Computer Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL-EJ), 23(4), 56-75, 2022

Speaking Self-efficacy and L2 Motivational Self System in Online EFL Emergency TBLT and TSLT Classes: A Multiple-treatment Counterbalanced Experimental Study

Nguyen Nhat Quang (nhatquang.ed@gmail.com) * Corresponding Author
HQT Education Co. Ltd, Vietnam

Pham Nhat Linh (nhatlinhpham2017@gmail.com)
HQT Education Co. Ltd,, Vietnam

Nguyen Thi Thu Hien (hiennt@haui.edu.vn)
Hanoi University of Industry, Vietnam

Abstract

This study examines the effects of task-based language teaching (TBLT) and task-supported language teaching (TSLT) on EFL learners' L2 motivational self system (L2MSS) and speaking self-efficacy (SSE) in online emergency classrooms. Since 2020, many EFL emergency online classes have been established globally due to the outbreak of COVID-19. Notwithstanding that the teaching approaches have produced positive effects on learners' L2MSS and SSE in offline classes, it remains unclear how TBLT and TSLT can affect those factors in online emergency EFL speaking classrooms. Thus, the study recruited two groups of intermediate EFL non-English-majored first-year university students at High Quality Thinking (HQT) Education. During a two-month period, these participants alternately joined three TBLT and TSLT counterbalanced treatments of three different topics. After each online lesson, an immediate test was conducted to gather the students' perceptions of their SSE and L2MSS, followed by a two-week washout period. Results of the between-groups, within-group t-tests, and one-way ANOVA tests suggested that TBLT can be more effective in motivating students and enhancing their self-efficacy in totally online emergency speaking lessons.

Keywords: Emergency**,** L2 motivational self system, speaking self-efficacy, TBLT, TSLT.

Introduction

With the beginning of the post-methods era, TBLT and TSLT have received much attention as innovative approaches in language teaching and learning (Hismanoglu & Hismanoglu, 2011). TBLT and TSLT have been an essential part of the teacher repertoire for decades, especially in face-to-face classrooms. Both approaches have proved their effectiveness in teaching writing, listening, reading, and speaking (Albino, 2017; Chou, 2016; Kafipour et al., 2018; Mao, 2012). Moreover, the application of tasks in language teaching can positively affect the psychological variables of students, such as motivation or confidence (Sabet et al., 2014).

However, the unprecedented outbreak of the coronavirus has brought many challenges to English language teaching and learning, forcing teachers to transform physical classrooms into cyber learning. When learning online, students can suffer from a lack of motivation, a

shortened attention span, or a lack of direct interaction (Ferri et al., 2020; Kim & Frick, 2011; Mukhtar et al., 2020). Teachers also struggle to find suitable teaching approaches as a replacement for methodologies in offline classes. Specifically, Presentation-Practice-Produce (PPP) procedure seems ineffective in motivating and engaging students in an online setting (Gao & Zhang, 2020). Instead, such innovative approaches including interactive tasks are more feasible to encourage students' participation. Furthermore, although teachers can use various platforms, such as Zoom or Google Meets to sustain education amidst crisis, in developing nations where online instructions are rarely implemented, teachers are neither trained for teaching online nor provided with guidelines for effective teaching (Bailey & Lee, 2020). This situation brings up a quest for researchers to investigate whether several teaching approaches in offline classrooms can work as successfully as in online classrooms (Gao & Zhang, 2020). Additionally, because influences of the pandemic on health and society are present in people's lives, psychological issues, such as stress, demotivation, or low levels of self-efficacy, which may impact students' academic performance, have also been increasing. Many problems concerning learners' overall well-being have been reported; they can range from enduring prolonged educational disengagement to increased psychosocial challenges (Drane et al., 2021). It is questionable whether the effectiveness of some well-established approaches in the typical offline environment is still transferable in the online emergency remote classroom that is characterized by the learners' unpredictable and complex mental, psychological, and physical states. To this end, this article attempts to examine the impacts of innovative teaching approaches involving collaborative tasks - TBLT and TSLT - on language learners' motivation and self-efficacy in online emergency lessons. Within this multiple-treatment counterbalanced study, the authors aim to investigate the effects of the two approaches on students' L2MSS and SSE in online emergency EFL classrooms. To fulfill this aim, the researchers address two primary research questions:

1. What are the different effects of TBLT and TSLT on students' speaking self-efficacy?
2. What are the different effects of TBLT and TSLT on students' L2MSS?

The first part of this article proposes the significance and practicality of the study, followed by detailed literature on computer-assisted tasks, TBLT, TSLT, L2MSS, and SSE. Second, the authors demonstrate research methodology, data collection, and data analysis procedures. Then, findings, discussions and pedagogical implications are presented. Finally, the conclusion comprises answers to the research questions, the research's applications, recommendations, limitations, and future directions.

Literature Review

Tasks and Computer-assisted Language Tasks

Task is defined by Ellis (2003) as a work plan that "requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome" (p. 16). A task should focus primarily on constructing meaning and consist of one or more gaps, including information-gap, reasoning-gap, and opinion-gap (Prabhu, 1987). When learners perform a task, their linguistic and nonlinguistic knowledge should be used to accomplish its tangible outcome. Language tasks can be categorized in many ways. According to Ellis (2009), unfocused tasks help students improve their overall communicative abilities, while focused tasks encourage them to practice a grammatical structure. Nunan (2004), on the other hand, divides tasks into

pedagogical and real-world tasks, claiming that pedagogical tasks are solely exploited in the classroom whereas real-world tasks are used in everyday interactions.

