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This dissertation consists of two manuscripts to examine English language learners’ (ELLs) task engagement in computer-assisted learning environment. The purpose of first paper is to explore ELL’s Internet usage and their engagement in Internet tasks. This paper examines ELLs’ Internet usage in order to gain insights into what Internet tasks engage them as well as the reasons why learners engage in these Internet tasks. Survey results showed participant ELLs used the Internet for purposes such as social interaction, searching, email, entertainment, and study. Time spent on the Internet varied, but ELLs reported frequent Internet use. This paper also presents several Internet materials and tools used by participants collected and organized based on the purposes.

The second paper highlights the issue of whether or not ELLs can be engaged in Internet tasks assigned by the teachers. A study was conducted in which an online learning group was created in order to provide participants with opportunities to communicate and practice their English outside of the classroom using Facebook that many of the participants were already familiar with and used on a regular basis. Tasks were designed to help participants work toward the goals of their course while utilizing the features setup and commonly use in Facebook such
as discussion-thread commenting. The results show that the participants’ levels of task
engagement when using the Internet tasks as part of coursework varied. Taken together, these
findings might be useful and helpful for teachers and researchers to indicate ELLs’ task
engagement when assigning Internet tasks, and then adjust the instructions and course design
following the components of task engagement to engage students in tasks.
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CHAPTER ONE

AN EXPLORATION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER’S
INTERNET USAGE

Abstract

by Ai-Chia Chang, Ph.D.
Washington State University
December 2014

Chair: Joy Egbert

This paper explores English language learners’ (ELLs) Internet usage and their engagement in Internet tasks. Engagement, specifically task engagement, is defined as behaviors, emotions and cognitive processes demonstrated while working on a task. Researchers suggest that the use of Internet tools may enhance learners’ engagement in language learning tasks. This paper examines ELLs’ Internet usage in order to gain insights into what Internet tasks engage them as well as the reasons why learners engage in these Internet tasks. Survey results showed participant ELLs used the Internet for purposes such as social interaction, searching, email, entertainment, and study. Time spent on the Internet varied, but ELLs reported frequent Internet use. Implications are made about how teachers can use this information from this study to enhance their own language learning classrooms.
INTRODUCTION

For decades, learners’ lack of engagement has been a big issue in schooling (Finn, 1989; Newmann, 1992). As a result, engaging learners in learning tasks is a main focus for teachers. Researchers propose that learners who are engaged in learning tasks will perform better than those who are not engaged (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Lee 2012; Lin, 2012; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). Thus, it appears that task engagement may play an important role in learners’ academic performance and achievement.

Issues of task engagement are of particular interest in the language learning classroom (Egbert, 2003; Guthrie, 2001; Lee, 2012). Many studies have focused on the components that may support task engagement for language learners; some researchers suggest that learners’ engagement in tasks is related to optimal language learning conditions. These conditions, which include opportunities for learner autonomy and social interaction, are believed to enhance learners’ engagement in tasks (Egbert & Hanson-Smith, 2007; Guthrie, 2001; Spolsky, 1989). Other conditions include connections to learners’ interests and lives outside of school (e.g., Cummins, Brown, & Sayers, 2007; Egbert, 2009; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004). Other studies have shown that Internet technologies can support task engagement (Egbert, 2007; Kessler, Bikowski, & Boggs, 2012; Sun & Chang, 2012).

Internet technologies may be used as one form of support for engaging learners in language learning tasks (Zou, 2011). In fact, many English language learners (ELLs) already use the Internet for various reasons (Burrus, 2009; Kessler et al., 2012; Lin, 2012). Many online activities can increase their English learning opportunities and achievement (Chen & Peng, 2008; Hafner & Miller, 2011; Lockley, 2011; Yang, 2011). For example. Students participate in online discussions that provide reading, thinking and writing practice. Thus, based on previous research
on task engagement and Internet-enhanced language learning, it is very likely that teachers could increase their learners’ levels of task engagement by integrating Internet technologies into their language learning curriculum. In order to do this effectively, however, it is important to understand what engages ELLs on the Internet.

To aid in this understanding, the purposes of this study are to 1) explore what tasks engage ELLs on the Internet, and 2) examine the reasons why learners engage in these Internet tasks. This exploratory study provides a direction for further research that may help teachers to support learners’ task engagement by integrating engaging online tasks into language learning curriculum.

In order to fulfill the purpose of this study, this paper first reviews the literature on task engagement and Internet-enhanced learning language, done both in and outside of class. The study is then described in detail, examining the methodology, participants, data collection, and analysis. The last section of this paper focuses on the limitations of the study, results and discussion, and implications of the findings.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to develop a framework for the investigation, this brief review of the literature will first describe definitions and features of task engagement, followed by research around the use of Internet technologies to enhance learners’ task engagement.

Defining Task Engagement

For decades, there was not a unified or single definition of task engagement in the literature. The main reason for this was because motivation and engagement in general were often seen as similar or synonymous (e.g., Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000; Meltzer & Hamann, 2005). According to Lin (2012), motivation is “a general perception of content, a discipline area, or an activity that influences attitudes – positive or negative – toward task engagement” (p. 5). Unlike motivation, task engagement has been viewed as a means of understanding a learner’s behaviors, emotions, cognitive processes, and performance with the quality of involvement in carrying out the tasks (Christenson, Reschly, Appleton, Berman, Spanjers, & Varro, 2008; Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Hijzen, Boekaerts & Vedder, 2007). In other words, for something to be a component of task engagement, it must occur as a result of or during the task itself.

As a result of the relationship between motivation and engagement, previous research has included components of task engagement within definitions of learning motivation and engagement. For example, according to Bandura’s (1997) self-efficacy theory, a theory of motion, a person undertakes the task with persistence during the task. This implies that persistence can be actually seen as a behavior that occurs during a task (therefore making it part of task engagement). Therefore, although the self-efficacy theory is a theory of motivation,
elements of the theory also relate specifically to task engagement. Another example can be found in Guthrie and Wigfield’s (2000) proposal that intrinsic reading motivation requires learner interest and intentional participation in an activity. These assertions are based on their studies and research findings on reading motivation. However, because these components are emotional and behavioral, respectively, and are directly related to the process of doing a task, they can also be seen as part of task engagement.

Further, in Young’s (2005) study of learning motivation in self-regulative learning environments, the results are similar to the studies mentioned previously. Young found that, with effective learning strategies, active participation, and control of the learning process, learners might be motivated to learn the task and then cognitively engage. However, the three components he mentions can be seen as components of task engagement because they occur while learners are participating in the task.

These common components of task engagement found previously within the definitions of motivation and engagement in learning were gathered and categorized by Lin (2012) to define task engagement thoroughly. Her model is discussed in the next section.

Lin’s Model of Task Engagement

Lin (2012) reviewed the literature on motivation and engagement to clarify differences between the two terms. Based on the differences, she defined task engagement generally as “involvement in a task” (p. 12). According to Lin, task engagement is a combination of behavioral, cognitive and emotional expressions that demonstrate an individual’s active involvement and investment during a task. Lin’s model includes the components of task engagement most commonly found in the literature. These components of task engagement are presented in Figure 1, Lin’s (2012) model of task engagement. This model provides an inclusive
framework for researchers to understand what can be observed and measured from learners’ behaviors and emotions. It can also be used to determine which components are present during an individual’s participation in a task.

Figure 1. A model of task engagement, (Lin, 2012)

The explanations of these three categories are summarized below.

**Behavioral engagement.** Behavioral engagement in tasks relates to learners’ behaviors that can be observed or measured while learners are engaged in a task. An example of
behavioral engagement is participation, which is explained by Lankshear and Knobel (2007) as “involvement in some kind of shared purpose or activity – taking part in some kind of endeavor in which others are involved” (p. 158). Teachers can see evidence of participation directly from learners’ actions, such as continuously taking part in an activity and being willing to complete the challenges in the task. Research also shows that a learner’s participation usually relates to other behaviors, such as persistence and willingness to take risks in completing the task (Archambault, Janosz, Morizot, & Pagani, 2009; Cummins et al., 2007). In other words, a learner can show one or more indications of being engaged.

**Cognitive engagement.** Cognitive engagement in tasks relates to the components that should be present during task participation. Examples of cognitive engagement include setting goals, student-centered and authentic approaches to learning, and opportunities for learners to develop their depth of cognitive processing (Lin, 2012; Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2012; Pintrich, 2004). Research also shows that engaging tasks seem to be the key to developing learners’ cognitive processing (Kuh, 2003; Yang, 2011). In other words, creating tasks that support cognitive engagement can lead to student engagement during a task. Overall, appearance of the components of cognitive engagement increases the opportunities for learners to engage cognitively while doing tasks.

**Emotional engagement.** The third category in Lin’s model is emotional task engagement; this relates to an individual’s attitudes, interests, and values while doing a task. While engaged, learners may express emotions: enjoyment, excitement, interest, confidence, respect, and eustress (Skinner, Furrer, Marchand, & Kindermann, 2008). The appearance of these emotions while participating in a task would indicate the learner’s emotional engagement. The literature also
suggests that learners might be engaged in tasks when their interests, needs, and cultural backgrounds are integrated into the curriculum (e.g., Cummins et al., 2007; Egbert, 2003; Lee, 2007; Shultz, 2008). This integration might provoke engagement that can be observed through the learners’ emotions during the learning process. Overall, the components of emotional engagement relate to learners’ expressions during a task.

To summarize, Lin’s (2012) model presents three categories that comprise task engagement: behavioral, cognitive and emotional. This comprehensive model, which is based on the literature, can be used as a framework for researchers and teachers to explore what engages learners, how to measure learners’ task engagement, and how to create engaging tasks in a learning environment. In the next section, the literature shows how technology may support this model of task engagement.

**Internet Technologies Used as Support for Task Engagement**

If used well, technology may be one tool that can support task engagement in all of Lin’s (2012) categories. Researchers propose that learners might be more confident, engaged, and successful in academic performance while using Internet technologies for educational purposes (Coiro, 2003; Egbert, 2009; Greenhow, Robelia, & Hughes, 2011; Lankshear & Knobel, 2007). For example, Laird and Kuh (2005) investigated the relationships between learners’ use of information technology and educational outcomes. The results show that participants who used information technology, such as email, to communicate with other learners and faculty for academic reasons, report that they discuss assignments or complete classroom-related activities more than those who do not use information technology. The results also show the positive relationship between the use of information technology and student engagement in doing tasks. This use of information technology provides opportunities for interaction and collaboration,
student-centered and authentic approaches to learning, and participation and involvement in discussing learning-related issues that are all related to the components of task engagement.

Some research results and findings also support the idea that Internet-based activities can enhance language learning (Kikuchi, & Otsuka, 2008; Lockley & Promnitz-Hayashi, 2012). For instance, research on the use of social networking sites in EFL classrooms found that learners expressed that it was easier for them to communicate and discuss with peers about course-related activities and assignments through social networking sites, and they enjoyed using Internet tools for English learning (Kikuchi and Otsuka, 2008; Promnitz-Hayashi, 2011; Terrell, 2011). In these studies, participation in the discussions, collaboration, and enjoyment are directly related to task engagement in three dimensions: behavioral, cognitive, and emotional.

In order to use Internet technologies effectively for student learning, researchers propose important components of engaging Internet-assisted language learning tasks (Cummins et al., 2007; Egbert, 2005). These components include participation, involvement, interest, and meaningful text. Internet activities, therefore, may sustain task engagement. These components of task engagement reflect Lin’s (2012) model for the most part; overall, the literature integrated in Lin’s model implies that instruction may make task engagement and learning more effective if it is based on learners’ interests, needs and everyday use of Internet materials (Taynton, 2012; Woo, Herrington, Agostinho, & Reeves, 2007; Yang, 2011).

**Research Questions**

In the literature on using Internet technologies as support for language learning, research has focused on what technologies were used by learners most or how previous experiences of using technology influenced learning; however, these studies do not explain why learners are interested in and engaged by using these Internet technologies. Based on Lin’s model of task
engagement, this leads to the research questions in this study:

1. What purposes do adult ELLs have for accessing websites/Internet materials?
2. Who set up the goals for using the Internet?
3. How long do adult ELLs usually spend on the Internet per day?
4. What language do adult ELLs usually use while using Internet technologies?

Answers to these questions may help researchers and teachers understand what Internet technologies engage learners and why learners may be engaged for different purposes while using the Internet. Study results might also fill gaps in the literature by providing detailed information about student engagement in Internet tasks and exploring perspectives from diverse participants.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

An exploratory qualitative study fit well as the method of investigating the questions for this study because this study sought to gain insight into learners’ Internet technology use as a basis for further investigation (Cresswell, 2007; Glesne, 2011; Maxwell, 1996). The research questions focus on exploring how learners use Internet technologies and what tasks and activities they are interested in. Therefore, survey data collection and Internet-use logs were used to answer the research questions in this study.

Research Context

The study took place in an intensive English program (IEP) in the northwestern United States (US). The program is characterized by the IEP as an intensive academic training program that enhances learners’ English competence. The IEP has six levels that address fundamental through advanced English. Each level contains required courses that address language skills: listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar. Learners can also take elective classes such as a computer workshop or preparation courses for English proficiency exams.

Participants

Participants (N=40, 10 female and 30 male) were adult ELLs studying at the IEP at the intermediate level, one class at level three and two classes at level four. Students at these levels can read and discuss young-adult novels and write three- to five-paragraph essays on themes found in the readings. The age-range of the participants was from 19 to 33. Participants came from China (6), Colombia (1), Egypt (1), Korea (2), Kuwait (1), Libya (2), Oman (10), Saudi Arabia (13), Taiwan (2), UAE (1), and Yemen (1).
Participant Technology Background

Specifics on exactly how each student had used the Internet prior to this study were not asked about. However, during the interviews, six participants expressed that their previous Internet use in their home countries was different from what they experienced in the US. Some interviewees discussed limited Internet access and politically-based website restrictions in their countries, while others mentioned open availability but with limited personal use/practice. Most important, all participants had used the Internet previous to this study and were part of the increasing trend in their home countries toward more Internet use.

Data Sources

Through participants’ self-report, their interests in and needs for using Internet technologies during this study were explored to help understand participants’ engagement in Internet activities. Logs and interviews were used to understand what engaged participants on the Internet in their everyday activities. These two data sources are explained below.

Use of Online Materials Record (logs). Participants were asked to monitor and keep records of their Internet use five times during a two week period. This number and time frame was chosen to minimize the burden on students who were already busy with course-related assignments and activities. Participants were also allowed to record their logs at their convenience to also reduce the risk of competing with their coursework. The questions in the log (which can be found in Appendix A) included six parts: purposes for using the Internet, devices participants used and the amount of time spent on each device, goals for using the Internet, languages used, and websites participants logged on to. These six parts presented information about what engaged participants on the Internet and how they used Internet technologies.

