

Exploring an Online Language Teaching Task Design and Its Implementation: A Case Study in an Online Course

Romadhon

Didi Sukyadi

Pupung Purnawarman

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

romadhon@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

During the outbreak issues, English online courses become an alternative for students to deepen and strengthen their English proficiency. Task-based language teaching (TBLT) in an online environment requires a framework that teachers or developers follow. As in schools, online courses also have a task design to guide teaching and learning. Hence, it is essential to investigate an online language task design and also its implementations whether based on any framework or not. This study conducted a qualitative case study design focusing on a newly established English online course as the main resource for collecting detailed and in-depth data. Since it was recently established, it has provided relevant data on how a task design was developed. Therefore, this study explores a task design in a recently established online course using Hampel's an online language teaching framework (2006), consisting of three levels: approach, design, and procedure. Data collections were taken from an open-ended questionnaire of all tutors using a google form, document analysis of the syllabus of the beginner class level, and classroom observation from recorded videos of the learning process. Those data were analyzed using Hampel's framework to present approach, design, and procedure the online course embodied. The findings show that the online course followed the Hampel's online language teaching framework from the task design to implementations. Even though implicitly implemented, the online course incorporated second language acquisition, sociocultural and medium, mode, and affordance. Its design and procedure only consisted of the content's organization and objectives without further information about instructional teaching and medium, modes, and affordance. This study is appropriate as a recommendation for online English language teaching provided by online courses or formal schools to rethink their task design.

Keywords: English online course, case study, online language teaching framework, task-based language teaching

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the pandemic, all activities, including teaching and learning English, are conducted via the internet, whether formal or informal. English online courses can help students deepen and strengthen their English skills while they are studying at home. It demonstrates massive open online courses, or MOOCs (González-lloret & Ortega, 2015). An online course, like any other, must have a task design to guide teaching and learning. In developing online task design, educators and developers must consider a framework that assists them in organizing teaching activities based on theoretical foundations for online language teaching.

A task is defined as a sequence of activities with specific instructions at the beginning and end that function on communication as the characteristics of Task-based language teaching (TBLT) (González-lloret & Ortega, 2015). TBLT is a pedagogical approach to knowledge construction that can improve teaching and learning, including language learning (Hampel & Stickler, 2015). Approaches, designs, and procedures should be considered by developers, educators, or teachers in a synchronous online environment. According to Hampel (2006), the approach refers to theories of language and language learning, such as second language acquisition theory, sociocultural theory, and medium, mode, and affordance. Richards and Rodgers (2001) then define a design to transform an approach into a method. Procedures, on the other hand, refer to the actual techniques, moment-to-moment practices, and behaviour.

Several studies on task-based language and teaching (TBLT) mediated by technology have been conducted. According to Thomas and Reinders (2010), TBLT combined with computer-assisted Language Learning (CALL) helped students improve their language learning by providing more authentic context and materials. Izadpanah, S. (2010) discovered that motivation, attitudes toward learning, students' beliefs, language anxiety, and preferred learning styles had a greater impact on learning than materials or methods.

Dooly (2011) conducted a study in which teachers' intended plans and students' work plans differed due to dealing with dialog opportunities provided by digital learning, which was unstable, public, and flexible. Furthermore, Lai and Li (2011) examined the use of technology in TBLT and discovered that students and teachers faced a variety of demands and needs that necessitated the development of new knowledge and skills. Bryfonski

and McKay (2019) studied TBLT implementation and evaluation using 52 samples. According to the findings, TBLT implementation had overall positive and robust effects on various learning outcomes.

The majority of the previous studies mentioned above are focused on the implementation of TBLT mediated by technology. They did not, however, discover the task design framework, which must be investigated in order to provide a detailed perspective on how task-based online language teaching is accomplished. The purpose of this study is to examine the task design of an online course and its implementation using Hampel's (2006) three online language teaching framework levels: approach, design, and procedure. A qualitative case study was used as an inductive and investigative method to better understand one specific case (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). The research setting was chosen to be a newly established online course. This study responds to the following research question: how does a newly established online course develop and implement approaches, design, and procedures in the task design?

