



Original Article

Examining the Effects of Task-Based Language Teaching and Presentation-Practice-Production Technique on High School Students' Writing Performance

Trinh Quoc Lap¹, Tran Minh Bao Ngoc¹,
Le Cong Tuan^{1,*}, Le Thanh Thao¹, Nguyen Thi Khanh Doan¹

School of Foreign Languages, Can Tho University, Can Tho, Vietnam

Received 09th July 2025

Revised 03rd March 2026; Accepted 11th March 2026

Abstract: This study investigates the effects of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and the traditional approach of Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) lessons on English writing skills among EFL learners in a high school in Vietnam. With a sample of 80 participants, the study employed a pre-test, middle-test, and post-test design to measure improvements in four aspects of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. Both paired-sample t-tests and independent-sample t-tests were used for data analysis. The results revealed that TBLT and PPP significantly improved all aspects of the tested writing. However, TBLT showed more gains, as indicated by higher t-values across the four categories. The study began with no statistically significant differences between the control and experimental groups ($p = 0.81$). By the middle test, a borderline significance emerged ($p = 0.05$), indicating that the TBLT intervention may have had an effect. By the post-test, the p-value ($p = 0.06$) suggested a trend toward improved writing proficiency for the TBLT group. The findings are discussed through the lens of Flow Theory, highlighting the importance of task engagement and intrinsic motivation in the learning process. The study has implications for ELT in Vietnam and similar contexts and offers recommendations for future research.

Keywords: TBLT, PPP, Flow Theory, writing performance, EFL high school students.

1. Introduction

English as a Foreign Language (EFL) policy and teaching have gained significant importance in Vietnam in recent years, thanks

to the nation's globalization and increased integration into the world economy. As one of the four language skills, writing has often been cited as particularly challenging for Vietnamese EFL students [1-3]. The challenges are noticeably connected to learners' limited competence and teachers' instruction as well. In these studies, the authors highlighted the roles

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: lctuan@ctu.edu.vn

<https://doi.org/10.25073/2588-1159/vnuer.5238>

of motivation and teaching methods as key contributors to improving learners' engagement and progress. Mastery of writing is not merely an academic exercise but a necessity for personal and professional development in various spheres of life.

Despite the abundance of research on effective EFL teaching methods, a dearth of studies remains in comparing the effectiveness of different approaches, particularly in the EFL context of Vietnamese learners [4, 5], where two commonly utilized methods are PPP and TBLT.

However, there is a gap in understanding how these methodologies impact the writing performance of Vietnamese EFL students, particularly in relation to the psychological feature of flow. Particularly, there has been very scant research that applies the Flow Theory to examine the effectiveness of specific EFL teaching methods, such as Task-Based Language Teaching and the Presentation, Practice, and Production approach. Therefore, the primary objective of this experimental study was to compare the effectiveness of TBLT and PPP in teaching writing to Vietnamese EFL students. Specifically, this study aimed to answer the question: "*Which teaching method, TBLT or PPP, is more effective at improving the writing skills of Vietnamese EFL students in light of the Flow Theory?*"

2. Literature Review

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching [6]. It emphasizes interaction and the use of functional language. Dos Santos [7] argued that CLT allows for more authentic language use and encourages students to develop a more nuanced understanding of language by focusing on meaning over form. Several studies, for example, Yundayani et al. [8], indicate that CLT improves EFL students' writing skills, especially their ability to express ideas coherently and

logically. CLT has been implemented in Vietnam, with the most widely practiced version being the PPP instructional procedure.

TBLT, a derivative of Communicative Language Teaching, advocates for meaningful tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction [9]. Research by Nunan [10] highlights that tasks in TBLT should be engaging and meaningful, eliciting real-world language use. Several studies have found that TBLT can improve learners' written performance. A survey by Kafipour et al. [11] found that Chinese EFL students showed substantial improvement in writing complexity, accuracy, and fluency following a TBLT intervention. However, fewer studies are focusing on the effectiveness of TBLT in the context of Vietnamese EFL learners' writing performance.