Participants returned a total of one hundred and forty five logs: twenty participants each
returned five log entries, four participants each returned four log entries, six participants each returned three log entries, one participant returned two log entries, and nine participants each returned only one log entry. The reasons that the twenty participants did not return all the records were given as follows:

- The logs were not a required part of their coursework; they would rather spend more time finishing the class assignments.
- Four participants showed their unwillingness to write their logs. They claimed that it was an issue of privacy.
- The participants simply forgot to keep the log. They kept one or two logs only before the day the logs were collected.
- Two participants responded that they did not feel comfortable returning the unfinished logs.
- Three participants were worried about the confidentiality if they were found surfing certain websites, which were forbidden because of political concerns in their home countries.

**Semi-structured Interviews.** In order to learn more about participants' Internet experiences beyond what was asked in the logs, six participants were interviewed with semi-structured questions. Along with the questions in the log, additional questions were formed based on interviewees’ log responses to gain insights into their perceptions of and reasons for using Internet technologies. The interviewees were selected based on three criteria: diverse backgrounds (one Chinese, one Taiwanese, one Japanese, one Omani, one Libyan and one Egyptian), experiences of using the Internet, and their willingness to participate in the interview. Pseudonyms are used later in this paper when referring to particular participants.
**Unstructured Interviews.** Unstructured interviews were conducted at the times of log collection. If the researcher noticed that there were questions not answered on a participant's log sheet, that student was immediately asked about the missing section. The main reasons included they decided not to share online activities, they forgot to keep the logs, and they didn’t answer all the questions. Four participants who completed all logs volunteered to participate in additional interviews.

**Data Analysis**

**Logs.** Responses to section one of the log sheet, participant purposes for logging onto the Internet, were counted to find the total numbers of responses to each item (see Figure 2). In section two, which included a question on time spent online, responses were averaged to calculate the minimum, maximum, and the average time spent online among participants. For question three, goals were organized and categorized; similar ideas were grouped together along with the names of those who set which goals. In the final section, the websites participants visited were then listed and counted, and the language they used on these websites was also counted and categorized into four categories: English, first language, both English and first language, and other language. Results of these logs helped provide answers to the research questions.

**Interviews.** As noted previously, unstructured and semi-structured interviews were conducted with volunteers or when participants’ logs were incomplete. Information from these interviews was kept as written field notes and was member-checked by reviewing the notes with each participant. The semi-structured interviews were audio-taped and transcribed. The interview responses were organized and categorized (Boeije, 2010) to see what themes emerged. The interviews provided detailed information to support the log data. The analyzed data were
summarized in light of the research questions, and the theoretical model was used to help draw conclusions and implications.

Limitations

This study had some limitations. First, the number of participants in this study might have been too small to make generalizations about larger ELL populations; however, the data revealed deep information about what and why participants used Internet technologies. Second, the data collected from the logs, which were based on individual differences in using the Internet, were the focus of the study and might not to be generalizable to all Internet users. General trends in the data may be generalizable, though, because of the diversity of students in this study. Third, not every participant completed the logs thoroughly. However, the amount of data about participants’ Internet uses was still considerable. Conducting interviews also gave the data more rigor than only having logs. In addition, only six participants were formally interviewed. This issue was compensated for by conducting unstructured, informal interviews. Last, the main limitation of this study was the use of mainly self-report data; however, the point was to gather individual data to explore what websites engaged students on a daily basis, and self-report was the most effective way to collect it.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore what engages ELLs on the Internet. The results and relevant discussion are presented below according to the research questions.

Question 1. What purposes do adult ELLs have for accessing websites/ Internet materials?

In each log, participants identified their purposes for using the Internet, selecting all that applied from a list of six common Internet activities: social activity, study, search, e-mail, checking the news, entertainment, and none of the above/prefer not to say. Figure 2 shows how many times total each activity was checked in the collected logs. Because participants were allowed to check more than one item in each log, the total equals more than the number of collected logs.

Figure 2. Participant purposes for using the Internet

According to the data, participants used the Internet most often for email. The second most reported usage was for other social activity. Study was also selected at a high level – checked seventy-six times. Less than seventy reported checking the news (sixty-five times) or entertainment (fifty-four times) as a purpose for using the Internet. Only one participant reported none of the above/preferred not to say. When asked about his response, he replied that he just
simply did not want to tell anyone what he liked to do on the Internet.

In the log, participants also reported the Internet activities they frequently participated in. According to participant log responses, identified main Internet activities were organized in table 1 and explained as follows:

Table 1. Internet activities participants frequently participated in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Activity</th>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Internet technologies used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Social networking sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Messenger sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Search engines (ex. Google)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moodle (an online learning management system)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Watching movies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listening to music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watching sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Downloading (apps, music, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Browsing websites that interesting to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Google</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yahoo!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Google apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yahoo! apps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check the news</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>News websites (ex. CNN, BBC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amazon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finding sellers or product information through search engines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Specific purposes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social activity. Participants reported using specific sites to communicate with friends, family, classmates, and teachers. Communication via email and activities on social networking
websites were the most common Internet activities reported by participants. According to the interviews, participants explained that checking email was fast. Most of the time, they just checked if there was a new message or replied to an important email in a few minutes. They did not want to miss any important communication via email, especially in regards to their studies. They noted that social activity was similar to checking email; they posted their status or just “checked in on Facebook” for a minute. They communicated with each other by posting and responding to posts on Facebook.

**Study.** Participants noted that search engines were very important for their study. These sites helped them find answers to their assignments, articles or information to help them discuss the assigned questions for the course topic of the week. Besides using search engines, the use of Moodle was required by some teachers for posting assignments, responding to assigned questions, and holding discussions.

**Entertainment.** Participants reported the need for entertainment such as watching movies, listening to music, and other Internet activities done during their leisure time.

**Search.** Participants looked for information or materials by using different tools such as Google, Wikipedia, and Yahoo Apps!. The information included articles for study, weather reports, tickets, and college application requirements.

**Check the news.** Checking news was for both academic and individual purposes. Participants checked the news to understand current issues or news about their home countries. Some participants were assigned to read or watch news on the Internet for class discussion and writing. However, in the data participants did not note specifically whether checking news was an assignment or just their interest.

**Shopping.** Participants mentioned online shopping. One specifically stated that he
searched for product information first and then found the best seller to place his order with. Another participant preferred Amazon for her online shopping. The other three did not specify how they did their online shopping.

These data suggest that purposes of Internet use are varied. Each purpose meets participants’ individual needs, interests, and goals. In the literature on task engagement, meeting students’ needs, interests and goals are main components. Therefore, participants appear to be engaged in a variety of Internet activities. Overall, these results provide a general idea of participants’ purposes for using the Internet in their personal lives. Teacher’s understanding of ELL’s purposes for Internet use and integrating the purposes to create engaging class-related activities might increase student’s engagement while doing tasks.

**Question 2. Who set up the goals for using the Internet?**

According to the theoretical framework, it is important for us to know who made the choices and set the goals for the participants’ Internet use because this might influence participants’ task engagement. Based on the log reports, the reasons participants chose specific Internet materials differed, but their choices met their goals.

**Personal goals.** Twenty-five participants reported that they used the Internet solely for personal goals, such as Facebook for social interaction. Two of the participants mentioned downloading songs, applications, and movies. All of the participants said they used Google and Yahoo! or Google Apps to search for information for the goals they pursued. According to the responses about specific goals of using the Internet, eight participants among the eighteen participants who reported using the Internet for study or learning purposes mentioned learning English vocabulary, improving listening comprehension, and checking information to improve/edit their writing for their own goals. One participant reported that he had no specific
goal, just using the Internet as a tool for different purposes. During the semi-structured interviews, interviewees stated that they were required to use language skills such as reading, listening, and writing in online tasks. Max, Mohammed, and Isaac mentioned that they wanted to improve their English; therefore it was great if they could learn more English while using the Internet, no matter if it was for school work or for social interaction.

**Both personal goals and someone else’s goals.** Two participants reported using Skype to contact their families and friends who were in their home countries. Four participants reported chatting with friends on Facebook because their friends used Facebook for communication. They visited websites that were available to keep them up-to-date on what was happening in their countries. Participants who did not answer this question were asked to explain their answers in unstructured interviews. They all said they used the Internet for different people’s goals, including their own.

**Personal and teachers’ goals.** Seven participants noted it was both my teachers’ and my goals – they completed assignments and checked grades on Moodle, used search engines/dictionaries to complete written assignments, and reading/watching news for class discussion.

Overall, students identified two main types of goals for using the Internet - first their own goals and second their teachers’ goals. A trend found in the logs was that their choices were based on their own needs. However, many participants did not specify whether their goals were their own goals, other people’s goals, or both. Based on participants’ responses in this section, it was likely that different Internet materials met different people’s goals and needs.

These results suggest that participants chose certain Internet activities because they had specific goals for using the materials. In the research literature on task engagement, goal setting and giving choices are important of components to enhance student engagement during a task.
Question 3. How long do adult ELLs usually spend on the Internet per day?

Participant logs noted when and how long participants were on the Internet on the days they chose to record. According to the data, the minimum time spending on the Internet was ten minutes and the maximum time participants kept the Internet on was about fourteen hours. The average time based on the overall hours reported by participants in the logs was five to six hours.

Two logs showed that the participants often logged in over ten hours on the Internet. One of the participants said that he kept log-on status all day long but he only used his computer when necessary. The overall hours he spent of his time doing activities on the Internet might be closer to seven to eight hours. Another participant said that he used the Internet so many times within the 14 hours. Each time he logged in was for a different length of time; he checked many websites at different times on the days he filled out the logs.

Only two participants did not keep a time record. They were asked why they did not complete the time tracking. They explained that they used Internet accessible devices such as smartphones and iPads to log onto the Internet whenever they could. Therefore, it was difficult for them to remember how long in a day they used the Internet. In fact, most of the logs showed the same results, that participants did not note the time clearly for the same reason. Six interviewed participants expressed similar experiences, that when they wanted or needed to use the Internet, they returned to their computers or laptops. Therefore, there was no specific time frame of participants’ use of Internet found from the logs. These Internet accessible devices such as smart phones and iPods increase the opportunities for participants to participate in different activities and do tasks even for a few minutes.

Question 4. What language do adult ELLs usually use on the Internet?

From the logs collected from participants, the language used when accessing Internet
materials seemed to be determined by either personal preference or the websites begin accessed. Sixty-one websites were identified as being accessed by participants. Among the sixty-one websites, the five most-used websites by participants are Facebook, Google, email, YouTube, and Yahoo! apps. The language used for each of these websites by participants is listed below:

Table 2. Language used by participant ELLs while using the Internet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First language used</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Google</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>Yahoo!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English used</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both of First Language and English used</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers of Participants</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the interviews, the reasons why participants used their first language, English, or both while using the Internet are explained below.

**Facebook.** Three interviewed participants explained the reason why they used English on Facebook: When Facebook was presented in their first language, Arabic, it was not easy to understand how to use functions and applications due to translation problems. Six interviewed participants explained that they needed to use English to communicate with friends from different countries. While they were on Facebook, they used their first languages and English for different reasons such as reading English posted by their English-speaking friends and updating their posts in their first languages.

**Google.** Two of the participants used Google Maps on the day they filled out the log, which was available only in English on their devices. Participants who did not write down the language they used were interviewed. They said they did not write down the language because
they searched for information presented both in English and their first language. The interviewed participants stated that their focus was on the information they got from Google, so that could be English, their first language, or both.

**Email.** Participants who did not answer the language-use question specifically noted that their language depended on with whom they communicated; they might use English or their first language. The two participants who noted specifically using both English and their first language and the six interviewed participants did the same - replied in English to e-mail from their teachers and replied in their first language to messages from friends who shared the same first language. The data shows that the recipients are the main reason for the language used in email communication.

**YouTube.** Participants noted that they were on YouTube to listen to music or watch videos that were in English or their first languages. The interviewed participants added that sometimes they shared the music or videos found on YouTube with friends and made comments in English or their first language.

**Yahoo!.** Participants used Yahoo! as a search engine, for checking news, and for other functions provided by Yahoo!. The participant who used both languages on Yahoo! was using the Yahoo! dictionary, so this participant noted bilingual for language use.

Overall, the language used by participants showed that participants used many resources on the Internet and with other people they interacted with. Furthermore, some websites were built in multiple languages that participants could choose from. Therefore, they used English, their first language, or both depending on their purposes and audience. The language participants reported using most was English. This indicates that participants felt there were many opportunities to be exposed to English environments on the Internet, and more important, they
were willing to use the Internet in English. Willingness to take risks during tasks is one component of behavioral engagement. This implies that learners’ willingness to take on challenges or risk in learning from Internet technologies may increase task engagement.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In previous studies, results mainly show general correlations between Internet use and academic performance and between Internet use for learning purposes and engagement (e.g., Chen & Peng, 2008; Lockley, 2011; Smith & Caruso; 2012; Taynton, 2012.) This study explores ELLs’ routine uses of the Internet, focusing on how they are using the Internet and for what reasons. The results fill this gap in the literature. Answers to the research questions echo components of task engagement presented in Lin’s model (2012); the data suggest that Internet activities may engage participants.

**Behavioral engagement.** Based on information found in the logs and interviews, participants demonstrated components of behavioral engagement while using the Internet. Activeness, participation, and control are three examples. Participants noted regularly checking and responding to email (activeness), and participating in discussion or other social activities to connect with other people online (participation). Though their levels of these components varied by participant, their presence in the logs implies behavioral engagement’s connections with Internet activity. Control is another component of behavioral engagement listed in Lin’s (2012) model. Although participants did not directly state how they controlled their Internet use, they did have the ability to decide what, when, and how to use the Internet technologies. Even though some Internet activities were assigned by their teachers, the Internet still provided participants with various choices to help them complete their assignments. Further, in the engagement literature mentioned previously, needs and choices are closely linked to behavioral engagement because having choices gives students control of the learning pace and tasks. This may help engage students in using Internet technologies if they make their own choices regarding what
activities or tasks to do. Overall, based on participant's data, the participants appeared to be behaviorally engaged in Internet tasks.