The findings of this study are significant as a reference for online language teaching, whether in traditional schools or online course institutions, to rethink their task design in developing and implementing approaches, design, and procedures based on the online language teaching framework.

Literature Review

Defining Task design

Language teaching and learning are broad concepts that can be applied in a variety of pedagogical contexts. One of them is technology-mediated Tasks-based Language Teaching (TBLT). Several researchers have discussed task-based definitions ranging from general to specific (Nunan, 2004; Lai & Li, 2011; González-lloret & Ortega, 2015). According to Long (1985), a task is any activity that people do for free or in exchange for rewards. According to Richard (1986), a task is a set of activities that involve understanding the language but do not necessarily involve language production. Ellis (2003) defines a task in relation to English teaching as a work plan that requires learners to understand language pragmatically and use the language appropriately. As a result, it can engage learners' productive or receptive, spoken or written, and cognitive processes. Nunan (2004) then adds that a task is a set of classroom activities that leads

learners to comprehend, manipulate, produce, and interact with the target language in order for them to become communicative.

Furthermore, Ellis (2009) describes four characteristics of operational definition in TBLT: focus on meaning, finding the gap, expanding learners' resources, and setting the outcomes. Then, in technology-mediated-TBLT, González-lloret and Ortega (2015) stated additional operational definitions: primary focusing on meaning, goal orientation, learner-centeredness, holism, and reflective learning. As a result, it can be concluded that a broad definition of a task refers to activities that people should complete. A task is primarily defined as a series of classroom activities that guide learners to deal with language in order for them to be communicative individuals. Furthermore, TBLT strengthens language teaching to promote meaning-based, objective-based, and learner-centeredness.

Task Design in Online Language Teaching

As the advancement of Information Communication and Technology (ICT) influences how language is taught, educators and researchers attempt to deal with the domains of Computer-assisted Language Learning (CALL) and Computer-mediated Communication (CMC) in language teaching (Hubbard, 2009, P.1). However, when it comes to teaching English, there will always be challenges (Ellis, 2003; Lai & Li, 2011) and benefits (Hampel, 2008). TBLT, as one of the pedagogical approaches (Hampel & Stickler, 2015), is appropriate for maximizing benefits and minimizing challenges (González-lloret & Ortega, 2015) in online language teaching. Furthermore, this approach focuses on how learners engage with their target language to become communicative, and the learning process prioritizes syllabus and instructional goals (Nunan, 2004; Richards, 2005).

Because CMC is a CALL development concept that deals with networked or Internet-based applications, it is more relevant as a theoretical foundation for online language teaching task design (Hampel, 2006). CALL with a computer assists learners in language drilling for only reading and writing. Meanwhile, in terms of multimodality, CMC supports the implementation of TBLT in online language teaching. It supports synchronous and asynchronous visual, audio, verbal, or textual modes. It becomes proof of massive open online courses (MOOCs) (González-lloret & Ortega, 2015).

A framework of task design

Hampel (2006) developed a three-level framework approach, design, and procedure in online language teaching based on Richards and Rodgers (2001).

Approach

Three theories about the nature of language and language learning are covered in the approach. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is a theory influenced by psycholinguistic theory (Hampel, 2006), in which learners use language in their mental processing for negotiating meaning (Ellis, 2000, 2003). According to Chapelle (2001), this theory emphasizes learners' cognitive development by focusing on form and meaning, taking into account learners' characteristics, authenticity, relating English to beyond language potential, and practicality in developing online language task design. It also emphasizes the concepts of input, interaction, and output. Krashen (1981) defines input as learners' exposure to meaningful and communicative activities in their native language. Long and Robinson (1998) contend that learners can maximize input by incorporating it into interactions. By simplifying, elaborating, confirming, understanding checks, clarifying requests, and recasting, learners can improve their understanding.

