

Teaching English Language Journal

ISSN: 2538-5488 – E-ISSN: 2538-547X – <http://tel.journal.org>

© 2026 – Published by Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran

TELL



Please cite this paper as follows:

Abdullaeva, B. S. (2026). Student-Developed Tasks and Their Effects on Enjoyment, Academic Resilience, and Language Growth among Uzbek EFL Learners. *Teaching English Language*, 20(2), 109-159. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2026.485251.1720>

Research Paper

Student-Developed Tasks and Their Effects on Enjoyment, Academic Resilience, and Language Growth among Uzbek EFL Learners

Barno Sayfutdinovna Abdullaeva¹

*Professor, Vice-Rector for Scientific Affairs, Tashkent State
Pedagogical University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan ¹*

Abstract

In Uzbek English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, student-developed tasks may offer learners opportunities to take a more active role in shaping classroom practice, yet their effects on learners' positive emotional experience, academic resilience (AR), and language growth (LG) remain insufficiently examined. This study examined the effects of student-developed tasks on Uzbek EFL learners' foreign language enjoyment (FLE), AR, and LG. Seventy Uzbek intermediate EFL learners participated in a quasi-experimental pretest-post-test study and were selected through convenience sampling. They were assigned to an experimental group (EG) and a control group (CG). Before the intervention, both groups completed an FLE scale, an AR scale, and a general English language test. EG studied

¹ Corresponding author: barno.sa2024@gmail.com

three lessons of Touchstone 3 through student-developed tasks, whereas CG studied the same lessons without task-based activities. After the intervention, the same measures were administered as post-tests. Data were analyzed using independent-samples t-tests and one-way ANCOVA. The results showed that the EG obtained significantly higher post-test scores than the CG in FLE, AR, and LG after the corresponding pre-test scores were controlled, with significant group effects for FLE, $F(1, 67) = 9.80, p = .003$, AR, $F(1, 67) = 9.25, p = .003$, and LG, $F(1, 67) = 27.72, p < .001$. The findings suggest that student-developed tasks can support learners' enjoyment, resilience, and English language development by involving them more directly in purposeful classroom activity. The study points to the value of learner-generated task design as a practical way to strengthen affective engagement and LG in EFL instruction.

Keywords: Student-developed Tasks, Foreign Language Enjoyment, Academic Resilience, Language Growth

Received: October 24, 2024

Accepted: July 14, 2026



1. Introduction

Contemporary English as a foreign language (EFL) classrooms are increasingly expected to support not only learners' linguistic development but also the affective and motivational conditions that sustain participation. Although cognitive and social dimensions have long shaped second language (L2) research, recent scholarship has increasingly emphasized emotions as central components of language learning (Dewaele, 2015; Dewaele et al., 2019; Dörnyei & Ryan, 2015). Within affective research, foreign language anxiety has received particularly sustained attention, a line of inquiry

reinforced by Horwitz et al. (1986) and extended in later work on learners' emotional experiences in language classrooms (Dewaele et al., 2023). This emphasis has gradually been complemented by growing interest in positive emotional experiences that may help learners participate more confidently, remain engaged, and persist in foreign language learning.

Positive emotions have become an important focus in foreign language learning because of the increasing influence of positive psychology (PP) in L2 research (De Smet et al., 2018). Over the past two decades, PP has encouraged a more balanced understanding of learners' emotional lives by considering both positive and negative emotions as part of the learning process (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). This shift has supported an interdisciplinary view of how positive emotions contribute to language learning, classroom participation, and learner development (Dewaele et al., 2019; MacIntyre et al., 2019). Accordingly, research on foreign language enjoyment (FLE) in L2 contexts has expanded considerably, especially as scholars have examined how enjoyment relates to learners' achievement, motivation, and willingness to engage with classroom challenges (Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele et al., 2022).

For the present study, FLE is particularly relevant because enjoyment is not simply momentary pleasure. Rather, enjoyment refers to positive emotional experiences that may emerge when learners engage with novelty, challenge, and meaningful classroom activity, especially when they move beyond routine practice and encounter achievable but demanding learning tasks (Li et al., 2018). From this perspective, FLE can be understood as a positive classroom emotion that supports exploration, participation, and sustained effort in learning a new language (Akkaş et al., 2022). Dewaele and MacIntyre (2016) describe FLE as a complex emotion shaped by the interaction between challenge and perceived ability, reflecting learners'

112 Teaching English Language

Student-Developed Tasks ...

desire to succeed when facing demanding tasks. FLE may also involve enjoyment derived from L2 use, positive appraisal of classroom conditions, willingness to continue meaningful learning experiences, and motivation to overcome future obstacles (Li, 2020; Mierzwa, 2018). In classroom settings, this emotional experience can be reflected in learners' personal satisfaction, supportive relationships with teachers and classmates, and a positive classroom atmosphere that encourages participation and learning (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016).

Academic resilience (AR) is another important construct within PP and is closely connected to learners' ability to continue learning despite academic difficulty. In EFL contexts, AR refers to learners' capacity to adapt to learning setbacks, maintain effort, and recover from challenges that may interrupt their academic progress (Dent & Cameron, 2003; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Liu & Chu, 2022). AR is especially relevant to language learning because learners frequently encounter anxiety, communicative difficulty, limited confidence, and repeated performance demands. Everhart Chaffee et al. (2014) argued that resilience plays an important role in reducing stress and anxiety associated with learning a new language and in improving the overall language learning experience. Similarly, resilient learners are more likely to maintain motivation and satisfaction despite stressful academic conditions and to recover more quickly when they face demanding learning situations (Ryff & Singer, 2003). They can also persevere in the face of difficulty, regulate worry more effectively, and respond to classroom challenges with greater confidence and persistence (Smith, 2006). Academically resilient students may therefore sustain higher levels of achievement, engagement, and academic performance despite events and emotions that place them at risk of academic failure (Martin & Marsh, 2009).

Task-based classroom practices may create learning conditions that support both FLE and AR in EFL settings. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) exposes learners to meaningful and authentic language use through a sequence of classroom tasks, giving them opportunities to use language for communicative purposes while developing new linguistic resources (Ellis, 2009). In this approach, learners are not only expected to acquire new forms but also to process and use previously learned language in purposeful interaction (Khezzinejad et al., 2025; Rahimi & Rezai, 2023). Nunan's (2004) principles of TBLT emphasize needs-based content, learning through interaction in the target language, the use of authentic materials, attention to the learning process, the integration of learners' personal experiences, and the connection between classroom learning and real-life language use. Van den Branden (2009) similarly describes TBLT as an approach in which practical tasks promote meaning negotiation and language use for meaningful, non-linguistic outcomes.

This learner-centered orientation is particularly important for student-developed tasks because learners are not only completing activities designed by the teacher; they are also involved in shaping the tasks through which classroom learning takes place. Larsen-Freeman and Anderson (2011) describe TBLT as a strong version of communicative language teaching because it emphasizes language development through use. From this perspective, learners may notice and use linguistic resources as communicative needs arise during task completion. Richards and Rodgers (2014) also identify tasks as a central component of lesson design and instruction. Thus, although TBLT has been interpreted in different ways, it generally foregrounds meaningful language use, learner participation, and task completion as central principles of classroom learning. However, less attention has been given to whether tasks developed by learners themselves

can simultaneously support FLE, AR, and language growth (LG), particularly among Uzbek EFL learners. Addressing this issue, the present study examines the effects of student-developed tasks on Uzbek EFL learners' enjoyment, resilience, and language development.