**Cognitive engagement.** The data show that some participants were already familiar with popular websites prior to participating in this study. For example, the social networking site Facebook was used most for social activities. Search engines Google and Yahoo! were used often to get information for personal use or school-related activities. Skype and various email providers were used for communicating with others. These examples show that participants are familiar with various Internet options used to meet their goals. Lin’s model shows that having goals is important in task engagement. Students may be cognitively engaged in a task if they have the opportunities to interact with other people. Participants expressed that in social and course-related activities, they had opportunities to interact with other Internet users and classmates. For example, they made comments on other Facebook users’ posts and chatted with others using different messenger programs. They also exchanged their opinions on teacher-facilitated discussion boards. This interaction appears to be a sign of cognitive task engagement. According to the data, many Internet activities listed by participants meet the features of authenticity. For example, one interviewed participant made her traveling plans and reserved tickets and accommodations online. While planning, she needed to use her background knowledge and skills to complete her plan. She also used a dictionary to help her understand the content written in English on different websites. Her use of knowledge and skills to achieve her goals demonstrates cognitive engagement. These authentic tasks provide learners with opportunities to learn, think, and solve problems. Overall, if teachers can provide opportunities for setting goals, provide opportunities for interaction, and provide authentic tasks, learners may be engaged in doing tasks. This may be done through the use of Internet technologies.
**Emotional engagement.** Entertainment was one of the main Internet activities participants did in this study. Participants mentioned watching movies, listening to music, and watching sports. Their choices of entertainment also related to individual interests and needs. For example, one participant liked to shop online. Online shopping met his interests, allowing him to make purchases that may not have been available in his area, but he also stated that he sometimes just browses for fun. Participants in general talked about using the Internet to meet their interests in many ways. Overall, emotional engagement may play an important role impacting a learner’s engagement while doing a task.

The research questions about the purposes of using Internet technologies, whose goals they pursued, the length of time spent on the Internet, and the language usually used while using the Internet lead to this conclusion.

To conclude, engaging tasks should include as many components of task engagement as possible to reach the largest number of students. Based on participants’ Internet use, this study helps us understand that task engagement may occur while students are involved in Internet activities because students show positive behavioral and emotional task engagement, and Internet activities seem to meet the components of cognitive engagement. Therefore, it is for teachers to integrate Internet technologies in curriculum.

**Implications for Teaching and Further Study**

Based on the conclusions above, several implications for teaching and further study can be noted.

**Teaching**

Based on the information reported by participants, teachers might want to consider integrating Internet technologies students often use into the curriculum. These include
technologies such as social networking sites for writing and social interaction, YouTube for listening and viewing, and email for communication. Further, because many students are already familiar with the Internet to some extent, teachers can let students use the Internet to reach academic goals. For example, participants mentioned that they checked news to learn about current issues. Teachers can ask students to do a mini-project, find a piece of news, identify the problems, and discuss and find possible solutions, because these are projects that mirror tasks they may do online in their real lives. In addition, teachers can help students set learning goals during Internet-based activities. With clear goals and authentic approaches to tasks as mentioned in Lin's task engagement model, teachers may engage students in the learning process.

Moreover, students can demonstrate what they can do with Internet technologies to teachers and peers to complete class activities or assignments. This also helps teachers who are not familiar with the Internet technologies students use on a daily basis. However, as noted in the study results, teachers also need to be aware of privacy issues. Even though there was only one participant in this study who said he did not want to share what he liked to do on the Internet, teachers need to be careful and aware that not every student would like to share what sites they use. Email and Facebook both have privacy protection settings, so if students are not comfortable with publishing their writings to everyone, there are solutions. Participants also mentioned that they liked to share information and exchange their thoughts by making comments on social networking sites. So on YouTube, teachers can ask students to share the songs or videos they like and explain their choices or summarize the videos in a comment box. By doing so, teachers may engage students in different tasks that meet students’ needs, interests, and goals. Based on the differences in time spent on the Internet, teachers should think about how to give students an appropriate amount of time to complete the assigned tasks.
Further Study

In addition to addressing the limitations of this study on the use of Internet technologies and language learning, further study can explore which Internet technologies engage adult ELLs during the learning process and how and to what extent they are engaged. In this study, participants expressed that exposure to English increases the opportunities for them to learn vocabulary and other language skills while using the Internet. Additional research can further explore the correlation between Internet use and language achievement. To this end, further study on task engagement and English learning could be conducted to see whether using Internet technologies as a part of course-related activities can influence task engagement and language learning.
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APPENDIX A

Use of Online Materials Record (Logs)

Instructions: Please complete one record page each time you log onto the Internet either at home or at school. This includes if you are accessing the Internet by cell phone, computer, or any other digital device.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. What did you generally do on the Internet during this session?  
   □ Social activity  
   □ Study  
   □ Search  
   □ E-mail  
   □ Check the news  
   □ Entertainment  
   □ None of the above/Prefer not to say

2. When did you log on?  
   Date:_____________________
   Start time: _______________________
   End time: ________________________
   Total time: ____hrs. ____mins.
   What device did you use?  
   □ Computer  
   □ Cell phone  
   □ iPad/iPod  
   □ Other (_______________________)

3. Was there a specific goal for the use of the Internet during this time? If so, please write it below.  
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   Who gave you the goal stated above? (Mark one or more answers)  
   □ It is my own goal  
   □ It is my teacher's goal  
   □ It is someone else's goal

4. Please list the websites you logged onto and the language of the site.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URL of the Websites</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

Possible Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. Overall, how do you choose websites to use?

2. From your log, I found that you spend most of your time on ________________ (website) while using the Internet. Why do you do so?

3. In your log, you mentioned that you use ____________________ for ______________.

   Do you think it’s possible to use it for language learning as well? Explain.

4. ________________ (types of online materials) are mentioned several times. Are they used for any specific purposes?

5. Most of the sites you use to study are in ________________ (language). Why is that?

6. What about the web sites you chose attracted you to them? For example, the design of the website, content, functions or colors...?

7. In your log, you mentioned that you use ________________ for ______________.

   Does the language presented in ________________ make any difference while you are using it?

   If yes, please explain.
SEGUE BETWEEN PAPERS

The first paper examined English Language Learner’s (ELL’s) Internet usage for the purpose of gaining insights into the types of Internet tasks that engage ELLs and the reasons for this engagement. Findings from this survey revealed that participants used the Internet for purposes such as social interaction, entertainment, and study. There has been a rapid increase in the use of Internet technologies for learning purposes; however, very little research has been conducted on how the implementation of specifically and purposely designed Internet tasks can impact students’ task engagement within ELLs’ coursework. Therefore, the second paper will use the Internet technology identified as the most commonly used among participants in the first paper, and along with a specific model of task engagement, to identify the impacts of Internet tasks when used as part of ELLs’ coursework on task engagement. The purpose is to help teachers and curriculum designers create tasks that incorporate elements of task engagement while also taking into consideration the types of Internet materials many students participate in outside of class.
CHAPTER SIX

ELL STUDENT ENGAGEMENT IN COMPUTER-ASSISTED
LANGUAGE LEARNING TASKS

Abstract
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Chair: Joy Egbert

This paper explores levels of student engagement in online tasks when used as part of language learning coursework. Participants participated in an online learning group through Facebook as an aspect of their coursework. Tasks were design using a model of task engagement, and participants were surveyed and interviewed to determine perceptions of task engagement within the Facebook learning group tasks. Results showed that task engagement among participants and across tasks varied dramatically.
INTRODUCTION

Many researchers propose that engaging students in tasks during the learning process helps students perform better and more successfully achieve learning goals (Christenson, Reschly & Wylie, 2012; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Egbert, 2003; Egbert & Ernst-Slavit, 2010; Finn, 1989; Lin, 2012; Meltzer & Hamann, 2004; Newman, 1992). Unfortunately, students are not always engaged in tasks assigned by their teachers. Engagement in non-academic, online activities such as using social media appears to be on the rise, but there is little research available exploring possible links between use of social media and the academic learning environment. It is important to understand what kinds of online tasks are engaging students outside of the classroom and to what extent they are engaged in these tasks, as this understanding may help to engage students in academic tasks.

Chang’s (2013) exploratory study focused on using social media to explore engagement in Internet tasks. The findings of her study suggested several types of online tasks that may engage adult language learners in learning. The study categorized students’ main purposes for doing tasks on the Internet into six categories: social activity, study, searching for information, e-mail, checking the news, and entertainment. The study also identified the online tools most students used on a daily basis outside of the classroom. Social networking sites (SNSs), particularly Facebook, were found to be the tool frequently engaging to participants. Although understanding what kinds of tasks students are engaged in online is useful for gaining insights into adult English Language Learners’ (ELLs’) general use of Internet technologies, these findings do not explain how and to what extent students are engaged in online tasks or how this knowledge can be applied to the language learning classroom. The purpose of this current study
is to explore levels of student engagement in online tasks when used as part of language learning coursework.
CHAPTER SEVEN

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to develop a framework for investigation, this brief review of the literature will first define the terms "task" and "task engagement." Features of task engagement will then be explored, followed by research surrounding the use of social networking sites as a learning tool to support English language learning and enhance task engagement.

Definition of a Task

In general, a task is an assigned work as part of one’s duties or is an activity to be done as a goal within a given time frame (“Task,” 2014). In the language learning literature, Long (1985) defines a task as a piece of work that people do in daily life such as making breakfast, making a reservation, or buying a pair of shoes. Some researchers’ definitions of task put a particular emphasis on language; for example, Richards, Platt, and Weber (1985) define a task as “an activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language” (p. 289) which “may or may not involve the production of language” (p. 289). Breen’s (1987) definition of a task includes “a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes… which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning” (p. 23). Synthesizing the various definitions of “task,” in this study a task is defined as an activity that meets a specific language learning objective or goal within a given time. In this definition, a task can include a topic, information about the topic, learning objectives, tools, materials, participation structures, and the learning outcome (see Appendix B for an example of task instructions).

Definition of Task Engagement

There is not yet a unified definition of the concept of being engaged in a task, but Chang
(2013) explains that “for something to be a component of task engagement, it must occur as a result of or during the task itself” (p. 2). According to Lin (2012), task engagement in general means “task involvement,” which concerns students’ behaviors, cognition, and emotions (p. 27). In order to create a model of task engagement, Lin (2012) surveyed the literature and organized the common components. In her model (see Figure 1), Lin (2012) included three categories: behavioral task engagement, cognitive task engagement, and emotional task engagement; this echoes many researchers’ statements (see, for example, Christenson et. al., 2012; Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Guthrie, 2001; Reeve, Jang, Carrell, Jeon & Barch, 2004; Skinner, Furrer, Marchand, & Kindermann, 2008). Each category in Lin’s (2012) model contains components of task engagement that can be used to investigate, observe, and/or measure student engagement during tasks. Based on the literature mentioned above, the definition of task engagement is becoming involved in and thinking about what one is doing during a task and responding to the task in the process.
Figure 1. A model of task engagement (Lin, 2012)

According to Lin’s (2012) model in Figure 1, choice, control, and interest are common components of task engagement across the three categories. Having choices is important in learning because it empowers students to choose from various learning resources, group members, and task components, based on learning preference (Chang, 2013; Cummins, Brown, & Sayers, 2007; Egbert, 2003). Control is another important component. An important aspect of control over one’s own learning is the opportunity to select the appropriate pace of information exposure and intake. For example, some students read more quickly than others, and some learn
faster through multimedia such as videos (Cummins et al., 2007; Lin, 2012). Additionally, if students are able to apply their personal interests and preferences to the language learning environment, they may be more likely to participate, which may enhance the outcome or increase the possibility to achieve the language goal (Lin, 2012; Reeve et al., 2004). For example, participants in Lin’s (2012) study expressed their willingness to complete tasks when the tasks met their interests or learning preferences. Research shows that with these opportunities, students are more likely to be engaged in doing tasks (Chang, 2013; Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011; Lin, 2012).

More specifically, each of the above-mentioned categories (behavioral, cognitive, and emotional) of task engagement contains a number of components. Chang (2013) used these components to explore ESL learners’ Internet use outside of class in order to study the types of Internet technologies and materials that engage adult language learners as well as the reasons learners engage. The findings show that participants were engaged in using Internet technologies for a variety of personal and/or academic reasons, personal interests, and choices related to purposes and interest, and having control in the use of Internet.

According to Chang's study, participants appeared to be engaged while doing Internet tasks because the tasks offered opportunities for participants’ behavioral, cognitive, and emotional engagement. Based on previous studies, Chang’s (2013) study, and Lin’s (2012) task engagement model, an adapted model of task engagement was created for the current study. This model, shown in Figure 2, is used as the framework in the current study to investigate participants’ engagement in specific tasks that provide opportunities for engagement. Engagement opportunities are supported by integrating popular Internet technologies and materials as part of students’ English learning. The model is explained below.
The three categories of task engagement - behavioral, cognitive, and emotional - sometimes overlap because of the interplay between components (Christenson et al., 2008; Fredricks, Blumenfeld & Paris, 2004; Skinner et al., 2008). For example, students’ active participation in a task, a feature of behavioral engagement, may result from their interest in the task itself, an aspect of cognitive engagement. Furthermore, because of having an interest in doing the task, a student may show positive emotions and attitudes, components of emotional engagement, during the process. In other words, one or more components may affect or be influenced by components of the same or other categories.

**Behavioral engagement.** A review of the literature indicates that behavioral engagement is indicated by "learners’ behaviors and actions that can be observed or measured while students are engaged in a task” (Chang, 2013, p. 5). These behaviors include the following indicators:

*Active participation.* This means that students take obvious part in a task by speaking,
writing, demonstrating, sharing, posting, and/or other observable actions (Appleton, Christenson, Kim & Reschly, 2006; Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Reeve et al., 2004).

*Control over learning.* Based on participants’ responses, Chang (2013) suggests three major components that affect student control over learning. These are opportunities to choose: 1) materials and tasks, 2) time spent on tasks, and 3) the pace of doing tasks (Christenson, Reschly, Appleton, Berman, Spanjers, & Varro, 2008; Egbert, 2003). Each of these components demonstrates decisions that students can make concerning their individual involvement in a task. Chang (2013) and Kikuchi and Otsuka (2008) found that students have different preferences for different learning materials or presentation modes. For example, Chang (2013) found that some students preferred reading articles that took longer to read than others and which required more detailed information in order to complete their coursework. Some students preferred watching videos just for fun. They also appreciated the ability to pause or replay videos in order to control the time and pace of the presentation of information. As a result, time spent on Internet-based tasks lasted from a few minutes to a few hours depending on the student and which task she or he decided to pursue. Overall, the behavioral engagement category contains components of task engagement based on students’ active participation, involvement, and control during a task.

*Cognitive engagement.* A task that supports cognitive engagement provides opportunities to think and reflect while participating in it (Appleton et al., 2006; Fredricks et al., 2004; Furlong & Christenson, 2008; Lin, 2012).

