Assessing Online TBLT Practices using RAIS Frameworks: In-service EFL Teachers' and Students' Perspectives

Yudhi Arifani (yudhi.a@mail.rmutk.ac.th)
Institute of Science, Innovation and Culture, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Bangkok, 10120, Thailand
and Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik, Indonesia

Muhammad Rafiek (mrfk@ulm.ac.id)
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin Kalimantan, Indonesia

Yaoping LIU (yaoping.l@mail.rmutk.ac.id)
Institute of Science, Innovation and Culture, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Bangkok, 10120, Thailand

Arthur McNeill (arthur.m@mail.rmutk.ac.th)
Department of Education and Society, Institute of Science, Innovation and Culture, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Bangkok, 10120, Thailand

Biyanto Biyanto (biyanto@uinsby.ac.id)
State Islamic University Sunan Ampel, Surabaya, Indonesia

Abstract

Pedagogical and situational authenticity have become central issues in task-based language teaching (TBLT) research. This study explores English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers' and students' perceptions regarding the fulfillment of situational authenticity using relatedness, authentic, ill-structured, and solvable (RAIS) frameworks and examines how they implement these four frameworks in their online TBLT practices. Within a mixed methods design, a questionnaire was administered to 90 EFL teachers (39 male and 51 female) and 180 students (82 male and 98 female) from nine provinces in Indonesia to examine the fulfillment of the RAIS framework in teachers' online TBLT practices. A qualitative interview was then conducted with 18 teachers and 36 students to draw on their practices and challenges in applying the frameworks in online TBLT practice. The quantitative data were analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test to explain the fulfillment level of the frameworks in teachers' online TBLT and the significant difference in perception between the two groups of participants. Thematic analysis was applied to draw on their practices and challenges in implementing the frameworks in online TBLT. The findings indicate low to high fulfillment of some RAIS frameworks in teachers' online TBLT practices. There was no significant difference in perception between the two groups' participants, except in implementing situational authenticity and assessment frameworks. Situational authenticity was minimally applied because of teachers' lack of understanding and limited awareness of the model of the framework. Another challenge was the focus of teachers' assessment, which overlooked the collaborative process during online TBLT activities.

Introduction

In online task-based language teaching, assessment is defined as the systematic process of collecting information to measure teachers' attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and skills in implementing online instruction for improving the quality of English as a foreign or second language (EFL/ESL) teaching and learning practices using technology (Gan & Leung, 2020; Norris, 2016). In the milieu of EFL instructional practices, assessing teachers' online TBLT practices has become more challenging because they now include more complex variables, such as technology use, pedagogy, English, and content knowledge (Fang et al., 2021; Budianto et al., 2022).

TBLT is the refinement of the communicative language teaching (CLT) framework, which aims to equip language learners with cognitive and communicative abilities in the target language through learning by doing (Arifani, 2022; Moore, 2018). So far, TBLT practices have also evolved in many forms, such as technology-mediated task-based (Balaman & Sert, 2017; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021), mobile-supported task-based language teaching (Fang et al., 2021), TBLT in CMC (Gurzynski-Weiss & Baralt, 2014; Kato, 2016), and TBLT CALL (Jarvis, 2015). TBLT practices in the online network have benefitted in fostering the quality of second language teaching and learning (Castañeda, 2019; Fang et al., 2021; González-Lloret & Ortega, 2018; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021; Xue, 2022).

However, recent findings of TBLT research are not without disparagement. The first criticism refers to the theoretical framework of TBLT applied in the previous studies needed to distinguish the issues of situational and pedagogical authenticities. Consequently, it is hard to identify the effectiveness of TBLT practices in relation to learners' real-life experiences (Arifani, 2022; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2017) since they need to specify their theoretical framework and whether they employ pedagogical or situational tasks which have different purposes and outcomes. Second, most of the previous studies tend to investigate TBLT based on how effectively the task focuses on learners' boundaries, and they may neglect to acknowledge that the quality of tasks greatly depends on teachers' abilities to design tasks (Arifani, 2022; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2017). Third, some available studies have developed and employed numerous instruments to gauge the implementation of TBLT and task qualities, such as the assembly model of task (Berger & Veerkamp, 1994), evidence-centered design (Mislevy et al., 2002), classical psychometric or classical test models (Bachman & Palmer, 1996), discrete-task assessment (Long & Norris, 2000), and four-process frameworks (Almond et al., 2001). Those models are frequently used to assess the task's difficulty level, but they may fail to assess the quality of TBLT from the lens of situational authenticity.

Responding to those issues, Arifani (2022) developed and validated an instrument to assess EFL teachers' perceptions of their TBLT qualities. This instrument was developed using relatedness, authentic, ill-structured, and solvable (RAIS) principles to accommodate the issues of situational authenticity, design, and difficulty level in the TBLT design and practices. The theoretical framework of the RAIS instrument will be elaborated in the literature review section. Finally, this study explores in-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives and practices of the online TBLT using the RAIS framework. Detecting the diversity of participants' views (by

comparing the perspectives of teachers and students) could avoid biased interpretation, augment the validity of the findings, and unveil the dynamic aspect of online TBLT practices (Arifani et al., 2019; Dashtestani & Hojatpanah, 2022).

Literature Review

RAIS framework for assessing TBLT

Arifani's RAIS framework comprises four dimensions: *relatedness, authenticity, ill-structure,* and *solvable* principles. The researcher derives the *relatedness* principle from the self-determination theory (STD) initiated by Ryan and Deci (2000) and Wong (2022). This STD theory consists of three dimensions: *autonomy, relatedness,* and *competence*, but the author only includes the second dimension because it is very relevant to situational authenticity or social context in assessing the quality of TBLT. In its original version, *relatedness* refers to teachers' willingness to relate their students to social context (Arifani et al., 2021; Ryan & Deci, 2000). This theory is similar to Vygotsky's (1979) sociocultural theory, which postulates that language learning cannot be separated from its sociocultural milieu. From its initial conception, the author elaborates on *relatedness* in the natural learning situation.

