meaning. Second, it should contain some kinds of gaps, including information-gap, reasoning-gap, and opinion-gap (Prabhu, 1987). The third feature is the learners’ reliance on linguistic or non-linguistic use to accomplish their activity, and the fourth is a detailed outcome of the task. Ellis’s definition of tasks and task characteristics is hereby applicable for both Task-based language teaching and Task-supported language teaching in this article.

Tasks can be classified in different ways. Unfocused tasks usually facilitate students’ general communication skills, whereas in focused tasks, students must practice a particular grammar structure (Ellis, 2009). From another perspective, Nunan (2004) separates tasks into pedagogical and real-world tasks, stating that pedagogical tasks only happen in the classroom when the latter can be applied in daily life conversations. With the rise of computer-assisted language teaching and online language teaching, another type of task, computer-assisted language tasks, becomes increasingly popular. A computer-assisted task generally has defining criteria of an offline task, while it is conducted on an online platform. The platform where online language classrooms take place should afford the opportunities to enhance the language learning and teaching process (Colpaert, 2013). According to Colpaert (2013), the online language learning and teaching environment should first enhance students’ access to up-to-date cultural materials and realia. In other words, with the assistance of technology, the classroom environment should focus on visualizing and stimulating students’ learning experiences. Secondly, students should have adequate communicative activities to acquire the target language. In an effective online learning environment, technology enables students to work with tasks that contribute to their communicative competence by practicing different tasks and activities instead of just reading textbooks (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014). Technology-mediated learning environments can also enhance students’ exposure to authentic language and useful platforms due to their dynamic functions, such as supplying an immersive gaming environment, whiteboards, emails, or blogs. Noticeably, according to Murphy (2016) and Stockwell (2013), students who work with technological platforms have a higher level of motivation than other students because technology-based instruction and student-centered approaches in online classrooms have the potential to contribute to motivation enhancement (Hancock *et al.*, 2002).

Language teaching and learning with tasks

Task-based language teaching and task-supported language teaching. *Task-based language teaching* is the practice of CLT philosophy, which aims at providing communicative opportunities and tasks that can facilitate students’ linguistic development (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). In essence, TBLT gives priority to content-based tasks rather than linguistic features (Littlewood, 2004). While



task-based language teaching is based on the transfer-appropriate processing theory, *task-supported language teaching* hinges on skill acquisition theory. That is, task-supported language teaching is applied with the methodological procedures of Present-Practice-Produce. The purpose of tasks in TSLT is to consolidate the learners' pre-existing knowledge to enhance their fluency (Ellis, 2003). Tasks applied in a PPP lesson support the transformation of declarative and explicit knowledge into procedural and implicit, or at least speeded-up declarative knowledge.

Lesson design with tasks. As mentioned above, tasks in TBLT can be focused or unfocused. For focused tasks, learners already know what linguistic items to focus on before doing the task, yet in unfocused tasks, the learners mainly focus on meaning rather than linguistic knowledge. In contrast, TSLT requires focused tasks because it must support the teaching and learning outcome of the PPP lesson. According to Ellis (2009), the lesson design of a TBLT classroom contains three main stages: pre-task, main task, and post-task. He proposes that before starting a lesson, teachers should create a preparatory task for students to be involved and motivated (Dörnyei, 2001). The task in this phase can act as a model for the main task coming afterward (Prabhu, 1987). After that, the main task will center around students' performance, which is considered the cornerstone of TBLT lessons (Ellis, 2009). The third and last phase of TBLT lessons is post-task that encourages students to re-practice the task, reflect on what they have done, and draw attention to linguistic forms that students usually make mistakes (Loshcky & Bley-Vroman, 1993). According to Ellis (2009, p.96), teachers can correct students' errors by providing "consciousness-raising activities," creating tasks for students to produce the language, and conducting "noticing activities" in the last stage.

In contrast, TSLT usually applies the PPP framework to incorporate tasks in the production stage. According to DeKeyser (1998), the PPP approach focuses on presenting the target language first (in the cognitive stage), followed by activities for developing the habit of using language (associative stage), and freer practice to encourage students to use the language (autonomous stage). PPP advocates believe that familiarizing students with regular uses and forms of a linguistic item through teachers' guidance can enhance students' accuracy and reduce errors (Hall, 2018). He argues that teachers should demonstrate how the target language's items are accurately used for students by exploiting this method, beginning with contextualizing and presenting clear instructions on how a new language item is used in real life. The presentation stage is followed by the practice stage, which includes drills and exercises from control practice to freer practice. The last stage, production, involves the application of language items that students have acquired into free-practice tasks to foster learner speeded-up declarative or procedural language knowledge development.

The suitability of tasks for an emergency language class

TBLT may be suitable for emergency language teaching and learning thanks to four overarching characteristics. Firstly, as mentioned above, students have to use their own knowledge to perform tasks rather than using the presented language by the teacher, which is appropriate for the flexibility of an emergency ELT class. Students can still learn with peers to perform the task without constant scaffolding and support from the teacher. Compared to the PPP approach, which requires teachers in most stages, particularly in presentation and practice, task-based learning appears to address the constraints of emergency learning when teachers cannot attend to many online groups of students simultaneously in a virtual lesson. Secondly, authentic materials in TBLT classrooms can be suitable for emergency ELT classes. These digital pedagogic and authentic materials on the Internet can be found more easily, which in turn minimizes the need to digitalize offline coursebooks and handouts. Finally, collaborative tasks are highly effective in enhancing students' interaction. Emergency ELT classes take place during wars, conflicts, or global diseases such as COVID-19, so students may suffer from anxiety, stress, burnout, and demotivation (Aristovnik *et al.*, 2020; Gillis & Krull, 2020). Thus, working with tasks in a small group or building classroom community through tasks (González-Lloret, 2020) can provide students with a sense of connection, collaboration, and de-isolation. Regarding the suitability of tasks for emergency ELT classes, the authors expect TBLT and TSLT to cater to teachers' and students' needs in an emergency language class while creating a motivating and encouraging learning environment. Therefore, this article aims at investigating different uses of tasks in EFL online emergency classrooms and comparing the effects of task-based teaching approaches with the conventional PPP approach on students' motivation and speaking self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy is a concept drawn from Bandura's social-cognitive theory, referring to one's confidence in their capacity to complete activities successfully (Bandura *et al.*, 1999). When people gain increased confidence and self-perception after a successful performance, they expect another successful performance in the future. In addition, people who feel assured that they can acquire specific skills and perform certain tasks are more likely to sustain more efforts. Negative feedback from others causes them to hold self-doubts and fixate personal flaws when challenges arise. In ELT studies, self-efficacy is a strong predictor for language learning strategies, motivation, and language achievement (Liu, 2013). A study by Chen and Lin (2009) concludes that students with higher academic self-efficacy tend to have higher academic performance than those who have medium or low self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1990), Mikulecky *et al.* (1996), and Wood and Locke (1987), self-efficacy is three-fold in general. The first dimension is *ability*, which focuses on the student's perceived ability to speak English. This component assesses features like the ability to participate fully in conversations that are entirely in English, the ability to communicate



with lecturers or international students, and the ability to speak English under pressure. The second dimension, *activity perception*, addresses students' beliefs of activities that need them to communicate in English. This dimension assesses features such as students' perceptions of role-plays, debates, oral presentations, and in-class discussions. Finally, the *aspiration* dimension refers to how success or failure influences self-efficacy expectations in similar or unfamiliar situations or environments. It also assesses characteristics such as learners' aspiration to speak English successfully or in the future.

