



The Impact of Teaching Through ENGAGE Model on L2 Speaking of Iranian EFL Learners

Research Article
pp. 205-225

Mehrnoosh Abdollahzadeh¹
Hamed Barjesteh*²
Reza Biria³

Received: 2020/10/12 Accepted: 2021/01/06

Abstract

ENGAGE model, as a unique brilliance learning system, has been proposed to help language teachers to revolutionize language learners' experiences by transcending the limitations of conventional methodologies and addressing the whole being of the learners. The present study sought to investigate the impact of using ENGAGE model on the speaking skills of Iranian EFL learners. For this purpose, from the target population of students learning English in one of the language institutes in Iran, 100 female intermediate students with an age range of 18 to 25 were randomly selected out of 150 participants and assigned to three groups, receiving their instruction based on the principles of Audio Lingual Method (ALM), (n = 32), Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) (n = 33), and ENGAGE model (n = 35). Applying a tripartite cycle comprising pretesting, intervention, and post-testing, the obtained data were analyzed via SPSS. The outcome of the posttest data analysis revealed that the participants taught by ENGAGE model significantly outperformed those in other samples on target L2 speaking tasks. Subsequently, the participants in the three groups were interviewed to see how they perceived the inherent merits of the ENGAGE model in real practice. The qualitative data drawn from the interviews with the students were analyzed through content analysis relying on open and axial coding forms and the results reflected that the ENGAGE model was the most pedagogically efficient method compared to TBLT and ALM. Notably, the findings could have interesting implications for ELT practitioners, program developers, and EFL teachers.

Keywords: ALM, brilliance leaning system, EFL learners, ENGAGE model, speaking skill, TBLT

* Corresponding Author

¹ PhD Candidate, Department of English Language and Literature, Ayatollah Amoli Branch, Islamic Azad University, Amol, Iran. mehrnoosh_abdolahzadeh@yahoo.com

² Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Ayatollah Amoli Branch, Islamic Azad University, Amol, Iran. ha_bar77@yahoo.com

³ Assistant Professor, English Language Department, Khorasgan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran. biria_reza@yahoo.com

Introduction

Second language speaking is a priority for many L2 or foreign-language learners. The reason lies in the fact that speaking, as a significant component of the target language, is the prime means of communication (Hughes, 2013). That is why speaking is emphasized among the L2 language learners (Kim & Craig, 2012). In teaching L2 speaking, EFL teachers and course books rely on various approaches, ranging from traditional to modern ones (Eslami et al., 2015; Kim, 2014). Likewise, some other studies (Baker, 2015; Kim & Craig, 2012; Kozulin, 2002) have rarely looked beyond reading and writing skills. Moreover, EFL learners are typically perceived as reticent in class (Sadeghi & Maleki, 2015). A lot of researches (Borich, 2016; Darling-Hammond, 2016; Muijs & Reynolds, 2017; Nilson, 2016; Rivers, 2018) have been done by educational stakeholders to help students gain the required skills. However, teachers cannot completely rely on some methodologies, or more specifically talking, as Kumaravadivelu (2003) acknowledges, “there is no best method there ready and waiting to be discovered” (p. 12). He goes further to believe that it is futile to look for one best method. Accordingly, in the pursuit of the research, the researcher is determined to keep as far away from the old established and prescribed methodologies as he resorts to more interactionist theories such as the one proposed by Long (1985).

A plethora of L2 research (Ghanizadeh et al., 2018; Sundqvist & Sylvén, 2016; Yang et al., 2013) support the importance of listening-speaking and how comprehensible input facilitates L2 development in the classroom context. Yang et al. (2013) argue that developing proficiency in listening is the key to achieve proficiency in speaking.

Two of the highlighted methods in ELT which claimed the development of L2 speaking and meaning negotiation under their guidelines were Audio-lingual Method (ALM) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT).

In the present study, ALM was operationally defined as the teacher-centered method in which all four skills were sequentially focused on in the classroom and fluency as well as accuracy of the learners' production was of paramount significance. TBLT was also operationalized through the method employed to teach EFL speaking and writing with tasks at its center, the way theoretical perspectives of this approach have been presented in the literature as well as the way Ellis (2003, 2009) proposed it.

Irrespective of the success of both of the aforementioned methods in the Iranian EFL context in the past, lack of a well-sequenced, centralized, and strong educational method in teaching L2 in general, and in the Iranian context, in particular, has created a lot of problems for the L2 teaching (Akbari, 2015; Nair et al., 2017).

To fill this educational gap, Halsey (2011) presented her naturalistic-oriented educational proposal, namely the Energizing, Navigating, Generating, Applying, Gauging, and Extending (ENGAGE) Model, in her book titled *Brilliance by Design* which paved the way for the emergence of educational program changes in America, especially in California where Halsey and Halsey (2017) and Halsey et al. (2018) used the model to develop an educational program stressing the environmental issues in California. Though old traditional and modern methods of language teaching have found their ways to the Iranian

educational system (Safari & Rashidi, 2015), to the knowledge of the present researchers, ENGAGE model has not been practiced as a framework in the English Language Teaching (ELT) domain in the Iranian context yet. Considering the ever-growing demand of Iranian EFL learners for fluent and effective speaking, this study was an attempt to investigate the comparative effects of ALM, TBLT, and ENGAGE model in improving the speaking skill of Iranian EFL Learners.

Literature Review

The present section deals with the notions of TBLT, ALM, and ENGAGE model in terms of their teaching L2 speaking methodology.

TBLT

Task-Based Language Teaching was in fact initiated by Prabhu (1987) beginning in 1979 (Ellis, 2009). TBLT is an extension of the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in which the syllabus is specified in terms of functions and notions. As Ellis (2019) discusses, through pre-task planning and within-task planning, the advocates of CLT and TBLT focus on real language use in various language skills, especially speaking. Natural learning within the classroom context is one the gifts of TBLT to the learners. There may be cultural barriers to the uptake of TBLT in some parts of the world where people are highly self-culture oriented. Another problem within the scope of TBLT backs to the misunderstanding of the concept of focus on form: Some individuals might think it only pertains to grammar, while it is largely relying on vocabulary as well as pronunciation.