2. Related Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Background

2.1.1 Enjoyment

Foreign language enjoyment (FLE) has become a central construct in contemporary EFL research because it helps explain why learners continue to participate, take communicative risks, and invest effort in demanding classroom tasks. Recent affective-oriented work in EFL research, shaped by the emotional turn and the growing influence of PP, has shifted attention from anxiety alone to a broader range of classroom emotions (Botes et al., 2022; Dewaele et al., 2018). As subjective experiences embedded in classroom interaction, emotions shape learners' engagement, persistence, and performance. Language classrooms are emotionally dynamic spaces in which evaluation, interaction, teacher support, and peer participation influence how learners experience the learning process (Hargreaves, 2001; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014). Although earlier research largely examined the effects of negative emotions on L2 acquisition (Dewaele et al., 2023), more recent studies informed by PP have shown how positive emotions can support engagement, motivation, and learning (Dewaele et al., 2018).

Within this line of research, FLE is important because it captures learners' positive responses to challenge, participation, and classroom interaction (Dewaele & Dewaele, 2020). Learners who enjoy their classroom experiences are more likely to show intrinsic motivation, engagement, and

sustained effort in learning (Dewaele et al., 2023). Learning enjoyment can also be interpreted through Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which argues that learners are more likely to engage when activities support autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this sense, enjoyment is not only an affective reaction but also a motivational resource that may help learners remain involved in meaningful classroom activities. Intrinsic motivation and satisfaction may also help reduce disengagement and emotional exhaustion, which are central features of burnout (Wu et al., 2023). From the perspective of broaden-and-build theory, FLE and other positive emotions may help buffer negative emotional states, including anxiety, by broadening learners' momentary thought-action repertoires and helping them build cognitive, social, and psychological resources, including AR (Fredrickson, 2009). Accordingly, FLE is often treated as an activating, task-related emotion in L2 classrooms and as a prominent positive emotion in L2 education (Botes et al., 2022; Fathi & Hejazi, 2024).

FLE refers to the positive feelings learners experience when using or learning a foreign language (Dewaele et al., 2018; Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2014). This construct matters because enjoyment can support motivation, willingness to communicate, and improved learning outcomes (Botes et al., 2022). Private enjoyment (PE) and social enjoyment (SE) are commonly identified as two central components of FLE (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016; Jiang & Dewaele, 2019). PE concerns the pleasure learners experience during individual target-language use, such as individual reading or media-based exposure to the target language. By contrast, SE concerns the pleasure learners derive from interaction with others in the target language, such as group discussion, classroom conversation, or collaborative task completion. Research in L2 learning has shown that FLE is associated with learning achievement, motivation, and grit, and has often been negatively associated with anxiety

(Fathi & Mohammaddokht, 2021; Jin & Zhang, 2021). Recent EFL research also suggests that teacher-related factors can shape learners' FLE (Zhang et al., 2023).

Several studies highlight the role of FLE in supporting favorable educational outcomes, including stronger engagement, greater willingness to communicate, improved L2 proficiency, and lower L2 anxiety (Botes et al., 2022; Fathi et al., 2023; Shen, 2021). In addition, FLE has been linked to learners' creativity, self-assessed competence, and self-efficacy, which suggests that enjoyment is connected to learners' motivational, cognitive, and self-belief systems (Derakhshan & Fathi, 2024; Dewaele & Dewaele, 2020). FLE may also reduce anxiety and encourage learners to take communicative risks during L2 learning, helping them engage more deeply with language input and classroom interaction (Mohammad Hosseini et al., 2022; White, 2018). Recent studies have also linked enjoyment with lower disengagement and burnout. For example, Li (2022) examined classroom enjoyment in relation to disengagement and burnout among EFL learners and showed that positive classroom experience can reduce learners' withdrawal from learning. Similarly, Li et al. (2024) conceptualized and measured burnout in Chinese EFL learning, clarifying how exhaustion and disengagement appear in this context. Taken together, these studies suggest that FLE is not a peripheral classroom feeling but a meaningful affective condition that may support learners' participation, resilience, and language development. In the present study, student-developed tasks are expected to provide a classroom context in which learners can experience enjoyment through autonomy, peer interaction, meaningful challenge, and active contribution to the learning process.

2.1.2 Academic Resilience

AR is important in EFL learning because learners regularly encounter communicative difficulty, language anxiety, performance pressure, poor results, and repeated setbacks. Recent L2 research has increasingly drawn on psychological perspectives to explain persistence, motivation, and demotivation in language learning, and AR has received growing attention as a construct that helps explain why some learners continue to progress despite academic challenges (Kim & Kim, 2021). Morales and Trotman (2004) define AR as learners' capacity to succeed academically despite obstacles and hardship. Across these definitions, AR is viewed as a dynamic process through which learners overcome barriers to academic progress and continue working toward their goals (Morales & Trotman, 2004). Similarly, Cassidy (2016) conceptualizes AR as involving coping strategies that help learners manage academic stress, respond to difficulty, and pursue personal and academic goals.

A resilience-oriented view shifts attention from learners' deficits to the personal and contextual resources that help them respond constructively to difficulty. Knight (2007) argued that resilience research has moved from deficit-focused explanations toward strength-based perspectives that examine the factors enabling students to respond adaptively to adversity. Krovetz (2008) also emphasized that AR is a dynamic and multidimensional process shaped by individual behaviors, psychosocial conditions, and sociocultural contexts. In EFL classrooms, these factors may include peer support, teacher guidance, classroom climate, learners' self-regulatory habits, and opportunities for meaningful participation. Therefore, language programs, EFL teachers, and university classrooms can play an important role in helping learners strengthen the capacities needed for academic success (Thomsen, 2002).

Rajendran and Videka (2006) describe AR as an individual's capacity to function effectively when facing identifiable stressors. In educational contexts, AR refers to learners' ability to achieve goals despite academic pressure, task difficulty, poor performance, or language anxiety (Edwards et al., 2016). Truebridge (2016) further explains resilience as a dynamic process that develops through the interaction between personal resources and external support systems, allowing individuals to maintain adaptive functioning despite adversity, threat, or daily academic stress. Howe et al. (2012) distinguished psychological and sociological perspectives on resilience. From a psychological perspective, AR involves adaptive development when learners encounter serious difficulties. From a sociological perspective, AR reflects how individuals draw on social conditions, opportunities, and environmental resources to continue developing in challenging circumstances.

AR can also be understood as a psychological resource for managing stress effectively (Connor & Davidson, 2003). Herrman et al. (2011) noted that resilient students can persevere through adversity and maintain adaptive functioning, while Ungar (2012) emphasized that resilience is shaped by the interaction between individuals and their environments. AR can therefore be viewed as a dynamic process shaped by both psychological and social factors. Such resilience helps learners adjust to difficult circumstances and continue functioning constructively (Masten & Tellegen, 2012). White et al. (2010) also describe resilience as a protective characteristic that may explain why some learners perform better than others under challenging conditions. Jowkar et al. (2014) identified academic, behavioral, and emotional dimensions of AR, showing that resilience is not limited to achievement but also involves learners' conduct, emotional regulation, and response to academic demands.

Several educational researchers have examined AR in relation to classroom learning and learner development. Waxman et al. (2012) found that language learners with medium and high levels of AR reported stronger classroom competence and more adaptive participation. Kim et al. (2018) also showed that AR can be considered an instructional goal because it may reduce demotivation and support sustained engagement in English learning. Resilient learners often demonstrate stronger motivation, problem-solving ability, social skills, and commitment to learning goals. In addition, previous research has shown that AR has a substantial positive impact on learners' motivation and a negative relationship with demotivation (Kim, 2019; Shin & Kim, 2017). As a factor related to motivation and well-being, AR reflects individuals' capacity to view challenges as opportunities for intellectual growth (Zeng et al., 2016). For this reason, AR deserves close pedagogical attention in language education because it provides a useful framework for understanding how learners manage anxiety, sustain well-being, and continue learning under pressure.

