



**EFFECTIVENESS OF FLIPPED CLASSROOM IN IMPROVING ORAL  
COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND MOTIVATION IN ENGLISH  
DEBATE FOR EFL COLLEGE STUDENTS IN CHINA**

**By**

**CAO LIXIA**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra  
Malaysia, in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy**

**February 2025**

**FPP 2025 3**

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in  
fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**EFFECTIVENESS OF FLIPPED CLASSROOM IN IMPROVING ORAL  
COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE AND MOTIVATION IN ENGLISH  
DEBATE FOR EFL COLLEGE STUDENTS IN CHINA**

By

**CAO LIXIA**

**February 2025**

**Chairman : Associate Professor Lilliaty binti Ismail, PhD**  
**Faculty : Educational Studies**

This study, grounded in Sociocultural Theory, Achievement Goal Theory, and Constructivist Learning Theory, examines the impact of the flipped classroom on the oral communicative competence and motivation of Chinese EFL college students in an English debate course. It also explores students' perceptions of this teaching strategy. Sixty-four second-year English majors from a public university in Sichuan, China, were purposefully assigned to experimental and control groups. The selection process involved three stages: first, selecting classes with 32 students each; second, forming debate groups of 4 students per group; and third, identifying 8 students from the experimental group for focus group interviews and all 32 students from the experimental group for open-ended questionnaires. The experimental group received flipped classroom instruction for 14 weeks, while the control group followed conventional blended learning. An Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design was employed, using pre- and post-debate tests, motivation

questionnaires, focus group interviews, and open-ended questionnaires. The quantitative results informed the purposeful selection of participants and the development of questions for the qualitative phase, aiming to deepen the understanding of the initial findings. Quantitative results revealed significant improvements in the experimental group's Sociocultural Competence ( $p = .001$ ) and Strategic Competence ( $p = .007$ ), but no significant difference in Interactional Competence ( $p = .847$ ). Regarding motivation, the experimental group showed significant gains in General Motivation ( $p = .005$ ), Performance Goals ( $p = .004$ ), and Social Goals ( $p = .026$ ), but no significant difference in Mastery Goals ( $p = .116$ ). Qualitative findings identified six themes—Student Engagement, Teacher Role, Collaboration and Interaction, Teaching Aids and Instructional Materials, BP Debate Exercise, and Technological Issues—that further elucidated the quantitative results. The study concludes that the flipped classroom is more effective than conventional blended learning in enhancing EFL students' oral communicative competence and motivation. Based on these findings, a systemic flipped classroom model tailored for English debate in EFL contexts was developed, integrating “teacher-technology-student” dynamics and expert insights from semi-structured interviews. This model emphasizes student-centered learning, collaboration, and technology integration to foster engagement and critical thinking. The research has significant implications for EFL education. Teachers can adopt the proposed model to enhance student engagement and oral proficiency, while students benefit from an interactive learning environment that builds confidence and problem-solving skills. Curriculum developers and policymakers can integrate flipped learning principles and AI-driven tools to improve language education

outcomes. The study also contributes to the broader discourse on technology-enhanced language instruction, offering practical insights for researchers and educators. The thesis concludes with recommendations for future research in this area.

**Keywords:** Blended Learning, English Debate, Flipped Classroom, Motivation, Oral Communicative Competence

**SDG:** GOAL 4: Quality Education



Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Doktor Falsafah

**KEBERKESANAN KELAS BERBALIK DALAM MENINGKATKAN  
KOMPETENSI KOMUNIKATIF LISAN DAN MOTIVASI DALAM DEBAT  
BAHASA INGGERIS DALAM KALANGAN PELAJAR KOLEJ EFL DI  
CHINA**

Oleh

**CAO LIXIA**

**Februari 2025**

**Pengerusi : Profesor Madya Lilliaty binti Ismail, PhD**  
**Fakulti : Pengajian Pendidikan**

Kajian ini, yang berpaksikan kepada Teori Sosiobudaya, Teori Matlamat Pencapaian, dan Teori Pembelajaran Konstruktivis, meneliti kesan kelas berbalik terhadap kompetensi komunikatif lisan dan motivasi dalam kalangan pelajar kolej EFL dari China yang mengikuti kursus debat Bahasa Inggeris. Kajian ini turut meneroka persepsi pelajar terhadap strategi pengajaran ini. Seramai 64 pelajar tahun kedua jurusan Bahasa Inggeris dari sebuah universiti awam di Sichuan, China, telah dipilih secara bertujuan dan dibahagikan kepada kumpulan eksperimen dan kumpulan kawalan. Proses pemilihan melibatkan tiga peringkat: pertama, memilih dua kelas yang masing-masing mempunyai 32 pelajar; kedua, membentuk kumpulan debat yang terdiri daripada 4 pelajar setiap kumpulan; dan ketiga, mengenal pasti 8 pelajar daripada kumpulan eksperimen untuk temu bual kumpulan fokus serta semua 32 pelajar kumpulan eksperimen untuk soal selidik terbuka. Kumpulan eksperimen menerima pengajaran kelas berbalik selama 14 minggu,