L2 motivational self system

The L2 motivational self system was suggested by Dörnyei (2009) as a model with three key dimensions: *the ideal L2 self*, *the ought-to L2 self*, and *the L2 learning experience*. According to Dörnyei (2009), the ideal L2 self is the L2-specific feature of one's ideal self. It is a model of whom the L2 user would like to become in the future. If one aspires to be a competent L2 user who can successfully communicate with foreign friends, for example, the ideal image of oneself as a fluent L2 user might serve as a powerful motivation to bridge the gap between one's current self and this ideal image. Simultaneously, the ought-to L2 self is the second component of the L2 motivational self system, which refers to the traits one feels a strong inclination to possess (Dörnyei, 2009). For example, if a person wishes to acquire an L2 to meet his or her boss's or teacher's expectations, the ought-to L2 self can serve as the primary drive for L2 acquisition. Lastly, learners' attitudes toward second language learning are influenced by situation-specific motives. In other words, the L2 learning experience manifests the contextual and executive motives directly connected to the immediate learning environment and experience. This final component acknowledges that teachers, classroom practices, peers, and other elements in the learners' environment may impact their motivation to acquire an L2 (Lamb, 2012).

Theoretical framework

The effects of teaching approaches on speaking self-efficacy and motivation. Research in psycholinguistics and psychology has tried to delineate the relationship between the teaching approach, self-efficacy, and motivation in the offline environment (Harris & Leeming, 2021; Tavakoli *et al.*, 2019). Mills (2014) evinces three criteria comprising a teaching approach that fosters self-efficacy development: (1) instructional choices, (2) curriculum design, and (3) training in strategy and attribution. After conducting experimental research applying TBLT and conventional teaching approaches, Hamad (2013) concludes that different teaching methods have different effects on students' confidence in their speaking skills. The research findings show that task-based learning is superior in developing students' proficiency and self-efficacy as students were more motivated in lessons using TBLT than the PPP approach. Another article by Leeming (2017) concludes that after a one-year course studying with TBLT and PPP, 77 students' self-efficacy increased dramatically, which in turn

increased their proficiency. This longitudinal experimental study, however, came to the conclusion that there was no significant difference between the means of speaking efficacy of the students in the TBLT and PPP classes. As different studies point out contradictory results, it is hard to conclude whether the different approaches may result in different levels of learners' speaking self-efficacy and motivation. Admittedly, the extensive literature review exposes the gaps in research regarding the effects of teaching approaches, inclusive of TBLT and TSLT, on speaking-self efficacy and motivation in both online and offline classrooms. Among the limited articles focusing on the relationship between instructional approaches, self-efficacy, and motivation in language teaching and learning (Harris & Leeming, 2021), a majority of studies only focus on other skills such as reading (Tavakoli *et al.*, 2019), writing (Erkan & Saban, 2011; Piniel & Csizér, 2014), and listening (Collins & Hunt, 2011). There is indeed a severe gap in the academic world to assess the effects of teaching approaches, particularly TBLT and TSLT, on speaking efficacy in the classroom. Furthermore, as teachers have been forced to shift from the traditional face-to-face to online emergency classrooms since the outbreak of COVID-19, it is questionable whether EFL learners' motivation is also influenced by teaching approaches in a virtual environment.

The relationship between self-efficacy and motivation. There is a co-dependent relationship between self-efficacy and motivation. When learners have confidence in their ability to fulfill a task designated in a lesson, they will have a more positive attitude towards learning (Kormos *et al.*, 2011). Moreover, learners will likely alter their behavior to assign a heightened level of effort to succeed in a task if they have high self-efficacy (Schunk, 1991). Furthermore, Zimmerman (2000) also claims that self-efficacy could enhance learning motivation and sustain it. Likewise, Dörnyei (2009) combines self-efficacy as a cognitive constituent of the motivation-cognition-affect model. Tilfarlioglu and Cinkara (2009) conducted a study with 175 students of three different proficiency levels and concluded that, regardless of their language proficiency, learner self-efficacy positively correlates with their academic success due to academic motivation and self-setting goals. As explained in the introduction, a self-setting goal is their ideal self that is a part of the L2 motivational self system. Tilfarlioglu and Cinkara's study aligns with other research works in applied linguistics and social psychology, supporting the causal relationship between self-efficacy and motivation (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013; Piniel & Csizér, 2014; Yusuf, 2011).

Based on the thorough review of the literature above, this article proposes a conceptual framework representing the relationships between teaching approaches, speaking-self efficacy, and motivation in offline classes:

1. Offline teaching approaches impact speaking self-efficacy.
2. Offline teaching approaches impact motivation.
3. There is a positive correlation between self-efficacy and motivation in an offline speaking class.




Figure 1. Relationships between teaching approaches, speaking self-efficacy, and L2 motivational self system

However, these relationships have not been proven yet in the online emergency environment. Therefore, to bridge the gap researching English language teaching and learner psychology in the computer-assisted environment, the authors seek to investigate the first two relationships representing the effects of teaching approaches (TBLT, TSLT, and PPP) on self-efficacy and motivation in online speaking classes within this study. Nonetheless, the correlation between self-efficacy and motivation will be mentioned here and there in this article regarding their inextricable relationship. Thus, this article proposes three research questions:

1. What are the effects of online teaching approaches (TBLT, TSLT, and PPP) on learners' speaking self-efficacy in an emergency speaking class?
2. What are the effects of online teaching approaches (TBLT, TSLT, and PPP) on learners' L2 motivational self system in an emergency speaking class?
3. What are the students' perceptions about how the three online emergency speaking classes may affect their speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system?

Methodology

The rationale for the method choice

Based on postpositive ontology and pragmatic epistemology, the authors follow the convergent mixed-methods research by Creswell (2012). In this study, the authors hope that qualitative data collected from the focus-group interview would add weight and clarity to the quantitative data of the questionnaire. In other words, our main purpose of combining these two types of data and analysis is triangulation, which can be achieved through applying a mixed-methods approach (Riazi & Candlin, 2014). This design also allows the researchers to combine the greatest elements of both quantitative and qualitative data

collection so that the two sets of data can complement each other and thus, provides the researchers with an in-depth understanding of the research subject (see Figure 2).




Figure 2. Research design rationale

Participants

The participants were 120 Vietnamese EFL learners, 60% males and 40% females, aged 24–31. They were English-major students of a part-time program at Hanoi University (HANU). Simple random sampling was used to recruit the participants, and three out of five English classes on the campus were randomly selected. The majority of the participants had a full-time job, while about 20% were doing a part-time job; they were also in their first year of the program. According to their placement test results provided by the school, their English proficiency was at the low to mid intermediate level (B1.1-B1.2 level) of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. In addition, all participants were native Vietnamese speakers with similar cultural backgrounds. Regarding its composition, this sample might be considered representative of Vietnamese first-year students pursuing a second Bachelor’s degree in English at HANU.

Sampling techniques

In this study, two sampling procedures, simple random sampling and stratified sampling, were implemented to select the participants for the survey and the focus group interview, respectively. Before the experiment, the study participants, who were also the survey respondents, were employed using simple random sampling. Three out of five English classes on the campus were randomly selected. The participants (N = 120) were Vietnamese EFL learners from three intact classes at HANU (n1 = 40; n2 = 40; n3 = 40). According to Creswell (2012), in simple random sampling, the researchers select individuals for the sample so that any sample of size N has an equal likelihood of being drawn. Therefore, each individual of the population under investigation could have an equal chance of being selected. In the qualitative stage, stratified sampling was

used in order to select the interviewees. Observations about the students' rate of participation, attendance, and contribution were made. Both this set of data and the mid-term test results were analyzed. As a result, three groups of students with different levels, including high, middle, and low performance, were formed. In each class, one student in the high-performance group and one student from the low-performance group were randomly chosen for the interview. Because the number of students in the middle-performance group was twice as high as the number of students in high-performance or low-performance groups, two students from the middle-performance group were chosen from each class. In total, the researcher recruited 12 students for the group interview. The rationale behind the division was to reduce any effects of language performance on self-efficacy and the L2 motivational self system (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2013; Jaekel, 2020).