Strengthening AR may help sustain learners' motivation in EFL classrooms. Learners who recognize the value of L2 learning and connect language learning with their personal, academic, and communicative goals are more likely to remain engaged in the learning process. It is also important to help learners understand that difficulty is a normal part of language learning and that challenges can be managed through realistic classroom support, strategic effort, and future-oriented planning. Learners with higher AR are more likely to sustain motivation, take responsibility for learning, and achieve stronger academic outcomes than learners who lack such resilience (Rouse, 2001). In the present study, student-developed tasks are expected to support AR because they give learners opportunities to participate actively, cooperate

with peers, respond to manageable challenges, and experience greater responsibility for classroom learning.

2.1.3 Task-Based Language Teaching

Richards (2006) described TBLT as an important shift in language pedagogy from form-focused instruction toward meaning-oriented language use. In this approach, language learning is organized around communicative tasks that provide learners with meaningful contexts for using the target language. Rather than treating language as a set of isolated forms to be practiced separately, TBLT encourages learners to complete meaningful activities that resemble communicative purposes beyond form practice. These tasks create opportunities for learners to use the target language for interaction, problem solving, and meaning negotiation. Learners are encouraged to draw on available linguistic resources during task performance, although teachers may provide useful language support before, during, or after the task (Beding & Inthapthim, 2019).

The distinction between an exercise and a task is central to defining TBLT. Ellis (2003) explained that an exercise usually directs learners toward the practice of a particular grammatical form, whereas a task is designed around a communicative purpose. Nunan (2004) identified two types of tasks: pedagogical tasks, which refer to classroom-based language use, and authentic tasks, which reflect language use beyond the classroom. Although pedagogical tasks may vary in design, they generally prioritize communicative use of the target language and place meaning at the center of classroom activity. At the same time, meaning and form are not completely separate because learners draw on their linguistic knowledge to express meaning in particular contexts.

Several definitions of task converge around the same core principles. Skehan and Foster (1999) described tasks as meaning-oriented activities with a connection to real-world language use and an outcome that can be evaluated. Willis and Willis (2001) viewed a task as an activity in which learners use the target language to achieve a communicative objective. Ellis (2003) similarly defined a pedagogical task as a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically to achieve a communicative goal. Nunan (2004) also emphasized that classroom tasks require learners to comprehend, manipulate, produce, or interact in the target language. In this view, the main concern is constructing meaning rather than manipulating isolated linguistic forms.

Scholars have proposed several classifications of tasks. In addition to Nunan's (2004) distinction between pedagogical and real-world tasks, Prabhu (1987) classified tasks as information-gap, reasoning-gap, and opinion-gap tasks. Willis and Willis (2001) classified tasks into listing, sorting and ordering, comparing, problem-solving, sharing personal experiences, and creative tasks. Ellis (2009) also distinguished between focused and unfocused tasks. Focused tasks are designed to elicit particular linguistic forms during communication, whereas unfocused tasks encourage broader communication without targeting a predetermined form. Tasks can also be classified according to language skill: input-providing tasks support receptive skills such as listening and reading, while output-prompting tasks encourage productive skills such as speaking and writing. Taken together, these classifications show that tasks may differ in type, skill focus, and communicative demand, but they share communicative purposes and a primary focus on meaning.

Several researchers have identified key features of tasks in TBLT. Willis (1996) argued that tasks give learners more opportunities to use the

target language, encourage them to test their own hypotheses about language, give teachers flexible ways to organize interaction, and increase learners' active participation. Skehan (1996) also emphasized four major qualities of a task: a primary focus on meaning, a relationship to authentic activity, priority given to task completion, and assessment based on a defined outcome. Ellis (2003) identified five defining features of pedagogical tasks: they involve communicative language use, give learners opportunities to participate in meaningful communication to complete specific tasks, require learners to use the target language to achieve a specific outcome, prioritize meaningful activity while allowing attention to linguistic form when needed, and help learners understand how the target language can be used for communicative purposes.

Willis and Willis (2009) further argued that tasks should primarily focus on meaning, attract learners' interest, be evaluated in relation to non-linguistic outcomes rather than only formal accuracy, and maintain relevance to real-world situations. Richards and Rodgers (2014) also identified several task attributes, including information exchange, communicative goal completion through language, and the distinction between real-world tasks and pedagogic classroom tasks. Overall, TBLT views tasks as meaningful and purposeful classroom activities that help learners understand why they use the target language and how classroom language can connect with everyday communication. Tasks should therefore have clear communicative outcomes so that teachers and learners can judge whether the task has been successfully completed.

This learner-centered understanding of tasks is especially relevant to student-developed tasks. In the present study, student-developed tasks are treated as a practical extension of TBLT because they connect learner choice, classroom participation, peer collaboration, and meaningful language use.

When learners help design tasks, they do not simply complete teacher-prepared activities; they also participate in shaping the learning process. This view is consistent with a pragmatic orientation to contemporary education, in which classroom practice should connect curriculum, learner identity, social participation, and meaningful communication (Zohrabi, 2023). Student-developed tasks may therefore help learners connect English learning with their own experiences, choices, and communicative needs.

This perspective is also useful for EFL teachers who work within demanding institutional conditions and need classroom procedures that support engagement, creativity, and manageable participation (Zohrabi & Paydar, 2025). Student-developed tasks can provide such a procedure because they distribute responsibility among learners, create opportunities for purposeful interaction, and make classroom activity more responsive to learners' needs. In this sense, student-developed tasks operationalize TBLT in a way that may support FLE through autonomy and meaningful participation, AR through manageable challenge and peer support, and LG through purposeful use of English. Accordingly, they can contribute to more purposeful, participatory, and context-sensitive EFL instruction.

2.2 Empirical Background

Empirical studies have generally shown that TBLT can support learners' language skills, especially when tasks create opportunities for meaningful interaction, purposeful language use, and active classroom participation. Kaikaew and Lornklang (2015), for example, examined the effect of task-based learning with a Thai cultural focus on tenth-grade learners' writing skills and their perceptions of TBLT implementation. Their findings showed that learners' writing performance improved after receiving TBLT-based instruction. The learners also demonstrated positive task performance and

reported favorable perceptions of culturally oriented TBLT in English instruction.

Evidence from speaking-focused studies has also supported the value of TBLT. Pham and Nguyen (2014) reported improvements in students' oral performance in an action study on task-based speaking activities with 53 English-major freshmen. Data were collected through observation notes, tests, and questionnaires, and the findings showed that students spoke more fluently because they felt more comfortable speaking in front of others and had more opportunities for peer interaction during TBLT-based instruction. Similarly, Beding and Inthapthim (2019) investigated the effect of TBLT on Thai EFL students' speaking ability and examined students' perceptions of its classroom implementation. The study involved 36 first-year English and Education majors selected through purposive sampling. Data were collected through pre- and post-speaking assessments, questionnaires, and semi-structured interviews. The quantitative data were analyzed through a dependent t-test and descriptive statistics, while the qualitative data were examined through content analysis. The findings showed that the participants' speaking performance improved significantly at the .01 significance level, and most respondents reported favorable perceptions of TBLT.

