INNOVATION IN LANGUAGE LEARNING International Conference

Beyond Visible Participation: Conditions Shaping Learner Motivation in Task-Based EFL Speaking Classrooms

Baokun Gu

The University of Sydney, Australia

Abstract

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is often presented as an innovative approach that can strengthen learner motivation by giving speaking a meaningful communicative purpose [1]. However, greater observable participation does not necessarily indicate stronger motivation. This paper presents a focused thematic review of theoretical and empirical research on TBLT, L2 motivation, classroom engagement, willingness to communicate, peer interaction, and speaking-task design in EFL contexts. It examines how task-based speaking may support, constrain, or change motivation-related responses and identifies three interconnected classroom conditions. First, communicative purpose is more likely to become motivationally meaningful when tasks are relevant to learners and provide genuine content ownership or decision-making. Second, peer interaction can support participation when learners have clear, equitable roles and experience the classroom as socially safe; poorly managed group dynamics may instead restrict access to talk [2]. Third, task challenge needs to remain manageable through planning time, linguistic scaffolding, teacher support, and repeated task experience. The review also shows that engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate should be treated as situated and partial indicators of motivation [3, 4]. Visible talk may reflect task pressure, assigned roles, proficiency relationships, or peer expectations, while quieter participation may involve anxiety, preparation, or cognitive engagement. The paper argues that the innovative value of TBLT lies less in using communicative tasks as a fixed method than in designing meaningful, manageable, and context-sensitive speaking experiences. It concludes with practical implications for task choice, grouping, pre-task preparation and role allocation in EFL speaking classrooms.

Keywords: *Task-Based Language Teaching; learner motivation; EFL speaking; classroom engagement; willingness to communicate*

1. Introduction

Research on L2 motivation and classroom engagement suggests that oral participation in EFL classrooms is shaped by learners' linguistic competence as well as confidence, anxiety, perceived task value, peer interaction, and willingness to communicate [3, 5]. Learners may recognise the importance of speaking English yet hesitate when participation involves real-time response, public error, peer comparison, or teacher evaluation [3]. This makes EFL speaking classrooms a relevant context for examining how classroom activities shape motivation-related responses. Observable participation cannot be interpreted as a direct measure of motivation, since the amount of talk produced during classroom interaction may also reflect task requirements, proficiency relationships, assigned roles, and learners' opportunities to contribute during interaction [2, 4]. Limited speech may likewise coexist with anxiety, preparation, language monitoring, or cognitive engagement and does not necessarily indicate low motivation [3, 4].

By organising speaking around meaning-focused tasks and communicative outcomes, TBLT can give learners a clearer reason to contribute to classroom interaction [1, 6, 7]. Learners may exchange information, negotiate meaning, solve problems, or reach decisions through interaction, with their contributions forming part of task completion [1, 8]. Empirical studies indicate that communicative task design does not guarantee stronger engagement or willingness to communicate; learners' responses vary with task relevance, opportunities for choice and contribution, peer interaction, task demands, and classroom support [9, 10, 11]. The motivational potential of task-based speaking depends on how learners experience the task during interaction, including whether participation feels meaningful, manageable, and socially supported [2, 4].

A recurring conceptual issue in research on task-based speaking is that motivation is often inferred through engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate, although these constructs capture only particular dimensions of learners' motivational experience [3, 4]. Recent research further shows

that engagement has been defined and measured unevenly across language-learning studies, and that self-reported engagement may not correspond closely with discourse-based indicators such as amount of talk, turn-taking, or responsiveness [12, 13]. Visible participation provides partial and situated evidence of learners' responses to task-based speaking and does not directly indicate motivational strength [4, 13].

This focused thematic review examines how task-based speaking may support, constrain, or reshape motivation-related responses in EFL classrooms. It aims to clarify the relationship between learner motivation and visible participation, synthesise evidence around three interconnected conditions—communicative purpose and learner agency, peer interaction and classroom safety, and task challenge and scaffolding—and consider their implications for speaking-task design.

The review is guided by two questions:

(1) How has previous theoretical and empirical literature conceptualised the relationship between Task-Based Language Teaching and learner motivation in EFL speaking classrooms?

(2) What task features and classroom conditions have been found to shape learners' engagement, participation, or willingness to communicate during task-based speaking activities?