Consequently, within the TBLT design, tasks should relate to pedagogical and situational authenticity. Tasks should offer learners real, meaningful learning experiences for their future lives (Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2017). Further, Arifani (2022) also gives a clear example of relatedness principles, such as in teaching English to nursing students on how the contents of a task could relate to how nursing students communicate with doctors, patients, patient's families, and other stakeholders using acceptable English. Through this example, he expands the concept of *relatedness* into connecting to the curriculum, real learning experience, and relevant content knowledge.

Second, *authenticity* signifies that language learning materials should contain authentic materials designed not for intentional use in the classroom (Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2017). This principle aims to give language learners experience to understand and use non-classroom-based English to enrich their knowledge. The task design of an authentic task should be able to connect students to engage with native speakers' learning materials such as novels, textbooks, films, plays, newspapers, and digital learning resources (Brown, 2000). In assessing the quality of task design, the researcher will apply this principle to gauge how far teacher-made tasks fulfill the *authenticity* principle.

Third, *the ill-structured* principle designates tasks that hold problems, but the responses to the problem need to be provided (An & Cao, 2014). Different experts interpret the tenet of ill-structured tasks from different angles. Voss & Post (1988) reflect ill-structured tasks from task representation and solution elements. Next, Jonassen (1997) interprets ill-structured tasks as learners' labors to address task spaces and contextual boundaries, analyzing and finding the solution to a problem through critical thinking. Meanwhile, Sinnott (1989) views ill-structured from four identifiers: task spaces, task solutions, memories, monitors, and metacognitive aspects. In assessing the quality of teacher-made TBLT, the researcher applied four identifiers of an ill-structured task proposed by Sinnott (1989). Through these indicators, the researcher can justify whether or not teacher-made TBLT has fulfilled these four indicators.

Fourth, the concept of *solvable* task refers to task *complexity* generated from second language acquisition theory (Krashen et al., 2018). Tasks should be complex or one level above students' level of competence. For support of Krashen's critics regarding the weaknesses of readability level in responding to the complexity of a task, see Pitler & Nenkova (2008). In this paper, the research views the complexity of a task from Krashen's second language acquisition and Vygotsky's sociocultural perspectives. Therefore, in designing tasks, language teachers must see the availability and possibility of their students to engage, interact, and communicate with people from different cultures to solve their tasks within a specific schedule. All RAIS dimensions and items will be elaborated in detail in the instrument section. Finally, the researcher applied these RAIS principles to assess in-service EFL teachers' perception in designing their TBLT to show how pedagogical and situational issues are reflected in teacher-made TBLT practices.

Previous research on TBLA

TBLA is divided into two categories: face-to-face TBLA (FTF TBLA) and technology-based TBLA (Online TBLA). The two TBLA categories have the same goal, namely to collect information about the extent to which the implementation of task-based (FTF and Online TBLT) can improve students' communicative competence and real-life experiences (Balaman & Sert, 2017; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021). From these two important key terms, in the context of online TBLA, they are expected to provide information on the extent to which the implementation of online TBLT can improve students' communicative competence and provide real-life experiences using relevant technologies (Arifani, 2022; Ellis, 2009; Ellis, 2017). Through online TBLT, students can apply their learning experience to their future lives when they are involved in the community within the target language context.

Regarding the issue of communicative competence and situational authenticity, Ellis (2017) criticized various previous studies on TBLA, which he considered were far from the standard of those two frameworks. According to Ellis (2017), these conditions occur because most English teachers use the principles of pedagogical authenticity in their TBLA design. They rely heavily on the curriculum and textbooks, which sometimes need to follow the context of the target culture. So learning is limited to mastering the knowledge of language, grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation (Castañeda, 2019; González-Lloret & Ortega, 2018; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021; Xue, 2022). According to our understanding, one of the reasons why English teachers have not been able to design real-life tasks is probably due to the absence of an assessment instrument that can be used as an excellent model to assess whether teachers' TBLA designs represent the frameworks of situational authenticity. Second, current assessment designs are dominated by discrete tests that focus more on mastering language knowledge than communicative competence and real-life experience.

For example, the type of assembly test design initiated by Berger & Veerkamp (1994) is more directed towards the discrete test model by putting forward three main approaches: the purpose of the test formulation, implementation, and information on test results according to the specified target. This design is not by the objectives of TBLA itself, which mainly emphasizes learners' communicative competence and real-life experiences. Second, the psychometric or classical test design also contains a set of assumptions about the relationship between examinees' actual test scores and factors that affect their scores (Bachman & Palmer, 1996). This design is close to its predecessors, which emphasize the validity and reliability of tests based on statistical

measurements rather than communicative purposes. Therefore, they are not suitable for the TBLA context.

Third, Long and Norris (2000) are the initiators of TBLA, often known for promoting the concept of discrete skills assessment (DSA). This concept prioritizes students' abilities at the level of language *per se*, lexicon, syntax, and understanding of the contents of the test items, which are mostly separate from the actual context. One of the areas for improvement of this model is that its emphasis is merely on linguistic competence (knowledge of vocabulary and grammar). Looking at the weaknesses of the DSA, Mislevy et al. (2002) proposed an evidence-centered design (ECD) assessment using a more comprehensive framework. The ECD model no longer focuses on language *per se* but emphasizes how students can use language appropriately and effectively in appropriate contexts (Mislevy & Yin, 2013). Even though the ECD model has prioritized aspects of communicative competence, this test model emphasizes output only. At the same time, the process of how the teacher creates the TBLA design needs to be better defined.