*Opportunities to set goals.* Goal setting has been discussed regarding its impact on learning process and outcomes because goal setting strategies provide opportunities for learners to monitor personal learning and exert effort to achieve the goals (Christenson et al., 2012; Fredricks et al., 2004; Locke & Latham, 1990 & 2002; Stutzman, 2008; Zimmerman &
Kitsantas, 1996). According to Chang’s (2013) study, besides the learning goals decided by the teachers and program administrators, such as mastering specific English skills in order to pass the course and developing communicative skills to join social events, students also set their own goals for online tasks that were not included in course learning goals. For example, because one participant wanted to improve his listening comprehension, he ordered an Internet movie channel to watch movies and practice online. Another participant wanted to become more efficient when shopping for groceries in America, so she read recipes to learn food-related vocabulary to help her find items labeled in English more easily when in supermarkets. The tasks - watching movies and reading recipes - provided these students with opportunities to accomplish their own goals.

**Authenticity.** Authenticity, in general, means students communicate with real/authentic people, learn in and about real contexts, use materials that may be applicable outside of the classroom, and complete tasks that correspond to the real world (Ellis, 2003; Woo, Herrington, Agostinho, & Reeves, 2007). In other words, students can apply what they learn from authentic tasks to real-world contexts and use these skills to solve problems outside of the academic environment. These experiences provoke students’ cognitive processes in doing a task by supporting their thinking and using strategies to solve problems, completing the assignments, and applying the skills and knowledge learned from the task to real life.

**Interest.** In order to increase the possibility of cognitive engagement, tasks should relate to students’ interests (Ainley, 2012; Egbert, 2003; Lin, 2012). Students’ interests can be revealed from the choices they make while completing assigned tasks. For example, some students like to communicate with others asynchronously via text message and some prefer to communicate in real time using chat features. Furthermore, some students are more engaged in reading, and some prefer watching videos. Interest in content is also important. Being able to
incorporate areas of personal interest into assignments can have a positive effect on student engagement. The more students are able to apply their personal interests to an academic task, the more likely they may be to engage in the given tasks. This promotes cognitive engagement by offering students choices based on individual interests to participate in and complete tasks.

**Emotional engagement.** This category relates to an individual’s emotions and attitudes toward or while doing a task; the literature on engagement clearly shows that emotions - positive or negative - can influence levels of engagement (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990; Egbert, 2003; Skinner et. al., 2008). As noted previously, emotional engagement may arise from the level of interest and active participation; likewise, behavioral engagement and cognitive engagement may arise from emotional engagement.

**Deep emotions.** Emotions refer to a person’s reaction to a situation, circumstance, or person. Emotions are feeling felt during an interaction, such as happy, sad, or scared. The literature on engagement shows that many students show emotions such as happiness, enjoyment, excitement, and anxiety while participating in activities on the Internet (Egbert, 2003; Lin, 2012; Skinner et al., 2008; Tsou, Wang, & Tzeng, 2006). Participant emotions were considered deep when they expressed strong feelings toward a task. In Chang’s (2013) study, participants expressed their interest and excitement about doing Internet tasks such as reading recipes, shopping, reading articles/news about their home countries, and watching movies. Participants mentioned continuous participation in Internet tasks, especially when they felt happy and excited. Research has also found that negative emotions can impact task engagement. Burrus (2009) and Chang (2013), for example, found that students who were required to use Internet technologies for tasks that didn’t interest them demonstrated negative emotions.

**Strong attitudes.** Attitudes refer to the way a person looks at or feels about a situation,
circumstance, or person. An attitude is a feeling or mindset adopted toward a certain circumstance or person and can often be expressed through a person’s behaviors. Attitudes are often described as being good or bad, positive or negative. Participant attitudes were considered strong when they expressed a clear favor or disfavor toward a task. In Chang’s study (2013), participants showed both positive and negative attitudes toward doing Internet tasks. Some participants stated that a positive attitude was part of the reason for their active participation in doing tasks. However, one participant mentioned the need to look up words in a dictionary while she was using English-only websites. It took her more time and caused a feeling of frustration. During the task, she demonstrated both positive and negative attitudes toward this task. However, she stated that both attitudes pushed her to complete the task and learn new English vocabulary.

Overall, the model in Figure 2 presents components of task engagement that describe students’ engagement in a task. Though the exact number of components needed for a task to be considered engaging has not been established, many studies have found that social networking sites (SNSs), which will be discussed further in the next section, show potential and may help ELLs engage in tasks.

Social Networking for English Learning

A major theme found in the responses in Chang’s (2013) study concerning task engagement was students’ regular, often daily, use of social networking sites (SNSs). Results showed that students considered themselves to be engaged while doing many tasks on SNSs. Therefore, SNSs may be an appropriate tool for supporting and investigating student task engagement.
An SNS is any website that provides a platform for users to build online communities and form relationships with other users by sharing interests, activities, materials, backgrounds or connections. SNS users are often highly engaged in maintaining personal connections or social interactions based on commonalities or shared interests with other SNS users (Alloway, Horton & Alloway, & Dawson, 2013; Hart & Steinbrecher, 2011; Madge, Meek, Wellens & Hooley, 2009). One of the main reasons that Chang's participants chose to participate in these activities through the platform of an SNS was their interest in using something "popular." The participants were curious why such a site was used by so many people, and they were interested in using something their friends were using. This directly relates to the task engagement components of interest and positive attitudes.

The literature notes that the ability of students to learn through communication, interaction, and collaboration demonstrates SNSs’ potential as a learning tool in education (Gomez, Roses, & Farias, 2012; Tseng & Yeh, 2013; Madge et. al., 2009; Richardson, 2010; Wankel, 2011). Researchers (e.g., Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt, 2010; Lester & Perini, 2010) suggest that social networking sites can provide opportunities for active and collaborative learning by connecting students through the use of communicative applications such as email, messages, chats and posts; these fit with the cognitive engagement components in Figure 2. This can make learning a part of social activities that students participate and engage in regularly and help students who engage in such activities attain their learning goals (Hijzen, Boekaerts, & Vedder, 2007; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Thus, participants may engage behaviorally (ex. participation), cognitively (ex. interaction and receiving feedback), and emotionally (emotions and attitudes) in online tasks while using SNSs.

There have been a few studies exploring students’ use of Facebook for academic
purposes. One study on the academic use of the social networking site surveyed 70 undergraduate students showed that 91% of participants used Facebook daily and many participants used it not just for personal purposes but also for school-related activities such as discussion and exchange of educational information (Karimi, Ahmad & Khodabandelou, 2013). More than 30% of participants perceived Facebook as providing a positive impact on academic performance and agreed that Facebook can be important to students for their educational success. In a similar study, which surveyed university freshmen, Madge and her colleagues (2009) suggested that social networking sites can be used for informal learning purposes for interaction and discussion between students about academic-related work and activities. The results of another undergraduate survey on learning in the Facebook environment indicate that interaction through Facebook can enhance participants’ English learning in communication skills and writing (Kabilan, Ahmad & Abidin, 2010). The participants in these studies showed at least one or more components of task engagement; this suggests that SNSs, because they apply to many of the students' uses and interests, may sustain task engagement to increase opportunities for English learning. This also implies that course activities that are presented on SNSs to be completed outside of class could possibly increase opportunities for English learning.

To sum up, within the literature, research has focused on SNSs’ potential as an engaging learning tool for educational purposes; however, the research does not explore student task engagement through the use of SNSs within the context of language learning coursework. Thus, this study examines student task engagement in English language course tasks. Based on the refined model of task engagement, presented previously, and previous research on task engagement in English learning through SNSs, the research questions for this study are:

1. When framed as an aspect of coursework, how do students use SNSs for English
learning? To what extent do they do so?

2. How do language students perceive themselves to be engaged while using SNSs during the completion of coursework? Why?

3. What components of engagement do participants demonstrate when they use SNSs for coursework? If reported, how do these components match the adapted model?

This research works to fill the gap in the literature, a lack of understanding about student engagement through the use of SNSs within the context of language learning coursework, by providing detailed information about whether or not students are engaged in using social networking sites for required coursework. The answers to these questions may help researchers and language teachers understand how students engage while using social networking and the perceived and potential impact of SNS use on their English learning.
CHAPTER EIGHT

METHODOLOGY

A qualitative study exploring adult ELLs’ uses of a social networking site as an educational environment for assigned tasks and their perceptions of engagement during the online tasks provides an in-depth understanding of the use of such Internet technologies and how adult ELLs engage in tasks. Document analysis, surveys, and semi-structured interviews were used to answer the research questions in this study.

Descriptions of Setting and Participants

Setting. The study took place in an intensive English program (IEP) at a university in the northwestern United States (US). The IEP has six levels that address fundamental through advanced academic English. The program is described by the IEP as an intensive and academic training program that enhances students’ English competence in the four language domains as well as grammar.

There were three instructors involved in this project. Two were Caucasian Americans and one was Chinese. Two of the instructors had a Master’s degree in TESOL and between one and five years of teaching experience. The third instructor had decades of teaching experience but had no TESOL-related degree.

Participants. Twenty-six students (15 male, 11 female) from three sections of an intermediate-level speaking and listening course at the IEP made up the participants in this study. They were adult (ages 18-35) international students with diverse backgrounds (e.g., 1 from Afghanistan, 4 from China, 1 from Korea, 1 from Kuwait, 1 from Libya, 1 from Oman, 1 from Rwanda, 8 from Saudi Arabia, 6 from Taiwan, 2 from UAE). The eight-week course aimed to develop students’ listening comprehension and discussion skills. General course assignments
included note-taking, listening to lectures and/or watching videos, and participating in group discussions on a variety of topics. Students were also required to write reflections on given topics and lead in-class discussions.

**Participant backgrounds in using SNSs.** A background survey was conducted in the second week of the course session. Participants were asked to answer questions related to their current feelings about their engagement in school-related tasks and their levels of experience with and use of SNSs. The data were used to explore how students liked to engage and the extent to which participants perceived SNSs to be an effective learning tool.

Twenty-six participants completed the background survey. Participants could choose more than one answer to some questions; therefore, some of the survey questions had more than twenty-six responses. According to participants’ responses to the background survey (and in keeping with Chang’s pilot), they used the social networking site (SNS) Facebook most often. Other frequently used social networking sites included Twitter, Instagram, Google+, and QQ. Three participants reported that they did not use any SNS, while twenty-two participants reported that they used SNSs every day. The activities participants frequently participated in on SNSs were social interaction with people through posting their thoughts or information about their lives, making comments on posts they read, sharing articles and videos, chatting via text messages, and learning something from the posts. They usually used the following materials on SNSs for social interaction: videos, articles, music, news, jokes, games, pictures, and quotes. The reasons that participants said they participated in these activities were having a sense of participation in a community, entertainment, having positive emotions such as excitement and enjoyment, learning, and making friends. Sixteen participants reported that they had not had experience using SNSs for language learning purposes before. However, nineteen participants
believed that it was definitely possible to use SNSs to learn English, and ten participants reported that it might be possible to use SNSs to learn English. The reasons they stated that they believed they could learn English on SNSs were because they used English for communication online or it required English skills to read or listen to the shared information and write comments. This survey helped gain insights into initial perceptions toward using SNSs for learning purposes. Participants’ willingness to work on SNSs may influence their level of engagement during tasks. In addition, this information helped the instructors and researcher to understand better how to integrate Internet materials and the functions provided by SNSs into the curriculum.

**Procedures of Setting up the Learning Group**

Because Facebook is the social networking site most frequently used by students (Chang, 2013; Hart & Steinbrecher, 2011; Kabilan, et al., 2010; Karimi, et al., 2013; Mazman & Usluel, 2010), it was the SNS used to investigate whether or not participants in this study were engaged when SNSs tasks were used as part of their language coursework. The following steps explain how Facebook was implemented and used:

1. The researcher created a learning group on Facebook (referred to as the “Facebook learning group” or FLG below), and the course instructors and the researcher instructed any students who did not already have an active Facebook account to create one so that they could participate. (Facebook accounts are free to create.) They were informed that they might use an existing account or create a new account if they were concerned with privacy.

2. Participants were instructed on how to set privacy settings to ensure the security of any personal or private information.

3. Participants were instructed on how to join the FLG. The instructors set up the basic
guidelines and rules for this Facebook group, helping participants to set goals and understand the purposes for attending this learning group. In addition, students were asked to use appropriate language within the group.

Participants were asked to complete four tasks in the FLG over the course of this eight-week class. Instructions were to be given for each task by the instructors through the FLG. In each task, students posted assignments and participated in discussion all within the FLG in order to meet the learning goals. These tasks covered the language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar) that students were required to master to complete the program. Participants were given one week to complete each task, which, according to the instructors of the course, was enough time for task completion. Tasks were designed to help students prepare for class discussions and activities by providing opportunities to organize information they’d like to discuss in class and by providing information and different resources about the assigned topic. This preparation was done to help students interact in class discussions by making students more aware of how to talk about their ideas, understand their peers’ perspectives, and even disagree with peers. On the other hand, for students who were slower at organizing ideas and writing, these tasks were designed to help students better prepare to complete coursework. They could use their peers’ posts and comments as examples to finish the tasks. The tasks were developed to match the task engagement model by enhancing participation in tasks, giving control over learning, providing opportunities to set goals, opportunities to learn English, multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback, providing authentic topics, and fulfilling interest; participants’ emotions and attitudes toward tasks might be influenced by how tasks were designed.
4. The instructors were asked not to intervene or lead online discussions or make comments. Only if students had questions or concerns about using Facebook or had unsolved problems with English learning were the instructors expected to assist; otherwise they were asked to remain passive observers. This was designed this way because the instructors lectured in class to enhance participants’ understanding of the discussion topics. In addition, according to the course objectives, participants were expected to lead discussions and give feedback based on their understanding. Therefore, on the FLG page, participants were expected to lead discussions without the instructors’ intervention or additional lectures. This was an attempt to increase the opportunities for participants to be exposed to different learning materials during tasks and to explore participants’ participation in tasks, interaction with peers, and their emotions and attitudes toward doing tasks without instructors’ guidance and help as well.

During class time, the instructors were asked to discuss participants’ performance and needs observed in the FLG. For example, cultural differences and arguments would be discussed and resolved, or repeated grammatical errors would be explored during class.