In online classrooms, tasks are often computer-mediated. A computer-assisted task consists of all features of an offline task. However, it is conducted on a virtual platform that satisfies the standards of an effective learning environment. Rather than using textbooks, technology allows students to perform tasks with various procedures (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2014). As authentic materials with enormous input sources are handy on the Internet, teachers can employ tasks such as shopping for necessities, booking tables, or choosing medical centers, which are similar to real-life interactions. Compared to tasks in traditional textbooks, technology-mediated tasks are more updated, beneficial and relevant for learners (González-Lloret, 2020). In brief, a computer-assisted task is generally completed in a cyber platform that meets both the characteristics and features of a good learning environment.

Language Teaching and Learning with Tasks

While transfer-appropriate processing theory underpins TBLT, skill acquisition theory is the foundation of TSLT. TBLT, based on communicative language teaching philosophy (Butler, 2011), attempts to provide communicative opportunities for students (Ellis, 2003). Understandably, it also prioritizes meaning-focused activities over linguistic characteristics (Littlewood, 2004). On the other hand, tasks are exploited in TSLT to help learners activate their prior knowledge and improve their accuracy. Usually, tasks used in a Present-Practice-Production (PPP) model transform declarative and explicit knowledge into procedural and implicit knowledge, or tentatively, speeded-up declarative knowledge.

In TBLT, tasks can be either focused or unfocused. Learners in focused tasks are aware of linguistic elements before performing a task. Ellis (2009) suggests that a TBLT lesson includes three stages: pre-task, main task, and post-task. In the first stage, he recommends that teachers provide students with a preparatory activity to lay a foundation for the major task that follows (Prabhu, 1987). The main task, which is considered the backbone of TBLT lessons, will revolve around students' performance of the tasks (Ellis, 2009). In this step, students are granted opportunities to communicate, while teachers are ready to provide help if necessary (Chong & Reinders, 2020). The final part of TBLT lessons - post-task - encourages students to re-practice the task, reflect on what they have learnt, and highlight their mistakes. The teacher can rectify students' mistakes by drawing their attention to common ones, then providing tasks for their language generation, and lastly encouraging their awareness of mistakes. TSLT, however, often incorporates tasks in the production stage of the PPP framework. PPP, according to DeKeyser (1998), emphasizes linguistic features in the cognitive stage, then implements drills for constant usage of the language in the associative stage, and finally uses freer practice to encourage students' production of the target language in the autonomous stage. In the first phase (Presentation), teachers present students with structures, following either an inductive or deductive approach. This stage is mostly teachers' talk, while students have few opportunities to communicate (van den Branden, 2016). The lesson then proceeds with drills (Practice) in different modes, individual, pair work, or group work. The activities in this phase can encourage students to use given structures with accuracy. In the last phase (Production), tasks can be incorporated into freer practice to facilitate students' familiarity with acquired knowledge. There are various types of practice, but they are mostly interactive.

Self-efficacy

Bandura, in his social-cognitive theory, coined the term *self-efficacy* to refer to one's belief in their ability to accomplish a task (Bandura, 1997). It is thought that after performing a task, people get greater confidence and self-perception, and they predict another successful

performance in the future (Greene, 2017). Furthermore, those who are confident in their ability to learn certain skills and execute specific tasks are more likely to put great effort into their work, but negative feedback from others may lead to self-doubts and focus on personal shortcomings when they encounter new obstacles. Self-efficacy can be considered a major predictor of language learning techniques, motivation, and accomplishments in EFL research. High levels of self-efficacy are related to excellent performance in many language learning activities (Chen, 2020). In a longitudinal study by Harris and Leeming (2022), it was discovered that over the course of one academic year, there was a rise in both the students' L2 proficiency in English and their speaking self-efficacy although the two experimental groups of students were exposed to different teaching approaches. However, the link between teaching approaches using tasks in the classroom and the beneficial development of students' SSE is a crucial yet understudied issue (Mills, 2014). It is also unclear whether the effectiveness of TBLT and PPP is still guaranteed in the online emergency classroom. Therefore, more effort should be made to examine how TBLT and TSLT can affect English learners in emergency online classrooms in times of COVID-19. Within the scope of this study, SSE consists of three constructs. The first component is *ability*, which involves students' perception of their capacity to communicate in English. The second component, *activity perception*, is concerned with the students' perceptions of activities that necessitate English communication. Lastly, *aspiration* illustrates how self-efficacy expectations are affected by success or failure in novel circumstances or places. This construct also considers factors such as a learner's desire to speak English fluently both in the present and in the future.

L2 Motivational Self System

Dörnyei (2009) proposed the *L2 Motivational Self System* with three essential dimensions: the ideal L2 self, the ought-to L2 self, and the L2 learning experience. According to Dörnyei (2009), the first dimension, *the ideal L2 self*, is a representation of the L2 user's ideal future image. If one wishes to be a fluent L2 user who can interact with foreigners, the ideal picture of oneself as a fluent L2 user can be a motivator to bridge the gap between one's actual self and this ideal image. Next, the *ought-to L2 self* refers to the abilities or qualities that a person desires to have. For instance, students who want to live up to their parents' and teachers' expectations can decide what personal traits they should develop, and this perception can act as a source of motivation for learning. Finally, context-based incentives may impact learners' attitudes toward language learning. The students' motivation can be either fostered or degraded based on their current learning environment and *L2 learning experience* which is characterized by the importance of instructors, classroom procedures, and peers (Dörnyei, 2009).