ALM

Combining behavioristic psychology principles and American structural linguistics accompanied with Contrastive Analysis (CA) developments, during and after the World War II, paved the way for the emergence of Oral Approach, the Aural-Oral Approach, and the Structural Approach which later on resulted in the development of ALM (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). This method emphasized grammatical accuracy in speaking (Richards, 2008). Though ALM is considered the first scientific approach in the ELT (Juffs, 2020), it had its own shortcomings such as the weak learning theory (Chomsky, 1966) and high amount of meaningless repetition the ALM used in its instructions (Rivers, 2018).

The ENGAGE Model

Halsey (2011) proposed the concept of *Brilliance by Design* which was manifested in the ENGAGE model of education. Likewise, Halsey (2016) proposed the idea that individuals' brain can be energized and their mindfulness, which emphasizes paying deliberate attention to the present moment through observation of thoughts and emotions without judging, can be increased. She asserted that traditional approaches to teaching cannot engage the learner's mind. To engage the mind, Halsey and Halsey (2017) recommend active learning strategies. One such strategy is the ENGAGE Model by Halsey (2011) which "takes a six step approach to teaching content by using active

learning techniques combined with utilizing meaningful interpretation” (Halsey & Halsey, 2017, p. 8). Kim et al. (2017) used the ENGAGE Model in the domain of nursing practices. In this regard, they found “improvement in EBP beliefs had direct effects on improvements in job satisfaction of the participants” (p. 90). Likewise, Glance et al. (2018) have developed a model, known as learn, expand, and engage (LEE), which has been inspired by Halsey’s (2011) ENGAGE Model. They indicate that “the LEE model provides a framework for higher education instruction that directly responds to a recently identified need for competency-based student learning pedagogy in the helping professions” (p. 104).

Highlighting the environmental issues connected with Chaparral ecosystems and specific and iconic vegetation of California, Rundel (2018) developed an educational program for the operationalization of ecosystem knowledge of the students for turning the tide on urbanization, land-use change and protection of endangered species (p. 1). Underwood et al. (2018) also propose that the ENGAGE Model can be used for curriculum development in the educational settings aiming at paving the ground for more awareness toward the environment, wild life, global issues, and consequently, more responsible life-long learning.

A plethora of research has been conducted on EFL speaking classrooms at the international level (Albino, 2017; Aljumah, 2011; Guchte et al., 2015; Housen & Kuiken, 2009; Jassem, 1997; Kunnu & Sukwises, 2014; Lee, 2009; Nakatani, 2010). Almost all these studies have concluded that EFL students need to be able to overcome the speaking breakdowns resulting from the lack of speaking activities in EFL classes (Ghaemi & Hassannejad, 2015). A key aspect of dealing with such a difficulty is knowing communication strategies. Therefore, there should be a crucial concern in our English classes for communication strategy instruction with a systematic method. The ENGAGE Model (Halsey, 2011), which takes a relatively new approach to teaching content, could be employed in teaching speaking.

Due to the fact that, today in Iranian education system especially in English language institutes, ALM and TBLT are totally common, in this research, these two methods were compared with ENGAGE model. Considering the problems stated above and the purpose of the present study, the following research questions were formulated.

1. Do ALM, TBLT, and ENGAGE model have statistically significant different effects on the English language speaking development of Iranian EFL learners?
2. What are students’ attitudes toward incorporating ENGAGE model, TBLT, and ALM in the speaking classroom?

Method

Participants

The participants of the study were 100 female intermediate level learners (N = 100) with the age range of 18 to 25 in one of the language institutes in Damghan (Mofid Language School). These participants were randomly selected out of 150 intermediate students (N = 150) attending English conversation classes. Also, their performance in a standard QPT was taken into consideration for the purpose of homogeneity. The selected students

were divided into three groups; (ENGAGE model, n = 35), (ALM group, n = 32), (TBLT group, n = 33).

Instrumentation

Quick Placement Tests. In order to check the homogeneity of the participants, a standard Oxford Quick Placement Tests (QPT) was used. The test was reported to have had a high reliability ($\alpha = .91$) based on Cronbach's alpha (Berthold, 2011, p. 674). In the present study, the results indicated that QPT had a reliability index of KR-21 = .72.

IELTS Pretest of Speaking. The second instrument used in this study was a standard pretest of speaking selected out of the standard IELTS series. This was done to tap the learners' L2 speaking knowledge more appropriately based on a standard measure. An "inter-rater reliability index reported for the speaking test of IELTS was [$r(3000) = .87, P < .01$]" (O'Sullivan, 2018, p. 1). This index, as O'Sullivan mentions, belongs to March, 2018 from over 140 countries worldwide.

IELTS Posttest of Speaking. The speaking posttest was a new speaking IELTS test selected out of the standard IELTS series. "The inter-rater reliability index reported for this speaking test of IELTS was [$r(2000) = .82, P < .05$]" (Fernandez, 2018, p. 8). To score the participants' performance, both in the pretest and posttest phases, the IELTS Speaking band descriptors (public version), which covered the speaking sub skills, were used.

Semi-Structured Interview. The selected students (1/3 of the study participants in each group) took part in a semi-structured interview which took 15-30 minutes after the intervention process. The interview guide was used to collect the qualitative data. In this regard, ten learners from each group were interviewed prior to the intervention process to find their views concerning the previous instructional types they had experienced. Then, following the intervention, the same students were asked to take part in an interview for their attitudes towards the method which was employed in each of the conversation classes. The data were analyzed and categorized through *open coding* (general related views) and *axial coding* (specific issues).