The implementation of emergency language teaching at Hanoi University

Relying on the characteristics of ERT and the suggestions by Gacs *et al.* (2020), the process of implementing emergency ELT classes at Hanoi University in this research was divided into four main stages, including preparation, design, implementation, and evaluation. According to Gacs *et al.* (2020), in the first stage, lecturers at this university were recommended to consider the perspectives of students towards online learning. One reason is that students could be greatly affected by the practices of ERT in language education. Characteristics of students with full-time employment, family commitments, and other responsibilities were included in course design and delivery (Robinson *et al.*, 2020). A needs analysis and training for teachers, then, should be conducted to prevent technology-related problems. In the second stage, factors such as learning objectives, delivery format, platforms and tools, organizational structure, modes, skills, interaction types, assessment, and evaluation plan were informed to students. The lecturers at HANU needed to highlight that although the design of online learning was conducted prior to the course, ERT is based on the premise that courses should be tailored to the actual educational context (Gacs *et al.*, 2020). After this stage, the final design should be gauged before implementation to reduce design flaws. In the implementation stage, lecturers were advised to establish communication practices, establish a learning community, and give support where relevant. Teachers could scaffold understanding strategies, deliver necessary feedback, and teach online learning strategies (Gacs *et al.*, 2020). In this stage, it could also be advisable for teachers to revisit some ERT's affordances and constraints to offer on-time solutions for unpredictable challenges (Gacs *et al.*, 2020). Because this trend of ERT may continue for a long period, it is vital that the ERT process be constantly evaluated. Gacs *et al.* (2020) propose the release time for course maintenance and curricular development in the last stage. Finally, professional training, curricular planning, and evaluation practices should be conducted. In short, the process proposed by Gacs *et al.* (2020) can be effective in second/foreign language education because it has

addressed an important difference between online learning and ERT, which is the urgent and rapid design of ERT during crisis times.



The rationale for the main task choice

The tasks in the three lessons aim to boost students' teamwork, communication, and presentation skills. After working in groups, in Lesson 1, students can talk about their meal preparation with a limited budget. After Lesson 2, students can design a house using three sustainable materials and present their building plan to the class. After Lesson 3, students are required to design infographics that summarize the timeline of space exploration missions. The main tasks in the first TBLT lesson ask students to work in groups to prepare meals in a day with 100 dollars. In the main task of the second TBLT lesson, the students have to choose three green materials to build a sustainable house. In the third lesson, the main task requires students to read the texts, extract historical events related to space exploration, and arrange them in chronological order before demonstrating them as an infographic. The complexity of the three main tasks requires students to use both their reasoning ability and their teamwork skills. A detailed description of task type and features is provided in Appendix A.

In a TSLT lesson, the tasks are employed as freer practice for students after the teacher instructs students and explicitly advises them to use specific grammar structures and lexical items. The PPP class will learn the same content as the TSLT class. However, the last activity for free practice is the conversation time for students to discuss the topic they learned rather than doing a task.

Research instruments

Questionnaire. The questionnaire employed in this study contained 36 items and was divided into two parts (see Appendix B). The first part examined the three dimensions of learner self-efficacy: ability, activity perception, and aspiration, and the second part included three dimensions of the L2 motivational self system: ideal self, ought-to self, and learning experience. On a 5-point Likert-type scale, participants were asked to choose one of five replies, from (1) “strongly agree” to (5) “strongly disagree.” Because the participants were more fluent in Vietnamese, the English version of the questionnaire was translated into Vietnamese. The purpose of translating into the participant's first language was to increase the data's reliability and obtain a high response return rate (Thomas, 2013).

Regarding the pilot test of this questionnaire, an English class of the same level (B1) was chosen randomly at HQT Education, Ho Chi Minh City. There were 25 students in this online class, and one out of the three TBLT lessons was taught to these students. After the lesson, they were asked to complete the pilot questionnaire. The responses were collected, and Cronbach's alpha was used to examine these responses. It yielded high values for the six dimensions of the L2 motivational self system scale and the speaking self-efficacy scale (from

$\alpha = .879$ to $\alpha = .970$). The results confirmed that this survey was reliable enough to administer to the experimental groups.

Focus-group interview. According to Cohen *et al.* (2011), focus groups could supplement more traditional types of interviews, questionnaires, or observation, because it is useful for collecting qualitative data and triangulation. The interview question taxonomy is provided in Appendix B. The interviewer did not raise these questions in a fixed but random order. Instead, the specific focus-group interview began with basic and less complex questions before moving on to more complex research questions, as directed by King and Horrocks (2010). Moreover, some questions contained a probe and prompt function, which was intended to evaluate the interviewees' comprehension and prompt the interviewee to explain himself/herself (Drever, 1995).

Procedures

After acquiring consent from the department's management board and presenting the research outline, the researchers randomly chose three out of five B1 classes at HANU. Within this study, the researchers chose to use Zoom, an online platform for communication, which closely resembles in-person instruction. Also, with the advanced Breakout rooms and the co-annotate option that allow for group work and presentation, this online platform can be considered an ideal online learning environment for emergency classes. Zoom enabled the teachers to provide students with computer-supported tasks with both criteria and functionalities of an effective learning environment. Over the past two months, because many students in Vietnam had been using online platforms due to the lockdown of schools and institutions, the participants in this study were rather familiar with Zoom. Thus, no tutorials on how to use Zoom were given. Besides the synchronous session, students also had the Google Classrooms and Facebook's group as an asynchronous platform for the emergency ELT class where they could get the learning materials, discuss their difficulties, and ask for support from their teachers and friends. At the beginning of the procedure, the researchers visited the online classes and explained the research to the students. On recognizing that obtaining people's signatures using written consent forms could be perceived as distressing for the participants (Nakkash *et al.*, 2009), the authors verbally solicited their consent to join in the study rather than obtaining signatures. The participants of the three classes ($n_1 = 40$; $n_2 = 40$; $n_3 = 40$) were taught by the same teacher, who had received training about TSLT, TBLT, and PPP in university. Also, the researchers and the teacher had worked together about pedagogical aspects to reach a complete agreement on the instruction of each lesson. The three classes studied three speaking sessions over three weeks about Food, Sustainable Housing, and Space Exploration. After the three weeks, 120 questionnaires were delivered online, and 117 were collected as three students were quarantined due to COVID-19 infection (return rate = 97.5%). As COVID-19 prevented face-to-face interaction, 12 students from three classes were chosen to participate in the



online focus group interview. They were invited to meet with the researchers in the Zoom meeting, where the focus group interview took place for about 60 minutes. The interview was taped, transcribed, and closely examined.



Data collection and analysis

The quantitative data included students' responses from the speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system questionnaire. The questionnaire responses were entered into the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) on SPSS. Regarding the qualitative data, the interview was recorded and transcribed by one of the authors. The first author then re-inspected the transcription to ensure data accuracy. The researchers used Nvivo version 11 to analyze the qualitative data collected. Sentiment analysis was used to provide an overall picture of the learners' feeling polarization towards each approach, followed by content analysis to elucidate aspects related to learners' speaking self-efficacy and motivation. Nvivo's sentiment analysis served as a preliminary analysis to assess the learners' overall emotion towards their lessons at the interview session, which could give a general idea about how the students felt towards each teaching approach. In the sentiment analysis, the researchers cross-referred the transcripts' words with the opinion lexicon provided by Nvivo 11. After that, the researchers calculated the sentiment score for each method using the following formula:

$$\sum \text{very positive words} \times 2 + \sum \text{positive words} - \sum \text{very negative words} \times 2 - \sum \text{negative words}$$

The students' overall feelings towards a teaching approach are positive polarity when the sentiment score > 0 . The students' overall feelings towards a teaching approach are negative when the sentiment score < 0 . The students' overall feelings towards a teaching approach are neutral when the sentiment score $= 0$. As Nvivo's sentiment analysis works automatically based on the comparison between the interview transcripts and the sentiment datasets, there are cases that Nvivo may misinterpret the data, for example, when the interviewees use sarcastic comments. Thus, after Nvivo exported the sentiment score, the first author inspected each case in-depth with the interviewer notes and the audio recordings to ensure the sentences analyzed presented the accurate emotions of the participants.