For a comparison of the two approaches, Nguyen [12] and Duong and Nguyen [13] have explored the general effectiveness of the TBLT and PPP methods in improving language skills in the Vietnamese EFL setting. However, there is a conspicuous lack of research focusing on writing performance, and even fewer studies have considered the psychological aspects of learning, such as "flow", in this specific context. The Flow Theory by Csikszentmihalyi [14] posits that individuals are most engaged and productive in a state of "flow" - an optimal state of intrinsic motivation, where one is fully immersed in the activity. Egbert [15] applied the Flow Theory in language learning contexts and found that students were more motivated and performed better academically when they experienced a state of flow during lessons.

Comparing the two approaches, TBLT and PPP, is, therefore, a worthwhile endeavor. Theoretically, TBLT could be hypothesized as surpassing PPP in the extent that the former advocates less focus on form and allows more learner activity. The first two stages of the PPP lesson do not fully involve learners in revealing their optimal engagement. This study aimed to

contribute further insights to the existing literature on EFL teaching methods by providing empirical evidence on which approach may be more effective for Vietnamese learners. The results could inform EFL pedagogy, curriculum development, and teacher professional learning and development programs in relevant EFL contexts.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Design

This experimental study aimed to empirically investigate the effectiveness of TBLT and PPP in enhancing the writing skills of Vietnamese EFL students. The research

relied on the results of three writing tests to assess students' writing performance before, during, and after instruction using an assigned teaching method.

3.2. Participants and Context

The study involved 80 Vietnamese EFL students whose proficiency was estimated to be equivalent to an intermediate level. They were in the 6th grade at a secondary school in the Mekong Delta. These participants were randomly assigned to two distinct groups: the PPP group and the TBLT group, each comprising 40 students. Table 1 below summarizes the background information of the two groups.

Table 1. Participants

Groups	Number of participants	Genders		Learning years
		Male	Female	
Practice and Production	40	17	23	3-5
Task-Based Language Teaching	40	22	18	3-5
<i>Total</i>	80	39	41	3-5

The PPP group consisted of more females than males, with 23 females and 17 males. In contrast, the TBLT group had more males ($n = 22$) and fewer females ($n = 18$). Additionally, both the PPP and TBLT groups displayed a similar range of years of learning English (between 3 and 5 years), indicating that the participants had a comparable level of exposure to the English language. Moreover, all participants were taught using the same Global Success Grade 6 coursebook. This ensured a standardized curriculum content across both groups. Although they followed the same coursebook, the two groups were subjected to different teaching methodologies. The PPP group followed the established teaching method: present, practice, produce. Meanwhile, the TBLT group was exposed to the practice of

communicative teaching using tasks. Therefore, the teaching method employed for each group served as the independent variable in the study.

3.3. Teaching Materials

For this study, the control and experimental groups utilized the coursebook Global Success Grade 6, published by Pearson in 2022. This coursebook series was developed as part of the National Foreign Languages Project and was designed for Level 2/CEFR A2 students. Each book consists of twelve units and four reviews, organized into seven lessons or headings: Getting Started, A Closer Look 1, A Closer Look 2, Communication, Skill 1 (Reading and Speaking), Skill 2 (Listening and Writing), and Looking Back & Project. Each lesson is allocated 45 minutes, while each review receives two 45-minute periods. Students are

supposed to attend three English lessons each week, equivalent to 105 periods spread across 35 weeks in a school year.

According to McNemey and Elledge (2013) [16], an effective intervention ranges from eight to twelve weeks. Hence, the 12-week duration of this study was considered appropriate. As required by the English curriculum for grade 6, students are expected to be able to write short, simple passages of approximately 40-60 words and brief letters, postcards, or messages related to everyday communication within the curriculum's topics. During the research timeframe, five topics were covered in both groups: Unit 8 (Sports and Games), Unit 9 (Cities of the World), Unit 10 (Houses in the Future), Unit 11 (Our Greener World), and Unit 12 (Robots). The writing tasks were strategically placed in the 6th period of each unit, with a primary focus on writing descriptive paragraphs. This made them especially relevant for this study. The detailed teaching and testing plan is attached in Appendix A.

3.4. Data Collection

The study employed a three-tier testing mechanism, comprising a pre-test, a middle-test, and a post-test. These tests were adapted from Task 1 of the writing tests in the Vietnamese Standardised Test of English Proficiency (VSTEP) and the written part of the final exam in Vietnamese secondary schools. We modified each section of these tests to accommodate the learners' proficiency level. Although the teaching plan outlined six topics for each semester, time constraints for the intervention led us to focus on five topics from the teaching plan.