The interviewees were singled out from the participants in the quantitative phase through convenience sampling provided they gave their consent for further cooperation. The interview guide's content and construct validity were confirmed through expert judgment validity criteria (Creswell & Clark, 2017). To ensure the reliability of the interview, the researchers relied on the intra-rater reliability in which one of the researchers (the interviewer) gave similar ratings when observing the same performance (Dörnyei, 2007). For the present study, the researchers' consistency in the process of eliciting the information was then accounted as the representative of reliability of the interview. As the interviews were done by one of the researchers, she tried to be consistent in rating and weighting the learners' views concerning the interview items in the post-phase.

In semi-structured interviews, "the researcher uses a written list of questions as a guide, while still having the freedom to digress and probe for more information" (Mackey & Gass, 2016, p. 173). The framework for carrying out the interview was based on Dörnyei's (2007) guideline.

Procedure

First, the standard QPT was administered to 150 intermediate students. Based on the scale presented for scoring QPT, 100 learners whose scores fell between 24 and 47 were selected as the main participants of the study. The selected participants were randomly assigned to three groups (the ENGAGE group as the experimental group, and TBLT as well as ALM as the other groups) with 33 to 34 students in each. Hence, one group received instruction through ALM, another one through TBLT, and the third group received ENGAGE model instruction.

In the second phase, the participants took part in a pretest of speaking to assure their homogeneity. It is worth mentioning that an inter-rater reliability index was employed to tap the learners' performance in the speaking test. Likewise, 10 learners from each group were interviewed prior to the intervention process to find their views concerning the previous instructional types they had experienced.

Following the processes of subject selection and getting ensured of the participants' speaking homogeneity, the researchers launched the intervention phase which lasted 10 sessions. The whole semester included 8 weeks and the learners attended the class three days a week each session lasting for 90 minutes in all groups. It is worth mentioning that the classes of three groups (ALM, ENGAGE, and TBLT) received the same hours of instruction and practiced with the same teacher in all groups.

In the Audio-Lingual Method Group (ALMG), the researcher provided the instruction advocating the principles of ALM which emphasized the use of grammatical sentence patterns. The procedure was as follows: (1) the language teacher gave a brief summary of the content of the dialogue, (2) the language learners listened attentively while the teacher read or recited the dialogue at normal speed several times, and (3) the language learners recited the dialogue line by line or together depending on their length. If the teacher detected an error, it was corrected and the student was asked to repeat the sentence, (4) repetition was continued with groups decreasing in size, (5) pairs of individual acted out of the dialogue. By this time, they had been supposed to memorize a text.

The TBLT group in the present study was exposed to real-world language. An example goes as follows: The teacher used pictures to elicit learners' speech and such pictures might have also focused on learners' real-world language and real life issues. Therefore, for the present study, the use of pictures to elicit learners' speeches was one of the appropriate methods. The students looked at the pictures and spoke about them. They were asked to connect them to their real life situations or bring their own family pictures to the classroom and talk about them. They used photos published in a recent newspaper about a specific novel event, like an accident or a festival, and talked about that. The teacher did not interrupt them while they were speaking. Nor did she fine-tune their production. This resulted in a less stressful situation for the learners.

In the experimental group (the ENGAGE Model group), the teacher used the principles of the ENGAGE model (Halsey, 2011). This model employs active learning strategies through naturalist education programs to engage the mind (Halsey, 2016). Hence, the six-step general perspectives

proposed by Halsey (2011, 2016) were taken into consideration in a language classroom at the intermediate level, as described below:

Step 1: Energizing students at the beginning of any classroom session through making them involved in the warm-ups, ice-breaking discussions, talking about daily life issues, and motivating them through using gestures and postures.

Step 2: Asking the students to navigate what they had gained in the energizing session and develop the new content. This way the content of what was being taught was developed by the learners and the teacher monitored them to talk about their own interests and concerns.

Step 3: Helping students generate personal meaning and connect what they had gained to their own life and what they felt given the new concepts they had learned and the topic(s) discussed in the classroom. This was done through asking the students to present oral reports to the classroom about the current events, their life and their feelings about recent events in the immediate social context and the like.

Step 4: Helping students apply their learning to the real world. This was done via asking the students study about the topic selected in the classroom, use the internet, get involved in the social media, collect information about a specific issue, and then present their own perspectives in the classroom. In the next step, students focused on what they could do to bring about a positive change in the social context and their own life.

Step 5: Making learners gauge and celebrate their progress. This was possible though employing self-assessment (SA) in the classroom context.

Step 6: Helping students extend their learning to action. This became possible through asking the students to use what they had learned in speaking about different issues, lecturing about various topics, taking part in debates and discussions in English, and if possible using what they had learned in the social media to find international friends, watching films, and solving the daily life issues and enjoying living through the English language world.

After the intervention, the three experimental groups received a speaking posttest. This was a new version of IELTS speaking test with the hope of measuring the participants' probable development in speaking skill. An inter-rater scoring system was used to score the learners' performance in the speaking test, and then the inter-rater reliability of the scores was taken into consideration. In the qualitative phase, which followed the quantitative one, the learner's attitudes towards the method employed in each of the conversation classes were elicited. The results of the quantitative study gave additional insights into the issue (Creswell & Clark, 2017). The collected quantitative data were fed into SPSS version 25 and the results were reported. Also, the qualitative data which came from the results of the posteriori interviews with the learners were analyzed through content analysis (Creswell & Clark, 2017) and relying on open coding, axial coding, and selective coding system. Then, the results of the posteriori interviews were compared to the priori interviews in each group. In addition, the posteriori interview results of the three groups were compared together and reported and the final findings were discussed against the similar previous findings in the literature and the results were presented.

Results

The first research question aimed to probe the efficacy of three models (i.e., ALM, TBLT, and ENGAGE) on the English language speaking development of Iranian EFL learners. To answer this research question, one-way analysis of variances (i.e., one-way ANOVA) was run. Table 1 displays the results of the Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. The non-significant results of the test ($F(2, 97) = .178, p = .837$) indicated that the three groups enjoyed homogenous variances on pretest of speaking.