In the content analysis, the researchers analyzed the data with NVivo 11 to create automatic codes. Through automatic coding and word frequency analysis, the researchers analyzed the emerging themes to explain the emerging phenomena further.

Results

Quantitative results

Table 1. Means and standard deviations comparing the three teaching approaches on self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system

| Approaches | n | Self-efficacy | | L2 motivational self system | |
|------------|-----|---------------|------|-----------------------------|------|
| | | M | SD | M | SD |
| TBLT | 40 | 3.42 | 0.66 | 3.43 | 0.53 |
| TSLT | 38 | 3.38 | 0.58 | 3.54 | 0.60 |
| PPP | 39 | 2.79 | 0.59 | 2.81 | 0.54 |
| Total | 117 | 3.20 | 0.67 | 3.26 | 0.64 |

Note. TBLT = Task-Based Language Teaching; TSLT = Task-Supported Language Teaching; PPP = Present – Practice – Produce

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for the three teaching approaches (TBLT, TSLT, and PPP). It is clear that in terms of self-efficacy and motivation, the mean values of TBLT and TSLT approaches are generally higher than that of PPP. The table also demonstrates that the mean self-efficacy is 3.42 for the students taught with TBLT, 3.38 for those in the TSLT class, and 2.79 for the PPP class. Levene's test was then used to check the assumption that the variances of Self-efficacy ($p = 1.00$) and L2 motivational self system ($p = .67$) groups are equal for independent variables. As a result, this assumption is not violated, and the LSD post hoc test can be utilized to examine which specific means are different from each other.

Table 2. One-way analysis of variance summary table comparing the three teaching approaches on learner self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system

| Sources | | df | SS | MS | F | p |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|
| Self-efficacy | Between groups | 2 | 9.76 | 4.88 | 12.94 | .000 |
| | Within groups | 114 | 42.98 | .38 | | |
| | Total | 116 | 52.74 | | | |
| L2 motivational self system | Between groups | 2 | 12.04 | 6.022 | 19.32 | .000 |
| | Within groups | 114 | 35.52 | .31 | | |
| | Total | 116 | 47.57 | | | |



Table 3. LSD post hoc tests of variance summary table comparing the three teaching approaches on learner self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system

| Source | Approach (I) | Approach (J) | Mean difference | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | (I-J) | p |
| Self-efficacy | TBLT | TSLT | .04 | .77 |
| | | PPP | .63 | .00 |
| | TSLT | TBLT | -.04 | .77 |
| | | PPP | .59 | .00 |
| | PPP | TBLT | -.63 | .00 |
| | | TSLT | -.59 | .00 |
| L2 motivational self system | TBLT | TSLT | -.11 | .37 |
| | | PPP | .62 | .00 |
| | TSLT | TBLT | .11 | .37 |
| | | PPP | .73 | .00 |
| | PPP | TBLT | -.62 | .00 |
| | | TSLT | -.73 | .00 |

As can be seen from Table 2, a statistically significant difference is identified among the three teaching approaches (TBLT, TSLT, and PPP) on learner self-efficacy, $F(2, 114) = 12.94, p = .000$, and on learner L2 motivational self system, $F(2, 114) = 19.32, p = .000$. Regarding the research questions, Post hoc LSD tests (see Table 3) indicate that the students in the TBLT class differ significantly in their belief about self-efficacy with the PPP class with $p < .05$. Likewise, there are also significant mean differences in the learner motivation between the TSLT and the PPP class with $p < .05$ using the same test. In other words, it might be stated that different teaching approaches can have different effects on learner self-efficacy and motivation; and lessons with tasks are more likely to influence learner self-efficacy and motivation than the PPP approach. On the other hand, there is only a small mean difference (.04) between the mean of the TBLT and TSLT (see Table 1), and the post hoc LSD tests also indicate that they do not significantly differ with $p = .77$ for self-efficacy and $.37$ for motivation (see Table 3) respectively. Because other factors do not change, it can be inferred that the difference in speaking self-efficacy and motivation (between students who learned with tasks and those who did not) come from the teaching approaches. Although the results show that PPP exerts little influence on self-efficacy and motivation, it remains unclear whether the TBLT or the TSLT approach significantly impacts the two psychological factors.

Sentiment analysis

Noticeably, because the sole analysis of quantitative data cannot identify specific differences between TBLT and TSLT, data obtained from the focus-group interview are combined to shed light on the students' perception of how each approach has affected their speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self

system. The sentiment analysis is used to investigate 108 turns of answers to 10 questions by 12 participants in the focus group interview.

Table 4. PPP, TBLT, and TSLT sentiment scores

| Approaches | Very negative | Negative | Positive | Very positive | Sentiment score |
|------------|---------------|----------|----------|---------------|-----------------|
| PPP | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4 | 9 |
| TBLT | 2 | 3 | 16 | 8 | 25 |
| TSLT | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 15 |

The sentiment analysis of the students' interview responses illustrates that, in general, they had positive opinions about all the three teaching methods used in the online emergency EFL class because all the sentiment scores are higher than 0. TBLT is what students showed the most positive feelings for, and PPP receives the highest rate of negative and very negative words in the students' responses. Although the three methods receive the same number of very negative words, TBLT and TSLT register only half the number of negative words compared with PPP. Noticeably, the numbers of very positive words in both TBLT and TSLT are twice that of PPP with 8, 8, and 4, respectively. As mentioned above, the authors also examined each sentence in the sentiment analysis report created by Nvivo, with the interviewers' notes and the audio recordings of the interview. In general, the analysis accurately reflects the emotions that the interviewees expressed at the interview. The students were more eager to talk about TBLT and TSLT than when they had to answer questions related to the PPP class. They also showed a more optimistic tone when talking about their positive experiences with tasks. Overall, although we cannot conclude that all the students are motivated, this data analysis implies that they are generally pleased with their lessons. However, students display more negative feelings towards PPP than TBLT and TSLT.

Content analysis

An insight into the content gives the researchers more details about factors contributing to the different levels of self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system in different teaching methods. The five emerging themes are the teacher's role, time allocation, group work, support, content, and pre-task or pre-activity preparation.

The teacher's role. Regarding the teacher's role, the teacher presented the target language for a long period in the PPP class, which resulted in students' divided attention. Participant 11 said, "I usually fell asleep in class; when the teacher called, I was startled and did not know what she had said." Participant 11's sharing implied that students lost their interest or even became demotivated when the teacher spent too much time taking the sole presenter role of the target language. However, in TBLT and TSLT classes, students were the



ones who did the tasks, and students thought, “There are also many good students, they can teach us interesting things during the task. The teacher is just a facilitator” (participant 2) or “I was excited to hear from my friends and learn more from them” (participant 1). The interviews revealed that as teachers took the backseat in the classrooms, students had more opportunities to work and exchange knowledge. Because the teachers were no longer the resource in the classroom but rather a person who assisted the interactions between the members in the class, peer scaffolding could happen and lead to an increase in students’ interest in listening to their peers’ ideas. In other words, when teacher changed their role from a resource to a facilitator, the students’ source of motivation could be generated from listening to their friends, especially those who were more proficient or had better performance in class.