2. Review Scope and Approach

This paper adopts a focused thematic review of conceptual and empirical research across several related areas, including Task-Based Language Teaching, L2 motivation, classroom engagement, willingness to communicate, peer interaction, and speaking-task design. The review focuses on EFL speaking contexts and examines how these bodies of research converge around learners' responses to task-based interaction. A small number of ESL and implementation studies are included for contextual comparison. The thematic synthesis centres on recurring classroom conditions and does not seek exhaustive coverage of a single narrowly defined construct.

Relevant literature was identified through ERIC, Scopus, and Google Scholar using search terms including task-based language teaching, TBLT, learner motivation, speaking, oral participation, engagement, willingness to communicate, peer interaction, task design, and EFL. Priority was given to peer-reviewed journal articles directly relevant to task-based speaking and motivation-related classroom responses, while foundational theoretical works were retained where they clarified key concepts or established major positions in TBLT and L2 motivation. Recent empirical studies were prioritised when they examined classroom-based tasks, engagement, willingness to communicate, peer interaction, or speaking-task design. Additional studies were identified through the reference lists of key publications. Sources were retained when they contributed directly to the conceptual or empirical focus of the review.

The selected literature was analysed thematically in four stages. First, studies were examined for how they conceptualised motivation in relation to engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate. Second, recurring classroom mechanisms shaping learners' responses to speaking tasks were identified. Third, convergent and divergent findings across theoretical and empirical studies were compared. The resulting synthesis was organised around three interconnected conditions: communicative purpose and learner agency, peer interaction and classroom safety, and task challenge and scaffolding. These themes are treated separately for analytical clarity while remaining closely connected in learners' experience of task-based speaking.

3. Conceptualising Motivation Beyond Visible Participation

Research on TBLT, L2 motivation, and task engagement suggests that the relationship between task-based speaking and learner motivation is conditional and mediated [4, 7, 9, 10]. TBLT gives speaking a potential motivational basis by organising language use around meaning-focused communication, learner contribution, and communicative outcomes [1, 6, 7, 8]. Learners' responses to these opportunities vary with perceived task value, competence, affective security, and interactional conditions [3, 5]. This combination of perspectives suggests that learners' motivational responses are contingent on how communicative opportunities are experienced during task-based interaction.

Across classroom-based and idiodynamic evidence, learners' motivation and willingness to communicate can shift as task interaction unfolds in response to topic accessibility, opportunities to contribute, interlocutor behaviour, affective responses, linguistic-cognitive demands, and group atmosphere [11, 14]. These patterns show that motivation-related responses remain sensitive to changes in the interaction during task performance.

This dynamic view also complicates the use of visible classroom behaviour as evidence of motivation. Engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate can all indicate how learners respond to speaking tasks, but they capture different dimensions of that response and should not be treated as interchangeable with motivation [3, 4]. Engagement, in particular, has been conceptualised across behavioural, cognitive, social, and affective dimensions, while classroom participation provides more directly observable evidence of learners' involvement in interaction [4, 12]. Willingness to communicate adds another situated indicator of learners' readiness to enter or sustain spoken interaction, but it can fluctuate during task performance as interactional and affective conditions change [11]. These distinctions matter because different measures may produce different pictures of the same learner experience. Self-reported engagement, for example, does not always align with discourse-based indicators such as amount of talk, turn-taking, responsiveness, or semantically engaged talk [12, 13]. Treating these indicators as equivalent can blur the distinction between observable participation and the motivational processes associated with it.

Greater amounts of talk may reflect task pressure, assigned roles, proficiency relationships, peer expectations, or greater opportunities to contribute, while limited speech may be associated with anxiety, preparation, language monitoring, cognitive engagement, or difficulty entering the interaction [2, 4, 13]. These possibilities make the amount of observable talk an ambiguous indicator of motivational strength. Observable participation is best interpreted in relation to learners' positioning and experience within the task; amount of talk provides only partial evidence of motivational response [4, 13].

Across the reviewed studies, variation in learners' motivation-related responses repeatedly converges around three interconnected conditions: whether communicative purpose provides meaningful opportunities for learner agency, whether peer interaction offers equitable and socially safe opportunities to contribute, and whether task challenge remains manageable through appropriate scaffolding and support [2, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16]. These conditions provide a framework for examining why similar task-based speaking activities may generate different patterns of engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate across learners and classroom interactions.