The tests were adapted from the textbook *Global Success*. Each test was structured similarly to ensure uniform difficulty levels, question types, and time allocation. Questions were designed at varying levels of difficulty: manageable (requiring recall and comprehension) and challenging (involving application and creation).

Each test consists of four parts:

i) Remembering level: Four multiple-choice questions that required students to identify language errors;

ii) Understanding level: Four constructed-response questions requiring students to rearrange given words into complete sentences;

iii) Applying level: Four constructed-response questions ask students to rewrite sentences with the given words;

iv) Creating level: One essay question (40-50 words) based on suggested topics.

The maximum score for each test was 10 points. Multiple-choice and constructed-response questions were each worth 0.5 points, while the essay question was worth 4 points. Two experienced teachers who met the CEFR B2 English language proficiency as mandated by the Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnamese (MOET) in 2018 graded the tests. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 20.0 to evaluate the scores.

A question-wise analysis chart and a test blueprint were prepared to ensure that the tests met educational objectives, covered content adequately, and maintained appropriate difficulty levels. An analytical scoring rubric for essay questions was adapted from Weigle [17], focusing on content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. The complete analytical scoring rubric is displayed in Appendix B.

A reliability pilot was conducted with 40 sixth-grade English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students who were not participants in the study but were similar in terms of English proficiency and motivation. The internal consistency of the pre-test was measured using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a reliability coefficient of 0.79 ($\alpha = 0.79$), which confirms the test's reliability.

3.5. Intervention

The TBLT Group: The instruction in the TBLT group was divided into three main stages:

i) Pre-task: Introduction to the topic and specific tasks, with brainstorming and discussion sessions;

ii) Task cycle: Students engaged in task completion in pairs or small groups, using the language creatively and contextually. They were also given time to plan, draft, and revise their writing;

iii) Language focus: A post-task review of language forms and structures used during the task, often led by the teacher but involving student input.

Additional task-specific sheets, real-world prompts, and guidelines were provided to facilitate the TBLT approach.

The PPP Group: The PPP group emphasized interaction as both the means and goal of learning. The core elements included:

i) Real-world communication: Tasks designed to replicate real-world scenarios, encouraging genuine communication;

ii) Interactive learning: Classroom activities that prioritize student-to-student and student-to-teacher interaction, including group work, pair work, and role-playing;

iii) Skill integration: Focus on integrating the four key language skills-listening, speaking, reading, and writing-within a communicative context.

The primary textbook was supplemented with additional conversation prompts, role-play scenarios, and interactive activities tailored to the PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production) methodology.

Both groups were subject to regular formative and summative assessments to monitor their progress. For the TBLT group, qualitative feedback was also collected to gauge the students' experiences with task-based activities. The PPP group had intermittent self-assessment and peer-assessment sessions to foster communicative competence. This intervention aimed to provide a robust comparative analysis between TBLT and PPP methodologies. By maintaining consistent testing conditions, curriculum, and educational materials, the study focused on teaching methods as the primary variable.

3.6. Data Analysis

The researchers employed various statistical tests to compare the effects of the two teaching methodologies, TBLT and PPP, on improving the writing proficiency of Grade 6 students. Specifically, paired sample t-tests and independent sample t-tests were used to analyze the data collected from the pre-test, middle-test, and post-test.

Paired sample t-tests were conducted to compare the mean scores of individual participants across different time points, mainly: i) Pre-test and middle-test; ii) Middle-test and post-test; and iii) Pre-test and post-test. This aimed to evaluate whether any significant differences in writing proficiency were evident within each group (TBLT and PPP) over time. Similarly, independent sample t-tests were used to compare the mean scores between the two groups (TBLT and PPP) at different time points: i) Pre-test; ii) Middle-test; and iii) Post-test. The purpose was to examine if there was a statistically significant difference in writing proficiency between the two groups at various stages of the intervention. The p-value was assessed to determine the significance of the results. A p-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1. Within the Conditions

The data from the pre-test and post-test underwent rigorous analysis using paired sample t-tests, aimed at evaluating the efficacy of the teaching approach in improving participants' writing skills within each group. The findings are delineated in Table 2.