Fourth, previous survey research on EFL teachers' creativity in online classes has indicated methodological flaws because of subjectivity and the inability to explore the dynamic aspects of teaching creativity (Arifani et al., 2019). The findings of the previous study by Arifani et al. (2019) revealed that teachers and students have different perceptions regarding online teaching creativity. The teachers perceive that they have high creativity when they teach online classes. Meanwhile, the students perceive that their teachers do not perform high creativity on a particular dimension of the creativity scale. Therefore, their previous study suggests exploring the questionnaire by comparing teachers' and students' perspectives to address the subjectivity issue. They also propose a mixed method combining quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews with the students and teachers to explore the dynamic aspect of creativity in online teaching. This effort was employed to augment the validity of the research findings (Arifani et al., 2019; Dashtestani & Hojatpanah, 2022).

Research questions

As the above literature review suggests, and to fill the related void, the present study endeavors to use the RAIS framework (as presented in the theoretical framework section) to explore how far the implementation of online TBLT fulfills real-life, authentic, ill-structure, and solvable frameworks. The research questions are formulated as follows:
1. What are in-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives on RAIS frameworks in online TBLT practices? Is there a significant difference between teachers' and students' perspectives?
2. How do in-service EFL teachers and students reflect RAIS frameworks in their online TBLT practices?

Methodology

Design

The research employs a mixed methods design combining quantitative survey and qualitative interview. The quantitative survey aims to explore the perceptions of in-service EFL teachers and learners of the RAIS framework in online TBLT and to find out whether there are any

inconsistencies of perspectives between the two groups of participants. Meanwhile, the qualitative interview was also applied to determine how in-service EFL teachers and students reflect RAIS frameworks in their online TBLT practices (Arifani, 2022). As individuals' perspectives can be very dynamic and comprehensive, the use of the mixed-methods design (quantitative survey and interview) could augment the validity of the research findings and help researchers identify the diversity of participants' views (Dashtestani & Hojatpanah, 2022).

Participants and settings

The first research participants included 90 senior high school teachers (39 male and 51 female) from nine provinces in Indonesia attending a two-semester online in-service teacher training organized by three host universities. There were also 180 learners (82 male and 98 female) from various senior high schools in the Indonesian settings whose EFL teachers were involved in the online in-service teacher training. This program was funded by the Ministry of Education, Research and Technology (MERT). The three host universities were nominated based on their accreditation reputation, the EFL program's best practices, the teachers' quality, and research outcomes (Arifani et al., 2021). In order to be able to attend the in-service training, they had to pass several tests: administrative qualification, potential academic test, pedagogic, talents, and interest tests. Pre-tests and post-tests were also administered before and after the online training. During the two-semester online training, two instructors, one senior teacher from the host university (holding a PhD Degree) and one school teacher (holding a master's degree), taught the participating teachers how about technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK), problem-solving, lesson plan design, integrating technology in classroom instruction, designing online tasks and assessment, peer-teaching, online teaching practice, discussion, and how to upload one best practice of TBLT video.

The in-service training was performed asynchronously and synchronously via the Indonesian e-learning system and Google Meet platforms. The asynchronous mode was applied to provide learning materials, upload weekly tasks, write a daily journal (based on what had been learned and what topics and issues need further discussion), assess participants' tasks, and upload teaching videos. Meanwhile, the asynchronous mode was applied to discuss and provide feedback during participants' presentations. Particular attention was paid to teachers' abilities to identify learners' learning problems, provide alternative solutions, design and implement TBLT using relevant technology, and asses learners' learning.

Next, in the teaching practice session, each participant had to perform individual online teaching with their students from his/her school for eight meetings. In this case, the teacher has to implement all TBLT stages during their classroom teaching: pre-task, task, planning, report, analysis, and practice. The teaching topics they learned during the online training (such as making reservations, planning vacations, writing emails, and making short movies) should be applied in the classroom. During this session, the two instructors regularly supervised and assessed his/her teaching progress. Then, they discussed it synchronously via Google Meet to get feedback from the two supervisors and other participants. The focus of the discussion was mainly on implementing TBLT using technology. At the end of the session, the two participants were invited to fill out the online RAIS questionnaire to reveal whether their TBLT fulfilled the RAIS framework.

Table 1

Demographic information of in-service teachers

Teacher Characteristics	N (90)
Gender	
Male	41.3%
Female	49.7%
Age	
27-30 years	96%
31-40 years	4%
Teaching experience	
5-7 years	77%
8-10 years	23%

Table 2
Demographic information of the students

Students Characteristics	N (180)
Gender	
Male	43.3%
Female	56.7%
Age	
16-17 years	89%
18-19 years	11%

Instrument

Development of RAIS questionnaires

As this study aimed at assessing EFL in-service teachers' and learners' perceptions of relatedness, authenticity, ill-structured, and solvable principles in an online learning context, the researchers employed a RAIS fulfillment scale developed by Arifani (2022) to identify their perspectives on how far their online TBLT fulfilled these principles. A 19-multiple choice format was presented with a five-interval scale from "low" to "high" to address the first research objective. The mean scores range from 1 to 2.5, 2.6 to 3.5, and 3.6 to 4, refer to low, moderate, and high fulfillment of RAIS principles/frameworks (Arifani, 2022). They contain four multidimensional elements of: relatedness (5 items), authenticity (6 items), ill-structured (5 items), and solvable (3 items).