4. Conditions Shaping Motivation in Task-Based EFL Speaking

Although they overlap during task performance, the three conditions are drawn from studies in different settings. In Vietnamese EFL picture-sequencing tasks, proficiency pairing influenced cognitive and social engagement [2]. In a US university ESL study, learners showed greater cognitive engagement in preferred tasks; topic and opportunities to develop ideas shaped those preferences [17]. A Chinese university EFL study linked willingness to communicate to interacting learner and classroom-environment factors [20]. In Hong Kong secondary schools, teachers and teacher educators emphasised examination demands and grammar instruction as considerations for TBLT implementation [35]. These contexts vary in learner populations, English-use opportunities, task types, and institutional priorities. Their findings suggest mechanisms through which context may shape agency, peer access, and manageability, but do not establish national differences or universal effects. The following sections examine these mechanisms.

4.1 Communicative Purpose and Learner Agency

Communicative outcomes can give speaking a clearer purpose when learners' contributions are needed to exchange information, develop ideas, solve problems, or reach a shared decision [1, 6, 8]. In task-based interaction, this purpose becomes more salient when learners can see that their contribution affects the developing exchange or joint outcome [4, 14]. A communicative outcome does not guarantee motivational value, since learners' engagement also depends on how relevant and personally meaningful the task becomes during participation [15, 17]. Communicative purpose becomes motivationally meaningful when learners recognise both a reason to contribute and a meaningful role for that contribution in the task.

Empirical research on task engagement further shows that personal relevance and content ownership can shape how learners experience communicative purpose [10, 15, 17]. Learner-generated content has been associated with stronger behavioural, cognitive, social, and affective engagement because learners can bring their own meanings into task performance [15]. Familiar or preferred topics can also make ideas more accessible and support deeper involvement in meaning-making during interaction [14, 17]. Perceived relevance appears especially important because learners are more likely to invest in a task when its content connects with their own interests, experiences, or communicative purposes [3,

10]. Personal relevance and content ownership may help explain why the same communicative structure is experienced as meaningful by some learners but remains largely procedural for others.

Evidence on learner choice presents a mixed picture [9, 10]. Greater choice can increase learners' sense of control, cognitive engagement, and enjoyment, while more open task conditions may also increase uncertainty or anxiety and produce less consistent effects on behavioural and social engagement [9]. Vo [10] found perceived task relevance to be a more salient predictor of engagement than choice. These findings indicate that agency depends on how learners can use the options available to them. Choice is more likely to support motivationally meaningful participation when learners perceive the task as relevant and have sufficient structure to manage its demands.

Agency is also shaped by whether opportunities for contribution remain available as interaction develops [11, 14]. Dynamic evidence shows that learners' motivation and willingness to communicate vary with topic accessibility, interlocutor responses, opportunities to contribute ideas, and linguistic-cognitive demands during group tasks [11, 14]. Continued agency is shaped by whether learners' contributions receive uptake and by their capacity to manage the demands of responding and developing ideas as the exchange progresses [11, 14]. This evidence distinguishes the provision of choice from learners' capacity to exercise influence during interaction. In this review, learner agency refers to the capacity to contribute personally meaningful content and continue shaping the developing exchange.

This pattern also complicates the interpretation of visible participation. Substantial amounts of talk may reflect task pressure, assigned roles, or interactional expectations without providing direct evidence of stronger motivation [2, 4]. Greater task openness may increase ownership and enjoyment for some learners while also creating uncertainty or anxiety that affects observable participation [9]. The amount of talk offers limited evidence of motivational investment or engagement [4, 13]. Communicative purpose and agency are more usefully examined through the extent to which learners can contribute personally meaningful content and continue shaping the task as interaction develops.

4.2 Peer Interaction and Classroom Safety

Peer interaction can support motivation-related responses when learners have meaningful and reasonably equitable opportunities to contribute during task performance [2, 4]. Pair and group work can produce collaborative, expert–novice, dominant–dominant, or dominant–passive patterns, creating different opportunities to influence the joint activity [18]. In mixed-proficiency dyads, participation is shaped by both proficiency relationships and task roles: lower-proficiency learners may contribute more actively when they hold task-essential information, while proficiency pairings can affect cognitive, social, and emotional engagement [2, 19]. The value of peer interaction lies partly in how roles and opportunities to contribute are distributed and sustained within the pair or group. Learners with a recognised role and access to task-relevant information have a clearer basis for influencing the joint outcome, and amount of talk can reflect this interactional positioning as well as willingness to engage [2, 18, 19].