The Effects of Teaching Approaches on SSE and Motivation

Many studies have investigated the connection between the impacts of teaching approaches on motivation and self-efficacy (Chen, 2014; Sabet et al., 2014; Tavakoli et al., 2019; Ulla, 2020). Regarding motivation, Ulla (2020) examined Thai EFL students' motivation and attitudes about speaking in a TBLT classroom. According to the findings, students in a task-based classroom were extremely driven to learn and practice English. Sabet et al. (2014) also compared the level of motivation of EFL students in TBLT and PPP classrooms. The findings indicate that students in the TBLT may have had a higher level of motivation than the PPP group. Concerning computer-assisted learning with tasks, Tavakoli et al. (2019) suggest in their study that Persian EFL students who studied with technology-assisted tasks could generally possess a greater motivation to learn English. For self-efficacy, Chen (2014) assessed

the effectiveness of using tasks in an internet-based learning environment towards the learners' self-efficacy and technological acceptance in a case study. After three months of experiencing the virtual course, the researcher concluded that the participants rated their levels of self-efficacy quite moderate, which might be indicative of effective language learning. However, there has been no clear confirmation of the effects of different approaches on students' speaking skills, motivation, and self-efficacy to communicate. The pandemic has created huge difficulties for teachers and students in an online environment. Because online emergency learning is radically different from conventional offline or online instructions, the need to investigate the influences of teaching approaches on students' speaking skills, self-efficacy, and motivation is present. The authors hope to provide insights into the relationship between the two approaches and students' motivation and self-efficacy in special emergency online speaking classrooms. Furthermore, most previous studies only indicate the effectiveness of using tasks to motivate and strengthen learners' self-efficacy in comparison to non-task-based teaching approaches (Ozan et al., 2005; Sabet et al., 2014). Hence, we also anticipate that if the two task-based approaches, TBLT and TSLT, significantly differ in how they affect learners' L2MSS and SSE, it can reveal the existence of other factors accounting for heightened motivation and self-efficacy besides the inclusion of tasks.

Methodology

The Rationale for the Method Choice

Grounded on post-positivist philosophy**,** this article follows a quasi-experimental research design using the repeated-measures with crossover design, also known as the multiple-treatment counterbalanced design (Edmonds & Kennedy, 2022). Each subject of the study would receive alternating treatment conditions in different periods to compare the effects of various treatments (Hedayat et al., 2006). In particular, the research first incorporates a within-subjects approach because the design aims to minimize and eliminate emerging issues of learner characteristic variations. Second, the research also applies the between-subjects contrast to evaluate the different impacts of TBLT and TSLT on the learners' motivation and SSE of the two classes when they study the same topics, themes, and lessons. This combination of both within-subject and between-subjects is advised by Edmonds and Kennedy (2022) to increase the rigor of the study when the sample size is small. While motivation and SSE may be affected by learners' characteristics and other factors besides the teaching approaches, the authors expect that by counterbalancing treatments, this study can reach a more rigorous conclusion of the two teaching approaches' effects on learners.

Table 1
Cross-over Design with Two Factors (Adopted from Edmonds & Kennedy, 2022)

Group	Questionnaire 1	Treatment	Questionnaire 2	Treatment	Questionnaire 3
1	O_1	X_A	O_2	X_B	O_3
2	O_1	X_B	O_2	X_A	O_3

According to Edmonds and Kennedy (2022), cross-over experimental research should implement the pretest-midtest-posttest model (Table 1). In the current study, questionnaires would be used after each treatment as the pre-, mid-, and post-tests. However, unlike other

aspects such as achievement test scores or language proficiency, motivation and self-efficacy are two highly complex, diverse, and impressionable systems that are constantly changing. Motivation and efficacy, by nature, are time-sensitive and activity-based (Ouweneel et al., 2013). The authors believe that prior to the first treatment, the use of a questionnaire to collect students' perceptions would not help this research objectively reflect the effects of such a treatment on students' motivation and self-efficacy. In addition, the researchers cannot control all external variables that possibly affect the students on the day they answer the first questionnaire. Therefore, the authors modified the aforementioned model to measure the immediate state of learners' L2MSS and self-efficacy after each lesson (Table 2). Considering the allotted time frame, the authors would change two treatments to three treatments to enhance the rigor of the design. Noticeably, the authors would leave a two-week washout period between each treatment to avoid the order effects of multiple-treatment sequencing interferences.

Table 2
Cross-over Design with Two Factors for L2MSS and SSE

Class	Treatment	Questionnaire 1	Wash-out	Treatment	Questionnaire 2	Wash-out	Treatment	Questionnaire 3
1	TBLT	IT_1		TSLT	IT_2		TBLT	IT_3
2	TSLT	IT_1		TBLT	IT_2		TSLT	IT_3

Participants and Sampling Technique

Sixty Vietnamese EFL learners, 28 men, and 32 women, aged 18-21 partook in the research for two months with three treatments and two wash-out periods. All participants were non-English majors of HQT Education's English training center in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The authors employed simple random techniques to recruit the participants and randomly assigned them to two classes. Based on placement test results provided by the center, the participants' English proficiency was at the low to mid intermediate level (B1.1-B1.2 level) of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. All participants were native Vietnamese speakers residing in Ho Chi Minh with similar sociocultural backgrounds. This sample might be considered representative of intermediate Vietnamese EFL learners at HQT Education. Every individual of the population under investigation also had an equal chance of being selected to minimize the effects of language performance and learner characteristics' discrepancies on self-efficacy and L2MSS (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Jaekel, 2020).

Research Instruments

Questionnaire

The researchers employed a 5-point Likert-scale questionnaire including 36 items to measure self-efficacy and motivation. The reflective dimensions for SSE were ability, activity perception, and aspiration in the first part of the questionnaire. The second part explored the three formative dimensions of the L2MSS, namely ideal L2 self, ought-to L2 self, and L2 learning experience (Table 3). Participants were asked to choose one of five replies, from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree."