Meanwhile, as Swain (1985) put it, output is required to modify language forms and activate their meta-linguistics in order to detect language use. This theory serves as a foundation for learners to maximize their input, interaction, and output through CMC by utilizing networked communication (Hampel, 2008). For example, consider the use of chatting features (Pellettieri, 2000).

The second is the sociocultural theory, which was developed in Russia from the 1920s to the late 1970s and resulted in various sub-theories. The social nature of learning is one of them. Then, in 1978, Vygotsky introduced socio-constructivism, which is a socially constructed Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Furthermore, Wertsch (1991) contends that cognition is a socially shared experience. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), communities of practice are an integral part of social practice that opposes the internalization of the learning process. In summary, as Johnson (2006) stated, knowledge is obtained through formal

and planned processes, but it can also be informal and transformative as provided by society. As a result, sociocultural theory emphasizes learning as a social phenomenon, interaction, and contribution from a broad perspective.

Individual mental processes associated with cultural, institutional, and historical context, as well as cultural mediation, are all part of sociocultural theory. It is more concerned with social interaction in language learning because the goal is to get students to communicate using language in social situations. As a result, learners can improve psychological functions such as thinking, reasoning, self-awareness, and so on. Lantolf (2006) adds that the mediating process is mediated by three fundamental factors: activities (play, work, education, etc.), artifacts (language and technology), and concepts. As a result, it is critical to process input and generate language output based on the context of the learners. Meskill (1999), for example, stated that in a socio-collaborative learning task, active, participatory, and meaning-centered learning from learners' diverse perspectives of cultures, societies, and educational strata are considered necessary. Moreover, with the technology used, teaching and learning language become transformative since it contributes to learners' language development and critical literacy and challenges social problems (Cummins, 2000).

Following sociocultural theory, the following are some task characteristics: For starters, it allows for different perspectives and opinions. Second, the lack of a single answer encourages active participation and interaction. Third, it provides some type of problem-solving opportunity (to which computers are particularly well suited). Fourth, it emphasizes the roles of individual learners and teams in engaging in processes or assisting learners in locating themselves within a community of participants. Finally, it encourages students to improve their understanding of the language's forms and functions. Then, Hampel (2006) puts sociocultural theory valuing communicative interaction into practice by stating that language teaching should: provide opportunities for arguing, interact with learners' responses, offer problem-solving, maximize learners' engagement, and strengthen their forms and functions in the language used.

Online language teaching is a computer (Hampel, 2008) or other technological tools with the same domains used for CMC (Hampel & Stickler,

2015). Online language teaching provides various modes of multimodality, such as combining audio, text, and graphics, because the medium connects with Networked Communication (NC) or synchronous. These modes provide synchronous and asynchronous audio and visual communication for teachers (Hampel, 2006). Teachers should consider the ability to anticipate challenges in a synchronous meeting and maximize its benefits in task design implementation. Several indicators must be included in online language teachings, such as joint production of texts and images; the online connection allows users to import text or images from the World Wide Web; texts and images can be saved; the simultaneity of specific modes (e.g., audio and text chat); all participants have equal rights, at least technically; the existence of sub-conferences (which can be used for group work); and turn-taking for socialization and community building. The task design of online language teaching must take into account medium, modes, and affordance under Computer-mediated Communication (CMC).

Design

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), developing design is a method for converting an approach to a method. As a result, the design includes objectives, content selection, and organization or syllabus model, types of learning and teaching activities, roles of learners, teachers, and instructional materials.

Procedure

The procedure, according to Richards and Rodgers (2001), is the final conceptualization level and language teaching organization. It leads to techniques, in-the-moment practices, and behavior. Furthermore, procedure integrated tasks and activities with lessons have three dimensions: the use of teaching activities (drills, dialogues, information-gap activities, etc.); the ways of practicing language specifically; and feedback concerning form or content in the utterance or sentences.

Previous Studies

Several studies have been conducted by various researchers to investigate TBLT design and implementation integrated with technology.