Table 1

Test of Homogeneity of Variances; Pretest of Speaking by Groups

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	df2
Pretest	Mean	.371	2	97	.691
	Median	.178	2	97	.837
	Median with adjusted df	.178	2	96.549	.837
	trimmed mean	.365	2	97	.965

Table 2 displays the descriptive statistics for the TBLT, ENGAGE, and ALM groups on pretest of speaking. The results indicated that TBLT ($M = 25.03, SD = 4.30$), ENGAGE ($M = 25.43, SD = 4.64$) and ALM ($M = 23.88, SD = 4.51$) groups had close means on pretest of speaking.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics; Pretest of Speaking by Groups

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error			Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
TBLT	33	25.03	4.326	.753	23.50	26.56	16	32
ENGAGE	35	25.43	4.648	.786	23.83	27.03	16	32
ALM	32	23.88	4.513	.798	22.25	25.50	16	32
Total	100	24.80	4.504	.450	23.91	25.69	16	32

A one-way ANOVA was run to compare the three groups' means on the posttest of speaking in order to probe the first research question. Table 3 displays the results of the Levene's test of homogeneity of variances. The non-significant results of the test ($F(2, 97) = .820, p = .433$) indicated that the three groups enjoyed homogenous variances on the posttest of speaking.

Table 3

Test of Homogeneity of Variances; Posttest of Speaking by Groups

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Posttest	Mean	1.024	2	97	.363
	Median	.820	2	97	.443
	Median with adjusted df	.820	2	96.431	.443
	trimmed mean	.954	2	97	.389

Table 4 displays the descriptive statistics for the TBLT, ENGAGE, and ALM groups on the speaking posttest. The results indicate that ENGAGE group ($M = 45.57$, $SD = 4.77$) has the highest mean on the posttest of speaking. This is followed by the TBLT ($M = 30.27$, $SD = 4.17$) and ALM ($M = 25.06$, $SD = 4.54$) groups.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics; Posttest of Speaking by Groups

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error	Lower Bound		Upper Bound	Min	Max
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
TBLT	33	30.27	4.178	.727	28.79	31.75		22	38
ENGAGE	35	45.57	4.779	.808	43.93	47.21		36	52
ALM	32	25.06	4.543	.803	23.42	26.70		18	34
Total	100	33.96	9.886	.989	32.00	35.92		18	52

Table 5 displays the results of the one-way ANOVA. Based on these results ($F(2, 97) = 189.11$, $p = .000$, Partial eta squared = .796 representing a large effect size), it can be said that there are significant differences between the three groups' means on the speaking posttest. Thus, it can be concluded that the first null-hypothesis is rejected.

Table 5
One-Way ANOVA; Posttest of Speaking by Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7700.848	2	3850.424	189.110	.000
Within Groups	1974.992	97	20.361		
Total	9675.840	99			

The significant results of the one-way ANOVA are followed by the post-hoc Scheffe's tests in order to compare the groups two by two (see Table 6).

Table 6
Post-Hoc Scheffe's Tests; Posttest of Speaking by Groups

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean		Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Difference (I-J)	Std. Error			
TBLT	ALM	5.210*	1.119	.000	2.43	7.99
ENGAGE	TBLT	15.299*	1.095	.000	12.58	18.02
	ALM	20.509*	1.104	.000	17.77	23.25

Based on the results displayed in Table 6 above, it can be concluded that;

1. The ENGAGE group ($M = 45.57$) has significantly outperformed the TBLT group ($M = 30.27$) on the posttest of speaking (Mean Difference = 15.29, $p = .000$).

2. The ENGAGE group ($M = 45.57$) significantly outperformed the ALM group ($M = 25.06$) on the posttest of speaking (Mean Difference = 20.50, $p = .000$).

3. The TBLT group ($M = 30.27$) significantly outperformed the ALM group ($M = 25.06$) on the posttest of speaking (Mean Difference = 5.21, $p = .000$).

The second research question examined the students' attitudes toward incorporating ENGAGE model, TBLT, and ALM in the speaking classroom. To answer this question, a semi-structured interview was conducted. More precisely, ten learners from each group were randomly interviewed to present their attitudes towards the method which had been employed in each of the conversation classes. All the data were categorized through open coding (i.e., general related views) and axial coding (i.e., specific issues). The interview comprised 10 items asking about a number of issues such as students' perception towards the method employed in the class, the feedback provided by the teacher, classroom learning in daily life, evaluating speaking in terms of fluency, coherence, lexical resource, accuracy, and pronunciation in speaking English. What follows illustrates the detail description of the items ($n = 6$) for the interview questions. All the qualitative data have been reported in terms of frequency and percentage with the hope of accounting for the learners' perceptions toward incorporating ENGAGE model, TBLT, and ALM in the speaking classroom.

The first item deals with the way learners feel about the method their teacher used in the classroom this term. Ten EFL learners from each group presented their ideas concerning the method they had received in their respective classrooms as categorized in Table 7 below. As the table shows, all the interviewees (100%) have asserted that they had enjoyed a friendly atmosphere in the class, while 80 percent of the TBLT group have had the same idea, while for the ALM group, the rate is just 40 percent. In terms of motivation, all the ENGAGE group participants (100%) have mentioned that the level of motivation was high in the classroom, while it was lower for the TBLT (70 %) and ALM (50%) groups. Similar results were obtained concerning the students' talking about their life experiences in the classroom, being involved in the classroom activities, and taking part in the classroom discussions. Likewise, it was found that think-aloud protocols and brainstorming techniques were mainly used in the ENGAGE model class. Finally, students could improve their English as well as their understanding of the world around in the ENGAGE model classroom more than the other methods.