Table 3
Taxonomy of the SSE and L2MSS Questionnaire and Focus-group Interview

Measured dimensions	Questionnaire Items	Adapted from
Ability	1-7	Gahungu (2007), Idrus et al. (2011), and Mikulecky et al. (1996)
Activity Perception	8-13	Gahungu (2007), Idrus et al. (2011), and Mikulecky et al. (1996)
Aspiration	14-17	Gahungu (2007), Idrus et al. (2011), and Mikulecky et al. (1996)
Ideal L2 Self	18-21	Taguchi et al. (2009)
Ought-to L2 Self	22-27	Taguchi et al. (2009)
L2 Learning Environment	28-36	Taguchi et al. (2009) and Papi (2010)

Because the participants were more fluent in Vietnamese, the English version of the questionnaire was translated into their mother tongue to increase the data's reliability and to obtain a high response return rate (Thomas, 2013). However, anticipating the unwanted inconsistency and flaws of back-translation (Behr, 2016), the authors applied a procedure of quality assurance to minimize potential issues of this method. Firstly, all the questions were translated by all the authors and reviewed by the first author. Both Vietnamese and English versions of the questionnaires were peer-reviewed by three other experts, all of whom held Ph.D. degrees in TESOL. The authors then revised the questionnaires according to their recommendations and conducted an online pilot test with 25 Vietnamese students via Google Quiz. Finally, these participants reported the problems with the online questionnaires which were then finalized to eliminate technological and mechanical errors. After the responses were collected, Cronbach's alpha was used to examine these responses ($.879 < \alpha < .970$). The results confirmed that this survey was highly reliable and applicable on a large scale.

Procedures

Having acquired consent from HQT Education, the researchers started sending out documents to recruit participants. Due to the schools' and institutions' closure, the participants in this study were rather familiar with online learning using Zoom, which was the platform chosen to provide treatment. After explaining the research, the authors provided the written consent form for the participants to sign. The voluntary participants of the two classes (class A and B) were taught by the same teacher who was the head-teacher of the English training center. The researchers and the teacher had worked together about pedagogical aspects to reach an agreement on the instruction of each lesson. The two classes studied three speaking topics (Meals, Construction, and Space History) over three weeks, but they were taught using different approaches. For example, in week 1, class A would be taught with TBLT in 90 minutes. Students in class A would neither be provided with vocabulary nor any language in advance to complete the task. Meanwhile, because class B was taught with TSLT using the same topic as class A, the teacher would present the target linguistic items and then give students some time to conduct controlled practice. Finally, students in class B would use what they had learnt to complete the task. After each lesson, the questionnaires were delivered on

the Internet with a 100% return rate from both classes. The responses were then analyzed with SPSS 20.

Lesson Design: The Rationale for the Main Task Choice

The tasks in the three sessions were designed to improve students' collaboration and communication. After working in groups, students were required to discuss their meal preparation on a limited budget in Lesson 1. Lesson 2 required them to design a house out of three sustainable materials and present it to the class. In Lesson 3, students had to create infographics that explained the timeframe of one space exploration expedition. The outcome of the first TBLT session was to motivate students to negotiate in groups and design a menu list for a day with 100 dollars. The major outcome of the second TBLT session was for students to select three green resources to erect a sustainable structure. The third lesson challenged them to reason with one another on which ideas and visual materials they should add to the infographics. The Appendix contains a sample description of the task types and characteristics of Lesson 2's main task. Additionally, TSLT employed the Present-Practice-Produce model with task-based freer practice. The same tasks were used as freer practice for students in these TSLT sessions after the teacher taught and provided grammatical structures and lexical elements related to the themes.

Data Collection and Analysis

Questionnaires were given after each treatment of the synchronous lesson via Google Quiz, and participants could only submit their answers once. After submission, they were not allowed to modify their answers. The quantitative data included students' responses from the self-efficacy and L2MSS questionnaire. The authors used a one-way ANOVA to discover whether there were significant differences between the questionnaires on SSE and motivation that each class took after a treatment. Moreover, to specify how the test results of a class changed after the treatment, the authors proceeded with LSD post hoc tests of variance.

Findings

Within-class Comparison

Table 4
Means and Standard Deviations Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class A

		SSE		L2MSS	
Stage	N	M	SD	M	SD
First (TBLT)	30	3.71	0.37	3.76	0.37
Second (TSLT)	30	2.91	0.38	2.89	0.53
Third (TBLT)	30	3.60	0.48	3.77	0.46
Total	90	3.41	0.54	3.47	0.61

Table 4 shows descriptive statistics for the three stages or three lessons with tasks that students in class A experienced. In the first and third stages, students were taught with TBLT lessons, but in the second stage, a TSLT lesson was conducted. Generally, Table 4 demonstrates that the mean values of both self-efficacy and motivation were higher for the TBLT lessons than for the TSLT lesson. The mean of self-efficacy was 3.71, which was the highest, for students in the first stage. Although this figure was followed by 3.60 of the mean for students' SSE in the final TBLT stage, the TSLT class's figure only registered 2.91. As regards students' L2MSS, the mean of the first and final TBLT lessons constituted 3.76 and 3.77, respectively, which were higher than that of 2.89 for the TSLT lesson. Tests of homogeneity of variances were also used to check the assumption that the variances of the three stages are equal for dependent variables. For self-efficacy (p = .36) and L2MSS (p = .44), the Levene's tests were not significant. Therefore, the assumption was not violated, and the LSD post hoc test could be used to examine which pairs of means were significantly different.