TBLT: First, the mean score for *content* significantly increased from 0.35 to 0.74. The paired-sample t-test indicates a highly significant difference ($t = -8.65$, $p < 0.001$). Additionally, there was a notable increase in the mean score for the criterion *organization*, from 0.35 in the pre-test to 0.74 in the post-test. The

t-value was -8.18, which is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). The mean score for *vocabulary* also increased significantly, from 0.26 to 0.68. The paired t-value of -7.84 is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Finally, the mean score for *grammar* also rose significantly from 0.24 in the pre-test to 0.64 in the post-test, with a t-value of -9.36, indicating a highly significant statistical difference ($p < 0.001$).

PPP: The mean score for the criterion *content* improved from 0.38 to 0.68, with a

significant t-value of -5.90 ($p < 0.001$). The *organization's* scores rose from a mean of 0.35 to 0.66, and this increase was statistically significant, with a t-value of -6.53 ($p < 0.001$). The *vocabulary* mean score significantly increased from 0.29 to 0.59, showing statistical significance with a t-value of -5.50 ($p < 0.001$). Regarding *grammar*, the mean score increased from 0.28 to 0.52. The t-value was -4.43, which is also statistically significant ($p < 0.001$).

Table 2. Within-group comparison of content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar

Group	Writing's aspect	Tests	Mean	SD	Pair Differences Mean	t	p
Task-Based Language Teaching	Content	Pre-test	0.35	0.37	-0.39	-8.65	0.00
		Post-test	0.74	0.32			
	Organization	Pre-test	0.35	0.37	-0.39	-8.18	0.00
		Post-test	0.74	0.32			
	Vocabulary	Pre-test	0.26	0.30	-0.41	-7.84	0.00
		Post-test	0.68	0.35			
	Grammar	Pre-test	0.24	0.27	-0.40	-9.36	0.00
		Post-test	0.64	0.32			
Practice and Production	Content	Pre-test	0.38	0.31	-0.30	-5.90	0.00
		Post-test	0.68	0.35			
	Organization	Pre-test	0.35	0.29	-0.31	-6.53	0.00
		Post-test	0.66	0.35			
	Vocabulary	Pre-test	0.29	0.28	-0.30	-5.50	0.00
		Post-test	0.59	0.39			
	Grammar	Pre-test	0.28	0.27	-0.24	-4.43	0.00
		Post-test	0.52	0.36			

In summary, the TBLT and PPP approaches led to considerable improvements in writing content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. However, the TBLT group

outperformed the PPP group, as evidenced by higher t-values across all writing categories. The higher t-values in the TBLT group across all writing categories indicate improved scores

and possibly a deeper level of engagement and intrinsic motivation, key components of the “flow” state. This suggests that the TBLT approach may offer a more conducive environment for achieving flow and, eventually, better learning outcomes.

4.2. Between the Conditions

The data collected from the pre-test, middle-test, and post-test were thoroughly analyzed using independent sample t-tests to compare the effectiveness of the two conditions in enhancing the participants’ writing performance. The results are presented in Table 3.

Initially, both the PPP and TBLT groups were statistically similar in writing proficiency, as confirmed by the non-significant p-value of 0.81 in the pre-test. This eliminates the initial skill level as a variable affecting the results, offering a clean slate for comparing the effectiveness of the two methodologies.

By the time of the middle test, a borderline statistically significant difference emerged between the two groups ($p = 0.05$). This suggests that both groups were possibly entering a state of “flow”, but the TBLT method was perhaps more effective in sustaining or deepening that state, as reflected in the higher writing proficiency. The tasks in TBLT might have been more aligned with creating a balance

between challenges and skills, a critical condition for inducing a state of flow.

In the post-test, although the p-value of 0.06 slightly exceeded the conventional alpha level of 0.05 for statistical significance, it still suggests a trend toward higher proficiency in the TBLT group. Given the theoretical framework of flow, it can be interpreted that the TBLT method might have been more successful in keeping students in the flow channel, where the challenges posed by the tasks are optimally matched with the learners’ skill level, leading to a high level of engagement and performance.

The study’s findings align well with the Flow Theory. Both TBLT and PPP were effective, but TBLT had a discernible edge in facilitating a learning environment where students were more likely to enter and sustain a state of “flow”. This psychological state could be a factor that significantly contributes to the higher improvements observed in the TBLT group. The current study contributes to the existing literature on implementing TBLT and PPP in language education, particularly in light of the Flow Theory. Several previous studies have also examined the impact of different teaching methodologies on language learning outcomes, though not always through the lens of the Flow Theory.