Specifically, relatedness refers to in-service EFL teachers' abilities to design tasks that accommodate pedagogy and relevant sociocultural theories so that the students can engage with relevant cultural communities, people, and stakeholders while implementing online TBLT (Arifani, 2022; Ellis, 2017). In brief, teacher-made TBLT requires peer assessment, collaboration, engagement with relevant cultural communities, available sources, and real-life experiences. The authenticity of TBLT requires the students to learn native speakers' digital or online resources and interact with real-life situations using the target language (Brown, 2000). Ill structure in teacher-made TBLT should reflect open response, one level above students' competence, complex reasoning, process, and outcomes. Solvable in TBLT should provide multiple solutions, be accomplished within a specific timeline, and should not be easily guessed. In modifying the contents and constructs of the RAIS questionnaire, the authors conducted a panel with three

different researchers majoring in CALL and TBLT research. Two of the experts held PhD degrees, and one was a Professor. They were invited to match the suitability of the questionnaire items with their constructs. The researcher then piloted the modified RAIS questionnaire to different groups of participants to ensure their validity and reliability. The Cronbach's alpha values reported relatedness (.094), authenticity (0.88), ill-structured (0.90), and solvable (0.86). The university management, principals, in-service EFL teachers, and students approved of the researcher's and team's involvement in the online training program and classroom data-gathering. All research participants were selected on a voluntary basis. Their confidentiality and anonymity were assured.

Interview

The researchers also conducted a semi-structured interview to support the quantitative analysis. The interview questions were constructed based on the purpose of the research. Four RAIS frameworks, relatedness, authentic, ill-structured, and solvable frameworks, were established in the interview items. The interview questions for the in-service teachers and students comprised eight items. Each RAIS category contained two questions: RAIS frameworks in online TBLT practices and challenges.

To validate the content of the interview questions, we invited three experts to justify the appropriateness of the items to the theory of RAIS using a checklist form. They were a CALL teacher (PhD Degree), a senior researcher in the area of TBLT (Professor), and an experienced instructor (Master's Degree). We then considered their comments and suggestions to determine the validity and reliability. The interview questions were also piloted to other in-service teachers and students who participated in the same online teacher training beyond the three host universities. The interview questions (8 items) were administered to 18 teachers and 36 students.

Data Collection and Analysis

The preliminary phase of the study began when the first author became the instructor of the in-service teacher training in one of the host universities, which joined a two-semester online teacher training program. Site visits and observations to the three host universities and schools were conducted during the online teacher training to socialize and explain the purpose of the study. The first RAIS questionnaire through an online survey was administered to the 90 EFL teachers who have accomplished implementing their TBLT in their online teaching practices. They were invited to fill out the questionnaire at the end of the training program after they uploaded their best TBLT practice videos. Meanwhile, the second online questionnaire with the same Google form was administered to the 180 students after the last online TBLT practice was accomplished so that the students could experience TBLT practice comprehensively.

To analyze the quantitative survey data, we produced descriptive and inferential statistics to identify the mean and standard deviation of each item of the RAIS questionnaire. Meanwhile, the differences between teachers' and students' perspectives were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. For the qualitative data analysis, two interviewers (the first author and the second co-author) transcribed the recorded interviews of both the teachers and students. Two coders further coded the transcribed interviews' content to ensure the coding's accuracy and consistency. Then, the displayed data were interpreted by the researcher and team.

Findings

In-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives of RAIS frameworks in online TBLT practices? Is there a significant difference between teachers' and students' perspectives?

Questionnaire

Table 3 presents the perspectives on in-service EFL teachers' practices of online TBLT using relatedness frameworks regarding the mean, standard deviation, and significant difference between the two groups of participants. Apart from implementing group work and exploring online sources during online TBLT practices, the students perceived their in-service teachers to have low and moderate fulfillment of relatedness frameworks in other items. In contrast, the teachers believed they had moderate fulfillment of real-life experience during online TBLT practices. The teachers also reported moderate fulfillment of pedagogical tasks and target culture communities.

Table 3
In-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives of relatedness in online TBLT

Items	Participants	N	M	SD	Mann Whitney U test	P
The online TBLT assigns students to work in groups.	Teacher	90	4.47	0.77	1687	0.112
	Student	180	4.40	0.82		
The online TBLT provides pedagogical tasks from the curriculum.	Teacher	90	3.12	1.39	2867	0.149
	Student	180	2.77	1.44		
The online TBLT provides students with real-life experience.	Teacher	90	3.68	1.36	1092	0.000
	Student	180	1.42	0.83		
The online TBLT assigns students to engage in target culture communities.	Teacher	90	3.27	1.31	241.5	0.242
	Student	180	3.38	1.21		
The online TBLT involves available online sources.	Teacher	90	4.80	1.17	2348	0.352
	Student	180	4.70	1.53		

The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also indicated no significant differences between the perspectives of teachers and students concerning four relatedness framework items: group work, pedagogical task, engagement in target culture communities, and exploring available online sources during online TBLT practices. The respondents from the two cohorts disagreed on real-life experience during online TBLT implementation. The teachers perceived that they had high fulfillment of real-life experience during online TBLT, but the students perceived that their teachers needed higher fulfillment regarding this item.

Table 4 shows the perspectives on in-service EFL teachers' practices of online TBLT using authentic frameworks regarding the mean, standard deviation, and significant difference between the two groups of participants. Based on the comments of the teachers and students, the in-service teachers still rely on the element of speech during the implementation of online TBLT. They still moderately emphasized speech elements such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary.