Table 5
One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class A

Source		*df*	SS	*MS*	*F*	*p*
SSE	Between Groups	2	11.31	5.65	33.13	.000
	Within Groups	87	14.85	0.17		
	Total	89	26.16			
L2MSS	Between Groups	2	15.39	7.70	36.85	.000
	Within Groups	87	18.17	0.21		
	Total	89	33.56			

Regarding Table 5, the between-groups differences for SSE and L2MSS were statistically significant. In specific, the difference was identified among the three stages on class A's self-efficacy F (2, 87) = 33.13, p = .000 and on their L2MSS F (2, 87) = 36.85, p = .000. LSD post hoc tests were provided below (Table 6) to compare the group means.

Table 6
LSD Post Hoc Tests of Variance Summary Table Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class A

Source	Stage (I)	Stage (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
SSE	First (TBLT)	Second (TSLT)	.80	.00
		Third (TBLT)	.11	.31
	Second (TSLT)	First (TBLT)	-.80	.00
		Third (TBLT)	-.69	.00
	Third (TBLT)	First (TBLT)	-.11	.31

		Second (TSLT)	.69	.00
L2MSS	First (TBLT)	Second (TSLT)	.87	.00
		Third (TBLT)	-.01	.93
	Second (TSLT)	First (TBLT)	-.87	.00
		Third (TBLT)	-.88	.00
	Third (TBLT)	First (TBLT)	.01	.93
		Second (TSLT)	.88	.00

Post hoc LSD tests (Table 6) show that the students' perspectives about self-efficacy in the second stage differed significantly from their belief in the first and third stages with $p < .05$. Similarly, there were also significant mean differences in learners' motivation between the TSLT and the TBLT classes with $p < .05$ using the same test. The fluctuation in their perspectives could be the result of the teaching approaches to which they were exposed. The TBLT lessons were more likely to influence the students than the TSLT lesson. In addition, there was only a small mean difference between the mean of the first TBLT and the last TBLT lessons (Table 4), and the post hoc LSD tests also indicate that the two lessons did not significantly differ with $p = .31$ for self-efficacy and .93 for motivation, respectively. It seems that the TBLT lessons had more influence on the students' efficacy and motivation. The next section will investigate whether class B would exhibit the same outcome.

Table 7
Means and Standard Deviations Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class B

		SSE		L2MSS	
Stage	n	M	SD	M	SD
First (TSLT)	30	2.96	0.48	2.94	0.57
Second (TBLT)	30	3.83	0.38	3.86	0.45
Third (TSLT)	30	2.93	0.57	3.10	0.39
Total	90	3.30	0.63	3.24	0.63

Table 7 provides descriptive statistics for the two TSLT lessons and one TBLT lesson that were taught to students in class B. Unlike class A, in the first and third stages, the teacher applied a TSLT approach; and in the second stage, a TBLT approach was used. Overall, Table 7 shows that the mean values of both self-efficacy and motivation were higher for the TBLT class than they were for the TSLT classes, which was in alignment with the findings of class A. For L2MSS, the mean was 2.94 in the first stage, which was also the lowest. It was followed by the mean for motivation in the third lesson (3.10). Finally, the highest mean belonged to the second TBLT stage with 3.86. For students' self-efficacy, the mean values of the first and final TSLT lessons were 2.96 and 2.93, respectively, which were lower than 3.83 for the TBLT

lesson. Levene's test for equality of variances was also used to check the assumption that the variances of the three stages were equal for independent variables, with self-efficacy (p = .33) and L2MSS (p = .10).

Table 8
One-way Analysis of Variance Summary Table Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class B

Source		*df*	SS	*MS*	*F*	*p*
L2MSS	Between Groups	2	14.65	7.33	31.42	.000
	Within Groups	87	20.29	0.23		
	Total	89	34.94			
SSE	Between Groups	2	15.65	7.83	34.52	.000
	Within Groups	87	19.73	0.23		
	Total	89	35.38			

Regarding Table 8, a statistically significant difference was identified among the three stages of class B's speaking L2MSS F (2, 87) = 31.42, p = .000 and their speaking efficacy F (2, 87) = 34.52, p = .000. However, follow-up tests need to be applied to compare the group means and determine which specific means were different from which other ones.

Table 9
LSD Post Hoc Tests of Variance Summary Table Comparing the Three Stages on the SSE and L2MSS of the Students of Class B

Source	Stage (I)	Stage (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
L2MSS	First (TSLT)	Second (TBLT)	-.92	.00
		Third (TSLT)	-.16	.20
	Second (TBLT)	First (TSLT)	.92	.00
		Third (TSLT)	.76	.00
	Third (TSLT)	First (TSLT)	.16	.20
		Second (TBLT)	-.76	.00
SSE	First (TSLT)	Second (TBLT)	-.87	.00
		Third (TSLT)	.03	.80

Second (TBLT)	First (TSLT)	.87	.00
	Third (TSLT)	.90	.00
Third (TSLT)	First (TSLT)	-.03	.80
	Second (TBLT)	-.90	.00

As can be seen from the Post hoc LSD tests (Table 9), the students' perspectives about SSE when studying with a TBLT lesson differed significantly from their perspectives in the first and third stage when studying with TSLT lessons ($p < .05$). Similarly, there were also significant mean differences in motivation between TSLT and TBLT with $p < .05$ using the same test. In line with the findings from class A, the teaching approaches noticeably affected the students' levels of efficacy and motivation. The post hoc LSD tests also indicate that the two lessons did not significantly differ with $p = .20$ for L2MSS and .80 for self-efficacy, in turn. Because other factors did not undergo any changes and the findings of class A and class B were similar, it can be stated that the students' self-efficacy and L2MSS were more affected by the TBLT approach.