Table 3. Between-group comparison: TBLT and PPP

Tests	Group	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	S.D	p
Pre-test	Practice and Production	40	0.50	7.75	3.94	1.98	0.81
	Task-Based Language Teaching	40	0.25	7.25	3.84	1.91	
Middle-test	Practice and Production	40	0.50	9.00	4.69	2.16	0.05
	Task-Based Language Teaching	40	1.75	9.50	5.67	2.25	
Post-test	Practice and Production	40	1.00	9.75	5.65	2.63	0.06
	Task-Based Language Teaching	40	1.50	9.75	6.74	2.49	

In line with previous research, the current study found that TBLT and PPP are effective methods for improving language skills. This reinforces the broad consensus in the literature that these approaches hold value for language instruction. Additionally, a study by Larsen-Freeman [18] suggested that TBLT and PPP

could lead to improvements in various domains of language learning, which is empirically supported by the current study’s findings that both methods enhanced learners’ writing performance in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. Moreover, several studies have suggested the importance of the

psychological state of “flow” in learning [15, 19]. While they did not specifically compare TBLT and PPP, they found that tasks that engage learners can improve outcomes, a sentiment echoed in this current study.

However, while both approaches were practical, the study uniquely demonstrated that TBLT has a statistical advantage over PPP in enhancing language skills, as evidenced by higher t-values across all measured writing categories. This nuanced finding distinguishes this research from studies that do not focus on comparing the effectiveness of these methods. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, fewer studies have employed the Flow Theory as a framework to examine the efficacy of TBLT versus PPP. The current study fills this gap by specifically attributing the differences in effectiveness to the capability of TBLT to induce a “flow” state more consistently than PPP, which may lead to better learning outcomes. In the middle test, a borderline statistically significant difference emerged between the two groups ($p = 0.05$). Although not entirely groundbreaking, this specific finding has not been commonly reported in the literature and suggests that the effect of the intervention may manifest even before the end of the instructional period. The current finding, with a p-value of 0.06 in the post-test, is noteworthy as it slightly exceeds the conventional level for statistical significance. It raises the possibility that with a larger sample size, the trend toward higher proficiency in the TBLT group could achieve statistical significance, a finding that future studies might explore further.

In summary, this study shares some similarities with previous research concerning the general effectiveness of TBLT and PPP. Still, it distinguishes itself by utilizing the Flow Theory to explain the observed differences in effectiveness between the two methods. The current findings suggest that TBLT may be particularly conducive to achieving a state of “flow” - a key factor contributing to its higher efficacy in this study.

The attribution of the role of “flow” in contributing to the effectiveness of TBLT was strengthened through students’ opinions in a follow-up informal focus group interview. Following the post-test, six selected participants were invited to participate in a discussion, where they reflected on their involvement in the TBLT activities.

First, in the learners’ words, TBLT lessons provide opportunities to construct new knowledge based on what they already know. The students said that in doing a task, they can actively and creatively “apply the things teachers taught previously into new situations” (Student B). As opposed to following the rigid stages of the PPP lessons, practicing with tasks is found to be “very interesting, very exciting” (Students A and D). This positive feeling associated with the tasks’ topics, contents, and procedure reveals TBLT’s effectiveness in engaging and creating long-term motivation to learn among the students.

Furthermore, TBLT was reported to be encouraging, contributing to an enhancement of autonomy, a whole immersion, and a sense of achievement. With tasks, we learn to “work together, concentrate on our work” (Student F) and “feel confident and happy that we can do it” (Student C).

The learners’ engagement was found to be increased thanks to the timely support and individual scaffolding in TBLT lessons. Both students B and E said that their teacher gave them tasks “familiar to everyday situations and not difficult to do”. During the writing activities, “My teacher helped us with vocabulary, grammar, and ideas to write” (Student C).

In short, TBLT was described as taking care of each individual in class, requiring a more active role on the learner’s part, and facilitating language development. These elements collectively are believed to help increase the state of “flow” and account for the more significant gains in performance scores in the TBLT approach over the PPP method.

5. Conclusion

In Vietnam, English language education has garnered substantial attention as the country continues to integrate further into the global community. The quest for effective teaching methods has led to the implementation of various pedagogical approaches, including TBLT and PPP. However, despite their popularity, a comparative evaluation of the effectiveness of these methods in the Vietnamese educational context, primarily through the lens of the Flow Theory, has been notably absent.