**Task Descriptions**

The topics of the tasks for this study, decided on by the program’s curriculum coordinator, were 1) interracial marriage, 2) the U.S. Civil War, 3) the U.S. Civil Rights Movement, and 4) segregation. The discussion in the Facebook learning group (FLG) started with topic one, interracial marriage. On the FLG page, the instructors posted task instructions one week before the due date. The instructions included the discussion topic, a list of Internet materials, such as videos, images, and articles, based on the report of background survey about what Internet materials were used most by participants, the due date for when responses must be
posted, and assignment requirements. The instructors only provided the types of Internet materials that participants might like to use, not specific links. Participants could choose one type from the list or chose one of their interest. The link to the Internet materials chosen by participants had to be included in their posts. During the week, the instructors explained the topics, lectured to introduce the history behind the topic, and had participants take notes and discuss the content learned. The instructors also reminded participants to participate in the discussion in the FLG for each task. Participants were given one week to choose one Internet material related to the topic, post one reflection or summary of the chosen Internet material and comment on at least two peers’ reflections for each task, these were called “relevant” posts and counted for grades. “Irrelevant” posts would be any post irrelevant to the tasks, such as “Hi, everyone” or “Thank you for sharing.” The reflections and comments on the FLG counted as 10% of the total grade for this class.

Data Sources

Data sources are described below along with how the data were used to meet the purposes of this study.

Surveys. Two different surveys were used to understand participants’ perceptions of their task engagement. These surveys were conducted online via the survey website SurveyMonkey and could be completed anonymously. Surveys were anonymous because by doing so participants felt more comfortable with sharing how they used SNSs and to what extent they used it as part of coursework. In other words, participants would share both positive and negative reports on their use of SNSs and whether or not they were engaged in tasks. The survey links were posted onto the Facebook group page. Because of the diversity of native languages found in the classes, all participants were expected to answer the survey questions in English.
**Background Survey.** A background survey was conducted in the second week of the course session. Participants were asked to answer questions related to their current feelings of their engagement in school-related tasks and their levels of experience and use of SNSs. The data was used to determine how students liked to engage in tasks and the extent to which participants perceived SNSs to be an effective learning tool.

**Engagement Survey 1. Perceptions of task engagement survey.** Immediately after completing each of the four tasks, which began in week three of the course, students were asked to complete a task engagement survey. The questions were about their perceptions of using their chosen Internet materials, perceptions of engagement in the task, and whether or not they perceived that the task increased their opportunity for English practice.

**Engagement Survey 2. Engagement post survey.** This survey was given at the end of the semester. There are two sections in this survey. In section one, participants were asked to answer multiple choice questions about how they used the FLG, which types of materials they usually used in this group, and their overall perceptions of using the Facebook group for English learning. In section two, participants were asked to answer questions evaluating their engagement in the tasks using a Likert-type scale, rating their answers from zero to ten. Examples of question content include overall perceptions of using Facebook and Internet materials to complete the assigned tasks, levels of task engagement, and opportunities to set goals and learn English.

**Participant Interviews.** Semi-structured and unstructured interviews were conducted on a volunteer basis throughout the session. After participants finished the assigned tasks and engagement surveys, the teachers asked participants in class who would like to be interviewed. A total of eight participants volunteered and were interviewed in this study. Interviews were
member checked by asking participants to review the transcripts for fidelity to their language and intention.

These data collection methods revealed participants’ actions and activities on Facebook and how they engaged in the assigned tasks. Their responses to surveys and interviews indicated participants’ perceptions of task engagement while doing tasks on the FLG.

**Teacher interview.** The instructors of the three course sections were interviewed to gain understandings of 1) their perceptions of participant task engagement in this Facebook learning group, 2) their perceptions of participant learning and performance of the Facebook tasks, 3) their perceptions of whether this learning group helped participants prepare for class discussions and activities, and 4) whether and why they would use a Facebook learning group again in future classes.

**Document Analysis.** Participant’s documents were their posts, comments, and Internet materials used to support their ideas on the Facebook group page. All participant participation in the Facebook learning group was copied into Microsoft Word documents by topic. In these documents, the following elements were counted: number of participants, number of ‘on task’ posts (which means participants used key vocabulary and supporting sentences related to the assigned topic in their posts), number of ‘off task’ posts and medium used in the post (video, text-only, graphic, etc.). The elements were counted to track participants’ participation in tasks.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was an ongoing process which included organizing, analyzing, coding, and checking to accurately interpret the data collected from participants. The steps of analysis that were used to make meaning of the data are based on Cresswell (2008) and Glesne (2011):
1. Organize collected data by sorting and categorizing. From the FLG page, all posts were sorted and categorized in tables based on participants’ names, the topics, relevant posts including the Internet materials shared by participants, irrelevant posts, and the types of Internet materials in order to count the number of participants and posts, and types of Internet materials used by participants. In other words, participants’ actions and responses were recorded and analyzed as part of document analysis. This also highlighted important information related to the research questions of this study about to what extent participants were engaged in tasks while using SNSs as part of coursework.

2. The data from the Participant Perceptions of Task Engagement were categorized following the task engagement model (see Figure 2) in order to explore how participants perceived their level of engagement. The data from the Engagement Post Survey Section 1 were organized and sorted to find out the task engagement components reported by participants based on their perceptions. The data from the Engagement Post Survey Section 2 were categorized to find out what task engagement components were demonstrated by participants through what they did to complete the tasks on the FLG. This helped the researcher begin to make connections within the collected information.

3. Record and organize the anecdotal data based on participants’ responses collected from the surveys, interviews, and the observation of participants’ activities in the FLG. The data provided insight into participants’ use of Internet materials for doing the assigned tasks in the FLG. Interview responses were recorded, transcribed, and then open-coded in accordance with Boeije’s (2010) coding model to better gain insights into the participant’s responses. The interviews were used and/or compared with responses collected from the surveys. This is important to their task engagement because the
findings might indicate how participants were engaged in learning process by integrating Internet materials into language learning.

4. Summarize the analyzed data with regard to the research questions. Use the theoretical framework to help draw conclusions and implications.

**Limitations**

This study has some limitations that should be taken into account. First, the main limitation of this study was that teachers did not do tasks as original planned. The task engagement model was not followed. However, the task engagement model was still useful to investigate whether or not the tasks were engaging to participants and to what extent participants perceived themselves to be engaged in these tasks. Second, the use of mainly self-report data; however, the point was to gather individual data to explore how participants were engaged and why the tasks were not engaging and self-report was the most effective way to collect it. Third, most of the data were collected from anonymous surveys, it was difficult to track down individual differences. Fourth, participants who did not complete the tasks and surveys refused to be interviewed. Their absence from participating in tasks shows a significant impact on their level of engagement in tasks. However, the amount of data about participants’ perceptions of using SNSs was still considerable. Semi-structured interviews also compensate the loss of responses from the participants who did not complete each task engagement survey. Fifth, participants did not get enough help to solve technical issues such as unfamiliar with Facebook settings and functions and limited Internet access. The complaints and negative responses reveal some reasons why they are not engaged. This provides researchers and teachers with valuable information about how to engage students in learning tasks when using SNSs for learning purposes. Last, participants reported a programming issue - unorganized discussion thread on
Facebook. The discussion thread is too long to engage participants in learning. This provides one reason why participants became less engaged in discussions on FLG.
CHAPTER NINE

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to explore levels of ELL student engagement in online tasks when they are used as part of language learning coursework. The results and relevant discussion are presented below in order of the research questions for ease of presentation.

Question 1. When framed as an aspect of coursework, how do students use SNSs for English learning? To what extent?

Using SNSs for English Learning

Students used the FLG in specific ways for learning purposes. First participants’ posts on the FLG page showed that four types of Internet materials were shared: images, articles, videos, and music. Images were the most commonly shared Internet material; participants stated in the surveys that images best supported their understandings of the concepts. Other types of media used most often in the FLG for English learning were books, audio, and slideshows.

Also according to the surveys, before posting their chosen Internet materials to the FLG page, many participants first viewed several different types of material before sharing the one they felt best represented their understanding or feelings about the given topic. For example, two interviewed participants mentioned that they read books to gain more knowledge of the assigned topics. They did not share the books because they believed their peers would not read the books within the limited time and many of their peers were not interested in the topics. Therefore, they shared videos or images that were interesting and easy for them to understand. Another participant shared two online articles in a post on the FLG. She stated in the interview that she learned a lot from the readings; therefore, she used them to support her ideas.

As noted above, a list of Internet media types was provided by the teachers as reference.
However, the teachers did not provide specific websites or links in the list. Participants had to search for the links of the chosen Internet materials and post them on the FLG. By doing so, participants had options for the Internet materials based on their own interest or needs in completing the tasks. The number and types of Internet materials shared on the FLG, therefore, do not necessarily fully represent the number of types of Internet materials consulted for the completion of these tasks.

In the Post Engagement Survey, participants were asked about their selection and use of these Internet materials. Based on the results, among the twenty-four participants who completed the survey, nineteen participants reported that the Internet materials used for completing the tasks were easy to find through search engines, such as Google. Thirteen reported that they were able to find materials that supported their ideas, and four reported that materials helped them learn better. Only four participants reported that they did not care about the types of Internet material used or how closely it fit their personal interest or understanding; their goal was simply to complete the tasks as soon as they could. Understanding how students choose to use Internet materials for learning purposes may help teachers adapt their lessons to allow for learning that fits students’ preferences and allows for control over learning that may enhance students’ participation and level of engagement in tasks.

**Extent of Use**

In order to address the extent of use, the number of entries for each task on the FLG is provided. Table 2, seen below, shows the number of entries made by participants throughout the course. Posts were categorized as either relevant or irrelevant based on how closely they followed the instructions of that particular task. Post that responded to the questions and were on topic were labeled ‘relevant,’ and posts that did not respond to the questions or were off topic
were labeled ‘irrelevant.’ Posts typically came in the form of either a reflection or a reply. Reflections responded to task instructions and summarized the chosen Internet material shared with peers. Replies were responses to peer’s reflections. “Relevant” comments were the required length (a 5-8 sentence paragraph), agreed or disagreed with peers’ posts, and included an explanation of their opinions.

Table 1. Numbers of entries for each discussion on the FLG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants who</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total relevant posts</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reflections/ Replies)</td>
<td>(31/ 69)</td>
<td>(32/ 45)</td>
<td>(16/ 29)</td>
<td>(21/ 40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extent to which participants as a whole used the FLG for English learning is presented in Table 2. The Table shows that participation was highest during the first task and lowest during the fourth task. Task 3 was given during mid-term exam week, which may have influenced the drop in participants’ numbers from twenty-two to fourteen. Although participant numbers for this topic were the lowest, the individual level of participation for Task 3 compared to other weeks remained fairly consistent – an average of 3.2 relevant comments per participant. Participants noted less participation in the final task – the average number of relevant posts was 2.8 – possibly due to an increased workload in this and other classes due to it being the end of the term. Participants stated in surveys that that outside factors, such as heavy workload and grades, had an impact in their participation in classroom activities. Overall, the results indicate that some participants who participated in tasks were engaged in tasks to same level, however, they also showed that participants were not deeply engaged during the process due to different factors.
Another finding about extent of use was that the level of participation in the FLG varied dramatically among participants. Over the course of this study, only two participants completed all requirements for all tasks: one reflection and two comments on peers’ posts for each of the four tasks. Nine participants participated in all four topics but lacked either the appropriate number of reflections or comments. Eleven participants participated in only three topics. Two participants participated in only two topics, and two participants participated in only one topic.

Based on student surveys and interviews about the extent of use, there were two major factors influencing the variation in participation among participants: teacher support and outside workload. Many participants indicated that their teachers did not support or encourage the use of the FLG as much as would be expected. It was mentioned in several surveys that although participants used information from posts on the FLG to support arguments in class, their teachers seldom made connections between the students’ FLG discussions and in-class discussions. For example, one participant responded to the question whether or not the tasks on the FLG prepared them for class activities, “We don’t discuss what we post on Facebook a lot in class. But if we need to search for more information (materials) to learn the topic better, why not use that to support our class discussion?” Another three participants directly stated that they needed more teacher instructions and guidance to integrate in-class discussions and learning into the discussions on the FLG. Although the FLG and in-class discussion topics were the same, they seemed to be treated as two separate discussions, as opposed to one continuous discussion. Some interviewed participants stated that the disconnect between the FLG and class time made participation in the FLG seem unnecessary, like it was just extra work. This indicates that the tasks were not very engaging for some participants because of the lack of teacher support on the FLG, but still engaging for some of the participants who could lead the discussions as expected.
in the course objectives.

Also relevant to extent of use, participants stated that the FLG tasks slowly became less and less of a priority for participants as they progressed throughout the term. Some participants even mentioned that their teacher allowed them to not complete one of the tasks, as she would be absent in week 4 and canceled the class. She did not feel that students should be expected to participate in the online discussion when she did not lecture and teach the background knowledge of the topic. Four out of fifteen students from her class still completed the tasks on the FLG. However, her decision not to have participants complete the task influenced participants’ willingness to participate in discussions that week.

One more factor that influenced the extent of use was the control over learning, one of the behavioral task engagement components. When asked about whether or not there was enough time to finish the tasks, four participants mentioned in the last two tasks that they did not have enough time because they had a lot of homework to do for other classes. All the interviewed participants mentioned that they prioritized their time, giving more time to assignments seen as more critical or valuable to their overall learning or their final grade.

In conclusion, according to the findings about how students use SNSs for English learning as part of coursework and the extent of use, most participants who completed tasks on the FLG agreed that they still learned a lot from peers’ posts and Internet materials they shared. For example, participants made statements like “I think it’s encouraged me to work harder to support my ideas,” “It helps to have long and serious conversations with others which is good to develop my English in a very short time,” or “when I read something about the topic and I get the main idea, I can discuss it with my teacher and classmates.” One participant even mentioned that participating in discussions like this would be helpful for his further study in a college.
However, participation varied greatly, and fewer than half completed the tasks after task 2. It can be seen that variety in responses regarding participants’ perceptions of their own participation is as wide as their actual participation.

**Question 2. Do students perceive themselves to be engaged while using SNSs during the completion of coursework? In what ways? Why?**

Participant perceptions of their engagement in the Facebook Learning Group (FLG) tasks are presented in this section. In the first part of this section, participants’ perceptions of being engaged in tasks will be discussed. Participants’ perceptions of not being engaged will then be presented in the second part.

**Behavioral Engagement**

In this category of task engagement, participants’ perceptions of engagement were based on their perceptions of engagement related to their behaviors. Their responses explain how they perceived their behavioral engagement according to the components: active participation and control over learning.

**Active participation.** Overall, about two-thirds of participants perceived that they participated actively in the FLG. Of the 24 participants who completed the Engagement Post Survey, 16 indicated that they felt they were active in learning English while doing these tasks, 10 indicated that their participation in discussions both in class and on the FLG means that this course had more discussions than in other courses providing more time and opportunities to practice English, and 2 felt that they were active in doing tasks. When asked about students’ feelings toward their own participation in the tasks, one participant stated “I did finish one reflection and two comments per week. That’s the minimum requirement. So, I just do what I am asked to do every week. But I still tried to read all the posts as possible.” In the surveys,
participants did not directly state that they were not active in doing tasks. Mostly, participants who responded in surveys stated that they participated in doing tasks by posting their reflections or at least by reading peers’ posts. This implies that participants may not be participating actively at a certain level; however, there are no exact numbers or statements showing how many participants were not active if they did not participate at all.