Similar evidence has been reported in studies on reading and writing. Khademi et al. (2017) examined the effects of post-task activities on Iranian EFL learners' reading achievement. The study involved 47 Iranian EFL learners who were assigned to three groups, including two experimental groups (EGs) and one CG. Over ten instructional sessions, the EGs engaged in post-task reflection and repeated task performance. Data were collected through pretests, post-tests, and post-intervention semi-structured interviews with five learners from the EGs. The findings showed that post-task activities

had significant effects on learners' language competence, reading achievement, and willingness to participate in classroom tasks. Hanh and Tuan (2018) also examined the effect of TBLT on EFL learners' writing performance, with writing motivation considered as a possible factor contributing to writing improvement. Their quasi-experimental study included 40 freshmen, with equal numbers in EG and CG. The results showed that TBLT significantly improved learners' writing performance in content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. The findings also indicated that TBLT had a positive effect on students' writing motivation and that writing motivation was positively related to writing performance.

Further studies have examined TBLT in relation to motivation, learner attitudes, and oral performance. Chua and Lin (2020) examined the effects of TBLT on beginning-level Mandarin learners' motivation and the factors influencing their motivation to learn. Their findings indicated a statistically significant increase in learning motivation between the first-cycle and second-cycle post-treatment surveys. Interview results also showed that TBLT, a demanding schedule, and support from native Mandarin speakers influenced students' motivation to learn. Xuyen and Trang (2021) studied the effects of task-based speaking activities on non-English-major learners and explored students' attitudes toward task-based speaking activities. The participants were 58 non-English-major students enrolled in a General English course. Oral performance was measured through pre- and post-tests, and the EG's perceptions of task-based speaking activities were examined through a questionnaire. The results showed that participants in the EG improved more in oral performance than their counterparts in CG, who received conventional instruction. The learners also reported positive views of task-based speaking activities.

More recent work has further confirmed the usefulness of task-based practices for EFL speaking development. Farde Davaji and Ghoorchaei (2023) examined the effects of pre-task preparation on EFL learners' speaking accuracy. Ninety Iranian EFL learners participated in the study and were randomly assigned to three groups of similar size: no preparation, group pre-task planning, and individual pre-task planning. The findings showed a significant positive relationship between pre-task planning time and Iranian EFL learners' speaking accuracy. Individual pre-task planning was significantly more effective than group pre-task planning, and pre-task planning improved speaking accuracy compared with no planning. More recently, Lan Ngoc (2023) examined the effects of TBLT on EFL students' speaking ability. The study involved 60 students from a hospitality institution in Ho Chi Minh City and used a quasi-experimental design. For eight weeks, EG received TBLT-based instruction, whereas CG received conventional instruction. The results showed that students' speaking ability improved significantly after TBLT-based instruction, and learners reported favorable attitudes toward its use in speaking classes.

The reviewed studies indicate that TBLT can support English language development across different learner groups and instructional contexts. They also show that learners and teachers have generally reported favorable perceptions of TBLT in EFL contexts. However, most previous studies have focused mainly on language skills such as speaking, reading, and writing, leaving limited evidence on affective and motivational outcomes such as FLE and AR. Moreover, previous research has usually examined teacher-designed or researcher-designed tasks, while less is known about the effects of tasks developed by learners themselves. This gap provides the rationale for examining whether student-developed tasks support FLE, AR,

and LG among Uzbek EFL learners. Accordingly, the present study addressed the following research questions:

RQ1: Do student-developed tasks increase FLE among Uzbek EFL learners?

RQ2: Do student-developed tasks increase AR among Uzbek EFL learners?

RQ3: Do student-developed tasks develop LG among Uzbek EFL learners?

3. Method

3.1 Research Design

Because the study was conducted in existing Uzbek EFL classes, it used a quantitative quasi-experimental pretest-post-test control-group design. This design was suitable for examining the effect of student-developed tasks by comparing an EG with a CG in a natural instructional setting where the participants were drawn from intact EFL classes and could not be fully randomized at the individual level (Shadish et al., 2002). Both groups were assessed on FLE, AR, and LG before and after the intervention. Baseline scores were first examined to determine whether the two groups were comparable before instruction and were then entered as covariates in ANCOVA to adjust the post-test comparisons. Since the participants were selected through convenience sampling from existing EFL classes, a quasi-experimental design was more appropriate than a fully randomized experimental design. This design allowed the researchers to examine whether learners exposed to student-developed tasks showed stronger post-

intervention outcomes in FLE, AR, and LG than learners who received regular instruction, after controlling for pretest performance.

3.2 Participants

Seventy Uzbek EFL learners were selected from an accessible pool of 133 learners through convenience sampling. This sampling procedure was appropriate because the study was conducted in existing EFL classes and the selection process did not disrupt the normal organization of classroom instruction. The selected learners were assigned to two groups: 35 learners in EG and 35 learners in CG. Both groups included male and female learners, and the participants ranged in age from 18 to 27 years. PET results indicated that the selected learners were at the intermediate level of English proficiency. Specifically, learners whose PET scores fell within one standard deviation above or below the mean were included in the study. Table 1 presents the participants’ demographic information.

Table 1.
Participants’ Demographic Information

Groups	EG	CG
Number	35	35
Gender	Female and Male	Female and Male
Age range	18-27	18-27
Level	Intermediate	Intermediate

As shown in Table 1, the two groups were equal in size and were comparable in age range and English proficiency level. The inclusion of

intermediate-level learners helped maintain proficiency consistency across the groups before the intervention.

3.3 Instruments

The Preliminary English Test (PET), which includes speaking, listening, reading, and writing sections, was used to assess learners' initial English proficiency and to identify learners with comparable proficiency before group assignment. The PET is a Cambridge English assessment designed to evaluate learners' proficiency level (Yaghchi et al., 2016). After the PET was administered, learners whose scores fell within one standard deviation above or below the mean were selected. Consequently, 70 intermediate-level learners were included as the study participants.

FLE was measured using the Foreign Language Learning Enjoyment Scale (FLLES), developed by Aydın et al. (2024). The FLLES consists of 12 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The scale showed excellent internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha of .95.

AR was measured using the Academic Resilience Scale (ARS-30), which consists of 30 items and assesses learners' resilience in response to academic difficulty, setbacks, and stress. The scale measures three dimensions: motivation, self-regulation, and persistence. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Higher scores indicate higher levels of AR, and possible total scores range from 30 to 150 (Cassidy, 2016). In the present study, the scale showed acceptable internal consistency, $\alpha = .82$. Three applied linguistics specialists reviewed the FLLES and the AR scale for content relevance, clarity, and

appropriateness. The FLLES and AR scale were administered before and after the intervention.

LG was measured through a researcher-developed general English test, which was used as both the pretest and the post-test. The test included two reading passages with ten reading-comprehension items, ten multiple-choice vocabulary items, ten multiple-choice grammar items, and ten listening fill-in-the-blank items. A pilot study was conducted to examine the test's reliability, clarity, timing, and content appropriateness. Students completed the test in approximately 50 minutes. Cronbach's alpha was used to estimate internal consistency. The reliability coefficients were $\alpha = .80$ for the pretest and $\alpha = .83$ for the post-test.

3.5 Data Collection and Analyses Procedures

Seventy participants were assigned to two groups, with 35 learners in each group. Before the intervention, both groups completed three pretests to establish baseline scores for general English proficiency, AR, and FLE. These measures were administered prior to instruction to determine the learners' initial performance before the treatment.

During the instructional period, the EG studied three selected lessons of *Touchstone 3* through student-developed tasks. Learners were asked to design tasks related to each lesson, and the EG was divided into seven subgroups of five learners. Each subgroup prepared classroom tasks for peer completion. The selected lessons were taught through relevant student-developed tasks, and learners participated in the learning process by designing, completing, and discussing tasks. The teacher facilitated the activities by guiding task preparation, monitoring interaction, and providing support when needed.