Table 7

Participants' Viewpoints About ENGAGE Model, TBLT, and ALM in the EFL Classroom

No.	Viewpoint	Frequency			Percentage		
		ENG.	TBLT	ALM	ENG.	TBLT	ALM
1	The class enjoyed a friendly atmosphere.	10	8	4	100%	80%	40%
2	The amount of motivation was high in the classroom.	10	7	5	100%	70%	50%
3	Students talked about their life experiences.	10	8	5	100%	80%	50%
4	Almost all the students were involved in the classroom activities.	10	8	5	100%	80%	50%

5	Students had to read a lot outside the classroom to play a significant role in the classroom discussions.	10	10	6	100%	100%	60%
6	The think aloud protocols and brainstorming techniques we used in the class.	10	4	2	100%	40%	20%
7	Students could improve their English as well as their understanding of the world around.	10	7	3	100%	70%	30%
8	The class was boring.	0	3	8	0.00%	30%	80%

The second item asked the extent to which students learned to improve their speaking from the feedback provided by the teacher. The most frequently mentioned viewpoints by the students in the three groups concerning their L2 speaking development under the effect of the feedback provided by their teachers in the intervention period are categorized in Table 8 below. Based on the results categorized, in almost all the four factors signified by the students, ENGAGE model gains priority over TBLT and ALM. Also, TBLT is superior to ALM. This means that the feedback provided by teacher has helped L2 learners to improve their speaking ability in the ENGAGE model in the first place, while its effectiveness in TBLT has been good enough but falls in the second place, and ALM comes third.

Table 8

Students' Viewpoints About Their Teacher's Feedback on L2 Speaking

	Very Confident	Confident	Not Confident
1. Feeling about speaking in English	ENGAGE (70 %)	ENGAGE (30 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
	TBLT (60%)	TBLT (30%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (20 %)	ALM (30 %)	ALM (50 %)
2. The amount of effort one makes on speaking assignment	Significant Effort	Appropriate Effort	Inadequate Effort
	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)
	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (20%)
3. Understanding the feedback on assignments	ALM (0.30 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (50 %)
	Mostly Understand	Somewhat Understand	Inadequately Understand
	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (20 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
	TBLT (80%)	TBLT (20%)	TBLT (0.00%)
	ALM (0.20 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (60 %)

	Mostly Understand	Somewhat Understand	Inadequately Understand
4. Understanding the teacher's comments	ENGAGE (90 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
	TBLT (80%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (60 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (20 %)
	Yes	Maybe	No
5. Ability to correct mistakes	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (20 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (20%)
	ALM (20 %)	ALM (30 %)	ALM (50 %)

The next item probed if learners and teacher negotiate on decisions to be made about assignments and activities. The most frequently mentioned viewpoints by the students of the three groups concerning their feelings about decisions to be made about assignments and activities through teacher-student negotiations were categorized in Table 9 below.

Table 9

Students' Viewpoints About their Teacher-Student Negotiations on Decision Making

	Much to Very Much	Moderately	Little to A little
1. Taking the responsibility of learning	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (20 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (20%)
	ALM (30 %)	ALM (10 %)	ALM (60 %)
2. Feeling autonomous in learning and promotion of the power of learning	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)
	TBLT (60%)	TBLT (30%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (10 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (70 %)
3. Accurate mastery of language forms	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)
	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (20%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (10 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (70 %)
4. Application of learned material to new contexts	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)
	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (20%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (10 %)	ALM (10 %)	ALM (80 %)
5. Understanding of language rules	ENGAGE (80 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)	ENGAGE (10 %)
	TBLT (80%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (10%)
	ALM (20 %)	ALM (20 %)	ALM (60 %)

	ENGAGE (90 %)	ENGAGE (20 %)	ENGAGE (0.00 %)
6.Facilitating the learning process	TBLT (70%)	TBLT (10%)	TBLT (20%)
	ALM (20 %)	ALM (10 %)	ALM (70 %)

In terms of taking the responsibility of learning, which is one of the most significant factors in the negotiated syllabus focused on in the ENGAGE model, the majority of the learners (80 %) indicated that they could take the responsibility of their learning. Similarly, the majority of the learners in the TBLT group (70 %) expressed the same idea, while in the ALM group, 60% mentioned that they did not take the responsibility of their learning. Likewise, the majority of the ALM group students (70%) did not feel they could be autonomous in learning and promote their power of learning. Concerning the accurate mastery of language forms, the vast majority of the ENGAGE group learners (80 %) and TBLT group (70%) thought that teacher-student negotiations on decision-making had helped them gain proper mastery of language forms, while only a minority of ALM individuals taking part in the study (10 %) supported this idea. In addition, the majority of ENGAGE (80 %) and TBLT (70 %) learners thought that teacher-student negotiations on decision-making had helped them apply the learned material to new contexts, while only a small number of ALM individuals taking part in the study (10 %) supported this idea.

In terms of understanding of language rules, only a small number of ALM learners (20 %) thought that teacher-student negotiations on decision-making had helped them understand language rules well, while most of the ENGAGE and TBLT individuals taking part in the study (80 %) supported this idea. Likewise, only a low number of ALM learners (20 %) thought that teacher-student negotiations on decision-making had facilitated the learning process for them, while a vast majority of the ENGAGE (90 %) and TBLT (70%) individuals taking part in the study supported this idea.

The next question asked if students thought they could employ their classroom learning in their daily life. Almost all of the learners from the three groups who were interviewed presented similar ideas in this regard. The notions presented by the learners in the three groups were: using classroom learning for academic purposes, reading literary books, watching films, listening to music, and overseas and business trips as well as communication. In addition, some of the students had mentioned that they could use their classroom learning for emailing and using the Internet. Table 10 below summarizes the ideas expressed at the posttest level by the 10 students randomly selected from each group from among the study participants.

Table 10*Students' Views About Using Classroom Learning in Daily Life*

No.	Views	Frequency (f)			Percentage		
		ENG.	TBLT	ALM	ENG.	TBLT	ALM
1	Academic Purposes	10	10	10	100%	100%	100%
2	Read Books (Literature)	10	10	10	100%	100%	100%
3	Watch Films /Listen to Music,	10	10	8	100%	100%	80%
4	Overseas Trips/Communication	10	10	10	100%	100%	100%
5	Emailing/Internet	10	10	10	100%	100%	100%
6	Business	8	8	7	80%	80%	70%

The next item examined if the students could assess their own speaking in terms of fluency, grammar, and pronunciation in speaking English. The most frequently mentioned viewpoints by the students concerning their ability to assess their speaking ability and its components are categorized in Table 11 below. As the table displays, the participants' preferences of types of errors to be focused on are important to all the groups. The results showed that:

- A. All groups preferred pronunciation errors to be focused on as much as possible (100%)
- B. The ENGAGE model group (100%) preferred lexical resource errors to be focused on more than the TBLT (80%) and the ALM (70%) groups.
- C. Grammatical errors were preferred by the ALM model group (90%) more than the other two groups.
- D. Errors related to fluency and coherence were said to be focused on by the ENGAGE model (80%) and TBLT (80%) more than the ALM group (50 %).