According to Thomas and Reinders (2010), TBLT combined with computer-assisted Language Learning (CALL) helped students improve their language learning by providing more authentic context and materials. Izadpanah (2010) discovered that in TBLT, from theory to practice, teachers respected students as individuals and wanted them to succeed. Teachers also admitted that motivation, attitudes toward learning, students' beliefs, language anxiety, and preferred learning styles had a greater impact on learning than materials or methods. As a result, the teachers employed TBLT to foster a student-centered learning environment. Dooly (2011) discovered that a teacher's intended plan and a student's work plan differed because dealing with dialog opportunities in digital learning was unstable, public, and flexible. Furthermore, Lai and Li (2011) examined the use of technology in TBLT and discovered that students and teachers faced a variety of demands and needs that necessitated the development of new knowledge and skills.

Using the stimulated recall method for students and teachers in TBLT, Montoro Sanjosé (2012) discovered that teachers' perceptions and students' actual activities differed during the implementation process. Manuel, Lopes, and Ruiz-cecilia (2017) offered teacher training courses and produced samples of best practices in their study, which focused on designing technology-mediated tasks for language teaching. Bryfonski and Mckay (2019) investigated the effectiveness of TBLT programs on L2 learning by conducting a study on TBLT implementation and evaluation using meta-analytic techniques from 52 sample studies. The findings show that TBLT implementation has an overall positive and robust effect ($d = 0.93$) on various learning outcomes.

Previous relevant studies show that they were only interested in investigating task-based language learning mediated by technology and its positive and negative effects, without considering task design in a school setting. This study differs from previous research. Despite being in a formal education setting, an online course was chosen as the research site. Using Hampel's (2006) online language teaching framework, this study investigates how educators or tutors of a newly established online course developed and implemented an online language task design.

Research Methodology

To naturally capture the data, this study was conducted using a qualitative method with a case study design. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), qualitative research is interpretative and naturalistic. Meanwhile, a case study was chosen as an empirical investigation to investigate one specific case, which is a newly established online course. The researcher considers it critical to investigate and investigate task design and implementation in this online course. Because it is new, it is interesting to investigate how the online course developed and implemented a task design. Furthermore, it lacks the time to reflect on and evaluate online language teaching programs. As a result, this study was conducted to provide recommendations on developing and implementing online English language teaching, specifically for the online course, but also for other informal and formal education settings that may encounter an online environment during the pandemic.

Data Collections

According to Creswell (2013 in Merriam & Tisdell, 2015), a case study is a qualitative approach in which the researcher investigates a bounded system (a case) through detailed and in-depth data collection involving multi-sources of information such as observations, interviews, audio-visual material, documents, and reports. Furthermore, Hampel and Stickler (2015) state that qualitative and interpretative methods deal with written text, images, audio, and recorded video. As a result, the data for this study were derived from documents, audio-visual materials, and an open-ended questionnaire.

To capture the task design of the online course, the document refers to a task design or a syllabus of online teaching. The given document was a basic level online learning syllabus. It has twenty meetings, each of which lasts sixty minutes. The descriptions of the activities are in Indonesian. There were six videos of teaching activities on various topics. These audio-visual materials are required to document tutors' teaching procedures. In addition, an open-ended questionnaire was distributed via Google Form to five active tutors who frequently had online teaching schedules. The questionnaire was designed in accordance with the three approaches mentioned in the literature review: second language acquisition, sociocultural theory, medium, modes, and affordances. The document and the questionnaire were primary sources of information. The secondary data

was then a recorded video to confirm the data had previously been taken. The researcher gathered data by requesting a task design document, compiling a recorded video, and administering a questionnaire. By using those data collection techniques, a task design framework, including approach, design, and procedure, was obtained.