**Control over their learning.** Nineteen participants stated that they felt that they had control over their learning within the FLG group. Over the course of four tasks, 34 of out 83 total responses were received that indicated that the participants did feel they had control. In an interview, one participant, when speaking about the option to select the type of learning material shared, stated that he preferred to share videos "...because video is more interesting than other materials...it's easy to get the idea more clearly because for me I learn more and I understand more if I see the action or I do it by myself.” This implies that participants perceived they were engaged in tasks when they had control over learning. However, only nineteen participants stated this; there are no responses from other participants showing whether they felt the same way.

Overall, of those who completed the surveys, more than half of participants stated that they perceived their participation to be active and that they were given adequate control over their learning. For these participants, these tasks met the criteria for behavioral engagement; however, based on the components of behavioral engagement, for participants who disagreed or did not provide their responses, it is difficult to conclude that the tasks on FLG were engaging.

**Cognitive Engagement**

Participants’ perceptions on whether or not the tasks provided opportunities for cognitive engagement explain to what level participants perceived they were cognitively engaged in tasks. The findings are arranged below according to the five components of cognitive engagement.
Opportunities to set learning goals. Fewer than half of the participants who posted to the FLG stated that they felt they were given opportunities to set learning goals. This was indicated 43 times across the four task surveys and the final survey. Participants were asked about their own learning goals. Two participants provided the following perspectives. “I want to know more about why there is slavery”; “I want to know what’s the main cause of the Civil War.” One participant stated that he knew a lot and there was nothing new he expected from this class. One participant mentioned that he just wanted to do the assigned homework and get the grade for each task.

Opportunities to learn English. A similar number of responses were given regarding participants’ opportunities to learn English while doing the tasks. Forty-one responses indicating agreement about adequate opportunities to learn English were given across the four tasks. From the Post Task Engagement Survey, eighteen participants agreed that there were opportunities to learn English during tasks. Participants stated, “It helps to have long and serious conversations with others which is good to develop my English in a very short time.” “I listened to the video more than 8 times, so that caused me to get more vocabularies.” Only two participants disagreed that there were opportunities to learn English because the level of English in discussions was low. In the survey, one participant stated, “because we use easy English.” This indicates that for this participant it was not viewed as a good opportunity to learn English from the posts. One interviewed participant further explained that there was not much to learn from her peers’ posts due to too many errors in the posts and the lack of depth of the discussions.

Multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback. Over the course of four tasks, 43 out of 83 responses were also given indicating the presence of multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback throughout the four tasks. During the tasks, participants checked
different types of Internet materials to gain more knowledge about the tasks, and they received comments and feedback from peers that helped them to learn different perspectives and organize their ideas. When referring to their participation in the FLG, participants stated, "I can have more way to learn English," and "It forced me to search in different websites, so that leads me to know some good websites that I can use in my research paper." Only three participants disagreed that they got useful feedback from peers; they expected to have teacher support in discussions on their writing. This indicates that a slight majority of participants agreed that they were engaged in tasks when having the multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback.

**Authenticity.** A slightly lower number of positive responses were reported regarding the presence of authenticity across the four tasks. Thirty-six responses were collected that stated that participants felt the tasks were authentic. Participants stated that, “reading and listening ..interpretation of the photos, etc all those skills were gained using this website,” “when I read something about the topic and I get the main idea, I can discuss it with my teacher and classmates.” These are examples of authenticity because participants perceived that what they learned can be applied in real life and is useful for their study, which makes the tasks authentic to participants.

**Interest.** The same number of responses were also collected regarding participants’ agreement that they found the tasks met their interests and needs. Thirty-six responses stated that the participants found the task to be interesting. Explanations were such as the following three quotes. “the information i wanted,” “it matched,” “I interested on the US history.”

Overall, most participants who completed the tasks and surveys responded positively to each cognitive engagement component. The average number of participants who agreed they were cognitively engaged was only 15 out of 36. This result indicates that the tasks were not
engaging to the majority of students.

**Emotional Engagement**

Emotions and attitudes - both positive and negative - are two major components of emotional engagement. Participants were asked how they felt using SNSs as part of coursework. Their responses to the questions were organized to present how participants perceived their emotional engagement during tasks.

**Deep emotions and strong attitudes.** Thirty-four cases of emotions were recorded across the four tasks, with 26 instances of participants expressing they were happy while doing the task and 8 instances of participants expressing excitement. Following are a few examples of comments given by participants regarding their emotions and attitudes toward the tasks: “I feel I am active in learning English,” “I think it is useful in my exam,” “Just because I don’t like the social media!,” “I don’t really think that I enjoy it because the topics that we used were not interesting.” Although not every participant did the surveys for each task, some participants perceived that both positive and negative emotions and attitudes toward tasks influenced their level of emotional engagement.

In sum, the ways that participants perceived themselves to be engaged while using SNSs during the completion of coursework varied among components of task engagement. A roughly half of participants agreed that they were engaged in tasks when the tasks met the following criteria: active participation, control over learning (behavioral engagement,) opportunities to learn English, and multiplicity of exposure and production (cognitive engagement,) and deep emotions and strong attitudes (emotional engagement.) However, slightly fewer than half of participants felt they were engaged during the process because the tasks did not provide opportunities to set learning goals, useful feedback, authenticity, and interest. This indicates that
in order to increase participant task engagement, a task should be designed by following the task engagement components. Overall, these four tasks have different levels of engaging features based on the engagement criteria. According to the data, some students are engaged in tasks when they perceive that the tasks meet the task engagement components in Figure 2.

**Lack of Engagement**

Not all responses to the surveys were positive. Some participants also expressed negative feelings toward the tasks. The total number of participants who disagreed that the tasks were engaging was based on the data collected from the Post Engagement Survey. The following reasons based on participants’ responses and interviews explain the reasons why the tasks were less engaging.

**The tasks do not meet their interests and needs.** According to the data, except for topic one - interracial marriage - that can be discussed and has connections to real life experience, the other three topics are all about American history that they are not interested in. Nine participants stated that “It’s boring” or “It’s not interesting.” They also stated that they felt stressed/ frustrated working on boring topics. In addition, interviewed participants mentioned that the discussion topics cannot be changed/ edited by participants to the topics they are interested in. “i don't like to find the information this is not my interest,” was one remark made by one of the participants. Seven participants mentioned that they cannot apply the skills and knowledge learned from the tasks, especially the topics about American history. They expressed that they would not discuss anything about the topics with friends or in their lives. The tasks are just homework they need to complete for the class and the knowledge learned from the class cannot be applied after they finish this class. One participant very adamantly made the following remarks: “I would not use it in my real life because it has nothing to do with my life! For
example, I won't talk about topic like that with my friend!!” In other words, the tasks were not authentic to meet participants’ interests and needs. These results show that the tasks do not meet the some cognitive engagement components for these participants.

The learning opportunities are fewer than expected. Providing opportunities to learn English is one criteria of task engagement. Six participants disagreed that there were opportunities to learn English on the FLG. They expressed that they did not learn much English through the interactions with their peers. They found a lot of errors in peers’ posts. They also did not know whether or not their posts were correct and insightful. One interviewed participant mentioned that she had already got the score of 7.5 on the IELTS test and college admission. She believed that her English proficiency was better than anyone in this class, so there was nothing she could learn from her peers. This indicates that peers’ English proficiency influences the level of engagement in doing tasks.

Not enough exposure and feedback. Two participants mentioned that they used videos and images a lot to support their ideas only because these two were easy to find and easy to use to write summaries and comments about the content. They perceived that the convenience of selecting Internet materials for discussions on the FLG saved them time during the tasks but did not provide them a multiplicity of exposure. As to feedback, three participants said that they did not get feedback on their posts from the teachers. The teachers did not use participants’ perspectives posted on the FLG to explain the topics and help them understand the topics better. Two participants did not want to spend much time writing the posts because they believed that they did not get useful feedback from peers. Three participants stated that the teachers’ lectures were more informative, they did not think their peers’ ideas were helpful for the course’s writing tasks. Five participants believed that it would be useful to get feedback from teachers. These
responses indicate that teacher support and feedback may increase the student engagement during tasks.

Overall, the results show that some participants perceived themselves not to be engaged during tasks by identifying the task engagement components. Although the number of participants who perceived this is lower than half, it indicates that the tasks were not as engaging as the teachers and research expected.

**Question 3. What components of engagement do participants demonstrate when they use SNSs for coursework? If reported, how do these components match the adapted model?**

In contrast to question two, which focuses on participants’ perceptions of engagement, question three focuses on participants’ demonstration of engagement components in their participation in the Facebook Learning Group (FLG). In order to answer this question, data were collected from the FLG; interviews and the Engagement Post Survey Section 2. The findings present trends in participants’ actions while using the SNSs for coursework.

**Behavioral Engagement.** In this category, active participation and control over learning are the main components.

**Active participation.** Participants’ posts on the FLG were recorded and calculated to understand individual participation levels. Overall, across four tasks, there was a total of 283 relevant posts. Participants were asked to rate from zero (strongly disagree) to ten (strongly agree) about their overall participation. The participation through posting relevant posts and checking peers’ posts and comments ranged from 0 to 10 with an average number of 6.28, slightly above a neutral score of 5. Analysis of FLG activity supported this self report as, although all students participated in posting and comments, their individual levels of
participation varied dramatically across the four tasks (see Table 1 for specific numbers for each task).

Interviews were also conducted to find out how participants participated beyond what was posted on the FLG. Five interviewees stated that besides the posts, they checked their peers’ posts before posting their own, which often influenced how they wrote their own posts. They also shared that they often spent more time reading others posts than they did writing their own.

**Control over their learning.** Participants were asked via survey and interviews about the amount of control they were given regarding the selection of Internet materials to post. They were also asked if they felt they were given enough time to complete each task. The average rating for perception of control over learning was fairly high, at 7.8 out of 10. The rating number ranged from 5 to 10. This indicates more than half of the participants agreed that they had control over their learning. However, based on responses collected from surveys, some participants disagreed that they had control of the task topics, which were assigned by teachers, and they did not have sufficient time to complete the tasks due to heavy course load.

To sum up, participants who did participate in tasks demonstrated the behavioral engagement components at different levels – from zero to ten. According to some participants’ responses, the level of behavioral engagement might be influenced by outside factors such as grades and heavy course loads. Some participants stated that these factors did increase or decrease the level of behavioral engagement based on how much they were influenced during tasks. The results show that participants did not highly demonstrate the components of behavioral engagement, however, more than half of the participants, who participated in tasks, demonstrated active participation and agreed that they had control over their learning.
**Cognitive Engagement.** Participants’ self report on the five components of cognitive engagement was categorized and sorted based on the task engagement model in Figure 2 to present what cognitive components were demonstrated by participants during tasks on the FLG.

**Opportunities to set learning goals.** The number of participants who evidenced the components of this category during tasks varied. Based on the Engagement Post Survey Section 2, across the tasks, some participants agreed that they could set goals, giving an average rating of 6 out of 10 in slight agreement. The overall rating number ranged from 0 to 10. Participants gave comments such as, "I want to know more about websites that can help me do my homework,” “I want to learn more about using Facebook to learn English,” or “I want to learn why there were slaves.” This shows that some participants had their own learning goals while doing tasks assigned by teachers. Two participants who rated zero did not explain why they selected zero; however, from the Perceptions of Task Engagement Survey, two participants responded to the question - whether or not they had opportunities to set learning goals – “I just want to do my HW (homework),” and “I've already known how to use technology, so I don't think it has something to do with doing the HW.” This implies that some participants did not consider setting their own learning goals while doing tasks.

**Opportunities to learn English.** Most participants agreed that they had opportunities to learn English through different ways, rating from 0 to 10 with an average number 6.1, again showing slight agreement. In each Perceptions of Task Engagement Survey, most participants who completed the tasks agreed that the tasks provided opportunities to learn English. For example, participants mentioned that they checked different Internet materials to learn the tasks, checked peers’ posts to learn different perspectives, and completed the posts on the FLG, using English to complete these tasks. Participants who disagreed mentioned “not really because it
used an easy language,” and “little.” One interviewed participant mentioned that she found a lot of grammatical and spelling errors in peers’ posts that kept her from participating in discussions on the FLG.

**Multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback.** As to multiplicity of exposure, production, and feedback, most participants agreed that tasks provided exposure to learning materials (Internet materials and peers’ posts) with the average rating of 6.7, ranging from 0 to 10, and provided adequate feedback with the average rating of 5.5, ranging from 0 to 10. The Engagement Post Survey Section did not ask participants about production, but based on interview responses and Perceptions of Task Engagement surveys, many participants felt that the FLG provided enough opportunities for production with the responses like “yes, because I type English” or “I write reflections and comments.” Writing in English was considered production in this project.

** Authenticity.** Participants rated from 0 to 10 with an average number of 5 for authenticity. Only two participants agreed that all of the tasks were authentic. One interviewed participant explained that this was because she found it difficult to make connections between the topics/tasks and her own life, making it difficult to remain interested and practical in real life.

** Interest.** The rating ranges from 0 to 10 with an average number of 6.7 for interest. Participants were asked about the choices they made while completing the tasks such as the Internet materials they chose and the SNSs they used most for learning. Only two participants completely agreed that the tasks met their interest and need. Some participants stated that the tasks assigned by teachers were boring and did not meet their interest. However, other participants mentioned that different perspectives and Internet materials provided by their peers made it easier to remain interested.
In conclusion, participants demonstrated all the five components of cognitive engagement at different levels. However, the average number of cognitive engagement during tasks by using SNSs varied and did not present at a high score from the rating – the average number is from 6 to 6.7, slightly above the neutral score of 5 out of ten. This shows that participants might not be engaged in the tasks as expected.

**Emotional Engagement.** Participants were asked how they felt while using Internet materials to complete online tasks on the FLG. Their responses to the questions were organized to present their emotions and attitudes toward doing tasks.