Table 4
In-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives of authentic tasks in online TBLT

Items	Participants	N	M	SD	Mann Whitney U test	P
The online TBLT emphasizes learning to communicate through meaningful interaction in the target language.	Teacher	90	4.05	1.52	3590	0.754
	Student	180	3.83	1.03		
The online TBLT gives language learners experience in understanding and using non-classroom-based English.	Teacher	90	4.06	0.91	3546	0.695
	Student	180	3.98	1.52		
The online TBLT requires students to learn native speakers' digital or online resources and interact with the real-life situation using the target language	Teacher	90	4.97	0.40	2345	0.197
	Student	180	4.63	1.32		
The online TBLT must be natural and promote real meaning	Teacher	90	4.55	1.47	1709	0.375
	Student	180	3.87	1.37		
The online TBLT does not centre around each element of speech	Teacher	90	3.21	1.40	3026	0.911
	Student	180	3.02	1.52		
The online TBLT does not focus on the product, but it emphasizes the whole learning process	Teacher	90	4.81	0.86	2564.5	0.000
	Student	180	1.75	1.78		

Overall, there were no significant differences in perceptions between the two groups of participants in all categories of authentic tasks, except for the process of online task accomplishment. The result of the Mann-Whitney U test indicates a significant difference between teachers and students regarding the focus of the TBLT. The teachers perceived their high fulfillment in the process, but the students did not.

Table 5 describes the teachers' and students' perceptions of the ill-structuredness of the online TBLT. There were no significant differences in perceptions between the two groups of participants in all categories of ill-structured forms on teachers' online TBLT designs.

Table 5
In-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives of ill-structured online TBLT

Items	Participants	N	M	SD	Mann Whitney U test	P
The online TBLT is not true/false.	Teacher	90	4.97	0.35	2920	0.112
	Student	180	4.95	0.40		
The online TBLT involves complex reasoning, process, and outcome.	Teacher	90	3.28	1.67	3124	0.148
	Student	180	3.10	1.54		
The online TBLT provides open responses.	Teacher	90	4.95	0.40	2879	0.282
	Student	180	4.86	0.96		
	Teacher	90	4.71	1.01	1676	0.212

The online TBLT cannot easily be guessed.	Student	180	4.86	0.96		
The online TBLT contains one level of students' competence.	Teacher	90	3.86	1.38	2972	0.834
	Student	180	3.66	1.58		

All participants agreed that the design of the online TBLT had highly fulfilled all categories of ill-structured tasks on the four items: not true/false, open responses, task predictability, and difficulty level. The participants also knew the teachers' online TBLT design contained moderately complex reasoning, process, and outcome.

Table 6 presents the perceptions of teachers and students concerning the fulfillment of solvable principles in teachers' online TBLT practices. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test also indicate no significant differences in perception between the teachers and students on the category of the solvable framework.

Table 6
In-service EFL teachers' and students' perspectives of the solvable framework in online TBLT

Items	Participants	N	M	SD	Mann Whitney U test	P
The online TBLT instructions can be understood.	Teacher	90	4.69	0.79	2835	0.313
	Student	180	4.03	1.07		
The online TBLT can be solved	Teacher	90	4.22	0.98	3545	0.107
	Student	180	3.66	1.58		
The online TBLT provides multiple solutions	Teacher	90	4.60	0.78	2353	0.126
	Student	180	3.72	1.72		

Overall, all participants perceived high fulfillment of the three categories of solvable principle, namely task comprehensibility, solvable, and multiple solutions, during online TBLT practices.

In-service EFL teachers and students reflect RAIS frameworks in their online TBLT practices.

Teachers' and learners' perspectives of their relatedness in online TBLT practices and challenges

From the interview with the teachers, task-related practices were primarily implemented by assigning the students to do group work (N=18), fieldwork like interviewing other people, or field observation (N=12). The teachers also asked their students to learn from YouTube, e-books, or other online sources used by native speakers so that they could learn the target language and culture (N=17). The samples of the extracts are presented below.

> In my online tasks, I usually involve my students collaborating with their friends in groups of four or five to create electronic invitation letters, such as a birthday party (T7). I ask them to observe how people out there cook their food and ask them to create procedure texts such as how to cook noodles, install applications, and upload them to YouTube. Those activities are derived from the curriculum (T14).

> I often ask my students to give and get comments on a YouTube video to experience the actual communication and interaction with the target culture (Teacher 9). From this kind of activity, the students can practice their English with other people from different cultural communities (T18).

In my online tasks, I ask my students to browse the internet to accomplish their tasks, such as creating role-play videos about how to plan an overseas vacation, get a flight, book a hotel, or get a taxi. These activities are suitable to give them real-life experiences for their future, although it takes work to design similar topics. I need more practice than learning grammar in designing real-life task activities (T9).

My teacher often assigns me to work in a group to finish our tasks. During online task accomplishment, we divide our roles. I could have improved at video editing, so I asked my partner to handle it (S35).

Last month, I uploaded a video on how to make a friend. I created the video with my partners. I could have gotten a better score for my presentation as I got a few likes and comments from viewers (S29).

I like to browse the internet and make an overseas holiday plan. This activity will be helpful for my future when I go abroad. Unfortunately, my teacher only applies it once during my English class (S23).

The above excerpts indicate that the teachers attempted to relate their students to the curriculum and real-life task activities. Their pedagogical tasks were designing electronic invitation letters, finding grammatical patterns from an online text, creating role-play videos, and presenting how to make something (N = 14). Next, the teachers asserted that they relate their students to real-life experiences, such as asking them to book a hotel and order a taxi in different countries (N=3). Their inadequacy to design and perform real-life tasks was due to their understanding of this principle. Similarly, the results of interviews with the students mentioned that all categories of task-relatedness were moderate to highly fulfilled. However, they felt they could have done better by implementing real-life tasks (N=32).