Table 11*Types of Errors Focused on in Assessing L2 Speaking (by Groups)*

		Methods			
		ENGAGE	TBLT	ALM	
Errors to be focused on in assessing L2 speaking in the Self-assessment process	Pronunciation	N	10	10	10
		%	100%	100%	100%
	Lexical Resource	N	10	8	7
		%	100%	80%	70%
	Grammatical Accuracy	N	7	8	9
		%	70%	80%	90%
Fluency and Coherence	N	8	8	5	
	%	80%	80%	50%	

Finally, the last item probed if there is anything learners would like to say about the method their teacher used in the classroom in the semester just finished. The students of the three groups who were interviewed mentioned some significant points concerning the positive points of the methods and techniques they had experienced in their respective instructional types in the current study. They are presented in Table 12 below.

Table 12*Students' Views About Positive / Negative Points of the Methods Just Received*

No.	Views	Frequency (f)			Percentage		
		ENG.	TBLT	ALM	ENG.	TBLT	ALM
1	The class was very friendly	10	8	6	100%	80%	60%
2	Motivating students to go on	10	7	5	100%	70%	50%
3	Using films, clips, and teaching aids	10	7	4	100%	70%	40%
4	Emphasizing L2 speaking	10	8	7	100%	80%	70%
5	Making students work hard	10	8	7	100%	80%	70%

The learners in the ENGAGE model group mentioned that they liked the classroom and found it absolutely friendly compared to the previous classes and methods. Also, they emphasized that the knowledge and information they could receive throughout the semester was more than what they had received in the previous semesters. In addition, they felt highly motivated in the classroom and could connect the classroom learning to their extracurricular activities and studies. However, the weak students in the ENGAGE model, TBLT, and ALM had reported to have gotten tired as the assignments were beyond their ability and they had not been able to cope with all of them.

Discussion

The present study found that, compared to TBLT and ALM methods, the ENGAGE model had a more statistically significant effect on the English language speaking development of Iranian EFL learners. Likewise, the interview results showed that the learners in the ENGAGE model group liked the classroom and found it absolutely friendly compared to the previous classes and methods. As this is the first time the ENGAGE model has been used in the domain of L2 classroom, no previous studies exist in this regard. However, the implications of ENGAGE model in other disciplines and the window it has opened to the new scientific horizons can be discussed here and now. Then, the six steps of ENGAGE will be taken into consideration and the findings of the study will be discussed with regard to the notions and concepts ensued from those steps. The first point worth mentioning is that the priority of ENGAGE based L2 speaking model over the TBLT which is one of the most successful method in the ELT domain (Ellis et al., 2019) is stunning and attractive. This indicates that, irrespective of its novelty and lack of a theoretical linguistic background in this teaching approach, ENGAGE model has been successful.

Having been inspired by Halsey's (2011) ENGAGE model, Kilbourne (2011) developed his own model for improving safety training which relied on the three notions of connect, inspire, and ENGAGE. In fact, implicitly, he refers to the significance of metacognitive strategies (Novak, 1990; Oxford, 1989). In this regard, the present study's findings could find support in the learning psychology operationalized in the preplanning of activities before training the learners.

Halsey et al. (2018) suggest that the ENGAGE model can stimulate active learning and increase retention (Kilbourne, 2011). Since neuroscience and cognition are interwoven, therefore, it can be assumed that L2 speaking

development of the participants has been affected by their cognition and metacognitive strategies operationalized in the ENGAGE model.

In terms of educational significance of the ENGAGE model, Rundel (2018) signifies that ecosystem issues should be operationalized in the educational systems and any area, and its global significance should be first recognized by the students. It is likely that EFL learners not only improve their L2 abilities through paying attention to such concepts as those of the environment and social life, but also learn how to connect what they read and learn to the immediate social or environment context.

The success of the ENGAGE model in the present study can take support from Kim et al.'s (2017) study on the impact of using this model in the domain of nursing practices. In this regard, they found that "improvement in EBP beliefs had direct effects on improvements in job satisfaction of the participants" (p. 90). It is assumed that the L2 learners taking part in the present study also benefited from *navigating content* and connecting their learning to the real life situations. On the other hand, this teaching model relies on Bloom's taxonomy and its highest levels. It can be argued that the principles presented in LEE supported by ENGAGE model might be found useful, should they be used in the EFL classroom.

It is crystal clear that L2 speaking takes the responsibility of facilitating communication between interlocutors. L2 development has also been notified as a life learning concept (Leki, 2017). From this perspective, the present findings are in line with another study conducted by Underwood et al., (2018) which has been inspired by the ENGAGE model. They proposed that ENGAGE model can be used for curriculum development in the educational settings aiming at paving the ground for more awareness toward environment, wild life, global issues, and consequently more responsible learning and getting prepared for life learning. ENGAGE model which proved effective in L2 speaking development can be discussed in terms of its steps and their operationalization in the EFL domain.

Energizing learners: In the L2 speaking classroom, warm-ups, ice-breaking discussions, talking about daily life issues, and motivating students through using gestures and postures were taken into consideration. Also, this step deals with motivation, both internal and external, which have been researched concerning their effectiveness in L2 development (Csizér, 2017; Ushioda & Dörnyei, 2017).

Navigating content: In the L2 speaking class, asking the students to navigate what they had gained in the energizing session and develop the new content was of paramount significance. Likewise, the teacher and learners negotiated on decisions to be made about assignments and activities. This indicates the application of process-based syllabus (Breen, 1987) and negotiated syllabus (Clarke, 1991) in the EFL pedagogy.