Between-classes Comparison

Table 10
Comparison of Stage 1 TBLT and TSLT Approaches on SSE and L2MSS (n = 30 students of class A and 30 students of class B)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*Df*	*p*	*d*
SSE			5.98	58.00	0.00	1.56
TBLT	3.71	0.37				
TSLT	2.96	0.57				
L2MSS			7.47	58.00	0.00	1.91
TBLT	3.76	0.37				
TSLT	2.94	0.48				

Table 10 shows that the TBLT approach was significantly different from the TSLT approach on learners' self-efficacy and L2MSS. Inspection of the two group means indicated that the means of learner efficacy ($M = 3.71$) and motivation ($M = 3.76$) for the TBLT approach were higher than the means of the TSLT one, with efficacy ($M = 2.96$) and motivation ($M = 2.94$). The difference between the means is 0.75 for efficacy and 0.82 for motivation on a 5-point Likert scale. The effect size *d* was 1.56 and 1.91, which was a large effect size.

Table 11
Comparison of Stage 2 TBLT and TSLT Approaches on SSE and L2MSS (n = 30 students of class A and 30 students of class B)

Variable	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*	*d*
SSE			8.59	58.00	0.00	2.21
TBLT	3.83	0.45				
TSLT	2.91	0.38				
L2MSS			8.09	58.00	0.00	2.10
TBLT	3.86	0.38				
TSLT	2.89	0.53				

Regarding Table 11, in the second stage, the TBLT approach was also significantly different from the TSLT approach regarding self-efficacy and L2MSS. The two groups' means demonstrate that the means of motivation (M = 3.83) and efficacy (M = 3.86) for the TBLT approach were significantly higher than the means for the TSLT approach, with the mean efficacy being 2.91 and the mean motivation being 2.89. The difference between the means was 0.92 for efficacy and 0.97 for motivation on a 5-point Likert scale. The effect size *d* was 2.21 and 2.10, which was also a large effect size.

Table 12
Comparison of Stage 3 TBLT and TSLT Approaches on SSE and L2MSS (n = 30 students of class A and 30 students of class B)

Variable	M	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*P*	*d*
SSE			5.94	58.00	0.00	1.53
TBLT	3.60	0.48				
TSLT	2.93	0.39				
L2MSS			5.06	58.00	0.00	3.22
TBLT	3.77	0.46				
TSLT	3.10	0.57				

As shown in Table 12, in the third stage, the TSLT approach was also significantly different from the TBLT approach in SSE and L2MSS. The two group means demonstrate that the means of motivation (M = 3.10) and efficacy (M = 2.93) for the TSLT approach were significantly lower than the TBLT means, with the mean of efficacy being 3.60 and the mean of motivation being 3.77. The difference between the means was 0.67 for both efficacy and motivation on a 5-point Likert scale. The effect size *d* was 1.53 and 3.22, which is also large.

Discussion

How TBLT and TSLT Affects the Students' SSE

The quantitative data highlights a significant difference in the students' SSE when they were exposed to the two approaches. Overall, TBLT could affect students more positively during the COVID-19-prompted situation than TSLT in both in-class and between class analyses. The finding supports the results of previous studies by Ozan et al. (2005) and Chen (2014), which illustrate that there might be a close connection between the use of TBLT and learners' self-efficacy.

Specifically, the discrepancies in students' SSE scores could be attributed to several factors. Regarding online TSLT sessions, the focus on accuracy may have provoked the participants' anxiety. Such attention to linguistic items could be prioritized at the expense of SSE because several participants could have been afraid of losing face and refrained from speaking. In a study by Mak (2011), it was discovered that negative experiences such as the students' mistakes being rectified by teachers and peers might have created anxiety among the students. This fear of losing confidence and the current COVID-19 issue could accidentally place more pressure on those who attended TSLT sessions. Especially when some participants were required to get COVID-19 treatment in hospitals, they would have been more nervous because other patients could have been observing them during online classes. Likewise, other students who needed to stay home due to lockdown and quarantine might have been too worried to speak because of the parents' or family members' presence. Thus, the focus on accuracy could have overtaxed some students and greatly decreased their levels of SSE in TSLT sessions.

Finally, unlike TSLT, the teachers of TBLT groups may take and switch different roles (Richards et al., 2001) to encourage learning instead of being a sole presenter or lecturer. Especially when online emergency remote teaching is implemented because of COVID-19, Mohmmed et al. (2020) suggest that teachers should utilize various learning resources to offer immediate support to students rather than just giving lectures. Other studies have also confirmed the roles of teachers in the online classroom, especially their roles in the TBLT online classrooms in enhancing students' SSE (Nguyen et al., 2022). Hence, the TBLT groups in this present study might have benefited more from the teacher's various roles in the online classrooms and generally improved students' self-efficacy and communicative competence in comparison with the TSLT approach.

How TBLT and TSLT Affected the Students' L2MSS

Our findings also suggest that the TBLT approach could influence students more noticeably than TSLT in increasing students' motivation in both within-class and between-class comparisons. Previously, Sabet et al. (2014), Tavakoli et al. (2019), and Ulla (2020) concluded that the TBLT approach has mostly been considered more useful in motivating students than the PPP procedure, both in offline and online classes. They contend that the level of motivation among EFL students is affected by the presence of tasks. After comparing TBLT and PPP, Sabet et al. (2014) conclude, "students will be motivated when their teachers provide them with tasks which are challenging, used activities which are related to the real world, made them curious in learning new things, gave them enough autonomy, praised their efforts, and gave them useful feedbacks, and TBLT approach was more successful in this regard" (p. 959). That is, tasks are believed to play an indispensable role in motivating students. However, when the current study examined the two task-related approaches in online EFL classrooms, a higher motivation level was recorded in TBLT classes. It is plausible that a task, despite its

significance, may not be the only contributor to students' motivation. Therefore, this study may identify other factors responsible for students' motivation and provide more insights into the application of tasks in online EFL classrooms.