Teachers' and learners' perspectives of their authentic tasks in online TBLT practices and challenges

The results of interviews with the teachers and students concerning authentic tasks in online TBLT showed that most teachers implemented meaningful interaction with peers through group discussion (N=18). They also used native speakers' resources from YouTube, novels, and advertisements (N=16). The teachers also mentioned assessing students' task accomplishment based on process and product (N=15).

I always let my students use their mother tongue whenever they get stuck in a discussion or another session. The learning process is the most important thing for me; their English will evolve (T2).

I sometimes use native speaker resources for my students so they understand the correct language and its contexts simultaneously, although they often struggle to understand and use it (T6).

During online TBLT, I often observed their learning progress and guided them to finish their task. I often switch group members to facilitate learning (T17). I assess students' task accomplishment based on activities like language use, pronunciation, and video quality (T18).

My teacher allowed me to use my native language during classroom discussions. However, during task presentations, we always used English and edited our video before we uploaded it to a YouTube channel (T36).

My teacher always gives me notes and comments on my pronunciation and language during online task practices. Most of us have pronunciation problems and limited vocabulary use for our online task presentation (S30). After I finish my electronic invitation card, my teacher gives me a score based on language accuracy and performance.

Sometimes, the scoring process needs to be fairer, as my teacher always gives us the same score in the same groups. She never looks at individual contributions during online task accomplishment (S11). She gives us the scores based on what we produce.

The students also mentioned similar ideas to their teacher responses on implementing authentic tasks during online task-based practice concerning their teachers' efforts in facilitating our learning through feedback and corrections (N= 36). They also felt that the practices of online TBLT were meaningful for them to develop their critical thinking skills and English (N=33). Using native speakers' resources was quite challenging; they felt they learned accurate English in its context (N=31). Behind those positive responses, the students echoed their disappointment with the focus and process of the assessment (N=34).

Teachers' and learners' perspectives of their ill-structured tasks in online TBLT practices and challenges

As the interview results show, most teachers mentioned that their online TBLT practices have highly fulfilled the principles of ill-structured tasks. All teachers mostly asked their students to write a story, essay, observation report, and make a video presentation (N=18). They administered open-answer tasks so that their students could not guess the answers (N=18), and they had multiple solutions to accomplish their online tasks (N=18).

To introduce themselves and others, I usually ask them to make new friends from different countries through social media, Facebook, Instagram, or another platform. Through these activities, I estimated the difficulty level of my online tasks (T11). These are how they can develop their independence, confidence, and critical thinking (T1).

Designing appropriate tasks to facilitate their critical thinking skills becomes the most challenging work as not all students have the same English proficiency (T3). High-level students can engage with people from different cultures, but low-level learners need to (T13).

After my students finished their tasks, I still gave individual questions to check how far they had learned from our project. The questions are mainly in essays or short answers (T9).

I am not confident when my teacher asks me to make friends with other people using social media because my English could be better. I fear she/he will be disappointed with me (S34).

 The task of my teacher was very challenging. We had to observe and interview a local chef, ask him how he cooks fried rice, and get data on why people like it. Then, we create, submit, and upload our video (S7).

After finishing some projects, my teacher usually gives us some questions, and we have to respond to them and get feedback from him (S21).

Similarly, the students also mentioned positive ideas concerning online task practices. They felt the online task could develop their confidence, critical thinking skills, and communicative competence through field observation and interviews with local people (S31) and foreigners (S32). However, most students with low English proficiency expressed their disappointment and anxiety as they were afraid of making language errors (S13) and communication barriers.

Teachers' and learners' perspectives on their solvable tasks in online TBLT practices and challenges

The teachers mentioned that their online tasks fulfilled the principle of solvable principles. For the understandability principle, most teachers reported that they provided written instructions, explained the instructions, and asked the students randomly to restate them during the synchronous meeting via Zoom application(N=15). The teachers usually used break out a room in the Zoom app to check the student's progress in their tasks. However, assessing their collaboration process during the breakout room (N=14) was very challenging, and the students could find their strategies to finish the tasks (N=16).

> After explaining the instructions on how to do the online tasks, I always ask them to restate them individually (T3). After all, instructions are well-restated, and I will consider that they understand my lesson well (T18).

> I also used the breakout room to check how far the students had finished their tasks. I regularly enter the students' Zoom (room) to check their progress and provide necessary help (T11). This task was very hard for me as I had to visit them individually and needed help understanding their collaboration processes (T9). That is why I rely on the product.

> I always give them the freedom to accomplish their tasks. They can discuss and distribute the tasks to their members and browse internet sources (T10).

> My teacher often asks other students and me to restate his explanation. It was nice to confirm whether my understanding was correct (S36).

> During the discussion in our break room, the teacher usually enters our Zoom room to check our signs of progress and often supports us in finishing our tasks (S12). It was good, but one of my friends sometimes contributed little to the online group discussion (break out Zoom).

> I was unhappy when I worked hard to help my friends, but the teacher never knew about this process. Sometimes, it was unfair for us because my teacher only looked at the final product (S8).

Regarding the teachers' efforts to implement the solvable principles in their online tasks, the students reported similar responses to their teachers. The students felt they could accomplish their online tasks as they liked them (S30). They also liked their teachers' strategies for comprehension checks by involving them in restating their explanations individually (S16). Behind these positive views, the students were unsatisfied with teachers' assessment strategies, which overlooked the collaboration processes during task accomplishment (S19).