Generating meaning, as the third step, urges the learners to clarify the worth of the new information they have learned. In the L2 speaking class, this step was operationalized through asking the students to present oral reports to the classroom about the current events, their life and their feelings about recent events in the immediate social context and the like. This is partially in line with TBLT principles proposed by Ellis (2003), especially the real language tasks.

Likewise, this finding can take support from Ellis, Skehan, Shintani, and Lambert (2019) who proposed meaning-oriented tasks in speaking and communication.

Applying to the real world, as the fourth step, signifies that learners need opportunities during the teaching/learning process to testify their proficiency of the new skills (e.g., learning pronunciation, intonation, lexical resources, or real-world practice). In the L2 speaking class, this notion was implemented through asking the students to study about the topic selected in the classroom, use the internet, get involved in the social media, collect information about a specific issue, and then present their own perspectives in the classroom.

Gauging and celebrating, as the fifth step of ENGAGE model, concentrates on learners' assessing their own learning and development and how much they have learned through a quiz and celebrate their accomplishment. This concept was operationalized by employing teaching self-assessment (SA) principles and how to develop SA speaking checklists in the classroom context.

Extending learning to action, as the sixth step of ENGAGE model, pertained to follow-up activities to help ensure that learners act on their intentions to use their new knowledge (Halsey, 2011). They were encouraged to talk about various topics, take part in debates and discussions in English and if possible use what they have learned in the social media to find international friends, watch films, and solve the daily life issues and enjoy living through the English language world. This is in line with competency-based learning in the ELT domain (Nodine, 2016; Waddington, 2017).

Conclusion

The quantitative data analysis provided the researcher with two sets of findings: a) there were significant differences between the TBLT, ENGAGE, and ALM groups' means on the posttest of speaking. The ENGAGE group significantly outperformed both the TBLT and ALM groups on the posttest of speaking. Likewise, the TBLT significantly performed better than the ALM on the posttest. The qualitative findings were also in line with the quantitative findings, supporting the idea that ENGAGE model could be more helpful than the TBLT and ALM for the development of L2 speaking of Iranian students. However, in terms of factors such as creating a friendly atmosphere in the classroom, motivating students to continue their L2 development, using films, clips, and teaching aids, emphasizing L2 speaking, and making students work hard, almost all the three groups of the study were in agreement, though the concordance between the ENGAGE model and TBLT was more. Another point of divergence could be focusing on the grammatical accuracy in assessing L2 speaking. The ALM group mainly stressed on the grammatical errors, while for the ENGAGE and TBLT groups, pronunciation and lexical resource were more important, followed by fluency.

To sum up, the results of the present study showed that learners experiencing ENGAGE model teaching techniques resulted in better speaking commands compared to their counterparts receiving TBLT or ALM. Hence, it postulates that ENGAGE-based teaching techniques provide a better learning context for EFL learners' L2 speaking compared to those of the TBLT and ALM methods.

References

- Akbari, Z. (2015). Current challenges in teaching/learning English for EFL learners: The case of junior high school and high school. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 19(9), 394-401.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.524>
- 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>
- Aljumah, F. H. (2011). Developing Saudi EFL students' oral skills: An integrative approach. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 84-89.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p84>
- Baker, F. S. (2015). Emerging realities of text-to-speech software for nonnative English-speaking community college students in the freshman year. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 39(5), 423-441.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2013.835290>
- Berthold, M. (2011). Reliability of quick placement tests: How much faith can we place on quick paper or internet based placement tests. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 35(6), 674-698.
- Borich, G. D. (2016). *Observation skills for effective teaching: Research-based practice*. Routledge & CRC Press.
- Breen, M. P. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design Part II. *Language Teaching*, 20(3), 157-174.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480000450X>
- Brown, A. (2006). An examination of the rating process in the revised IELTS speaking test. In B. O'Sullivan (Ed.), *International English language testing system (IELTS) research reports* (pp. 1-30). IELTS Australia and British Council.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Chomsky, N. (1966). *Topics in the theory of generative grammar* (Vol. 56). Walter de Gruyter.
- Clarke, D. F. (1991). The negotiated syllabus: What is it and how is it likely to work? *Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 13-28.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/12.1.13>
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.
- Csizér, K. (2017). Motivation in the L2 classroom. In S. Loewen & M. Sato (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 418-432). Routledge & CRC Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). Research on teaching and teacher education and its influences on policy and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 45(2), 83-91.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X16639597>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivating classroom environment. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (Eds.), *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 719-731). Springer.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. W. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstanding. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231>
- Ellis, R. W. (2019). Towards a modular language curriculum for using tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 454-475.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818765315>

- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2019). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eslami, Z. R., Mirzaei, A., & Dini, S. (2015). The role of asynchronous computer mediated communication in the instruction and development of EFL learners' pragmatic competence. *System*, 1(48), 99-111.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.09.008>
- Fernandez, C. J. (2018). Behind a spoken performance: test takers' strategic reactions in a simulated part 3 of the IELTS speaking test. *Language Testing in Asia*, 8(1), 1-20.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-018-0073-4>
- Ghaemi, F., & Hassannejad, E. (2015). Developing EFL students' speaking; brainstorming vs. role-play. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 8(4), 211-221.
- Ghanizadeh, A., Razavi, A., & Hosseini, A. (2018). TELL (technology-enhanced language learning) in Iranian high schools: A panacea for emotional and motivational detriments. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 7(4), 92-100.
- Glance, D., Rhinehart, A., & Brown, A. (2018). Learn, expand, and engage: A model for teaching clinical skills in the helping professions. *Adult Learning*, 29(3), 104-114.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1045159518761845>
- Guchte, V. M., Braaksma, M., Rijlaarsdam, G., & Bimmel, P. (2015). Learning new grammatical structures in task-based language learning: The effects of recasts and prompts. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(2), 246-262.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12211>
- Halsey, R. W. (2016). The first ten things I learned in the wilderness: Stop talking at me. *Educational Management*, 2(3), 21-32.
<http://www.californiachaparral.org/naturecenters.html>
- Halsey, R. W., Halsey, V. W., & Gaudette, R. (2018). Connecting Californians with the chaparral. In E. C. Underwood, H. D. Safford, N. A. Molinari, & J. E. Keeley (Eds.), *Valuing chaparral* (pp. 295-322). Springer.
- Halsey, V. W. (2011). *Brilliance by design*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Halsey, V. W., & Halsey, R. W. (2017). *Connecting Californians with the Chaparral through the ENGAGE model*.
<http://www.californiachaparral.org/naturecenters.html>
- Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based language teaching: What every EFL teacher should do. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(3), 46-52.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049>
- Housen, A., & Kuiken, F. (2009). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(4), 461-473.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp048>
- Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of ELT*. Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, R. (2013). *Teaching and researching: Speaking*. Routledge & CRC Press.
- Jassem, Z. A. (1997). Towards better speaking in the English class: A sociolinguistic approach. *The English Teacher*, 2 (21), 41-52.
- Juffs, A. (2020). *Aspects of language development in an intensive English program*. Routledge & CRC Press.
- Kilbourne, C. (2011). Connect, inspire, and ENGAGE: A model for improving safety training. *Educational Views*, 2(3) 11-21.
<https://ehsdailyadvisor.blr.com>
- Kim, J., & Craig, D. A. (2012). Validation of a video-conferenced speaking test. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(3), 257-275.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.649482>

- Kim, S. C. (2014). Developing autonomous learning for oral proficiency using digital storytelling. *Language Learning and Technology*, 18(2), 20-35.
<http://llt.msu.edu/issues/june2014/action1.pdf>
- Kim, S. C., Ecoff, L., Brown, C. E., Gallo, A. M., Stichler, J. F., & Davidson, J. E. (2017). Benefits of a regional evidence-based practice fellowship program: A test of the ARCC Model. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 14(2), 90-98.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/wvn.12199>
- Kozulin, A. (2002). Sociocultural theory and the mediated learning experience. *School Psychology International*, 6(2), 125-136.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034302023001729>
- Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2007). Cognitive task complexity and linguistic performance in French L2 writing. In M. P. García Mayo (Ed.), *Investigating tasks in formal language learning* (pp. 117-135). Multilingual Matters.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macro-strategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.
- Kunnu, W., & Sukwises, A. (2014). Teaching speaking skills to adult English language learners through ALM. *ALM*, 7(3), 11-30.
- Lee, G. (2009). Speaking up: Six Korean students' oral participation in class discussions in US graduate seminars. *English for Specific Purposes*, 2(28), 142-156.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.01.007>
- Leki, I. (2017). *Undergraduates in a second language: Challenges and complexities of academic literacy development*. Routledge & CRC Press.
- Long, M. H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 377-393). Newbury House.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Muijs, D., & Reynolds, D. (2017). *Effective teaching: Evidence and practice*. Sage.
- Nair, R., Krishnasamy, R., & De Mello, G. (2017). Rethinking the teaching of pronunciation in the ESL classroom. *The English Teacher*, 1(14), 27-40.
- Nakatani, Y. (2010). Identifying strategies that facilitate EFL learners' oral communication: A classroom study using multiple data collection procedures. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 116-136.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00987>
- Nilson, L. B. (2016). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Nodine, T. R. (2016). How did we get here? A brief history of competency-based higher education in the United States. *The Journal of Competency-Based Education*, 1(1), 5-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cbe2.1004>
- Novak, J. D. (1990). Concept maps and Vee diagrams: Two metacognitive tools to facilitate meaningful learning. *Instructional Science*, 19(1), 29-52.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00377984>
- Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. Routledge.
- O'Sullivan, B. (2018). *Assessing speaking*. In A. J. Kunnan & B. O' Sullivan (Eds.), *The companion to language assessment publisher* (58-64). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118411360.wbcla084>
- Oxford, R. L. (1989). Use of language learning strategies: A synthesis of studies with implications for strategy training. *System*, 17(2), 235-247.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(89\)90036-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(89)90036-5)
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

- Rivers, W. M. (2018). *Teaching foreign language skills revisited*. University of Chicago Press.
- Rundel, P. W. (2018). California chaparral and its global significance. In E. C. Underwood, H. D. Safford, N. A. Molinari, & J. E. Keeley (Eds.), *Valuing chaparral* (pp. 1-27). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68303-4_1
- Sadeghi, B., & Maleki, M. (2015). Improving the ability of writing argumentative essays of Iranian EFL learners by raising awareness of rhetoric transfer. *Cumhuriyet Science Journal*, 36(3), 1541-1559.
- Safari, P., & Rashidi, N. (2015). Teacher education beyond transmission: Challenges and opportunities for Iranian teachers of English. *Issues in Educational Research*, 25(2), 187-198.
- Sundqvist, P., & Sylvén, L. K. (2016). Opening the window for L2 English development. In P. Sundqvist & L. K. Sylvén (Eds), *Extramural English in teaching and learning* (pp. 179-213). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-46048-6_7
- Underwood, E. C., Safford, H. D., Molinari, N. A., & Keeley, J. E. (Eds.) (2018). *Valuing Chaparral*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13513>
- Ushioda, E., & Dörnyei, Z. (2017). Beyond global English: Motivation to learn languages in a multicultural world: Introduction to the special issue. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(3), 451-454. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 34-45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12407>
- Waddington, J. (2017, October). Competency-based ELT: Learning to learn through our storytelling circle. In M. Baker (Ed.), *Proceedings of APAC-ELT Conference* (pp. 16-28). McMillan. <http://hdl.handle.net/10256/18422>
- Yang, Y. T. C., Chuang, Y. C., Li, L. Y., & Tseng, S. S. (2013). A blended learning environment for individualized English listening and speaking integrating critical thinking. *Computers & Education*, 63(2), 285-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.12.012>