The CG studied the same lessons through regular teacher-led instruction without student-developed task activities. In this group, the teacher presented the lessons through regular explanation, practice, and classroom instruction. After the selected lessons had been completed, the same measures were administered as post-tests to examine post-intervention changes in FLE, AR, and LG.

Independent-samples t-tests and one-way ANCOVA were conducted to analyze the data. The independent-samples t-tests were used to examine the initial comparability of the EG and CG on the pretest scores. One-way ANCOVA was then used to compare the groups' post-test scores after controlling for the corresponding pretest scores.

4. Results

Before addressing the three research questions, the normality of the data and the pre-intervention comparability of the two groups were examined. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used to check whether the scores followed a normal distribution. The results for the FLE pre-test and post-test scores are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

K-S Test for FLE Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
N	35	35	35	35
Mean	26.17	28.97	27.71	36.17
SD	3.72	6.52	5.07	10.72
Absolute	.12	.19	.15	.23
Positive	.12	.19	.15	.23

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
Negative	-.06	-.09	-.06	-.18
Test statistic	.12	.19	.15	.23
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.17	.06	.05	.07

As shown in Table 2, the K-S values for the FLE pre-test and post-test scores were at or above the conventional .05 level. Therefore, no serious departure from normality was observed for the FLE scores, and parametric analyses were considered appropriate. The descriptive statistics for the three pre-tests are reported in Table 3. These results were used to examine the initial comparability of the CG and EG before the intervention.

Table 3

Groups' Mean Scores in the Pre-tests

Variable	Group	N	Mean	SD	SE
FLE	CG	35	26.17	3.72	.62
FLE	EG	35	27.71	5.07	.85
AR	CG	35	48.65	6.42	1.08
AR	EG	35	47.51	6.48	1.09
LG	CG	35	13.40	2.86	.48
LG	EG	35	13.37	4.01	.67

Table 3 indicates that the two groups had closely comparable mean scores in the FLE, AR, and LG pre-tests. To determine whether these initial differences were statistically significant, independent samples t-tests were conducted. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Independent Samples T-test for the Groups' Pre-test Scores

Variable	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	SE Difference
FLE	3.66	.06	-1.45	68	.15	-1.54	1.06
FLE			-1.45	67.34	.15	-1.54	1.06
AR	.00	.97	.74	68	.46	1.14	1.54
AR			.74	67.99	.46	1.14	1.54
LG	1.39	.24	.03	68	.97	.02	.83
LG			.03	66.45	.97	.02	.83

As Table 4 shows, there were no statistically significant differences between the CG and EG in the FLE, AR, and LG pre-tests. These findings indicate that the two groups were comparable before the intervention in terms of FLE, AR, and LG.

The first research question examined whether student-developed tasks increased learners' FLE. The descriptive statistics for the FLE post-test scores are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Mean Scores of the Groups in the FLE Post-test

Group	Mean	SD	N
CG	28.97	6.52	35
EG	36.17	10.72	35
Total	32.57	9.52	70

As shown in Table 5, the EG obtained a higher FLE post-test mean score than the CG. The CG obtained a mean score of 28.97, whereas the EG obtained a mean score of 36.17. This descriptive difference suggests that learners who received instruction through student-developed tasks reported greater FLE after the intervention. To determine whether this difference was

134 Teaching English Language

Student-Developed Tasks ...

statistically significant after controlling for the FLE pre-test scores, a one-way ANCOVA was conducted. The results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Results of One-Way ANCOVA for the FLE Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3073.40	2	1536.70	32.25	.00
Intercept	4.52	1	4.52	.09	.75
Pre-test	2166.20	1	2166.20	45.47	.00
Group	466.86	1	466.86	9.80	.00
Error	3191.73	67	47.63		
Total	80528.00	70			
Corrected Total	6265.14	69			

Table 6 shows a significant group effect for the FLE post-test after controlling for the FLE pre-test scores, $F(1, 67) = 9.80$, $p = .003$. Therefore, student-developed tasks significantly increased the FLE of Uzbek intermediate EFL learners.

The second research question examined whether student-developed tasks increased learners' AR. Before conducting the ANCOVA, the normality of the AR pre-test and post-test scores was examined. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

K-S Test for AR Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
N	35	35	35	35

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
Mean	48.65	52.22	47.51	61.34
SD	6.42	7.66	6.48	17.57
Absolute	.11	.18	.09	.24
Positive	.11	.18	.07	.24
Negative	-.06	-.11	-.09	-.14
Test statistic	.11	.18	.09	.24
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.20	.05	.20	.07

As shown in Table 7, the K-S results for the AR scores were at or above the .05 level. Thus, the AR scores did not show a serious violation of the normality assumption, and parametric analyses were used. The descriptive statistics for the AR post-test scores are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Mean Scores of the Groups in the AR Post-test

Group	Mean	SD	N
CG	52.22	7.66	35
EG	61.34	17.57	35
Total	56.78	14.21	70

Table 8 shows that the EG obtained a higher AR post-test mean score than the CG. The CG obtained a mean score of 52.22, whereas the EG obtained a mean score of 61.34. This difference indicates that learners who received instruction through student-developed tasks demonstrated stronger AR after the intervention. A one-way ANCOVA was then conducted to examine whether the difference remained significant after controlling for AR pre-test scores. The results are shown in Table 9.

Table 9*Results of One-Way ANCOVA for the AR Post-test*

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2157.15	2	1078.57	6.12	.00
Intercept	1297.14	1	1297.14	7.37	.00
Pre-test	703.42	1	703.42	3.99	.05
Group	1627.94	1	1627.94	9.25	.00
Error	11790.63	67	175.98		
Total	239671.00	70			
Corrected Total	13947.78	69			

As shown in Table 9, the group effect for the AR post-test was statistically significant after controlling for AR pre-test scores, $F(1, 67) = 9.25$, $p = .003$. Therefore, student-developed tasks significantly increased the AR of Uzbek intermediate EFL learners.

The third research question examined whether student-developed tasks developed learners' LG. Before conducting the ANCOVA, the normality of the LG pre-test and post-test scores was checked. The results are presented in Table 10.

Table 10*K-S Test for LG Pre-test and Post-test Scores*

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
N	35	35	35	35
Mean	13.40	14.45	13.37	16.62
SD	2.86	3.45	4.01	1.61

Statistic	CG Pre-test	CG Post-test	EG Pre-test	EG Post-test
Absolute	.11	.16	.14	.16
Positive	.08	.16	.14	.16
Negative	-.11	-.14	-.09	-.11
Test statistic	.11	.16	.14	.16
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.20	.15	.71	.16

As shown in Table 10, the K-S results indicated no serious departure from normality for the LG scores. Therefore, parametric analyses were used to examine the LG results. The descriptive statistics for the LG post-test scores are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Mean Scores of the Groups in the LG Post-test

Group	Mean	SD	N
CG	14.45	2.26	35
EG	16.62	1.61	35
Total	15.54	2.23	70

Table 11 shows that the EG obtained a higher LG post-test mean score than the CG. The CG obtained a mean score of 14.45, whereas the EG obtained a mean score of 16.62. This descriptive difference indicates that learners who received instruction through student-developed tasks showed stronger LG than those in the CG. A one-way ANCOVA was conducted to determine whether this difference was statistically significant after controlling for LG pre-test scores. The results are reported in Table 12.