**Deep emotions and strong attitudes.** Throughout the surveys, participants who completed the tasks reported a range of emotions and attitudes toward the FLG and the task, including feeling interested, bored, stressed, and active in learning English. The number of each item mentioned across each Perceptions of Task Engagement Survey varied. For example, participants reported “interested” 26 times, “bored” 14 times, and “stressed/frustrated” only 2 times. Interviewed participants mentioned that they encountered both positive and negative emotions and attitudes throughout the course of the project. They explained that positive emotions and attitudes enhanced their engagement in tasks more than negative emotions and attitudes but that sometimes negative emotions and attitudes pushed them to work harder to achieve their learning goals. When asked to rate positive emotions and attitudes toward the FLG and tasks in Engagement Post Survey Section 2, twenty-four participants rated from zero to ten which gave an average score of 6.9 of ten, as compared to 4.9 out of ten, the average score regarding questions of negative emotions and attitudes. The findings in emotional engagement shows that both positive and negative emotions and attitudes may have an impact on student task engagement. However, based on participants’ responses in Perceptions of Task Engagement...
Survey, it seems that some participants believed that positive emotions and attitudes had a greater impact on task engagement than negative ones. This can be concluded that deep emotions and strong attitudes toward the task influence the level of task engagement to a certain level.

In sum, the results of the analysis support that the participants perceived tasks on the FLG to meet engagement components to some extent. According to all the interviewed participants, participants engaged or were not engaged in the tasks for different reasons. For example, the participant from Rwanda was aggressive and enthusiastic in learning any topic related to civil rights, revolutions, racism, and civil wars because this meets his needs and interests. The topics also connect to his real life experience. However, to some participants, these topics are not engaging because the topics do not meet their interest and the knowledge learned from the class cannot be applied to their real life experiences. The individual differences make the rating range huge – from zero to ten. Overall, twenty four participants completed Engagement Post Survey Section 2, and based on the data from this survey, more than half of participants agreed that they demonstrated the components of task engagement that meet the model of task engagement presented in Figure 2. Based on the data collected from Perceptions of Task Engagement Survey, even though fewer and fewer participants participated each week, more than half of those participants still demonstrated the task engagement components.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore ELL student engagement in computer-assisted language learning while using the SNS Facebook as part of coursework. Using a model of task engagement as the framework, answers to the research questions reveal variation in participants’ perceptions of being engaged in the tasks. Conclusions are made below about the effectiveness of using SNSs as a language learning tool and the effectiveness of using task engagement as a
model for designing engaging tasks.

There may be several reasons for the variation of participants’ perceptions toward task engagement in this study. Throughout the study, the teachers did not follow the task engagement model, the way the researcher had expected, while designing the tasks nor did they integrate Facebook well into the curriculum. This may have reduced student task engagement while participating in the FLG tasks. Many participants’ stated that they viewed the FLG tasks as being extra work, which also may have contributed to their lack of engagement. Teachers were reported as not being responsive to the struggles of students regarding the use of the FLG; this may have discouraged some participants from completing some of the tasks on Facebook as well.

This study did, however, show that the engagement model was a useful way to evaluate whether the participants were engaged. For example, participants did not perceive that the tasks presented in the FLG met the task engagement components listed in the model very well. For some participants, the tasks met most of the components but one or two components were not met, especially the components of interest and authenticity played a large role in student perceptions. For these participants, the tasks might have engaged them in some ways but because some components were not met, participants were not engaged overall. These findings indicate that the task engagement model can be useful as a guideline to create engaging tasks, because the participants who perceived the task engagement components positively also believed that they were engaged. If the model is not followed completely, however, student engagement may be negatively impacted, as it was for many students in this study. Therefore, task design should follow the task engagement model to include as many task engagement components that apply to as many students as possible in order to engage the largest number.
A final conclusion of this study is that using Internet technologies that students use outside of class to support task engagement in a classroom is not enough on its own to engage students in doing tasks. Although many participants used Facebook in their daily lives, using Facebook for course-related activities did not engage half of them during the learning process. In other words, using Internet technologies is not the solution to enhancing student task engagement. Rather, it can be one important part of meeting students' interests and needs in engaging tasks.

**Implications**

Based on the conclusions above, several implications for teaching and further study can be noted.

First, in order to enhance students’ levels of task engagement, teachers need to understand individual differences such as the reasons why students would be more or less engaged in particular task elements, such as topics, group formats, materials, and so on. In addition, teachers may consider giving students opportunities to create their own tasks, at least in part, so that they are more likely to meet the engagement criteria. As to using popular SNSs to engage students in tasks, teachers may need to check different social networking sites to select one that fits all students’ needs and interests before integrating it into tasks. Second, in this study, instructors did not follow the task engagement components closely in creating the tasks, particularly as to topic and feedback, which may have led to participants’ lack of task engagement. Further study could explore students’ task engagement when tasks are purposefully developed in accordance with the engagement model. Researchers may need have the power to control curriculum design and tasks in order to address the model appropriately. Additional research could also explore correlations between task engagement and learning achievement. In
order to find the correlations, it is important to follow students and identify each student’s perceptions of engagement during tasks. Finally, future research should use a much larger sample to relate student perceptions of the components and their levels of engagement in order to refine the model and provide concrete samples of types of engaging tasks.
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APPENDIX A

Descriptions and Examples of Tasks

There are four tasks that participants were required to complete for this course. The options for the Internet materials are listed below. Please use one of the following media that you like to make a reflection. Use a different material for each task. There should be four types of materials used.

Types of Internet materials
1. Images
2. Videos
3. Articles (any type of articles, for example news, stories, jokes, etc.)
4. Music with lyrics
5. Audio
6. Slide shows
7. Books
8. Production of your own (ex. recording, videotaping, etc. instead of writing.)
9. Other (please specify)

Task examples

Task 1
Topic: Introduce your country
Internet material: Video

Instructions: Participants are required to 1) find a video (interest), 2) watch and listen to the video (opportunities to learn English), 3) write a short paragraph (4-8 sentences) that summarizes the video to help their peers understand the content (production), 4) post the video link and their summary to the Facebook group page to share with their peers, and 5) view and comment on at least two peer-participants’ posts (participation and feedback).

Due date: This task should be completed by the end of week 3.

Video link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WE4CIkYsYDw

Summary: Taiwan is my home country. This video provides an overview of Taiwan.

From this video, you will know something about Taiwan - the location, a brief
history, population, and a little information about Taiwan’s growing technology business. You will also see different aspects of Taiwan culture in this video, including the transportation, natural scenes, buildings, and people. Hope you enjoy this video.

Task 2
Topic: Describe one aspect of American culture that you have experienced that differs from your understanding of American culture before first coming to this country.

Internet material: Record a one to two-minute audio or video file in which you talk about the assigned topic.

Instructions: In order to complete this task, participants are required to 1) think about what they want to say (opportunities to set goals), 2) outline their ideas or write the script (opportunities to learn English), 3) record the audio or video file (production), 4) add the file to the Facebook group page to share with their peers, and 5) view/listen to and comment on at least two peer-participants’ posts (participation and feedback). In step 4, participants can choose post the video file to YouTube and share the link in the Facebook group.

Due date: This task will be completed by the end of week 4.

Note: If participants need help recording or uploading their videos, the researcher and the instructor will provide assistance by giving written instructions or sharing tutorial video links on the Facebook group page that students can follow to complete the recording.

Script: “I watched American movies and TV shows in my home country and noticed that many Americans ate fast food every day. This seemed like a normal part of American culture. But when I came here, I found that not every American eats fast food often. I found two reasons why they don’t eat fast food every day. First, fast food is not healthy. Many Americans actually eat healthy food as much as they can. They realize that obesity is a serious problem and risks their life. So, fast food is not a good option for their diet. Second, although fast food restaurants seem to be everywhere, it doesn’t mean you can buy it whenever or wherever you want. Many Americans bring their own lunch from home. Now I know fast food is a popular or common meal, but not for everyone or everyday diet.”
Task 3
Topic: A legend from your country
Internet Material: Article
Instructions: To complete this task, participants are required to 1) find an article (interest), 2) read the article (exposure), 3) write 2-4 sentences reflecting on the content of the article (production), 4) post the article and the reflection to the Facebook group page to share with their peers, and 5) read and comment on at least two peer-participants’ posts (participation and feedback).
Due date: This task will be completed by the end of week 6.
Article title: Little Frog in the Well
Article link: [http://www.taiwandc.org/folk-fro.htm](http://www.taiwandc.org/folk-fro.htm)
Reflection: This story is about how a little frog learned of the world outside of the well. This story tells us that we should to expand our minds and learn about what is happening outside of our own communities. If we just focused on what is right in front of us, we would never improve ourselves. We also need to appreciate people who help us learn and grow. People in Taiwan call a narrow-minded or ignorant person a ‘little frog in the well.’

Task 4
Topic: Write a paragraph (5 – 10 sentences) that expresses your opinion of the assigned novel.
Internet material: Novel
Instructions: Participants are required to 1) read the assigned novel (opportunities to learn English), 2) write their opinions (production), 3) post the paragraph to the Facebook group page and share with their peers, and 4) read and comment on at least two peer-participants’ posts (participation and feedback).
Due date: This writing task will be done in the final week of the course session.
Novel: Holes
Writing example: I like this book because it tells multiple stories at the same time. To me, it is mysterious because it is difficult to guess the ending. From this book, I learned about American culture in the past and today. I also like the characters. They each had different personalities. I always like to see how people think and act
differently because of the personalities. This novel became a movie, so, I
watched the movie, too. The movie was great. I would recommend this novel
and movie to my friends.

Optional task:
Ask questions and give answers on the Facebook group page (participation, feedback,
opportunities to learn English). Participants can ask questions or give answers to peer-
participants’ questions. The questions need to be related to the assigned task or be about English
learning, such as grammar or spelling. Students can also post questions and ask the instructor to
answer. The instructor can decide to provide instant feedback or answer the questions in class,
but he/she needs to inform students when he/she will answer.
Optional task example:
Post: Can I use present tense and past tense in the same sentence?
Answer to the question: Yes, you can. If there are two independent clauses, you can use present
tense and past tense. For example, “Last year I lived in Taiwan, but this
year I live in America.”
APPENDIX B

An Example of Task Instructions

The instructions explain the learning objective(s), step by step procedures/a series of actions that need to be taken to produce a product, and presenting the product that shows the outcome. In each procedure, there might be individual actions as part of the sequence of a task. For example, if an assigned task is to post a video that relates to the discussion topic of the week on the class webpage and summarize the video to help the peers understand the content, students need to complete the following steps:

1. Understand the discussion topic of the week.
2. Understand the objective(s).
3. Find the Internet materials (i.e. videos, images, music, etc.) that relate to the topic and choose the one they would like to share with their peers.
4. Write a summary of the video content.
5. Log onto the class webpage.
6. Post the video link/resource and the summary within the given time.

Once students have finished the above six steps, they have completed the assigned task.
APPENDIX C

Background Survey

Instructions: Answer each question by choosing all answers that apply. Note that some questions can have more than one answer. Use the option named “other” to give your own answers or to explain your choices.

* Social networking sites are, for example, Facebook, Instagram, Flickr, Twitter, etc.

1. Personal information:
   A. Name
   B. Age
   C. Gender
   D. Nationality

2. Which social networking sites do you use regularly?
   A. Facebook
   B. Flickr
   C. Google+
   D. My Space
   E. Twitter
   F. None
   G. Other _______________________

3. How often do you use social networking sites?
   A. Every day.
   B. Several times a week
   C. Sometimes. once a week
   D. Seldom. once a month
   E. Never.

4. How do you spend most of your time on social networking sites?
   A. Posting information about your life
   B. Sharing videos/music/articles/photos
   C. Commenting on your friends’ posts
   D. Chatting with friends or family
E. Writing messages to friends or family
F. Reading other people’s posts or articles shared by other people
G. Learning (e.g., English, knowledge, new information, technology, etc.)
H. All of them
I. Other __________________________

5. Which of following interests explain your reasons for using social networking sites?
   A. Learning
   B. Entertainment
   C. Excitement, enjoyment, etc. (Positive emotions)
   D. Participating in the activities
   E. Making friends
   F. Producing (e.g., writing blogs, making videos, etc.)
   G. Other __________________________

6. Which materials do you usually like to use and/or share on social networking sites?
   A. Videos
   B. Articles
   C. Music
   D. Polls/Surveys
   E. Astrology/Horoscopes (signs of the birth)
   F. News
   G. Games
   H. Jokes
   I. Email/Message system
   J. Other __________________________

7. Have you ever used social networking sites for learning purposes?
   A. Yes. Explain what you used them for in Other (e.g., language learning, science, technology, etc.)
   B. No.
   C. Other __________________________

8. Do you think it is possible to use social networking sites to support language learning? Explain your answer in Other.
A. Yes. Explain why.
B. No. Explain why not.
C. Maybe. Explain.
D. Other
APPENDIX D

Participant Perceptions of Task Engagement Survey

Note: This survey will be given to participants every two weeks following the completion of the assigned. There will be four surveys in total.

Instructions: Answer each question by choosing all answers that apply. Note that some questions can have more than one answer. Use the option named “other” to give your own answers or to explain your choices.

1. Did this task provide the opportunity to decide what you want to learn? For example, "I want to know more about websites that can help me do my homework" or "I want to learn to record my voice.") Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
   A. Yes. Please explain how.
   B. No. Please explain how.
   C. Other.

2. Did you have enough time to finish this task? Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
   A. Yes. Please explain how.
   B. No. Please explain why.
   C. Other.

3. Did this task provide opportunities for you to practice your English? Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
   A. Yes. Please explain in what way you practiced English.
   B. No. Explain why not this task did not help you practice English.
   C. Other.

4. Did this task help you prepare you better for class activities? Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
   A. Yes. In what way did that do so?
   B. No. Why was the task not helpful?
   C. Other

5. Could you apply the skills and knowledge you have learned from this task to your real-life experience? Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
6. Did you have your own choice of learning materials for the completion of this task? Please explain your answer in the option “Other.”
   A. Yes. Please explain what choices you had.
   B. No. Please explain why.
   C. Other.

7. Did this task meet your needs and interests? Please explain your answer in the option named “Other.”
   A. Yes. In what way did the task meet your needs and interests?
   B. No. Why did the task not meet your needs and interests?
   C. Other

8. I felt ______________ while doing this task. Please select that all apply.
   A. interested
   B. bored
   C. excited
   D. active in learning English
   E. active in doing tasks
   F. stressed/frustrated
   G. productive
   H. distracted
   I. I practiced my English more than I did
   J. I did it for my grades
   K. Other ____________
APPENDIX E

Engagement Post Survey

Note: This survey has two sections. Please answer these questions about how you used the Facebook group for this class.

Section 1
Instructions: Answer each question by choosing all answers that apply. Questions can have more than one answer. Use the option named “other” to give your own answers or to explain your choices.