The first factor contributing to varying degrees of motivation between the TBLT and TSLT approaches may be the amount of teacher talking time and student talking time. It is generally believed that teacher talking time is mostly higher than student talking time in PPP classes, while the opposite is true for TBLT classes (van den Branden, 2016). The TBLT teacher often played the role of a facilitator who would guide students to perform tasks. Thus, they did not talk much but only directed students to self-explore, which might have engaged the participants. By contrast, in TSLT lessons, the teacher presented most of the materials, which accounted for roughly half of the lesson's time. And when the teacher delivered long lectures, students were more likely to display off-task behaviors. They could be distracted by social media, health concerns, and family matters, especially during the current setting – the COVID-19 pandemic. Accordingly, to boost motivation in online classes, especially during crisis-prompted situations, teachers should consider several suggested steps. First, they can assign collaborative tasks, which involve the participation of more than one student to increase peer interaction, and consequently generate greater motivation. Moreover, for both approaches, teachers can motivate students by providing tasks with topics that are familiar or personalized. It is likely that if students feel connected to the lessons, they will become more determined in learning (González-Lloret, 2020).

Another distinguishing feature that might cause different levels of motivation is the learners' agency within the two approaches. Because TBLT lessons generally gave students more control than TSLT ones (Tavakoli et al., 2019), learners' agency in TBLT classrooms was possibly higher. Students attending TBLT classes were encouraged to work enthusiastically and perform tasks by themselves without the teachers' constant intervention. Students were not closely watched and judged during TBLT sessions, so they might not be too worried about learning. However, students of TSLT could feel demotivated and avoid communicating in online classrooms because of the teacher's close attention to their performance. The operation in our classes is backed up by Chong and Reinders' (2020) research. They agree that learning opportunities are distributed generously among TBLT online classes, and students often complete tasks on their own, asking for teachers only when necessary. To address the problems in TSLT online classrooms, teachers can consider designing tasks that are adaptive to students or address their immediate and affective needs during the crisis. Ideally, teachers should consider trauma-informed teaching to help students overcome difficulties in learning. A possible kind of support can be that students have the right to negotiate whether the tasks are suitable for them or change the requirements of the tasks. As some students are under quarantine, or their family members have already suffered from COVID-19 severely, some sensitive topics such as diseases and death may trigger negative feelings, and consequently reduce their motivation to learn. Therefore, learners should be allowed to suggest a change of some tasks' topic if they feel vulnerable, but these requirements should be among the teacher's preparation and adaptation.

Conclusion and Limitations

This quantitative study has revealed different effects of the two teaching approaches on students' SSE and L2MSS in online COVID-19 emergency classrooms. Comparing TBLT and TSLT, the study has shown that the presence of tasks in a lesson does not necessarily relate to heightened motivation and SSE as implied by other previous researchers. Although both TBLT

and TSLT incorporate tasks, TBLT is more advantageous for students' SSE and L2MSS. This study clarifies that while tasks are used as an important part of a lesson, there may be other factors that can motivate and enhance students' SSE in a teaching approach. First, during the pandemic, the physical, mental, and psychological well-being of students should be rigorously considered because the implementation of different teaching approaches in the emergency online classes due to lockdowns and quarantines might cause different effects on the students' affective factors such as self-efficacy and motivation. Second, peer support may be necessary for this difficult period because mutual sharing can help them alleviate stress which may possibly affect the students' SSE and L2MSS in the emergency classroom. Moreover, learners' needs should also be appreciated by teachers; not only should teachers provide tasks, but they should also apply various techniques to attract students' attention or guide them through the lessons. It is suggested that teachers should strategically prioritize different teaching approaches during an entire course. For communicative purposes, most of the time should be spent on meaning-based learning with TBLT; and when it is important to prepare for written exams, teachers may allow the students' revision of lessons by doing focused tasks or focus-on-form activities using the TSLT approach. Noticeably, if taking English online courses becomes a daunting experience due to the teacher's dominant talking time, TBLT might be used so that students can have more opportunities to communicate. Allowing students to negotiate the time, topic, and form of tasks according to their actual learning context may be important to enhance their self-efficacy and motivation. Trauma-informed task-design using TBLT should also be carefully examined to support learners in times of crisis. One limitation of this study is that although counterbalancing can fundamentally pinpoint the effectiveness of TBLT over TSLT in boosting students' SSE and motivation, it requires more in-depth insight to investigate what factors can cause these discrepancies. Mixed-methods research can be conducted to ascertain the root causes of the differences in future studies. Furthermore, this paper is grounded in quantitative data, the findings of which may be considered tentative. Future research can incorporate the use of a qualitative approach to better elucidate different perceptions of TBLT and TSLT learners on their SSE and L2MSS. Lastly, because psychological variables such as self-efficacy and motivation are easily influenced by many factors outside the classroom, more extended research time may be needed to further validate this study's findings. Despite some limitations in the sample size or regional scale, the authors hope that the article can assist teachers, educators, and other researchers in future investigations and applications in times of crisis.

Data availability

Detailed data, questionnaires, and lesson plans will be provided by the corresponding author upon request.

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

Bailey, D. R., & Lee, A. R. (2020). Learning from experience in the midst of COVID-19: Benefits, challenges, and strategies in online teaching. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal*, *21*(2), 176–196.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman and Company.