The ratio of teacher and student talking time. The second aspect that influenced learner motivation and speaking self-efficacy was the ratio between student talking time and teacher talking time. In TBLT, students had more opportunities to proactively participate in group-work tasks than students of the PPP and TSLT classes. Student talking time was maximized in TBLT classes, with most of the students feeling “excited,” “motivated,” “engaged,” and “enthusiastic.” In contrast, five out of six students coming from the TSLT and PPP classes reported feeling “sleepy” and “only woke up when the teacher checked [their] attendance.” In the TSLT classroom, the students who were interviewed only felt excited in the last part of the lesson. One student said, “I am more awake when my teacher forces me to talk in the last part.” Particularly in the PPP class, participant 12 commented that “it was very time-consuming having to sit and listen to what the teacher said, especially when you don’t agree with what she said.” The other two students believed they were not adequately prepared for the last part because passive participation through practicing and drilling exercises did not help them generate enough ideas and even “didn’t know what to say.” Due to the lack of student talking time, the students of the PPP class were “not confident enough to have conversations in English with [their] classmates” (participant 11).

Group work: peer technical and content support. The third contributor was group work and peer support. In the PPP classroom, students were reluctant to speak and discuss with their friends, as stated “My friends are afraid to speak, they cannot talk without preparing notes. We are all afraid to make mistakes” or “I am the only one to speak in the breakout room.” In TBLT and TSLT classes, students were encouraged to work in groups, both by teachers and peers. For example, a participant said, “Studying with my current teacher, I can make a group presentation and learn many new words from others,” or another reported, “It’s fun to work in groups, I can learn a lot of skills.” Although all the students reported having technical issues with Zoom, such as “When I’m in a group where the network disconnects some friends, and I couldn’t hear much” (participant 4) or “The biggest problem is my unstable Internet connection to Zoom” (participant 6), they were happy that their friends provided adequate

technical scaffolding. When the teacher was busy presenting or was not in the breakout room, the students were happy to stand in and help their friends. A student in the TBLT class said, “I was eager to listen to my friend’s ideas, so when he lost [his] Internet connection, I [was] disappointed. But we managed to help him get back into Zoom” (participant 5).

However, there were still complaints about the mixed levels of competence in the three classes when the students had to collaborate. At times, several students were more dominant than others. Students from high-performance groups usually spoke more, and other students remained silent. Seven out of the 12 students complained about moments when there were “only some of us talk, and others keep silent all the time” (participant 7), “maybe they are not good enough to talk,” and “we are pulling each other down” (participant 11). In general, students in all groups seemed to be affected by the gaps in academic performance with their teammates. In PPP classes, students had a lower level of motivation as they were afraid of making mistakes. They also feared that they could not enhance their language skills as other group members hesitated to speak. By contrast, in TBLT and TSLT classes, students were more motivated as they were supported by their friends, both in the content of the lessons or technology use. However, in TBLT and TSLT classes, students also had problems with the mixed levels of group members. The high-performance students’ talking time accounted for the majority of the discussion, which demotivated lower-level students. Meanwhile, being obliged to work with lower-level students, high-level ones might also feel sluggish, disheartened, and stagnant as they could not learn from their groupmates.

Content. The content of the lessons also contributed to the students’ self-efficacy and motivation. Regarding some unfamiliar topics, students in TBLT classes reported, “normally, if they are topics that I don’t focus on, the lesson can open up more for me” (participant 9) or “The topic is so interesting, it’s simpler to say. The teacher scaffolds and suggests what you need to say” (participant 6). However, in TSLT and PPP classes, when the topics were unfamiliar, the students were “more afraid to talk” and “don’t know what to say.” Also, because the teacher usually focused on forms during the presentation and suggested speaking templates, students believed that accuracy should be prioritized over fluency. Thus, they avoided speaking for fear of losing face. One student said that “the teacher should have given us topics to prepare at home, then bring notes to the class and at least we can read from it to converse with our friends rather than saying wrong stuff.” The students were motivated because they liked the content that “incorporates cultures” (participant 8); however, they did not believe that it could help them improve their pronunciation (participant 5).

Preparation before main activities and tasks. The preparation before main activities or tasks also affected students’ self-efficacy. In PPP class, students passively absorbed the knowledge and did not have adequate preparation for their conversation in the last part of the lesson. One said that they had to listen and do exercises most of the time. Also, sometimes the teacher taught

something they already knew. One PPP participant even said that “I feel that the total lesson is useless and time-consuming. I am stuck” (participant 8). In TBLT class, pre-task activity prepared students with group work or pair work orally. Participant 1 said, “Before the main lesson, the teacher allowed me to discuss with friends what to fill in the blanks about the topic of different functions of a sustainable house, so I have some information and words to speak later. I can speak with ease.” As an interpretation, the active preparation for speaking activity can positively impact students’ self-efficacy and motivation.

Discussion

The effects of teaching approaches on speaking self-efficacy in the online emergency EFL speaking classroom

First, it is promising that teaching approaches have the potential to yield the same benefits in the online environment as in an offline EFL class. The quantitative data analysis reveals that the participants in TBLT and TSLT classes have significantly higher speaking self-efficacy. An insight into the content analysis also confirms this finding. Participants in the TBLT and TSLT lessons demonstrated very high self-speaking efficacy levels because of many interesting tasks in the three lessons. They were more confident that their friends and teachers could understand them. In contrast, the learners who took part in the PPP lesson lacked self-confidence. This is in line with the research by Leeming (2017), which signifies the positive impact of TBLT on the learners’ self-efficacy in an offline environment.

Students who were exposed to tasks also showed a firm belief about their ability to finish a task. They explained that they could control what they said and had sufficient vocabulary items to express ideas. However, the PPP class displayed reluctance to speak due to anxiety or a shortage of ideas. Sometimes, the students in the breakout rooms did not attempt to participate in the activity. Regarding aspiration, students in TBLT and TSLT also developed their trust, confidence, and ambitions after learning. They reported that they could use English like a native speaker because of the new approach. On the other hand, some students said that they thought there should be more emphasis on pronunciation and they had to practice pronunciation drills after class, because they were worried that the approaches failed to help them with pronunciation. The student’s concern that the tasks cannot help to enhance their pronunciation is also addressed in a paper by Newton (2017). Specifically, he states that the role of pronunciation has been greatly undermined due to the focus on oral fluency within communicative classrooms (Newton, 2017). Therefore, to improve the confidence or self-efficacy of learners in completing a speaking task, teachers might pay more attention to accuracy aspects such as pronunciation practice in the post-task phase. According to Derwing and Rossiter (2002), an effective way to help learners with their pronunciation is to deliver pronunciation instructions, which can be included in the focus-on-form session after doing the main tasks. Besides teaching communication, teachers should

also focus on the learners' communication strategies that learners can often employ to overcome communication breakdown if they mispronounce some words while participating in a conversation (Derwing & Rossiter, 2002).

Meanwhile, students from the PPP class were concerned about their abilities and learning styles. They thought that they should be more hard-working about learning English. Most of them believed self-study was quite challenging, and learning in emergency online classes was far more difficult than offline. TBLT students preferred the activities in which they could work as groups and listen to their friends' answers. Their mutual trust could be supported by information exchange among students (Chong & Reinders, 2020). The TBLT class that conducted group activities and group presentations had more confidence. They stated that the approaches in the three previous lessons allowed them to think more independently due to the open-outcome nature of the task choice, and the tasks were challenging enough for many students. It helped the TBLT students gain more trust in their own ability to fulfill the tasks. In brief, TBLT and TSLT approaches may positively affect students' attitudes, aspirations, and activity perception, yet the PPP approach fails to yield the same results. These findings align with other studies about the effects of TBLT and TSLT in offline classes on the students' L2 proficiency development and self-efficacy growth (Harris & Leeming, 2021; Leeming, 2017).