This study filled the gap by employing a robust methodology that included pre-tests, middle-tests, and post-tests to evaluate the effectiveness of TBLT and PPP in improving the writing skills of Vietnamese students. The effectiveness of the methods was examined, and the difference was sought, explained, and attributed to the role of flow. By employing the Flow Theory as a theoretical framework, the study found that TBLT may be more conducive to achieving a state of “flow” characterized by heightened focus, engagement, and intrinsic motivation, which could significantly contribute to its higher efficacy. This study makes a significant contribution to the field by quantifying the effectiveness of TBLT and PPP and introducing the novel element of the Flow Theory into the discourse on language education methodologies. Through its findings, the study offers valuable insights that can shape the orientation and practice of English language teaching in Vietnam and beyond, adapting to local contexts and accommodating diverse learning needs.

Firstly, the demonstrated effectiveness of TBLT over PPP in enhancing writing skills could have a profound impact on curriculum design. Educational institutions in Vietnam may benefit from revising their existing curricula to incorporate more task-based activities that align with the principles of the Flow Theory, thereby achieving optimal learning outcomes.

Secondly, these findings underscore the need for enhanced teacher training programs.

Given the success of TBLT in this study, teacher training modules should not only focus on the mechanics of TBLT but also incorporate the principles of the Flow Theory. Understanding how to strike a balance between the challenges posed by tasks and an individual’s skills can offer teachers a powerful tool for maximizing student engagement and learning outcomes.

Additionally, this study calls for a reassessment of evaluation methods. Traditional assessments, which often emphasize rote learning, may not be as practical in gauging skill development in English writing as more dynamic, task-based assessments. This is particularly important for evaluating nuanced aspects of writing skills, including content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. Policymakers in Vietnam should consider these findings when shaping the future of English language education, particularly in light of the nation’s ambitious goals to enhance language proficiency.

While the study focuses on the Vietnamese context, its findings have broader applicability. The significant improvements observed through TBLT suggest that this teaching method may be effective in various international settings where English is taught as a second or foreign language. Additionally, implementing the Flow Theory into TBLT provides a fresh perspective that educators worldwide might explore to enhance language teaching.

The study also opens doors for interdisciplinary research. By combining elements of educational methodology with psychological theories, such as the Flow Theory, educational scholars can develop more comprehensive and holistic educational approaches. Furthermore, the principles uncovered in this study can be readily adapted to digital learning environments. As online education becomes increasingly prevalent globally, understanding how to implement TBLT and encourage a state of “flow” in a digital setting becomes more crucial.

Lastly, this study can serve as a precursor to long-term research efforts focused on assessing the enduring impacts of TBLT and the Flow Theory on language learning. This could provide teachers and policymakers with a more comprehensive understanding of how these elements interact to affect language proficiency over an extended period.

While illuminating, this study has some limitations that must be acknowledged. Firstly, the sample size of 80 participants may not be large enough to generalize the findings to a broader population of English learners in Vietnam or other contexts. Furthermore, the study's duration was relatively short, raising questions about the long-term efficacy of the TBLT and PPP approaches. The study was also conducted in a controlled academic setting, which may not accurately reflect the varying classroom dynamics and student learning styles found in real-world classrooms. Finally, this study focused solely on writing skills; therefore, it does not provide a comprehensive view of how these teaching methods impact other language skills, such as speaking, listening, and reading.