Research on classroom environment and willingness to communicate highlights the social and affective conditions relevant to what this review conceptualises as classroom safety [20, 21, 22]. In Chinese EFL classrooms, willingness to communicate has been linked to learners' perceptions of peer relations and the wider classroom environment [20]. More recent evidence shows that class social climate is associated with in-class willingness to communicate through learners' emotional experiences, including enjoyment and anxiety [21]. Large-scale research with Chinese university EFL learners has also identified relationships among classroom environment, learner emotions, and willingness to communicate [22]. At the level of individual task performance, willingness to communicate can fluctuate with interlocutor behaviour, affective responses, and group atmosphere as interaction unfolds [11]. Classroom safety, in this sense, develops through how learners' contributions are received and whether participation can be sustained when hesitation or difficulty occurs [11, 20].

Interaction strategy instruction provides one way to shape these conditions [23]. Strategies such as inviting contributions, requesting clarification, responding to partners' ideas, encouraging further talk, and developing shared meanings can give learners concrete resources for maintaining peer interaction [23]. In Dao's [23] intervention study, interaction strategy instruction was associated with increased idea development and language-related reflection, greater responsiveness and encouragement between learners, and more positive emotional engagement. The effects were not uniform, since task features, proficiency, and learners' perceptions of their partners also influenced strategy use [23]. This qualification matters because instructional support cannot guarantee socially safe interaction, but it can establish routines that make reciprocal participation more achievable. The evidence positions classroom

safety as partly designable through interactional practices that teachers model, practise, and reinforce during peer tasks [23].

Research comparing behavioural, social, cognitive, and self-reported engagement provides further reason to interpret visible participation cautiously [13, 24, 25]. Task type and proficiency can affect behavioural, social, and cognitive engagement in different ways, so greater oral production does not necessarily correspond to stronger engagement across dimensions [24]. Classroom-based evidence from spoken decision-making tasks likewise shows that words and turns produced, negotiation of content, affiliative responses, anxiety, and enjoyment capture different dimensions of task engagement [25]. Discourse-based indicators also do not always align with learners' reported engagement [13]. A quieter learner should not be interpreted too quickly as unmotivated, and frequent talk does not establish stronger motivational investment [13, 25]. Visible participation needs to be interpreted alongside learners' roles, peer responses, social engagement, and access to meaningful contribution. Peer interaction is most supportive when learners can enter, sustain, and influence the interaction within a socially supportive environment.

4.3 Task Challenge and Scaffolding

Task challenge reflects both the demands built into a speaking task and learners' perceptions of their capacity to manage those demands [26, 27, 28]. Speaking tasks may require learners to comprehend or generate content, organise ideas, formulate language, monitor production, and respond within real-time interaction, placing several processing demands on them simultaneously [27]. Experimental evidence also shows that increasing task complexity can affect learners' speaking anxiety as well as aspects of oral performance, indicating that cognitive demand and affective experience may develop together during task performance [28]. A formally complex task will not necessarily be experienced as equally difficult by all learners, since perceived difficulty also depends on the linguistic, cognitive, and affective resources available at the point of performance [27, 28]. The motivational significance of challenge depends on whether learners perceive the task demands as within reach while they are trying to sustain communication.

Repeated task experience can change how learners perceive and manage speaking demands, although repetition does not consistently produce stronger engagement [16, 29, 30]. Longitudinal research shows that engagement across repeated speaking tasks can fluctuate with confidence, anxiety, attentional focus, and desire to speak, suggesting that familiarity with a task does not remove variation in learners' responses [16]. Situational willingness to communicate may develop as novice learners gain sustained experience with task-based communication across a sequence of lessons [29]. Learners' perceptions of repetition also depend on how practice is organised: Hanzawa and Suzuki [30] found that learners viewed repeated speaking positively overall, while the spacing of repeated performances affected perceived effectiveness and emotional engagement. The motivational value of repetition appears to depend on how repeated performances are organised and experienced, including whether increased familiarity is accompanied by confidence and perceived manageability [16, 30].