Data Analysis

Creswell's steps for data analysis were used to analyze the data (2012). The steps were as follows: (1) collect the data, (2) reduce the data, (3) display the data, and (4) draw a conclusion and interpretation based on Hampel's theoretical framework (2006). First, the researcher gathered data in a task design document, filmed learning activities, and distributed a questionnaire via a Google form. Second, they examined the content of a task design, as well as recorded videos of learning activities and a questionnaire, in three categories: approach, design, and procedure. The researcher used the following criteria to analyze the syllabus: objectives, content choice and organization or syllabus model, types of learning and teaching activities, roles of learners, roles of teachers, and roles of instructional materials. The researcher then followed Richards and Rodgers (2001) guidelines for recorded videos, focusing on teaching activities, particularly language practice, and feedback on form or content in utterances or sentences. Finally, the questionnaire was developed based on nations' second language acquisition, sociocultural theory, medium, modes, and affordances. The researcher then displayed the data in accordance with the three components of Hampel's framework (2006). The data was then interpreted and discussed in context of the theories mentioned in the literature review.

Findings and Discussion

The findings are drawn below based on a task design document, recorded videos of learning activities, and a questionnaire through a google form.

Approach

The tutors were admitted via questionnaire, as stated in the syllabus. They are visible in the recorded videos. They engaged in some relevant activities based on the SLA theory criteria proposed by Chapelle (2001), such as focusing on form and meaning, taking into account learner

characteristics, authenticity, relating English beyond language potential, and practicality. They considered learners' characteristics before teaching by administering a pre-test and exploring their personalities, needs, and language proficiency at the first meeting in an introduction session. It backs up Thomas and Reinders' (2010) research findings that TBLT combined with technology provides more authentic contexts and materials. It can be seen from the excerpt below:

Participant 1: Yes, I do it by conducting a pre-test.

Participant 2: Yes, before teaching, I always create chemistry with my students. Knowing what their needs and their character. Therefore, I can decide which strategy to teach them, especially personally.

Participant 3: Yes, before the actual meeting, I always held the technical meeting to discuss with my students the purpose of the learning and ask them to tell me some difficulties they faced in learning English before joining my course. I also gave them the pre-test to measure their English ability. Then, I ask them how they enjoyed the learning and their wishes about learning with me. Then, after the technical meeting, I take a note of the member related to the information I collected before and arrange the syllabus for the course by considering the needs, problems and characteristics of the students.

Participant 4: Yes, how they can accept the material.

Participant 5: No, I don't think it's characteristic. At the first meeting, I made them speak, so I just considered their skill level of English-speaking. Every class always has some kinds of learners. I just adjust my speed on explaining; if he/ she is low, I'll explain it slowly. If he still doesn't understand so, I'll explain in Bahasa. And the rest one, med and high skill I'll explain in English.

They mostly taught language forms by implementing topics arranged in the syllabus as part of speech and impromptu feedback while speaking activities. It is mentioned in the following excerpts:

Participant 1: Yes, by introducing them part of speech, kind of phrase, and kind of clauses then analyzing sentence.

Participant 2: No, language form is not my focus. However, it's only an additional term to explain how the sentence arranges to.

Participant 3: Yes, by using some simple tricks to remember grammatical forms

Participant 4: Yes, by Explanation and Example

Participant 5: Yes, I don't teach them, but I just let them know what their mistakes are and ask them to repeat what I corrected and question them on and on to ensure they don't do the same mistakes in the next meeting.

However, at the same time, they also focused on language meaning and context in their teachings. They emphasized the accuracy of language use with the contexts involved to make the best meaning. An example of activities is when they explained the functions of language expressions. The excerpts that show the activities are served below:

Participant 1: Yes, I do it by introducing some expressions used in daily communication, then translating them and telling the function of the expressions.

Participant 2: Yes, I ask them to find out the meaning of the English word and then translate the expression/sentences. I remind them if language meaning has two parts that connect to content and context. So, they can understand how unique language is, which has a lot of meanings, even only one word/ one letter like "a". it means a singular noun with different meanings based on the noun that will be explained.

Participant 3: Yes, learning by context. I always start my class by asking my students about their day or the current news in every meeting. Let them think and express their ideas in English and forbid them to use Indonesian. I prosecute them to deliver their thoughts in English no matter how hard it is. I let them open the

dictionary, use body language or signs, or ask their friends if they don't know the Indonesian words in English. I also train them to always look for keywords to express their ideas if they find expressing them in complete forms. And train them to know the functions of every single word in the sentence.