The effects of teaching approaches on L2 motivational self system in the online emergency EFL speaking classroom

The students of the three classes also demonstrated important differences in terms of their L2 motivational self system. The quantitative data shows that the two language teaching approaches using tasks and the PPP approach differ significantly. Additionally, the learners who took TBLT and TSLT lessons reported they maintained motivation from the beginning till the end of the experiment. They were excited to talk to their friends and listen to presentations. Also, the students were more motivated to engage in the task and found the task exciting. Our research findings are supported by Ulla (2020). According to 137 Thai EFL participants in the study by Ulla, the more interesting the tasks were, the more motivated the learners felt. The diversity of tasks provided in the TBLT lessons also encouraged the learners to join in the group activity even without the presence of their teachers in breakout rooms. In contrast, the participants in the PPP class were only motivated because the teachers checked their attendance and forced them to talk.

Regarding the ideal L2 self, the tasks and the atmosphere in TBLT and TSLT classes might motivate students to study. The TBLT and TSLT classes even changed the student's ideal motivational self as they wanted to be better at speaking and aspired to be a teacher in the future. Huang (2016) states that the TBLT approach could increase students' overall motivation in a positive way. By contrast, students from the PPP class seemed to have lower motivation, as a student confessed that she did not feel anything positive or negative. A decrease in the level of motivation can be explained by Sabet *et al.* (2014).

They compared the effects of the PPP and TBLT approach on students' motivation, and the results suggested that TBLT motivates students more than the traditional PPP approach.

Noticeably, in terms of the ought-to L2 self, the quantitative results show that the mean value of TBLT and TSLT is higher than the PPP method, but it cannot be seen in the qualitative data. From the interviews, it may be indicated that most of them were aware of their needs and perceived responsibilities. In PPP class, students hoped to receive topics beforehand to prepare and speak better in the class. In addition, the qualitative analysis does not depict any significant differences, which may be because when students are working together, regardless of whether to complete a task or not, learners' autonomy is enhanced (Eneau & Develotte, 2012). In other words, the students in this current study were generally motivated to conduct self-study. They appeared to be more confident with their speaking ability because they could perform the speaking tasks by themselves, which might signify motivated behaviors. In a study by Huang and Liaw (2007), it was also concluded that the autonomy of 116 college students in Central Taiwan was indicative of both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

Underlying factors related to the teaching approaches that affect students' speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system in the online emergency EFL speaking classroom

From the interviews, it can be seen that three teaching approaches could have different impacts on the self-efficacy and motivations of students. Six factors that can create such differences are the teacher's role, time allocation, content, group and peer support, and preparation for tasks. Regarding the teacher's role, in PPP and TSBT classrooms, the teacher conducted the presentation stage and taught linguistic items for a long period, resulting in students' divided attention. When the teacher solely acted as a linguistic resource for the students in class, they might find part of the lesson passively time-consuming, demotivating, and monotonous. Meanwhile, students in TBLT were entitled to conduct the task, and the teacher was only a facilitator, which made students appreciate their friends' support and exchanges. Likewise, according to Robinson *et al.* (2020)'s study on the perceptions of online learners towards their instructors' behaviors, instructors can play an active role within the classroom by being present and responsive or conducting necessary synchronous sessions. These actions by instructors can generate encouragement, engagement (Robinson *et al.*, 2020), and possibly, motivation for the online learners.

Because the teacher underscored different roles in TBLT, TSLT, and PPP, the ratio between teacher talking time and student talking time also varied. The dead time in the online emergency class could reduce learner attention; therefore, it might demotivate them from engaging actively in the lesson. Some students in the interview revealed that they fell asleep or even drove their motorcycle during these times while the teacher were presenting the lesson and not interacting with them. Multitasking, off-task, and behavioral disengagement



are also reported in many other studies applying technology in education (Lepp *et al.*, 2019; Sana *et al.*, 2013). Boredom during the lesson can cause learner disengagement in the entire learning process. A large-scale survey by Sana *et al.* (2013) with 452 undergraduate college students in the Midwestern United States reports that off-topic multitasking is significantly higher in online classes than in face-to-face classrooms. Additionally, it has been shown that multitasking on computers may hinder the comprehension of in-class lectures (Sana *et al.*, 2013). Because there could be a strong relationship between student engagement and perceived learning environment, as well as their motivation (Tas, 2016), it might be important to assign students with activities that require them to collaborate and pay constant attention to keep students engaged. Otherwise, their motivation will be negatively impacted (Kilian *et al.*, 2010). Finally, the teacher can enhance collaboration and reduce off-topic behaviors by providing and directing students to work together in productive tasks or speaking topics (Carpenter *et al.*, 2020).

The content of the lessons also affected students' self-efficacy and motivation. When the students perceived the topic as familiar or similar, they tended to show more interest in the task. On the other hand, when topics fell out of the students' scope of interest, they would be less likely to believe in completing the task. Also, the focus of the content could reduce the learners' engagement, especially when a large proportion of the lesson emphasized language accuracy. This finding may indicate that when the content prioritizes accuracy, not fluency, learners' speaking self-efficacy reduces. The Limited Resource model, in a similar vein, suggest that learners may have difficulty focusing on both meaning and form simultaneously. Therefore, they are likely to prioritize either accuracy or complexity/fluency but not both (Skehan, 1998).

Similarly, the pre-task could result in students' higher motivation, which was lacking in the PPP process. Noticeably, peer support may play a pivotal role in learners' motivation and efficacy, especially when they complete the tasks with their classmates (Chen, 2018) and receive technical and content support from their friends. It is preferable for teachers to bear in mind that students are not always experienced in learning with technology (Stockwell & Reinders, 2019); therefore, group support may help them with fundamental ideas about what to do online through both peer content and technical scaffolding. If the students had been allowed to prepare for the main tasks with their friends rather than doing drills to focus on accuracy, they would have felt more eager to present their achievement and become less afraid of losing face. The final problem that seemed to demotivate the students was the unequal competence of the members in a group. Many students reported that while some were highly productive, other members remained silent throughout the tasks. Therefore, it might be necessary for teachers to vary the group interaction dynamics so that students can work with different people. This suggestion could help students move gradually out of their comfort zone and support their speaking self-efficacy.

Conclusion

Although the lessons were delivered only in three weeks, this convergent mix-methods research showed that different teaching approaches could impact the second language learner's speaking efficacy and motivation in online Emergency classes. Furthermore, it could be concluded that TBLT and TSLT have more positive effects on the students' speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system than the PPP approach. To motivate students and enhance their confidence, it might be beneficial to teachers if they should consider the five aspects of applying different teaching methods: the teacher's role, time allocation, content, group and peer support, and preparation for main tasks. Although the online environment of an emergency EFL classroom may pose new challenges, the teacher can still successfully motivate and enhance learners' speaking self-efficacy with established methods such as TBLT and TSLT. Teachers should also prioritize student talking time and provide students with the opportunity for interaction and collaborative preparation. It is also important for the teacher to provide technical scaffolding or assign technical scaffolding as a group's goal to ensure that students are always supported in times of difficulties. A group support system in which students assist each other to complete tasks or deal with technical issues is also necessary in TBLT and TSLT online emergency classes. Educational institutions can also consider suggestions provided in this study as part of their teacher training to facilitate teachers during emergencies.

It should be noted that the current study did not set out to explore the relationship between learner speaking self-efficacy and their L2 motivational self-system. Future investigation into such a relationship may provide further comprehension of the previous findings. Second, the findings should be considered tentative because they may be affected by several external and environmental factors. It might be possible that prior to the experiment, the learners of the TBLT and TSLT classes had already had higher levels of speaking self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system than those in the PPP class. As a result, future studies may employ a pre-test to measure the scores of self-efficacy and motivation before the experiment. Another suggestion is that future researchers could adopt a counterbalancing design in which the same group of students will be exposed to all three teaching approaches to limit unwanted effects of free variables outside the classroom.