Table 12

Results of One-Way ANCOVA for the LG Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	144.54	2	72.27	24.11	.00
Intercept	610.41	1	610.41	203.64	.00
Pre-test	62.02	1	62.02	20.69	.00
Group	83.10	1	83.10	27.72	.00
Error	200.83	67	2.99		
Total	17256.00	70			
Corrected Total	345.37	69			

As shown in Table 12, the group effect for the LG post-test was statistically significant after controlling for LG pre-test scores, $F(1, 67) = 27.72$, $p < .001$. Therefore, student-developed tasks significantly developed the LG of Uzbek intermediate EFL learners. Taken together, the results showed that the EG outperformed the CG in all three post-tests after controlling for the corresponding pre-test scores. These findings indicate that student-developed tasks had significant positive effects on Uzbek intermediate EFL learners' FLE, AR, and LG.

5. Discussion

The findings indicate that student-developed tasks supported both affective and linguistic outcomes among Uzbek intermediate EFL learners. Learners in EG showed stronger post-intervention performance than those in CG across FLE, AR, and LG after the corresponding pretest scores were controlled. This pattern suggests that the intervention did more than provide additional classroom practice. By requiring learners to design lesson-related tasks, work in subgroups, prepare activities for peers, complete classroom tasks, and receive teacher support, the intervention positioned learners as active contributors to the learning process. FLE may have been strengthened

through learner choice, meaningful participation, and a more engaging classroom atmosphere. AR may have been supported through manageable challenge, peer assistance, and repeated opportunities to respond to task difficulty. LG may have improved because learners used English for purposeful communication, peer interaction, and task completion rather than relying mainly on decontextualized form practice.

The language-growth results align with earlier TBLT studies showing that meaning-oriented tasks can improve learners' writing, reading, and speaking performance. Previous research has reported that task-based instruction can support writing development, reading achievement, oral performance, language competence, and willingness to participate in classroom activities (Beding & Inthapthim, 2019; Hanh & Tuan, 2018; Kaikaew & Lornklang, 2015; Khademi et al., 2017). The present study extends this pattern by showing that learner-generated tasks can support broader LG rather than only a single language skill. In the present intervention, learners did not merely complete teacher-prepared activities; they prepared tasks, exchanged ideas, guided peer participation, and used English to achieve lesson-related communicative outcomes. This repeated cycle of preparation, performance, discussion, and feedback may have increased exposure to language input, encouraged communicative production, and created peer-supported opportunities for language use.

The affective findings also resonate with studies linking task-based work to motivation, learner attitudes, and positive classroom participation. Chua and Lin (2020) showed that TBLT supported learning motivation, while Xuyen and Trang (2021) reported that task-based speaking activities improved oral performance and were positively perceived by learners. Similarly, Lan Ngoc (2023) found that TBLT improved speaking

performance and learners' attitudes toward speaking classes. The present study adds to this line of work by focusing on FLE and AR alongside LG. This contribution is noteworthy because much of the previous empirical work has examined language skills or motivation, whereas the present findings suggest that student-developed tasks may also support learners' enjoyment of classroom participation and their capacity to persist through task difficulty. In this respect, the study shifts attention from teacher-designed task implementation to learner-developed task participation and from single-skill outcomes to combined affective and linguistic development in the Uzbek EFL context.

A key mechanism may involve learner ownership. Student-developed tasks gave learners opportunities to select lesson-related content, prepare classroom activities, organize peer engagement, and take responsibility for task completion. This form of participation may have made English more functional within classroom interaction because learners used the language to plan, explain, negotiate, and complete tasks with classmates. This interpretation is consistent with Nunan's (2004) view that TBLT connects classroom learning with interaction, learner experience, and meaningful language use. When learners prepared and completed tasks related to the lessons, English was not presented only as material to be studied; it became a practical resource for accomplishing classroom purposes. This likely contributed to the stronger LG scores observed in EG and may also explain why learners experienced higher FLE after the intervention.

Peer collaboration and teacher support offer another explanation for the findings. EG was organized into subgroups, and learners worked together to prepare and complete tasks. Such conditions may have allowed learners to use their existing linguistic knowledge, ask questions, receive peer assistance,

revise their ideas, and extend their language use through repeated interaction. The teacher's role as facilitator was also important because the tasks required guidance, monitoring, linguistic support, and classroom management. In this sense, the effectiveness of student-developed tasks should not be understood as the result of learner autonomy alone. Rather, the intervention appears to have worked through a combination of learner responsibility, collaborative participation, and teacher scaffolding. This interpretation is compatible with the central assumption of TBLT that language development can occur when learners use language to achieve meaningful communicative outcomes.

The affective gains can also be interpreted through SDT and broaden-and-build theory. From an SDT perspective, student-developed tasks may have supported autonomy because learners were involved in designing role-plays, questions, vocabulary activities, problem-solving tasks, and other lesson-related activities. They may have supported competence because learners used English for achievable communicative purposes and received support from peers and the teacher. They may have supported relatedness because the tasks required cooperation, discussion, and shared responsibility. From the perspective of broaden-and-build theory, positive classroom emotions may expand learners' participation and help them build cognitive, social, and psychological resources. This interpretation helps account for the stronger FLE and AR scores observed in EG. When learners experience enjoyment, cooperation, and meaningful challenge, they may become more willing to participate, manage difficulty, and continue investing effort in language learning.

Taken together, the findings suggest that student-developed tasks can function as a pedagogical bridge between meaningful language use and affective development. They appear to support LG by increasing

opportunities for purposeful English use, FLE by making classroom participation more active and personally meaningful, and AR by giving learners structured opportunities to face and manage learning challenges. However, these benefits depend on careful task modeling, teacher guidance, linguistic support, and alignment between task demands and learners' proficiency level. Student-developed tasks should therefore be viewed not as a universally effective technique, but as a context-sensitive instructional practice that can enrich EFL learning when it is carefully designed, scaffolded, and integrated into classroom instruction.

6. Conclusions

Learner-generated task design can support both affective and linguistic dimensions of EFL learning. In the present study, the advantage of EG indicated that student-developed tasks created classroom conditions for more active participation, stronger persistence, and more purposeful language use after baseline performance was taken into account. Learners who studied through student-developed tasks reported greater FLE, demonstrated stronger AR, and showed stronger LG than those who received regular instruction. These results indicate that learner involvement in task design can make classroom learning more participatory and personally meaningful because learners engage in task preparation, peer completion, shared responsibility, classroom interaction, and teacher-facilitated support. Enjoyment may be strengthened through autonomy and meaningful participation, resilience through manageable challenge and peer support, and LG through repeated communicative use of English.

The study connects student-developed tasks with affective and linguistic outcomes in an Uzbek EFL context. It illustrates how learner-generated tasks can operationalize TBLT principles through purposeful language use, learner participation, and classroom interaction (Nunan, 2004). It also links task-based participation with PP by showing that FLE reflects learners' positive engagement with classroom challenge, peer interaction, and meaningful activity (Dewaele & MacIntyre, 2016). In addition, the findings position AR as a classroom-supported process rather than only as an individual learner attribute. When learners receive opportunities to design tasks, cooperate with classmates, and manage attainable classroom challenges, resilience may be supported through instructional practice as well as personal effort (Cassidy, 2016; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

In practice, EFL teachers can integrate learner-generated task design into regular lessons by asking learners to prepare short role-plays, comprehension questions, vocabulary activities, problem-solving tasks, or mini-presentations connected to textbook units. These tasks should be supported by modeling, rubrics, time limits, language prompts, and peer-feedback routines so that learner autonomy is guided rather than left unsupported. Such practices can help learners take responsibility for learning, cooperate with peers, and use English for meaningful classroom purposes. At the curriculum level, textbooks and supplementary materials may include guided learner-generated task templates, reflection prompts, and peer-evaluation forms that help learners connect instructional content with their own communicative needs.