Participant 4: Yes, I do because we use Bahasa.

Participant 5: Yes, I do. If I can't catch their word, I ask them about the meaning. If the words suit to meaning, I'll let it, but if it sounds weird, I correct it with its use and meaning and give them some options of vocabulary they can use.

Further, they associated the expressions with learners' real-world teaching activities. Some tutors did the topics mentioned in the syllabus, such as habits, daily life, giving opinions, and arguments. The tutors' statements are presented below:

Participant 1: Yes, speaking English relates to their daily life habits.

Participant 2: Yes, I asked them to practice English related to their lives. For instance, telling opinions on the specific issues that are happening. Telling their daily activities, experiences or what they wanna be in the future. On the other hand, I have a conversation with my students related to their daily lives.

Participant 3: Yes, give them an analogy in the discussion related to the current issues and daily activities.

Participant 4: Yes, life is not imagined and games

Participant 5: Yes, I can't say yes, but I'll give examples that relate to them to make the material understandable.

They gave learners reinforcements and motivations to explore something other than the English materials during and after the teaching, such as asking learners to love literacy, music, and reading English-related news.

Participant 1: No. I don't.

Participant 2: Yes, I motivate my student to seek more knowledge outside the classroom, such as reading books, novels, newspapers or something that's happening. Actually, in the class, I give them time to relax by listening to music, then ask them to learn from the lyrics.

Participant 3: Yes, I always ask them to discuss the current news before the meetings.

Participant 4: Yes, like first before we love.

Participant 5: Yes, of course; I'll motivate them at the end of the section and give them tips to persuade them to love English.

They eventually looked into using a whiteboard and share screen to show videos, pictures, games, and other materials to teach English. In addition, they used Google Classroom, Google Forms, Instagram, WhatsApp, Kahoot, PowerPoint, and YouTube to supplement their instruction.

Participant 1: Yes, I usually share the screen when using the ZOOM mobile application to show some pictures and share the whiteboard to type some sentences discussed.

Participant 2: Yes, teaching in era 4.0 and considering the outbreak of the corona pandemic means a teacher should give innovative ways to teach a student with technology. I use some applications such as zoom and google classroom as an online class to discuss the material. Then, I used Google Forms to examine writing. Sometimes, I ask them to use an Instagram account to share their project speaking. Last, I have group discussions or English area in WhatsApp messenger.

Participant 3: Yes, using the Kahoot applications for some games. Also, PowerPoint to see the materials we discussed. Youtube for some related topic videos.

Participant 4: Yes, simply just join.

Participant 5: Yes, I always do that, and it depends on the situation and material. I will use a whiteboard to give them additional information, and as media for them to give their ideas, I type them on the whiteboard. And about the video, pictures and games just for an ice-breaking for them.

All those activities show that the tutors emphasized input, interaction, and output in developing learners' cognition (Krashen, 1981; Swain, 1985; Robinson, 1998). It strengthens what has been founded by Izadpanah (2010) that teachers acknowledge motivation, attitudes to learning, and students' beliefs since TBLT promotes a student-centered. The variety of social media and digital platforms that the tutors utilized show that CMC boosted learners' input, interaction, and output (Hampel, 2008).

The researcher discovered that the tutors performed the majority of the sociocultural theory characteristics mentioned by Meskill (1999). They improved learners' comprehension by teaching them the forms and functions of language implicitly and explicitly through the topics. Furthermore, they provided opportunities for learners to discuss various perspectives and opinions through the WhatsApp group.

Participant 1: Yes, outside the online classroom, I provide a WhatsApp group for discussions, including giving an opinion, argumentation, disagreement and question-answer section.

Participant 3: Yes, discussions about one current or sensitive issue like open debate. Everyone is free to give their argument and response to others.

Participant 4: Yes, For more experience, I think.

Further, they actively triggered learners to interact by actively giving them explorative answers.