References

- Albino, G. (2017). Improving speaking fluency in a task-based language teaching approach: The case of EFL learners at PUNIV-Cazenga. *SAGE Open*, 7(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017691077>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States*. Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC.





- Aristovnik, A., Keržič, D., Ravšelj, D., Tomažević, N., & Umek, L. (2020). Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on life of higher education students: A global perspective. *Sustainability*, 12(20), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12208438>
- Awang, H., Mat Aji, Z., Mohd Yaakob, M. F., Osman, W., Mukminin, A., & Habibi, A. (2018). Teachers' intention to continue using virtual learning environment (VLE): Malaysian context. *Journal of Technology and Science Education*, 8(4), 439–452. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.463>
- Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 2(2), 128–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413209008406426>
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. V. (1999). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 13(2), 158–166. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.13.2.158>
- Bao, R., & Du, X. (2015). Implementation of task-based language teaching in Chinese as a foreign language: benefits and challenges. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 28(3), 291–310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1058392>
- Bava Harji, M., & Gheitanchian, M. (2017). Effects of multimedia task-based teaching and learning approach on EFL learners' accuracy, fluency and complexity of oral production. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 16(2), 25–34.
- Baytiyeh, H. (2018). Online learning during post-earthquake school closures. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, 27(2), 215–227. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-07-2017-0173>
- Bing, W. (2017). The college English teaching reform based on MOOC. *English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 19–22. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n2p19>
- Carpenter, D., Emerson, A., Mott, B. W., Saleh, A., Glazewski, K. D., Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Lester, J. C. (2020). Detecting off-task behavior from student dialogue in game-based collaborative learning. In I. I. Bittencourt, M. Cukurova, K. Muldner, R. Luckin, & E. Millán (Eds.), *Artificial Intelligence in Education* (pp. 55–66). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52237-7_5
- Chen, I. C. (2018). Incorporating task-based learning in an extensive reading programme. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 404–414. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy008>
- Chen, M. C., & Lin, H.-J. (2009). Self-efficacy, foreign language anxiety as predictors of academic performance among professional program students in a general English proficiency writing test. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 109(2), 420–430. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.109.2.420-430>
- Chong, S. W., & Reinders, H. (2020). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: A qualitative research synthesis. *Language Learning and Technology*, 24(3), 70–86.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

- Collins, W., & Hunt, J. (2011). Improved student motivation and confidence through self-access listening, video forums and talking journals. *The JALT CALL Journal*, 7(3), 319–333. <https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v7n3.125>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Davies, L., & Bentrovato, D. (2011). *Understanding education's role in fragility: Synthesis of four situational analyses of education and fragility: Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Liberia*. International Institute for Educational Planning.
- DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). Cambridge University Press.
- Derwing, T. M., & Rossiter, M. J. (2002). ESL learners' perceptions of their pronunciation needs and strategies. *System*, 30(2), 155–166. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(02\)00012-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(02)00012-X)
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self system. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9–42). Multilingual Matters.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2013). Teaching and researching motivation. In C. N. Candlin & D. R. Hall (Eds.), *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833750>
- Drever, E. (1995). *Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research: A teacher's guide*. Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- Eneau, J., & Develotte, C. (2012). Working together online to enhance learner autonomy: Analysis of learners' perceptions of their online learning experience. *ReCALL*, 24(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344011000267>
- Erkan, D. Y., & Saban, A. İ. (2011). Writing performance relative to writing apprehension, self-efficacy in writing, and attitudes towards writing: A correlational study in Turkish tertiary-level EFL. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 13(1), 163–191.
- Gacs, A., Goertler, S., & Spasova, S. (2020). Planned online language education versus crisis-prompted online language teaching: Lessons for the future. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(2), 380–392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12460>

- Germain-Rutherford, A., & Ernest, P. (2015). European language teachers and ICT: Experiences, expectations and training needs. In R. Hampel & U. Stickler (Eds.), *Developing online language teaching: Research-based pedagogies and reflective practices* (pp.12–27). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gillis, A., & Krull, L. M. (2020). COVID-19 remote learning transition in spring 2020: Class structures, student perceptions, and inequality in college courses. *Teaching Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X20954263>
- González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (2014). Towards technology-mediated TBLT: An introduction. In M. González-Lloret & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Technology-mediated TBLT: Researching technology and tasks* (pp. 1–22). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.6>
- González-Lloret, M. (2020). Collaborative tasks for online language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(2), 260–269. <https://doi.org/10.1111/FLAN.12466>
- Hall, G. (2018). *Exploring English language teaching: Language in action*. Routledge.
- Hamad, M. M. (2013). Factors negatively affect speaking skills at Saudi colleges for girls in the South. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 87–97. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p87>
- Hancock, D. R., Bray, M., & Nason, S. A. (2002). Influencing university students' achievement and motivation in a technology course. *Journal of Educational Research*, 95(6), 365–372. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670209596611>
- Harris, J., & Leeming, P. (2021). The impact of teaching approach on growth in L2 proficiency and self-efficacy. *Journal of Second Language Studies*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1075/jsls.20014.har>
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Locke, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*.
- Huang, D. (2016). A study on the application of task-based language teaching method in a comprehensive English class in China. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7(1), 118–127. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0701.13>
- Huang, H.-M., & Liaw, S.-S. (2007). Exploring learners' self-efficacy, autonomy, and motivation toward e-learning. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 105(2), 581–586. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.105.2.581-586>
- Jaekel, N. (2020). Language learning strategy use in context: The effects of self-efficacy and CLIL on language proficiency. *IRAL – International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 58(2), 195–220. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2016-0102>
- Jeon, I. J., & Hahn, J. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(1).
- Kear, K., Chetwynd, F., Williams, J., & Donelan, H. (2012). Web conferencing for synchronous online tutorials: Perspectives of tutors using a new medium. *Computers and Education*, 58(3), 953–963. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.10.015>

- Kilian, B., Hofer, M., Fries, S., & Kuhnle, C. (2010). The conflict between on-task and off-task actions in the classroom and its consequences for motivation and achievement. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 25(1), 67–85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-009-0007-8>
- King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. SAGE Publications.
- Kormos, J., Kiddle, T., & Csizér, K. (2011). Systems of goals, attitudes, and self-related beliefs in second-language-learning motivation. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(5), 495–516. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr019>
- Lamb, M. (2012). A self system perspective on young adolescents' motivation to learn English in urban and rural settings. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 997–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00719.x>
- Leeming, P. (2017). A longitudinal investigation into English speaking self-efficacy in a Japanese language classroom. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 2(12). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-017-0035-x>
- Lepp, A., Barkley, J. E., Karpinski, A. C., & Singh, S. (2019). College students' multitasking behavior in online versus face-to-face courses. *SAGE Open*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018824505>
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319–326. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.319>
- Liu, M. (2013). English Bar as a venue to boost students' speaking self-efficacy at the tertiary level. *English Language Teaching*, 6(12), 27–37. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n12p27>
- Loshcky, L., & Bley-Vroman, R. (1993). Grammar and task-based methodology. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 123–167). Multilingual Matters.
- Lowenthal, P. R., Snelson, C., & Dunlap, J. C. (2017). Live synchronous web meetings in asynchronous online courses: Reconceptualizing virtual office hours. *Online Learning Journal*, 21(4), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i4.1285>
- Manegre, M., & Sabiri, K. A. (2020). Online language learning using virtual classrooms: An analysis of teacher perceptions. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1–16. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1770290>
- Mikulecky, L., Lloyd, P., & Huang, S. C. (1996). Adult and ESL literacy learning self-efficacy questionnaire.
- Mills, N. (2014). Self-efficacy in second language acquisition. In S. Mercer & M. Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 6–22). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783091362-003>
- Murphy, D. (2016). A literature review: The effect of implementing technology in a high school mathematics classroom. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 2(2), 295–299.