The findings should nevertheless be interpreted within the boundaries of the study design. The sample was limited to Uzbek

intermediate EFL learners, which restricts the transferability of the results to other proficiency levels, age groups, and instructional contexts. Because the intervention was limited to selected textbook lessons, longer task programs are needed to examine whether similar gains remain stable across a full semester or academic year. The study also relied mainly on quantitative pretest and post-test measures, so future mixed-methods work could include observations, portfolios, interviews, and interaction analysis to show how learners experience task design, collaboration, and challenge during instruction. Further research should also compare different learner-generated task types to identify which design features best support enjoyment, resilience, and LG. Overall, student-developed tasks appear to offer a useful way to make EFL learning more participatory, socially supported, and communicatively purposeful when task design is carefully modeled, scaffolded, and aligned with learners' proficiency level.

Abbreviations:

EG: Experimental group

CG: Control group

EFL: English as a foreign language

FLE: Foreign language enjoyment

AR: Academic resilience

PP: positive psychology

TBLT: task-based language teaching

SDT: Self-determination theory

PET: Preliminary English test

References

- Akkaş, F. D., Tekin, I., & Aydın, S. (2022). A correlational study on enjoyment and anxiety in a foreign language learning context. *International LET-IN 2022 Conference*, 306–314. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED625365.pdf>
- Aydın, S., Tekin, I., & Akkaş, F. D. (2024). Construction and validation of the foreign language learning enjoyment scale. *Psychology in the Schools*, 61(2), 657–670. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23076>
- Beding, B. P., & Inthapthim, D. (2019). The effects of using a task-based language teaching approach on the speaking skill of Thai EFL learners. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 17(1), 105–126. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jhusoc/article/view/197154>
- Botes, E., Dewaele, J.-M., & Greiff, S. (2022). Taking stock: A meta-analysis of the effects of foreign language enjoyment. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 12(2), 205–232. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2022.12.2.3>
- Cassidy, S. (2016). The academic resilience scale (ARS-30): A new multidimensional construct measure. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 1787. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01787>
- Chua, H. W., & Lin, C. Y. (2020). The effect of task-based language teaching in learning motivation. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 2(1), 41–48.
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC).

Depression and Anxiety, 18(2), 76–82.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>

De Smet, A., Mettwie, L., Galand, B., Hiligsmann, P., & Van Mensel, L. (2018). Classroom anxiety and enjoyment in CLIL and non-CLIL: Does the target language matter? *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 8(1), 47–71.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.1.3>

Dent, R. J., & Cameron, R. J. S. (2003). Developing resilience in children who are in public care: The educational psychology perspective. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 19(1), 3–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0266736032000061170>

Derakhshan, A., & Fathi, J. (2024). Grit and foreign language enjoyment as predictors of EFL learners' online engagement: The mediating role of online learning self-efficacy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 33(4), 759–769. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-023-00745-x>

Dewaele, J.-M. (2015). On emotions in foreign language learning and use. *The Language Teacher*, 39(3), 13–15.

Dewaele, J.-M., Botes, E., & Greiff, S. (2023). Sources and effects of foreign language enjoyment, anxiety, and boredom: A structural equation modeling approach. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45(2), 461–479. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263122000328>

- Dewaele, J.-M., & Dewaele, L. (2020). Are foreign language learners' enjoyment and anxiety specific to the teacher? An investigation into the dynamics of learners' classroom emotions. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 10(1), 45–65.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2020.10.1.3>
- Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2014). The two faces of Janus? Anxiety and enjoyment in the foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 237–274.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.5>
- Dewaele, J.-M., & MacIntyre, P. D. (2016). Foreign language enjoyment and foreign language classroom anxiety: The right and left feet of the language learner. In P. D. MacIntyre, T. Gregersen, & S. Mercer (Eds.), *Positive psychology in SLA* (pp. 215–236). Multilingual Matters.
- Dewaele, J.-M., Chen, X., Padilla, A. M., & Lake, J. (2019). The flowering of positive psychology in foreign language teaching and acquisition research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2128.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02128>
- Dewaele, J.-M., Saito, K., & Halimi, F. (2023). How foreign language enjoyment acts as a buoy for sagging motivation: A longitudinal investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 44(1), 22–45.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac033>
- Dewaele, J.-M., Witney, J., Saito, K., & Dewaele, L. (2018). Foreign language enjoyment and anxiety: The effect of teacher and learner

variables. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(6), 676–697.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817692161>

Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>

Edwards, T., Catling, J. C., & Parry, E. (2016). Identifying predictors of resilience in students. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 22(1), 26–34.

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

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>

Everhart Chaffee, K., Noels, K. A., & McEown, M. S. (2014). Learning from authoritarian teachers: Controlling the situation or controlling yourself can sustain motivation. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 4(2), 355–387.
<https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2014.4.2.9>

Farde Davaji, A., & Ghoorchaei, B. (2023). The effect of pre-task planning on the speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Contemporary Language Research*, 2(1), 42–48.
<https://doi.org/10.58803/JCLR.2023.168993>

Fathi, J., & Hejazi, S. Y. (2024). Ideal L2 self and foreign language achievement: The mediating roles of L2 grit and foreign language

enjoyment. *Current Psychology*, 43(12), 10606–10620.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05187-8>

Fathi, J., & Mohammaddokht, F. (2021). Foreign language enjoyment and anxiety as the correlates of the ideal L2 self in the English as a foreign language context. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 790648. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.790648>

Fathi, J., Pawlak, M., Mehraein, S., Mohammad Hosseini, H., & Derakhshesh, A. (2023). Foreign language enjoyment, ideal L2 self, and intercultural communicative competence as predictors of willingness to communicate among EFL learners. *System*, 115, Article 103067. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103067>

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist*, 18(1), 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124>

Fredrickson, B. L. (2009). *Positivity: Groundbreaking research reveals how to embrace the hidden strength of positive emotions, overcome negativity, and thrive*. Crown Archetype.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). Emotional geographies of teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1056–1080. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0161-4681.00142>

Herrman, H., Stewart, D. E., Diaz-Granados, N., Berger, E. L., Jackson, B., & Yuen, T. (2011). What is resilience? *The Canadian Journal of*

Psychiatry, 56(5), 258–265.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/070674371105600504>

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. A. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70(2), 125–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x>

Howe, A., Smajdor, A., & Stöckl, A. (2012). Towards an understanding of resilience and its relevance to medical training. *Medical Education*, 46(4), 349–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04188.x>

Jiang, Y., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2019). How unique is the foreign language classroom enjoyment and anxiety of Chinese EFL learners? *System*, 82, 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.02.017>

Jin, Y., & Zhang, L. J. (2021). The dimensions of foreign language classroom enjoyment and their effect on foreign language achievement. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(7), 948–962. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1526253>

Jowkar, B., Kojuri, J., Kohoulat, N., & Hayat, A. A. (2014). Academic resilience in education: The role of achievement goal orientations. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 2(1), 33–38.

Kaikaew, M., & Lornklang, T. (2015). *Using task-based learning focusing on Thai culture to promote English writing ability of tenth grade students* [Master's thesis, Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University].