Participant 2: Yes, When students give an example or speak, I'll give some notes (corrective feedback) for them like the pronunciation,

structure or word choice. Then, I ask them about the meaning of their sentence, just to know how their arranged sentence.

Participant 3: Yes, If I see that my students have high critical thinking but don't give a satisfying reason for their arguments, I will tell them to read more and ask them to always put the reason they give their statements.

Participant 4: Yes, Practice more.

Participant 5: Yes, in One of the cases, I just let them speak about their daily routine. While speaking, I listen to them and try to find anything I ask them. From the question I gave, they improved and explored what they missed to share.

They asked the learner to install a dictionary application to help with language tools.

Participant 1: Yes, I recommend the students to use "kamusku", "pintar bahasa Inggris", etc.

Participant 2: Yes, When students want to find more about the vocabulary with its classification, I ask them to use the Oxford online dictionary.

Participant 3: Yes, I always ask them to have an online or offline dictionary on their mobile phone for technological tools. Also, installing the google assistant to support their learning in English.

Surprisingly, they also used a WhatsApp group to engage learners in participants.

Participant 1: Yes, I usually invite them to discuss in WhatsApp groups in informal situations nowadays.

Participant 2: Yes, I always give some topic in WhatsApp group or ask them to do some challenge and exercise then share and discuss it.

Participant 3: Yes, I am always trying to catch them up in the group discussion. I ask them about their day and discuss one issue or send some jokes.

Participant 4: Yes, in our WA group.

Participant 5: Yes, before I close the meeting, I always remind them to keep in touch out the meeting on group discussion; sometimes they do, some don't.

The researcher discovered that the tutors demonstrated the majority of Meskill's sociocultural theory characteristics (1999). They improved learners' comprehension by teaching them language forms and functions implicitly and explicitly through the topics. Furthermore, they provided opportunities for students to discuss various points of view and opinions via a WhatsApp group.

The tutors did not make the most of some Zoom meetings for teaching language features based on Hampel's medium, modes, and affordance (2006). They collaborated on text and image creation using the share-screen feature. However, not all tutors shared any modes or resources from the website directly. Even though there was a recording feature, most tutors did not use it. It also happened with the chatroom feature; almost no tutors used it while teaching. Tutors also struggled with the share screen and breakout room features. Surprisingly, the tutors claimed that they could monitor learners' gestures via zoom meetings, despite the theory stating that it should be difficult.

Table 1.

Instructional materials of the online learning syllabus

Design

According to the data from a task design, the online course only explicitly mentions two aspects of designing a task that Hampel (2006)

highlights: the content choice with its organization and the objectives. There is no information on learning and teaching activities, roles of teachers and students, or instructional materials.

Procedure

The tutors provided specific teaching activities to achieve the learning objectives based on the questionnaire and recorded videos. Drilling, dialogues, and providing feedback on the form or content of an utterance or sentence are some examples. It leads to Hampel's task design for online language teaching (2006). When comparing what was written in the syllabus to recorded videos, it becomes clear that the procedures were not identical. Furthermore, due to connectivity issues, the teaching duration was reduced. As Dooly (2011) stated, it leads to the disadvantage of online language teaching because teachers' intended plans and students' work differ due to unstable, public, and flexible digital learning and dialog opportunities. Montoro Sanjosé (2012) elaborated that in TBLT, teachers' perceptions and students' actual activities differed in the implementation process.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion, this newly established online course implemented theoretical frameworks proposed by Hampel (2006). However, its syllabus or task design did not follow the frameworks. Mainly, in design approaches, what was done by tutors reflects second language acquisition theory, sociocultural theory, and medium, mode, and affordance, even though they were not mentioned in the task design. Particularly, the tutor did not maximize the modes and features of Zoom meetings, although it was the main video conference for teaching online. Both tutors and learners struggled with affordances such as unstable connections. The task design only had the content choice with its organization and objectives. The task design did not contain learning and teaching activities, learners' and teachers' roles, and instructional materials. Those unmentioned criteria exist in the procedure explained verbally by each tutor, such as drilling, dialogues, and giving feedback concerning form or content in the utterance or sentences.