Behr, D. (2016). Assessing the use of back translation: The shortcomings of back translation

as a quality testing method. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 20*(6), 573–584. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1252188

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 36–57. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000122

Chen, Y.-L. (2014). A study on student self-efficacy and technology acceptance model within an online task-based learning environment. *Journal of Computers*, *9*(1), 34–43. https://doi.org/10.4304/jcp.9.1.34-43

Chen, Y. (2020). Correlation between self-efficacy and English performance. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (iJET)*, *15*(8), 223–234. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i08.13697

Chong, S. W., & Reinders, H. (2020). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: A qualitative research synthesis. *Language Learning and Technology*, *24*(3), 70–86. https://doi.org/10125/44739

Chou, M.-H. (2016). A task-based language teaching approach to developing metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening*, *31*(1), 51–70. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1098542

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson.

DeKeyser, R. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In J. Williams (Ed.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42–63). 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. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-003

Dörnyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Longman. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833750

Drane, C. F., Vernon, L., & O'Shea, S. (2021). Vulnerable learners in the age of COVID-19: A scoping review. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, *48*(4), 585–604. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-020-00409-5

Edmonds, W. A., & Kennedy, T. D. (2022). *An applied guide to research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10. 4135/9781071802779

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). The methodology of task-based teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3), 19–45.

Ferri, F., Grifoni, P., & Guzzo, T. (2020). Online learning and emergency remote teaching: Opportunities and challenges in emergency situations. *Societies*, *10*(4), 86. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10040086

Gahungu, O. (2007). *The relationships among strategy use, self-efficacy, and language ability in foreign language learners* (Publication No. 3257728) [Doctoral dissertation, Northern Arizona University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database.

Gao, L. X., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Teacher learning in difficult times: Examining foreign language teachers' cognitions about online teaching to tide over COVID-19. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2396. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.549653

Greene, B. A. (2017). *Self-efficacy and future goals in education* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315523019

González-Lloret, M. (2020). Collaborative tasks for online language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12466

González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Technology-mediated TBLT: Researching technology and tasks* (Vol. 6). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.6

Hagemeier, N. E., & Dowling-McClay, K. (2020). The impact of COVID-19-related transitions on student well-being. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, *85*(4), 8291. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8291

Harris, J., & Leeming, P. (2022). The impact of teaching approach on growth in L2 proficiency and self-efficacy: A longitudinal classroom-based study of TBLT and PPP. *Journal of Second Language Studies*, *5*(1), 114–143. https://doi.org/10.1075/jsls.20014.har

Hedayat, A. S., Stufken, J., & Yang, M. (2006). Optimal and efficient crossover designs when subject effects are random. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *101*(475), 1031–1038. https://doi.org/10.1198/016214505000001384

Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based language teaching: What every EFL teacher should do. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *15*, 46–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049

Idrus, H., Salleh, R., & Lim Abdullah, M. R. T. (2011). Oral communication ability in English: An essential skill for Engineering graduates. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators & Education*, *26*(1), 107–123.

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

Kafipour, R., Mahmoudi, E., & Khojasteh, L. (2018). The effect of task-based language teaching on analytic writing in EFL classrooms. *Cogent Education*, *5*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1496627

Kim, K. J., & Frick, T. (2011). Changes in student motivation during online learning. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *44*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.44.1.a

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

Mak, B. (2011). An exploration of speaking-in-class anxiety with Chinese ESL learners. *System*, *39*(2), 202–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.04.002

Mao, Z. (2012). The application of task-based language teaching to English reading classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(11), 2430–2438. https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2430-2438

Mikulecky, L., Lloyd, P., & Huang, S. C. (1996). *Adult and ESL literacy learning self-efficacy questionnaire*. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED394022.pdf

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

Mohmmed, A. O., Khidhir, B. A., Nazeer, A., & Vijayan, V. J. (2020). Emergency remote teaching during Coronavirus pandemic: The current trend and future directive at Middle East College Oman. *Innovative Infrastructure Solutions*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s41062-020-00326-7

Mukhtar, K., Javed, K., Arooj, M., & Sethi, A. (2020). Advantages, limitations and recommendations for online learning during COVID-19 pandemic era. *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, *36*(COVID19-S4). https://doi.org/10.12669/PJMS.36.COVID19-S4.2785

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Nguyen, N. Q., Pham, N. L., & Nguyen, T. T. H. (2022). Tasks, self-efficacy, and L2 motivational self system in an online emergency EFL speaking class: A mixed-methods study. *The JALT CALL Journal*, *18*(1), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.29140/jaltcall.v18n1.518

Ouweneel, E., Schaufeli, W. B., & Le Blanc, P. M. (2013). Believe, and you will achieve:

Changes over time in self-efficacy, engagement, and performance. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, *5*(2), 225–247. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12008

Ozan, S., Karademir, S., Gursel, Y., Taskiran, H., & Musal, B. (2005). First graduates' perceptions on a problem-based and task-based learning curriculum. *Education for Health*, *18*(2), 256-271. https://doi.org/10.1080/13576280500148007

Papi, M. (2010). The L2 motivational self system, L2 anxiety, and motivated behavior: A structural equation modeling approach. *System*, *38*(3), 467–479. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.06.011

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Sabet, M. K., Tahriri, A., & Haghi, E. B. (2014). The impact of the 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

Taguchi, T., Magid, M., & Papi, M. (2009). The L2 motivational self system among Japanese, Chinese and Iranian Learners of English: A comparative study. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity, and the L2 self* (pp. 66–97). Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293-005

Tavakoli, H., Lotfi, A. R., & Biria, R. (2019). Effects of CALL-mediated TBLT on motivation for L2 reading. *Cogent Education*, *6*(1). 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.

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

van den Branden, K. (2016). The role of teachers in task-based language education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *36*, 164–181. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000070

Appendix

Sample Task Features: Sustainable House Design Task