- Khademi, M., Mellati, M., & Notghi Moghaddam, S. (2017). The impacts of post-task activities on Iranian EFL learners' reading achievements. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 8(1), 106–114. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0801.13>
- Khezzrinejad, M., Rashtchi, M., & Seifoori, Z. (2025). The effects of pre-task conditions on EFL learners' cognitive processes and writing performance. *Teaching English Language*, 19(1), 353–387. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2024.401334.1477>
- Kim, H., Doiron, K., Warren, M. A., & Donaldson, S. I. (2018). The international landscape of positive psychology research: A systematic review. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 8(1), 50–70. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v8i1.651>
- Kim, K. T. (2019). A mediating effect of positive psychological capital on the relationship between academic grit and academic burnout perceived by high school students. *Journal of the Korea Convergence Society*, 10(6), 219–225. <https://doi.org/10.15207/JKCS.2019.10.6.219>
- Kim, T.-Y., & Kim, Y. M. (2021). Structural relationship between L2 learning motivation and resilience and their impact on motivated behavior and L2 proficiency. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 50, 417–436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-020-09721-8>
- Knight, C. (2007). A resilience framework: Perspectives for educators. *Health Education*, 107(6), 543–555. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09654280710827939>

Krovetz, M. L. (2008). *Fostering resilience: Expecting all students to use their minds and hearts well* (2nd ed.). Corwin Press.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Li, C. (2020). A positive psychology perspective on Chinese EFL students' trait emotional intelligence, foreign language enjoyment and EFL learning achievement. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 41(3), 246–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1614187>

Li, C., Jiang, G., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2018). Understanding Chinese high school students' foreign language enjoyment: Validation of the Chinese version of the Foreign Language Enjoyment Scale. *System*, 76, 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.06.004>

Li, C., Zhang, L. J., & Jiang, G. (2024). Conceptualisation and measurement of foreign language learning burnout among Chinese EFL students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(4), 906–920. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2021.1931246>

Li, H. (2022). Classroom enjoyment: Relations with EFL students' disengagement and burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 824443. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.824443>

Liu, H., & Chu, W. (2022). Exploring EFL teacher resilience in the Chinese context. *System*, 105, Article 102752. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102752>

- MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2019). Setting an agenda for positive psychology in SLA: Theory, practice, and research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(1), 262–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12544>
- Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2009). Academic resilience and academic buoyancy: Multidimensional and hierarchical conceptual framing of causes, correlates, and cognate constructs. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(3), 353–370. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934639>
- Masten, A. S., & Tellegen, A. (2012). Resilience in developmental psychopathology: Contributions of the Project Competence Longitudinal Study. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24(2), 345–361. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095457941200003X>
- Mierzwa, E. (2018). The relationship between foreign language enjoyment and gender among secondary grammar school students. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 9(2), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs20182.117.135>
- Mohammad Hosseini, H., Fathi, J., Derakhshesh, A., & Mehraein, S. (2022). A model of classroom social climate, foreign language enjoyment, and student engagement among English as a foreign language learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 933842. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.933842>

154 Teaching English Language

Student-Developed Tasks ...

- Morales, E. E., & Trotman, F. K. (2004). *Promoting academic resilience in multicultural America: Factors affecting student success*. Peter Lang.
- Ngọc, N. T. L. (2023). The effects of task-based language teaching on EFL learners' speaking performance. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 108–134. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2023.5.3.13>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyen, T. M. H., & Luu, T. T. (2018). The effect of task-based language teaching on EFL learners' writing performance at Tien Giang University. *CTU Journal of Innovation and Sustainable Development*, 54(09), 91–97. <https://doi.org/10.22144/ctu.jen.2018.031>
- Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (Eds.). (2014). *International handbook of emotions in education*. Routledge.
- Pham, V. P. H., & Nguyen, H. L. (2014). The impacts of task-based speaking activities on English-majored freshmen's oral performance at Ba Ria-Vung Tau Teacher Training College. *Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science*, 4(1), 57–69.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

- Rahimi, S., & Rezai, A. (2023). Cultivating Iranian high school students' writing skills through task-based language teaching: A mixed-methods study. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 47(1), 1–13.
- Rajendran, K., & Videka, L. (2006). Relational and academic components of resilience in maltreated adolescents. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094(1), 345–349. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1376.047>
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Rouse, K. A. G. (2001). Resilient students' goals and motivation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 24(4), 461–472. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.2001.0383>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1020>
- Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (2003). Flourishing under fire: Resilience as a prototype of challenged thriving. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 15–36). American Psychological Association.

- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>
- Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (2002). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Shen, J. (2021). A review of the effectiveness of foreign language enjoyment and foreign language classroom anxiety on learners' engagement and attainment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 749284.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.749284>
- Shin, J., & Kim, T.-Y. (2017). South Korean elementary school students' English learning resilience, motivation, and demotivation. *Linguistic Research*, 34, 69–96. <https://doi.org/10.17250/khisli.34.201709.004>
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.1.38>
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning*, 49(1), 93–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9922.00071>
- Smith, T. W. (2006). Personality as risk and resilience in physical health. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 227–231.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00441.x>

- Thomsen, K. (2002). *Building resilient students: Integrating resiliency into what you already know and do*. Corwin Press.
- Truebridge, S. (2016). Resilience: It begins with beliefs. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 52(1), 22–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2016.1123041>
- Ungar, M. (2012). Social ecologies and their contribution to resilience. In M. Ungar (Ed.), *The social ecology of resilience: A handbook of theory and practice* (pp. 13–31). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-0586-3_2
- Van den Branden, K. (2009). Diffusion and implementation of innovations. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 659–672). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Waxman, H. C., Rivera, H. H., & Powers, R. A. (2012). English language learners' educational resilience and classroom learning environment. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 35(4), 53–72.
- White, B., Driver, S., & Warren, A. M. (2010). Resilience and indicators of adjustment during rehabilitation from a spinal cord injury. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 55(1), 23–32.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018451>
- White, C. J. (2018). The emotional turn in applied linguistics and TESOL: Significance, challenges and prospects. In J. de Dios Martínez Agudo (Ed.), *Emotions in second language teaching: Theory*,

research and teacher education (pp. 19–34). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75438-3_2

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2001). Task-based language learning. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 173–179). Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Some questions and answers. *The Language Teacher*, 33(3), 3–8.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman.

Wu, W., Wang, Y., & Huang, R. (2023). Teachers matter: Exploring the impact of perceived teacher affective support and teacher enjoyment on L2 learner grit and burnout. *System*, 117, Article 103096.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103096>

Xuyen, V. T. M., & Trang, N. H. (2021). Effects of task-based speaking activities on EFL learners' oral performance. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, 6(6), 17–37.
<https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v6i6.3906>

Yaghchi, M. A., Ghafoori, N., & Nabifar, N. (2016). The effects of authoritative vs. facilitative interventions on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Journal of Instruction and Evaluation*, 9(35), 177–194.

Zeng, G., Hou, H., & Peng, K. (2016). Effect of growth mindset on school engagement and psychological well-being of Chinese primary and middle school students: The mediating role of resilience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, Article 1873. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01873>

Zhang, L. J., Fathi, J., & Mohammaddokht, F. (2023). Predicting teaching enjoyment from teachers' perceived school climate, self-efficacy, and psychological wellbeing at work: EFL teachers. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 130(5), 2269–2299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00315125231182269>

Zohrabi, M. (2023). A pragmatic view on education: Navigating AI, technology, curriculum, and identity in the 21st century. *International Journal of Practical and Pedagogical Issues in English Education*, 1(3), 72–90. <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijpie.2023.233191>

Zohrabi, M., & Paydar, Z. (2025). Iranian EFL practitioners' issues at private institutes and state schools. *Teaching English Language*, 19(1), 81–118. <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2025.433009.1552>



2026 by the authors. Licensee Journal of Teaching English Language (TEL). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution–NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).