1. Which material(s) did you use often to complete your reflections?
   a. Images (photos)
   b. Videos
   c. Articles (ex. news, stories, research paper)
   d. Books
   e. Audio
   f. Your own production (ex. recording, making a video)
   g. Why did you use these materials to write your reflections?
   h. They were easy to get find on the Internet.
   i. They were related to the topics most.
   j. They supported my arguments/comments or thoughts.
   k. They were one of the top results when I searched the Internet.
   l. They helped me learn better about the topics.
   m. I didn’t really care about the materials; I just wanted to finish my reflection.
   n. Did you have enough time to finish this task?
   o. Yes. One week was enough.
   p. No. I would have liked more time.
   q. Other. ____________________________________________

2. Did this task provide opportunities for you to practice your English?
   If yes, please circle the answers that apply. If no, please circle the answers that all apply.
1. What did you do during this task?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>I learned new words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I had more time to check my writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>It helped me practice my speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>I improved my grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>I could practice my listening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other. ____________________________

2. What did you need more of from this task?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>I needed teachers’ comments more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>No one corrected my errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>I didn’t work hard on Facebook.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did this task help you prepare you better for class activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes. Please circle the answers that apply.</th>
<th>No. Why was the task not helpful?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>I understood better about the topics.</td>
<td>a. We didn’t continue the discussion often in class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I could use the reflections or comments to support my in class discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>It helped me organize my thoughts and comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other. ____________________________

4. Could you apply the skills and knowledge you have learned from this task to your real-life experiences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes. Please circle the answers that apply.</th>
<th>No. Please circle the answers that apply.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>I know how to use the Internet better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>I know how to think differently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>I understand different cultures better that help me to respect different voices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>I learned new technology skills that I can continue to use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other. ____________________________
5. Did you have your own choice of learning materials for the completion of this task?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes. Please circle the answers that apply.</th>
<th>No. Please circle the answers that apply.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I could look for the materials I needed on the Internet.</td>
<td>a. I didn’t have much choice of learning materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I could use appropriate materials to express my thoughts.</td>
<td>b. The teachers decided what to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I could use the materials I was interested in.</td>
<td>c. I was not interested in using the learning materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I could use the materials I could get from the Internet.</td>
<td>d. It didn’t fulfill my needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I could use the materials that helped me learn better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The learning materials fulfilled my needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other. _____________________________________________________

6. I felt ___________ while doing this task. Please select that all apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. interested</th>
<th>g. productive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. bored</td>
<td>h. distracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. excited</td>
<td>i. I practiced my English more than I did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. active in learning English</td>
<td>j. I did it for my grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. active in doing tasks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. stressed/frustrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other _____________________________________________________

**Post Engagement Survey Section 2**

**Instructions:** Please rate each sentence based on how much you agree - 0 means strongly dislike/disagree and 10 means strongly like/agree.

1. I felt comfortable being in this Facebook group for my English class.
2. It was helpful for my English learning to use the Facebook group for this class.
3. I felt bored in doing tasks in this Facebook group.
4. I understood how to do the tasks.
5. I could set my learning goals for this class. (For example, your learning goals might be something like, "I want to know more about websites that can help me do my homework" or "I want to learn to record my voice" "I want to ask questions about the coursework in the Facebook group.")
6. I checked my peers’ posts and comments.
7. I replied to my peers’ comments.
8. I posted in this Facebook group regularly.
9. I enjoyed sharing learning materials (e.g., videos, articles, etc.) in this Facebook group.
10. I believe that my English skills improved because of this Facebook group.
11. In this Facebook group, my opportunities to learn English increased from doing in class activities and using the textbooks to outside of class activities and using online learning materials.
12. I used a lot of materials, such as videos and articles, to complete the assignments.
13. My peers’ posts and comments in the Facebook group were helpful to my English learning.
14. I had enough time to complete the tasks in this Facebook group.
15. I could control my learning pace (ex. I could do the work when I wanted to).
APPENDIX F

Possible Semi-structured Student Interview Questions

Participant:

Date:

Time:

Please answer the following questions.

1. Overall, how do you feel about using Facebook for language learning?

2. Do you feel engaged in the tasks? In what way? Why and how?

3. From the surveys, I found that you would like to use ____________ (ex. images, videos, articles, audio, and production of your own) to complete the assignments. Why did you do so?
   - How do you choose the materials?
   - Which type of material helped you learn better or easier to learn English?
   - When using images, what are the reasons you use them?

4. Explain how you chose Internet technologies and materials while participating and doing the tasks in this group.

5. From the surveys, you mentioned that you feel “__________________”. How do this learning group and the tasks help with your English learning?

6. From the surveys, I found that you seldom make comments so far (e.g. make comments, participate, etc.) Why?

7. From the surveys, you perceived you were engaged in posting the materials you found.
   - Would you please explain more about your participation on Facebook and the way you use the Internet materials for English learning.
APPENDIX G

Semi-structured Teacher Interview Questions

Name:
Date:

1. Overall, how do you perceive using Facebook as a tool for your class?

2. Did you find any useful information about your students’ learning from this page? If yes, what are they? In what way the information helped you with your instruction?

3. How do you perceive your students’ performance and learning in this Facebook group? For example, students were active and participated in the discussions a lot. Students expressed themselves clearly by posting their comments.

4. Do you think student are benefited from participating in this group for their English learning? If yes, in what way? If not, why?

For example, did students prepare them better for class activities with their participation and completion of the assigned tasks on Facebook prior to the class? Or students did not complete the assignment on Facebook.

5. Do you think you will use Facebook for your class again? Explain.

6. From surveys and interviews, I found that students expected more teachers’ involvement in discussion. How will this change your perceptions of using Facebook for discussion session?

7. From surveys and interviews, students expressed that 1) the grades for participating the discussion is only 10%, which means too low for me to do more and 2) they didn’t have time or many opportunities to talk about what they posted on Facebook and this disengaged them in using Facebook for discussion. What do you think you can do to change this (to increase students’ willingness and engagement in using Internet for English learning)?
### APPENDIX H

Results of Four Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 2</th>
<th>Task 3</th>
<th>Task 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total On- Tasks Posts</strong></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflections</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Replies</strong></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-task</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Used</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Image</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX I

## Examples of Task Documents

### Task 1 Interracial Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Student A.J.</th>
<th>January 23 at 8:47pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Media type: Video</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello, I'd really like to share this video with you guys, it's all about the Gender Rules. What do you think if the men behave like the women Or vice versa? In my opinion it is unacceptable because women have very different traits, they are such kind of sensitive and gentle. However, the men have very different characteristics such as optimistic, have a very wise way to solve problems. What I do believe is a real man doesn't put others down with his actions, words or strength. He affirms and builds others up. And a real women does not have a nagging, or manipulative manner in which she deals with others.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qHWrlJwHko4">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qHWrlJwHko4</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers’ replies</th>
<th>Two like this. Seen by 37.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thanks for sharing this video. You be right on your thoughts about the gender perception on daily life. But what I have seen in the clip is all about the mutual cooperation and building trust in the family. It may seem awkward to some people when they see woman dominant in the family but just imagine if the woman were a man and vice versa then our vision would have changed. The lucid example is itself in the video which shows the changing habits and mutual cooperation between the couple. Therefore, women are more involved in decision making in the family affairs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 9:15pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I agree with shifting roles between man and woman isn't acetable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 9:15pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. yeah, I've same as your opinion ..I think that is completely unfair! women and men each of them were born in a special nature, so women cannot be men, and it's also the same with men.. one more, it would be so strange to act like other gender I believe that if men turn into women, we would have a very difficult life&quot; as a human being females have very different skills than males&quot; .. in my opinion,trying to change the gender rules is impossible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 10:11pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Teacher’s guidance  
what does it mean to act like another gender? If you are a girl--- isn't how you act acting like a girl? And if you are a boy, aren't all your actions the actions of a boy? | |
<p>| January 23 at 10:34pm | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>umm I mean like if I am a girl and I'm acting like a boy, or the opposite for boys... does it make sense now..?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 10:44pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Teacher’s guidance</th>
<th>Who is it that decides if you are acting like a boy? If you are a girl--- and you are acting in a way that is true to you--- nobody should be able to tell you that you are not acting like a girl. The very fact that you are a girl means you are acting like a girl...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 10:47pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think it can be damaging to boys and girls if we force them to keep their emotions inside because they are afraid of being judged. A boy should be allowed to show his sensitive side if he feels it--- and a girl who is acting strong and independent shouldn't be made to feel like she's acting like a boy--- rather, she's acting like a strong, independent girls--- and the boy aid acting like a sensitive boy. |

| January 23 at 10:49pm |

Wow! When I type fast I have a lot of typos! |

| January 23 at 10:50pm |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>yeah leslie I'm with you, but I'm not talking about my self..also, I meant ( to do stuff that just for men\women) and it would show in their reaction as an action, also it's just like if (the life were not as what we used to deal or live with) like &quot; the unreal life maybe!&quot; .. anyway I like the way that you're thinking with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 23 at 10:59pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>... I really like you comments and your opinion.. Talking about the cooperation and building the trust in the family.. That is a really great point, but actually we are here in this video talking about when someone acts like a woman or man...See More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 24 at 1:17am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.</th>
<th>Thanks for your comments, and I strongly agree with your comments Each one was born in a special nature ..</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 24 at 1:20am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Task 2 Civil War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Media: images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hi everybody, I found these three images online and these people died during the civil war. There were so many black and white people fought for the civil rights. They wanted freedom and tried their best to fight for it even though they need to sacrifice their lives. In my opinion, these people are all magnificent and we should all show respect to them. Regardless, the civil war was a very serious incident and we need to remember that. | 1. https://scontent-a-sea.xx.fbcdn.net/hphotos-ash3/t1/1618485_1441058402794234_17376772_n.jpg  
2. https://fbcdn-sphotos-d-a.akamaihd.net/hphotos-ak-prn2/t1/1504568_1441058406127567_476671567_n.jpg  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer’s replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> The motive behind the Civil War was right versus federal authority. As you all know that the Slave institution has played the key role in Civil War. As the tension between south and north of United States flamed in 1861. The confederacy states led by Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War between south and north lasted for four years and subsequently more than hundred thousand of people were killed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**February 1 at 11:05pm**  

| **2.** Slavery was the hirrable time and one main cause of civil war in America. I thinker that families suffered awful time to handle with. but the freedom happens in all states of American now. so in my opinion we have stop thinking about the past and keep looking to the future as a nice dream. |  
**February 2 at 11:20pm**  

| **3.** Civil war caused lots of things and only the bad things. We should know the history learn the history and remember it |  
**February 3 at 1:00am**  

| **4.** American civil in the United States led to freedom... The were sound and justifiable reasons for starting battle. They is a saying who needs peace prepare the battle. From my point of view, Slavery and racial segregations were ceased by the civil war. Am not saying that war is the best way to solve the issues, but in case there is no further alternatives, especially when a certain group is mistreated or considered as a non human being based on race, colour, religion, origin, ethnic, prespectives, life conditions, etc... what then should be done to cease it? |  
**February 4 at 6:18pm** |
5.
Thanks for sharing these nice pictures, I'd just to say that many slaves tried to request their own freedom from their masters..and they did not approve to give them their own freedom.. so many of slaves run to join into the Northern army to fight the South .. this was on reason of the civil war .. other slaves fought for their constitutional rights..and they thught that was so important to get the states' rights . Thanks fir sharing
February 5 at 7:03pm
### Task 3 the U.S. Civil Rights Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. MM</th>
<th>February 21 at 9:20pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>Media: article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This article is about the Pakistani girl's Civil Rights movement. 2013 she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her courage in standing up to the Pakistani Taliban and fighting for her right to be educated. This young girl, her name is Malala Yousafzai. From 2009 she wrote for a BBC blog about her daily life in school, as a result of it, more and more people know the situation of Pakistani female. She founded Malala foundation to help other girls in Pakistan. She is only 16 years old. She is so young but she is so great!</td>
<td><a href="http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-STM-182-2013#.UwWPySLPhwk.facebook">http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-STM-182-2013#.UwWPySLPhwk.facebook</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 likes this. Seen by 28.

### Peers’ replies

1.

I think Pakistan is the number one in not having rights!!! I've heard about a lot and a lot of problems that Pakistanis have .. technically, the rights are missing almost in every where .. each country around this tiny earth!!

February 22 at 8:43am
### Task 4 Segregation in 21st Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Media: image (photo with text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks set in the back and whites in front!? is that how to treat people equally!?</td>
<td><a href="http://rock.rapgenius.com/Bob-dylan-i-shall-be-free-lyrics#note-1642546">http://rock.rapgenius.com/Bob-dylan-i-shall-be-free-lyrics#note-1642546</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this picture as you can see it's very clear to see the racial segregation. From the website <a href="http://rock.rapgenius.com/Bob-dylan-i-shall-be-free-lyrics#note-1642546">http://rock.rapgenius.com/Bob-dylan-i-shall-be-free-lyrics#note-1642546</a> they mentioned Jim Crow laws in this picture that blacks were not able to be with whites, and they have to separate from whites in restaurants, buses, and stores. Actually, I really don't know how A.A. were dealing with that!! I guess it's really too painful to see other people dealing with me like that!! like animals??!!! probably, it was really a good step from Americans in general and it is still a good one ..that they have been killing this racial segregation.. one day all people will be equal till the end of the life! waiting for that day!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peers’ replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The segregation among blacks and whites were based on pathetic ideas that whites believed in and enforced on blacks. Rosa Parks is a black courageous woman who arose against the discrimination when she refused to get out of her seat for a white man. What makes me wonder and try to figure out is ; what if white people were the ones to be affected and treated in segregation; would they have been able to tolerate the pain of what the black people went through??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13 at 4:29pm · Like · 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ooooh yeah I'm thinking the same! really what would they do!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13 at 8:07pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I agree with aisha and no one can handle him self like the black people did. I think everyone must respect others like human being because we live together in this world and we must help each other to live in peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13 at 8:30pm · Like · 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I strongly agree with you, and Rosa Parks is the spark that led Black Ameicans to ask for their rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14 at 12:30am</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facebook Task Grading Rubric

Academic Listening & Discussion – Spring I 2014  
Name: ______________________________

Reflection #1  
Score: /20  %

Directions: Do some research and share your findings on our Facebook group. Post your response with 4 to 8 sentences and make at least 2 comments on other group members’ posts with 4 to 8 sentences. You should use all your own original words in your response and comments, paraphrase and mention sources if necessary. Do a quality job on this reflection to ensure a high passing grade. **This is due by __________________________.**

**Topic:** ________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grading Criteria</th>
<th>Points Earned</th>
<th>Points Possible</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proper Media:</strong> The student shared a piece of media that was easy to reach and understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thoughtful Content:</strong> The student explained the responses thoroughly, thoughtfully, and creatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount of Meaningful Responses:</strong> The student had 1 post (2 pts.) and at least 2 comments (2 pts.).</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanics:</strong> The student’s response was understandable because it accurately used appropriate grammar and vocabulary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>