- Nakkash, R., Makhoul, J., & Afifi, R. (2009). Obtaining informed consent: Observations from community research with refugee and impoverished youth. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 35(10), 638–643.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2008.028936>
- Newton, J. (2017). Pronunciation and speaking. In *The Routledge handbook of contemporary English pronunciation* (pp. 336–351). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315145006-21>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
- Paulsen, M. F. (2003). Experiences with learning management systems in 113 European institutions. *Educational Technology & Society*, 6(4), 134–148.
- Pham, L., Limbu, Y. B., Bui, T. K., Nguyen, H. T., & Pham, H. T. (2019). Does e-learning service quality influence e-learning student satisfaction and loyalty? Evidence from Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(1), 1–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0136-3>
- Piniel, K., & Csizér, K. (2014). Changes in motivation, anxiety and self-efficacy during the course of an academic writing seminar. In Z. Dörnyei, P. D. MacIntyre, & A. Henry (Eds.), *Motivational dynamics in language learning* (pp. 164–194). Multilingual Matters.
<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783092574-015>
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.
- Rashid, A. H. A., Shukor, N. A., Tasir, Z., & Na, K. S. (2021). Teachers' perceptions and readiness toward the implementation of virtual learning environment. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(1), 209–214. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.21014>
- Riazi, M., & Candlin, C. (2014). Mixed methods in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135–173.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444813000505>
- Robinson, H., Al-Freih, M., & Kilgore, W. (2020). Designing with care: Towards a care-centered model for online learning design. *The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology*, 37(3), 99–108.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJILT-10-2019-0098>
- Sabet, M. K., Tahriri, A., & Haghi, E. B. (2014). The impact of task-based approach on Iranian EFL learners' motivation in writing research abstracts. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 953–962.
<https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.4.953-962>
- Sana, F., Weston, T., & Cepeda, N. J. (2013). Laptop multitasking hinders classroom learning for both users and nearby peers. *Computers and Education*, 62, 24–31. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.10.003>
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26(3–4), 207–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653133>
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

- Stockwell, G. (2013). Technology and motivation in English-language teaching and learning. In E. Ushioda (Ed.), *International perspectives on motivation. International perspectives on English language teaching* (pp. 156–175). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137000873_9
- Stockwell, G., & Reinders, H. (2019). Technology, motivation and autonomy, and teacher psychology in language learning: Exploring the myths and possibilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39, 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190519000084>
- Tas, Y. (2016). The contribution of perceived classroom learning environment and motivation to student engagement in science. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 31(4), 557–577. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-016-0303-z>
- Tavakoli, H., Lotfi, A. R., & Biria, R. (2019). Effects of CALL-mediated TBLT on motivation for L2 reading. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1580916. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1580916>
- Thomas, G. (2013). *How to do your research project: A guide for students in education and applied social sciences* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Tilfarlioglu, F. Y., & Cinkara, E. (2009). Self-efficacy in EFL: Difference among proficiency groups and relationship with success. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 3(2), 129–142.
- Turchi, L. B., Bondar, N. A., & Aguilar, L. L. (2020). What really changed? Environments, instruction, and 21st century tools in emergency online English language arts teaching in United States schools during the first pandemic response. *Frontiers in Education*, 5, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2020.583963>
- Ulla, M. B. (2020). Students' speaking motivation and their perspectives on a task-based language classroom: Pedagogical implications. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(2), 681–688. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2020.17.2.26.681>
- Venkatesh, V., & Sykes, T. A. (2013). Digital divide initiative success in developing countries: A longitudinal field study in a village in India. *Information Systems Research*, 24(2), 239–260. <https://doi.org/10.1287/ISRE.1110.0409>
- Vuorikari, R., Velicu, A., Chaudron, S., Cachia, R., & Di Gioia, R. (2020). How families handled emergency remote schooling during the time of Covid lockdown in spring 2020: Summary of key findings from families with children in 11 European countries. The Publications Office of the European Union. <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/20a208c7-199a-11eb-b57e-01aa75ed71a1>
- Wang, Y., Liu, X., & Zhang, Z. (2018). An overview of e-learning in China: History, challenges and opportunities. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 13(1), 195–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745499918763421>
- Wood, R. E., & Locke, E. A. (1987). The relation of self-efficacy and grade goals to academic performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 47(4), 1013–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164487474017>

- Yusuf, M. (2011). The impact of self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and self-regulated learning strategies on students' academic achievement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2623–2626.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.158>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 82–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1016>

Appendix A

Task types and technical features in TBLT lessons

| Task types | Psycholinguistic features | Design features |
|------------------|--|----------------------------|
| unfocused | output-based | simple input (+) |
| pedagogical task | input: teacher-provided (authentic/semi-authentic menus as input source) | familiar topic (-) |
| | gap: reasoning-gap and opinion-gap | here and now (+) |
| | outcome: open, many possible outcomes | few elements (-) |
| | task-content: student-generated content | structured information (+) |
| | | single demand (+) |
| | | reasoning demand (+) |
| | | simple outcome (-) |

To ensure the participation of all students, the teacher asks each student to choose one material after discussing it with their friends. Then each group will share their ideas with the class. Students in the class are from low to middle intermediate (B1.1 – B1.2 CEFR), so these tasks are simple output-based tasks. The participants' jobs are in various fields; hence, it is beneficial for them to acquire specific schemata. Therefore, by creating tasks based on interesting topics, the teacher can encourage intermediate students to join in conversations. They have already learned together for over two months, so working in groups creates a friendly and supportive environment to share ideas willingly. In addition, the task uses authentic and semi-authentic materials (adapted information-filled pictures and reading texts from National Geographic Learning and a set of menus from famous restaurants). It can motivate students to talk, offer exposure to authentic cultural and linguistic knowledge, and stimulate on-task behaviors, focus, and engagement. When the TBLT approach is applied in the three lessons, the main tasks are unfocused and pedagogic. Students act as doctors and office workers, so they do not have to plan meals within a limited budget or design a house. When teachers provide students with input language, including menus from restaurants, usual occurrences in a space mission, and a list of sustainable materials for house construction, students must create their content and give their opinions in discussion to complete the task. The

outcomes may vary according to the students' choices. In terms of the design features, the input is easy, but the topics are not familiar. The task is considered here-and-now as students can have copies of the menus and the list of materials. Nonetheless, different menus, information about the space mission, and building materials are presented for students. Additionally, a discussion is the main focus of the task, so there is no fixed structure for information.

Appendix B

Taxonomy of the self-efficacy and L2 motivational self system questionnaire and focus-group interview

| Dimensions | Item number | |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| | Questionnaire | Interview |
| Ability | 6, 18, 19, 22, 24, 28, 36 | 2, 3 |
| Activity perception | 3, 14, 17, 20, 32, 35 | 4, 7 |
| Aspiration | 7, 4, 12, 16 | 2, 10 |
| Ideal L2 self | 2, 10, 15, 21 | 1, 2, 4, 5 |
| Ought-to L2 self | 1, 11, 25, 26, 30, 34 | 1, 6, 7 |
| Learning environment | 5, 8, 9, 13, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33 | 3, 4, 8, 10 |

The questionnaire employed in this study contains 36 items and is divided into two parts. The first part examines the three dimensions of learner self-efficacy: ability, activity perception, and aspiration. 13 questions were designed for the focus group interview. When there are three questions about the interviewees' English background, the other ten questions assess the three dimensions of the L2 motivational self system and the self-efficacy constructs.