Instructional scaffolding can alter learners' experience of task demands by providing resources for entering and sustaining task performance [31, 32]. Such support may include pre-task planning, topic preparation, modelling, language resources, staged procedures, and opportunities to monitor progress [1, 8, 32]. Importantly, these forms of support should not be assumed to increase engagement automatically. In oral decision-making tasks, Qiu and Bui [31] found that pre-task planning did not significantly increase behavioural, cognitive, or social engagement across face-to-face and synchronous video-mediated conditions, and learners reported mixed affective responses to planning. Other forms of structured support may operate differently: goal-tracking across sequenced interactive tasks has been shown to help learners monitor task performance and engagement in language use, although this evidence comes from an online TBLT context and should be interpreted within that setting [32]. Scaffolding is motivationally relevant through the particular support it gives learners for managing uncertainty and task demands. Its value lies in making a workable route through the task more visible without removing the communicative challenge that gives the activity its purpose.

Affective experience and perceived control further shape whether demanding speaking tasks lead to sustained engagement [33, 34]. Evidence from anxious EFL learners shows that anxiety can coexist with high levels of engagement when speaking tasks offer interesting content, some control over task participation, and a workable balance between challenge and skill [33]. Longitudinal research with Chinese EFL learners similarly links task-specific self-efficacy and enjoyment with the development of oral-task performance over time, highlighting the importance of learners' perceived capability as they

encounter repeated speaking demands [34]. These findings complicate a simple association between difficulty, anxiety, and disengagement. Anxiety or hesitation can coexist with substantial engagement, so visible ease or difficulty during performance should not be treated as a simple index of motivational investment [13, 33]. Challenge becomes more productive when learners experience sufficient control to remain involved while still being stretched by the communicative demands of the task.

Task challenge is interpreted through local curricula and classroom norms [7, 35, 36]. When a speaking task appears unrelated to assessed learning goals, its perceived value and demands may change; Hong Kong secondary-school educators have accordingly called for alignment with examinations and grammar instruction [35]. Such institutional factors may affect agency and interaction as well as scaffolding, without constituting a fourth condition.

5. Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this review suggest that teachers should interpret visible participation cautiously when evaluating learners' responses to task-based speaking [3, 4, 13]. Frequent talk may reflect task requirements, assigned roles, proficiency relationships, or greater access to interaction, while limited speech may coexist with anxiety, preparation, cognitive engagement, or difficulty entering the exchange [2, 13]. Pedagogical attention should therefore focus on the conditions of participation: whether learners understand the communicative purpose, have meaningful opportunities to contribute, receive interactional support, and can manage task demands.

Task design should give learners meaningful influence over what they communicate while keeping that agency manageable [10, 15]. Relevant topics and learner-generated content can strengthen perceived task value and make individual contributions consequential to the task outcome [15, 17]. Because greater openness may also create uncertainty or anxiety [9], teachers can offer bounded choices among topics, perspectives, or possible outcomes while keeping task goals and participation expectations clear.

Peer interaction should be designed to provide equitable access to contribution. Roles, proficiency relationships, and access to task-relevant information can create uneven participation [2, 18, 19], so teachers can allocate complementary roles, distribute task-essential information, and design outcomes that require input from multiple participants. Explicit support for inviting opinions, requesting clarification, responding to partners' ideas, and encouraging continued participation can also strengthen reciprocal interaction [23] and contribute to a more socially supportive classroom environment [20, 21].

Task challenge should be calibrated alongside the support available for managing it [26, 27]. Planning time, topic preparation, modelling, targeted language support, and staged task sequences can make task procedures more transparent and help learners manage communicative demands [1, 8, 32]. Repetition may be useful when it increases familiarity, confidence, and perceived manageability, although repeated performance does not automatically increase engagement [16, 30]. Across all three conditions, successful task design depends on meaningful opportunities to contribute, socially supportive interaction, and a manageable route through task demands. These criteria provide a more informative basis for evaluating task success than the amount of visible talk produced during an activity [4, 13].