References

- [1] L. T. Tran, Learners' Motivation and Identity in the Vietnamese EFL Writing Classroom, *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, Vol. 6, No. 1, 2007, pp. 151-163.
- [2] Q. L. Trinh, T. T. Nguyen, Enhancing Vietnamese Learners' Ability in Writing Argumentative Essays, *Journal of Asia TEFL*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2014, pp. 63-91.
- [3] T. T. L. Nguyen, Learning EFL Writing in Vietnam: Voices from an Upper-secondary School's Students, *Journal of Asia TEFL*, Vol. 18, No. 4, 2021, pp. 1195-1210.
- [4] Y. Hao, EFL Teaching Methods, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 8, No. 4, 2017, pp. 742-749.
- [5] C. N. Chien, Analysis of EFL Teaching Methods for Taiwan University Students, *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, Vol. 5, No. 5, 2014, pp. 985-993.
- [6] J. C. Richards, T. S. Rodgers, *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [7] L. M. D. Santos, The Discussion of Communicative Language Teaching Approach in Language Classrooms, *Journal of Education and E-Learning Research*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2020, pp. 104-109.
- [8] A. Yundayani, S. Susilawati, C. Chairunnisa, Investigating the Effect of Canva on Students' Writing Skills, *English Review: Journal of English Education*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 2019, pp. 169-176.
- [9] J. Willis, *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*, Intrinsic Books Ltd., 2021.
- [10] D. Nunan, *Task-Based Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [11] R. Kafipour, E. Mahmoudi, L. Khojasteh, The Effect of Task-based Language Teaching on Analytic Writing in EFL Classrooms, *Cogent Education*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2018.
- [12] G. V. Nguyen, Forms or Meaning? Teachers' Beliefs and Practices Regarding Task-based Language Teaching: A Vietnamese Case Study, *Journal of Asia TEFL*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 2014, pp. 1-36.
- [13] T. M. Duong, H. T. T. Nguyen, Implementing Task-based Language Teaching in Vietnamese Secondary Schools: What Hinders EFL Teachers?, *TESL-EJ*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 2021.
- [14] M. Csikszentmihalyi, *Applications of Flow in Human Development and Education*, Springer, 2014.
- [15] J. Egbert, A study of Flow Theory in the Foreign Language Classroom, *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 60, No. 5, 2004, pp. 549-586.
- [16] M. McInemey, A. Elledge, Using a Response to Intervention Framework to Improve Student Learning: A Pocket Guide for State and District Leaders, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED565680.pdf>, 2013 (accessed on: June 15th, 2025).
- [17] S. C. Weigle, *Assessing Writing*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [18] D. L. Freeman, *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*, Oxford University, 2000.
- [19] D. Amini, S. Ayari, M. Amini, The Effect of Flow State on EFL Learners' Vocabulary Learning, *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, Vol. 3, No. 5, 2016, pp. 9-18.

Appendix A. Teaching syllabus for writing skills

Week	Units	Topics	Writing tasks	Language focus
Week 0	The test	The pre-test		
Week 1	Unit 8	Sports and Games	Writing a paragraph of 40-50 words about a sport/a game.	<i>Vocabulary:</i> Sport and games <i>Grammar:</i> Past simple, imperatives
Week 3	Unit 9	Cities of the World	Writing a holiday postcard of about 50 words.	<i>Vocabulary:</i> Cities and landmarks <i>Grammar:</i> Possessive adjectives, possessive pronouns
Week 4	Review			
Week 5	The test	The middle test		
Week 7	Unit 10	Houses in the Future	Writing a paragraph of 50 words about a dream house.	<i>Vocabulary:</i> Types of houses and appliances <i>Grammar:</i> Future simple, <i>might</i> for possibility
Week 9	Unit 11	Our Greener World	Writing a paragraph of 50 words about ideas for a green club.	<i>Vocabulary:</i> Things that can be reduced, reused, and recycled <i>Grammar:</i> Articles, first conditional
Week 11	Unit 12	Robots	Writing a paragraph of 50-60 words about a robot one would like to have.	<i>Vocabulary:</i> Daily activities <i>Grammar:</i> Superlative adjectives (short adjectives)
Week 12	Review			
Week 14	The test	The post-test		

Appendix B. Analytical scoring rubrics

Components of Writing	Scores	Indicators
Content	1.0	The essay is relevant to the topic and easy to understand.
	0.75	The essay is rather relevant to the topic and easy to understand.
	0.5	The essay is relevant to the topic, but it is not entirely easy to understand.
	0.25	The essay is quite relevant to the topic, but it is not relatively easy to understand.
Organization	1.0	Most of the sentences are related to the main idea.
	0.75	Many sentences are related to the main idea.
	0.5	A few sentences related to the main idea.
	0.25	The sentences are unrelated to each other.
Vocabulary	1.0	There are a few errors in the choice of words, spelling, and punctuation.
	0.75	There are some errors in the choice of words, spelling, and punctuation.
	0.5	There are occasional errors in word choice, spelling, and punctuation.
	0.25	There are frequent errors in word choice, spelling, and punctuation.
Grammar	1.0	There are a few grammatical inaccuracies.
	0.75	There are some grammatical inaccuracies.
	0.5	There are numerous grammatical inaccuracies.
	0.25	There are frequent grammatical inaccuracies.