As discussed in the theoretical frameworks, Hampel's framework covers the complete needs for online language teaching, starting from approaches to design and procedure. Furthermore, this framework adopts pedagogical and computer-mediated communication domains relevant to Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). It will bring more significant impacts and benefits if both teaching design and online course implementation are aligned and support each other. Hence, it is recommended for online courses, specifically this recently founded online course or formal education, to align their design and implementations by following Hampel's framework's approaches, design, and procedures (2006).

REFERENCES

- Bryfonski, L., & Mckay, T. H. (2019). TBLT implementation and evaluation: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 23, 603 –632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817744389>
- Chapelle, C. A. (2001) *Computer applications in second language acquisition: foundations for teaching, testing and research*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. In Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth Edition)*. Pearson.
- Denzi, N. and Lincoln, Y. (2011), *SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, Dortmund: SAGE Publications. Grice,
- Dooly, M. (2011). Divergent perceptions of telecollaborative language learning tasks: Tasks-as Workplan vs. task-as-process. *Language Learning & Technology*, 15(2), 69–911.
- Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 7(3), 50–80.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4 (3): 193–220.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 221-246.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- González-lloret & Ortega. (2015). Towards technology-mediated TBLT An introduction. *Technology-mediated TBLT: Researching technology and tasks*, 1–22.

- Hampel, R. (2006). Rethinking task design for the digital age: A framework for language teaching and learning in a synchronous online environment. *ReCALL*, 18(1), 105–121. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344006000711>
- Hampel, R. (2008). Online communication in language learning and teaching. *Choice Reviews Online*, 46(01), 46-0112-46-0112. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.46-0112>
- Hampel, R. (2010). Task design for a virtual learning environment in a distance language course. In M. Thomas, & H. Reinders (Eds), *Task-Based language learning and teaching with technology* (pp. 131–153). London: Continuum
- Hampel, R., & Stickler, U. (2015). Introduction: From teacher training to self-reflective practice. In *developing online language teaching*. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137412263_1
- Hubbard, P. (2009). General introduction. In P. Hubbard (Ed.), *Computer-Assisted Language Learning* (Vols. 1–4, Vol. 1: Foundations of Call, pp. 1–20). New York: Routledge
- Izadpanah, S. (2010). *A study on Task-based Language Teaching : From theory to practice*. *US-China Foreign Language*, 8(3), 47–57.
- Lai & Li (2011). Technology and task-based language teaching: A critical review. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 498–521. <https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.2.498-521>
- Lai, C., & Li, G. (2011). Technology and task-based language teaching: A critical review. *CALICO Journal*, 28(2), 498–521. <https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.2.498-521>
- Lambert, V. a., & Lambert, C. E. (2013). Qualitative descriptive research: An Acceptable Design. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, 16(4), 255–256
- Lantolf, J. P. (2006). Sociocultural theory and L2: State of the art. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(01), 67–109.
- Manuel, A., Lopes, B., & Ruiz-cecilia, R. (2017). Designing Technology-mediated tasks for language teaching : A methodological framework. *H.U. Journal of Education*, 32(2), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2017025101>

- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Fourth). Jossey-Bass.
- Meskill, C. (1999) Computers as tools for sociocollaborative language learning. In: Cameron, K. (ed.), *Computer-Assisted Language Learning (CALL): media, design and applications*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger, 141–162.
- Montoro Sanjosé, C. R. (2012). *The language learning activity of individual learners using online tasks* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Open University, Milton Keynes.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. United Kingdom: Cambridge university press.
- Pellettieri, J. (2000) Negotiation in cyberspace: The role of chatting in the development of grammatical competence, in M. Warschauer and R. Kern (eds), *Network-based Language Teaching: Concepts and Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 59–86
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001) *Approaches and methods in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (Eds) (2010). *Task-based language learning and teaching with technology*. London: Continuum.