Discussion

While many available studies have dealt with the issue of pedagogical authenticity (Balaman & Sert, 2017; Castañeda, 2019; Fang et al., 2021; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021; Xue, 2022), this research strove to explore the current perception of situational authenticity (RAIS frameworks) in EFL in-service teachers' online TBLT practices and challenges. The questionnaire results showed no significant differences between the teachers' and students' perceptions concerning in-service teachers' fulfillment of the relatedness framework in their online TBLT. In the interviews, teachers and students perceived that they had also fulfilled the relatedness framework from

moderate to high level in their online TBLT practices. More specifically, except for the accurate life-task framework fulfillment, the students reported having low real-life experience in their online TBLT practices. This finding indicated that the fulfillment of real-life frameworks in teachers' online TBLT practices is not optimum yet. Practically, as conveyed by the teachers and students in interviews and questionnaires, the real-life task framework is still implemented in a limited way, such as in making and uploading video conversations on the topic of overseas holiday planning. In its implementation, students are asked to browse the internet to find out how to determine their vacation destinations, order airplane tickets, and order taxis and hotels using acceptable and appropriate target language. These findings also corroborate previous findings that indicate that using the internet and technologies in language learning could facilitate learners' language learning (Jarvis, 2015; Gurzynski-Weiss & Baralt, 2014; Kato, 2016).

As far as these two findings are concerned, we can interpret them in two directions. First, students feel happy with the online real-life activities. However, because the activities are limited to one topic, they perceive low real-life task practices in teachers' online TBLT practices. Second, teachers' efforts to balance pedagogical authenticity and situational authenticity still need to be more optimal due to their limited understanding of implementing real-life task activities in teachers' online TBLT. From these two interpretations, even though the implementation of real-life tasks in online TBLT has at least been able to fill the gap that has been the subject of debate. It is difficult for teachers to implement this framework due to the limitations of real-life task-based learning models and curriculum challenges. In general, the findings in this study are commensurate with the results of available research on TBLT practices using technologies (Balaman & Sert, 2017; Fang et al., 2021; Smith & González-Lloret, 2021). A small part of online TBLT practice can at least provide an overview of how EFL teachers implement situational authenticity or real-life frameworks in online TBLT.

Furthermore, based on the questionnaires and interviews, the teachers and students believed that the fulfillment of authentic tasks during online TBLT practices was high. However, in the assessment process, the teachers still relied much on students' language production, such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The students seemed unsatisfied with their teachers' assessment practices as they overlooked students' collaboration while accomplishing their online TBLT. There are two exciting parts related to assessment issues in online TBLT practices where the teacher gives greater weight to students' language performance and task outputs rather than the process. Feedback on students' language performance should be given as a secondary emphasis when the learning process is carried out with TBLA because the main focus in implementing TBLT is a communicative approach emphasizing communication skills that do not have to be 'natively like' performance. It should emphasize students' abilities to work together, be independent, and demonstrate critical thinking in accomplishing their online tasks.

These findings also indicate that assessment in the TBLT umbrella must prioritize the process, from task identification to accomplishment. When students collaborate on tasks in groups, the teacher's presence when entering the Zoom break out of each group does not just convey whether there are obstacles in the collaboration process. However, the teacher must be able to record and identify the process of working in the group so that individual contributions in group work can be identified as a basis for assessment. Because this is not done optimally, what happens is that students who feel they have contributed a lot in the process of completing online tasks feel disadvantaged because they get the same or even lower grades than other group members. Related to this, Arifani (2019) provides tips on how the collaboration process can be adequately assessed using the WhatsApp group. Teachers can better assess each individual's contribution to completing

online tasks through chat history in the WAG. Implementing TBLA by prioritizing viewers' comments when students are asked to upload their task outcomes will be more optimal and fair if teachers combine the entire process, outcomes, external viewers, and other possible aspects to minimize subjectivity (Ellis, 2017).

Concerning the issues of ill-structured and solvable frameworks in teachers' online TBLT practices, the results of interview questionnaires showed that the two groups of participants perceived teachers' online TBLT practices have implemented those frameworks well during online task practices using complex reasoning and freedom to accomplish their tasks. So far, the implementation of ill-structured and solvable principles has mainly been implemented to a limited extent in test item designs (An & Cao, 2014; Jonassen,1997). Through this research, we hope to provide new evidence that the two frameworks also apply to assess the quality of teachers' online TBLT practices.

Conclusion

Although a few available studies have raised serious issues regarding the pedagogical authenticity and situational authenticity debates with obscure theory, the present research has attempted to respond to the situational authenticity issues when using the RAIS framework to explore how far in-service EFL teachers' online TBLT practices have fulfilled these four requirements. The findings from this study prove that fulfilling situational authenticity in teachers' online TBLT practices becomes the most challenging task. On one side, they must follow the school curriculum and textbooks. Conversely, they must design their online TBLT practices using situational authenticity or real-life frameworks. Putting those two frameworks within teachers' online TBLT becomes this study's most crucial take-away conclusion. Facilitating learners with pedagogical and situational authenticity in teachers' online TBLT practices could be meaningful for the students in their academic and future lives. Other significant findings of the study relate to implementing online TBLT to facilitate learners' reciprocal collaboration, critical thinking, independent learning, and communicative competence. In addition, understanding current EFL teachers' online TBLT practices can further help improve the planning and development of online TBLT and other activities during online classroom teaching and learning. Given the Ministry of Education of Indonesia's aims in enhancing teachers' quality through online professional training, It appears that more attention should be directed toward preparing EFL teachers to use real-life online TBLT more skilfully and efficiently. In order to implement practical online professional teacher training, developing an adequate level of online TBLT becomes essential.

Moreover, equipping teachers with contextual TBLT before their online training attendance might be an acceptable idea. The data concerning teachers' and students' perceptions of online TBLT can be a reference for policymakers and educational planners. The present study is limited because it took a small sample of respondents based on their subjective perspectives. Therefore, further researchers can investigate factors contributing to teachers' challenges in fulfilling the situational authenticity framework in their online tasks. Finally, exploring the EFL teacher's online task-based practice using other frameworks is worth exploring.