6. Limitations and Directions for Research

This focused thematic review draws on settings that differ in educational level, English-use environment, teaching mode, and assessment expectations: Vietnamese and Chinese EFL classrooms, a US university ESL study, Hong Kong secondary schools, and an online Thai university module [2, 17, 20, 32, 35]. The studies also use different measures and methods, ranging from task discourse to participant perceptions. Consequently, the three conditions are an interpretive framework, not context-independent predictions of learning or performance. Their transferability remains to be tested across comparable contexts.

Future research would benefit from greater precision in how motivation-related responses are operationalised and interpreted. Engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate can provide valuable evidence of learners' task experience, but they capture different dimensions and may not align consistently across self-report and discourse-based measures [4, 12, 13]. Longitudinal and process-oriented designs could help clarify how these responses change within and across repeated speaking tasks, particularly as learners develop familiarity, confidence, and task-specific expectations over time [11, 16, 29]. Combining classroom observation with learner reflection or stimulated recall may



also provide stronger evidence for interpreting why visible participation increases, decreases, or remains uneven during task performance.

Future studies could compare similar tasks across EFL school and university settings while recording proficiency groupings, task familiarity, opportunities for English use, and assessment expectations. Such designs could test whether agency, peer interaction, and scaffolding operate similarly across settings [2, 10, 20, 35]. Researchers should distinguish immediate task performance from longer-term learning and triangulate spoken interaction with learners' accounts of their task experience [4, 12, 13]. This would clarify where the proposed conditions transfer and where adaptations are needed.

7. Conclusion

This review has examined how task-based speaking relates to learner motivation in EFL classrooms and why visible participation should be interpreted cautiously. Across the literature, TBLT offers motivational potential by creating opportunities for meaningful communication, learner contribution, and interaction, but learners' responses remain sensitive to how those opportunities are experienced during task performance [1, 4, 7]. Engagement, participation, and willingness to communicate provide useful evidence of learners' task responses, yet none can serve as a direct proxy for motivational strength because observable behaviour is also shaped by interactional roles, affective conditions, task demands, and access to contribution [12, 13].

The synthesis identifies three interconnected conditions that help explain this variation: communicative purpose becomes more meaningful when learners have genuine agency; peer interaction is more supportive when participation is equitable and socially safe; and task challenge is more productive when learners have sufficient scaffolding and perceived control. These conditions shift attention from the quantity of classroom talk to the quality of learners' opportunities to participate. The pedagogical value of TBLT lies in designing speaking tasks that learners can experience as meaningful, socially supportive, and manageable. These conditions provide a more informative basis for evaluating task success and interpreting learner motivation, while visible participation offers only partial evidence.

REFERENCES

[1] Ellis R., "Task-based language learning and teaching", Oxford University Press, 2003.
[2] Dao P., McDonough K., "Effect of proficiency on Vietnamese EFL learners' engagement in peer interaction", International Journal of Educational Research, vol. 88, 2018, pp. 60–72.
[3] Mercer S., Dörnyei Z., "Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms", Cambridge University Press, 2020.
[4] Philp J., Duchesne S., "Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom", Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, vol. 36, 2016, pp. 50–72.
[5] Dörnyei Z., Ushioda E., "Teaching and researching motivation", 2nd ed., Pearson, 2011.
[6] Long M. H., "Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching", Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.
[7] East M., "Foundational principles of task-based language teaching", Routledge, 2021.
[8] Willis D., Willis J., "Doing task-based teaching", Oxford University Press, 2007.
[9] Nakamura S., Phung L., Reinders H., "The effect of learner choice on L2 task engagement", Studies in Second Language Acquisition, vol. 43, no. 2, 2021, pp. 428–441.
[10] Vo H., "Giving choices or making tasks relevant? Classroom practices that foster L2 learner engagement", System, vol. 116, 2023, Article 103098.
[11] Li S., Xu M., Wang H., "Understanding EFL learners' willingness to communicate dynamics during a group communicative task: An idiodynamic perspective", Acta Psychologica, vol. 251, 2024, Article 104621.
[12] Hiver P., Al-Hoorie A. H., Vitta J. P., Wu J., "Engagement in language learning: A systematic review of 20 years of research methods and definitions", Language Teaching Research, vol. 28, no. 1, 2024, pp. 201–230.
[13] Hiver P., Dao P., "From task motivation to L2 learning: Understanding links through learners' task engagement", TESOL Quarterly, vol. 59, suppl. 2, 2025, pp. S24–S59.
[14] Guo Y., Xu J., Xu X., "An investigation into EFL learners' motivational dynamics during a group communicative task: A classroom-based case study", System, vol. 89, 2020, Article 102214.
[15] Lambert C., Philp J., Nakamura S., "Learner-generated content and engagement in second language task performance", Language Teaching Research, vol. 21, no. 6, 2017, pp. 665–680.

[16] Aubrey S., King J., Almukhaild H., "Language learner engagement during speaking tasks: A longitudinal study", RELC Journal, vol. 53, no. 3, 2022, pp. 519–533.
[17] Phung L., "Task preference, affective response, and engagement in L2 use in a US university context", Language Teaching Research, vol. 21, no. 6, 2017, pp. 751–766.
[18] Storch N., "Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work", Language Learning, vol. 52, no. 1, 2002, pp. 119–158.
[19] Dao P., McDonough K., "The effect of task role on Vietnamese EFL learners' collaboration in mixed proficiency dyads", System, vol. 65, 2017, pp. 15–24.
[20] Peng J.-E., "Towards an ecological understanding of willingness to communicate in EFL classrooms in China", System, vol. 40, no. 2, 2012, pp. 203–213.
[21] Wang H., Peng A., Patterson M. M., "The roles of class social climate, language mindset, and emotions in predicting willingness to communicate in a foreign language", System, vol. 99, 2021, Article 102529.
[22] Li C., Dewaele J.-M., Pawlak M., Kruk M., "Classroom environment and willingness to communicate in English: The mediating role of emotions experienced by university students in China", Language Teaching Research, vol. 29, no. 5, 2025, pp. 2140–2160.
[23] Dao P., "Effect of interaction strategy instruction on learner engagement in peer interaction", System, vol. 91, 2020, Article 102244.
[24] Garcia-Ponce E. E., Tavakoli P., "Effects of task type and language proficiency on dialogic performance and task engagement", System, vol. 105, 2022, Article 102734.
[25] Aubrey S., Philpott A., "Second language task engagement in face-to-face and synchronous video-based computer-mediated communication modes: Performances and perceptions", System, vol. 115, 2023, Article 103069.
[26] Robinson P., "Task-based language learning: A review of issues", Language Learning, vol. 61, suppl. 1, 2011, pp. 1–36.
[27] Zhang W., Zhang L. J., "Understanding assessment tasks: Learners' and teachers' perceptions of cognitive load of integrated speaking tasks for TBLT implementation", System, vol. 111, 2022, Article 102951.
[28] Mora J. C., Mora-Plaza I., Bermejo Miranda G., "Speaking anxiety and task complexity effects on second language speech", International Journal of Applied Linguistics, vol. 34, no. 1, 2024, pp. 292–315.
[29] Toyoda J., Yashima T., Aubrey S., "Enhancing situational willingness to communicate in novice EFL learners through task-based learning", JALT Journal, vol. 43, no. 2, 2021, pp. 185–214.
[30] Hanzawa K., Suzuki Y., "How do learners perceive task repetition? Distributed practice effects on engagement and metacognitive judgment", The Modern Language Journal, vol. 107, no. 2, 2023, pp. 451–478.
[31] Qiu X., Bui G., "Pre-task planning effects on learner engagement in face-to-face and synchronous computer-mediated communication", Language Teaching Research, vol. 29, no. 7, 2025, pp. 3170–3189.
[32] Soongpankhao W., Aubrey S., Lambert C., "Impact of goal-tracking on engagement in language use in an online TBLT module for Thai university students", System, vol. 119, 2023, Article 103184.
[33] Almukhaild H., King J., "Scaling the apex of engagement: Anxious language learners' positive flow experiences during speaking tasks", System, vol. 124, 2024, Article 103373.
[34] Chang P., Zhou L., Zhang L. J., "The roles of task-specific self-efficacy and enjoyment in EFL learners' development of speaking CALF: A longitudinal study", System, vol. 127, 2024, Article 103539.
[35] Carless D., "The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong", System, vol. 35, no. 4, 2007, pp. 595–608.
[36] East M., "Research into practice: The task-based approach to instructed second language acquisition", Language Teaching, vol. 50, no. 3, 2017, pp. 412–424.