References

Almond, R. G., Steinberg, L. S., & Mislevy, R. J. (2001). A sample assessment using in four process framework (No. 543). Center for the study of evaluation, national center for research on evaluation, standards, and student testing, graduate school of education & information studies, University of California, Los Angeles.

An, Y.-J., & Cao, L. (2014). Examining the effects of metacognitive scaffolding on students' design problem solving and metacognitive skills in an online environment. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *10*(4), 552–568.

Arifani, Y. (2019). The application of small WhatsApp groups and the individual flipped instruction model to boost EFL learners' mastery of collocation. *CALL-EJ, 20*(1), 52–73.

Arifani, Y., Khaja, F. N. M., Suryanti, S., & Wardhono, A. (2019). The influence of blended in-service teacher professional training on EFL teacher Creativity and teaching effectiveness. *3L: Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, *25*(3), 126 – 136 http://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2019-2503-10.

Arifani, Y., Mindari, R., Hidayat, N., & Wicaksono, A. S. (2021). Basic psychological needs of in-service EFL teachers in blended professional training: voices of teachers and learners. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *4*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1943691

Arifani, Y. (2022). Development and validation of an instrument to assess EFL teachers' perceptions of task assessment using RAIS frameworks. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balaman, U., & Sert, O. (2017). Development of L2 interactional resources for online collaborative task accomplishment. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *30*(7), 601-630. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1334667

Berger, M. P. F., & Veerkamp, W. J. J. (1994). A review of selection methods for optimal test design. (OMD research rapport; No. 94-4). University of Twente, Faculty of Educational Science and Technology.

Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of language learning and teaching (Vol. 4). Longman New York.

Budianto, L., Arifani, Y., Wardhono, A., & Poedjiastutie, D. (2023). The TPACK level of in-service EFL teacher online professional training: The perspectives of teachers, students, and trainers. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, *39*(2), 87-101. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2023.2167024

Castañeda, D. A. (2019). Improving conversational interactions with task-based activities in a Spanish as a second language class. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *34*(8), 1154-1181. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1666149

Dashtestani, R., & Hojatpanah, S. (2022). Digital literacy of EFL students in a junior high school in Iran: voices of teachers, students and ministry directors. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *35*(4), 635-665. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2020.1744664

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

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

Ellis, R. (2017). Position paper: Moving task-based language teaching forward. *Language Teaching, 50*(4), 507–526. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000179

Fang, W. C., Yeh, H. C., Luo, B. R., & Chen, N. S. (2021). Effects of mobile-supported task-based language teaching on EFL students' linguistic achievement and conversational interaction. *ReCALL*, *33*(1), 71-87. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344020000208

Gan, Z., & Leung, C. (2020). Illustrating formative assessment in task-based language teaching. *ELT Journal*, *74*(1), 10-19. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz048

González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (2018). Pragmatics, tasks, and technology: A synergy. In N. Taguchi- & Y. Kim (Eds.), Task-based approaches to teaching and assessing pragmatics (pp. 191–214). Amsterdam, Netherlands/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Baralt, M. (2014). Exploring learner perception and use of task-based interactional feedback in FTF and CMC modes. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 36*(1), 1–37. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263113000363

Jarvis, H. (2015). From PPP and CALL/MALL to a praxis of task-based teaching and mobile assisted language use. *TESL-EJ*, *19*(1), n1.

Jonassen, D. H. (1997). Instructional design models for well-structured and ill-structured problem-solving learning outcomes. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *45*(1), 65–94.

Kato, F., Spring, R., & Mori, C. (2016). Mutually beneficial foreign language learning: Creating meaningful interactions through video-synchronous computer-mediated communication. *Foreign Language Annals, 49*(2), 355–366. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12195

Krashen, S., Mason, B., & Smith, K. (2018). Some new terminology: comprehension aiding supplementation and form-focusing supplementation. *Language Learning and Teaching, 60*(6), 12–13.

Long, M. H., & Norris, J. M. (2000). 2000: Task-based language teaching and assessment. In Byram, M., editor, Encyclopaedia of language teaching. London: Routledge, pp. 597–603.

Mislevy, R. J., Steinberg, L. S., & Almond, R. G. (2002). Design and analysis in task-based language assessment. *Language Testing, 19*(4)*, 477–496. https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt241oa

Mislevy, R. J., & Yin, C. (2013). Evidence-centered design in language testing. In The Routledge Handbook of language testing (pp. 222-236). Routledge.

Moore, P. J. (2018). Task-based language teaching (TBLT). The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, *6*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0175

Norris, J. M. (2016). Current uses for task-based language assessment. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, *36*(1), 230–244. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190516000027

Pitler, E., & Nenkova, A. (2008, October). Revisiting readability: A unified framework for predicting text quality. In Proceedings of the 2008 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (pp. 186–195).

Sinnott, J. D. (1989). A model for the solution of ill-structured problems: Implications for everyday and abstract problem solving. In J. D. Sinnott (Ed.), *Everyday problem solving: Theory and applications* (pp. 72–99). Praeger Publishers.

Smith, B., & González-Lloret, M. (2021). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, *54*(4), 518-534. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000233

Voss, J. F., & Post, T. A. (1988). On the solving of ill-structured problems, chapter 9. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1979). Consciousness as a problem in the psychology of behavior. *Soviet Psychology*, *17*(4), 3–35.

Wong, R. (2019). Basis psychological needs of students in blended learning. *Interactive Learning Environments, 27*(6), 1– 15. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1703010

Xue, S. (2022). A conceptual model for integrating affordances of mobile technologies into task-based language teaching. *Interactive Learning Environments, 30*(6), 1131–1144. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1711132