manakala kumpulan kawalan mengikuti pembelajaran teradun secara konvensional. Reka bentuk kajian menggunakan Kaedah Campuran Berurutan Penjelasan, melibatkan ujian pra dan pasca debat, soal selidik motivasi, temu bual kumpulan fokus, serta soal selidik terbuka. Penemuan kuantitatif digunakan untuk memaklumkan pemilihan peserta bagi fasa kualitatif serta pembangunan soalan yang berkaitan, dengan tujuan memperdalam pemahaman terhadap dapatan awal. Hasil kuantitatif menunjukkan peningkatan signifikan dalam Kompetensi Sosiobudaya ( $p = .001$ ) dan Kompetensi Strategik ( $p = .007$ ) bagi kumpulan eksperimen, namun tiada perbezaan signifikan dalam Kompetensi Interaksi ( $p = .847$ ). Dari segi motivasi, kumpulan eksperimen mencatat peningkatan signifikan dalam Motivasi Umum ( $p = .005$ ), Matlamat Prestasi ( $p = .004$ ), dan Matlamat Sosial ( $p = .026$ ), namun tiada perbezaan signifikan dalam Matlamat Penguasaan ( $p = .116$ ). Penemuan kualitatif mengenal pasti enam tema utama—Penglibatan Pelajar, Peranan Guru, Kolaborasi dan Interaksi, Alat Bantu Mengajar dan Bahan Pengajaran, Latihan Debat BP, serta Isu Teknologi—yang membantu menjelaskan dapatan kuantitatif dengan lebih mendalam. Kajian ini menyimpulkan bahawa pengajaran melalui kelas berbalik adalah lebih berkesan berbanding pembelajaran teradun konvensional dalam meningkatkan kompetensi komunikatif lisan dan motivasi pelajar EFL. Berdasarkan dapatan kajian, satu model kelas berbalik secara sistematik telah dibangunkan khusus untuk kursus debat Bahasa Inggeris dalam konteks EFL, dengan menggabungkan dinamik “guru-teknologi-pelajar” serta pandangan pakar melalui temu bual separa berstruktur. Model ini menekankan pendekatan pembelajaran berpusatkan pelajar, kerjasama, serta integrasi

teknologi untuk menggalakkan penglibatan aktif dan pemikiran kritis. Kajian ini membawa implikasi penting dalam bidang pendidikan EFL. Guru boleh menggunakan model yang dicadangkan untuk meningkatkan penglibatan dan kecekapan lisan pelajar, manakala pelajar memperoleh manfaat daripada persekitaran pembelajaran yang interaktif, yang menyokong pembangunan keyakinan dan kemahiran menyelesaikan masalah. Pembangun kurikulum dan pembuat dasar boleh mengaplikasikan prinsip pembelajaran berbalik serta teknologi berasaskan AI untuk meningkatkan hasil pembelajaran bahasa. Kajian ini turut menyumbang kepada perbincangan yang lebih luas mengenai pengajaran bahasa berteraskan teknologi dengan menyediakan pandangan praktikal untuk penyelidik dan pendidik. Tesis ini diakhiri dengan cadangan untuk kajian lanjutan dalam bidang berkaitan.

**Kata kunci:** Pembelajaran Teradun, Debat Bahasa Inggeris, Kelas Berbalik, Motivasi, Kompetensi Komunikatif Lisan.

**SDG:** MATLAMAT 4: Pendidikan Berkualiti



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Lilliaty binti Ismail, whose guidance and encouragement have been invaluable throughout my studies. Her wisdom and energy have not only helped me navigate challenges but have also inspired me to make informed decisions. She has taught me the virtues of humility, and I deeply admire her.

I am also profoundly thankful to my co-supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Noreen binti Noordin, for her ongoing feedback and support. Her thoughtfulness, enthusiasm, and compassion have left a lasting impact on me, for which I am sincerely grateful.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to my wonderful friends—Ms. Wu Zhangli, Ms. Li Cong, Ms. Li Xuefeng, and Ms. Li Danyang. We have shared this journey together, and their candid suggestions have been instrumental in my progress. I would also like to acknowledge Ms. Wang Xiaoyu and Ms. Pei Shuchen, whose encouragement helped sustain my academic enthusiasm.

My heartfelt thanks go to all the students who participated in this research, as well as to the teachers and experts who offered their generous assistance. I am truly grateful for their cooperation and support.

Finally, I would like to extend my sincerest appreciation to my family, whose unwavering support—both emotional and financial—has made this academic journey significantly smoother. Their belief in me has been my greatest source of strength.



This thesis was submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The members of the Supervisory Committee were as follows:

**Lilliati binti Ismail, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**Nooreen binti Noordin, PhD**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Educational Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**ZALILAH MOHD SHARIFF, PhD**

Professor and Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 12 June 2025

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                        | Page          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>ABSTRACT</b>                                                                        | i             |
| <b>ABSTRAK</b>                                                                         | iv            |
| <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>                                                                | vii           |
| <b>APPROVAL</b>                                                                        | ix            |
| <b>DECLARATION</b>                                                                     | xi            |
| <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>                                                                  | xvi           |
| <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>                                                                 | xviii         |
| <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>                                                              | xix           |
| <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>                                                           | xx            |
| <br><b>CHAPTER</b>                                                                     |               |
| <br><b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>                                                              | <br><b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Introduction                                                                       | 1             |
| 1.2 Background of the Study                                                            | 1             |
| 1.3 Statement of the Problem                                                           | 7             |
| 1.4 Research Objectives                                                                | 12            |
| 1.5 Research Questions and Hypotheses                                                  | 13            |
| 1.6 Significance of the Study                                                          | 14            |
| 1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study                                                 | 16            |
| 1.8 Definitions of Key Terms                                                           | 18            |
| 1.8.1 Oral Communicative Competence                                                    | 18            |
| 1.8.2 Motivation                                                                       | 19            |
| 1.8.3 British Parliamentary Debate Format                                              | 20            |
| 1.8.4 Flipped Classroom                                                                | 20            |
| 1.8.5 Conventional Blended Learning                                                    | 22            |
| 1.9 Summary                                                                            | 23            |
| <br><b>2 LITERATURE REVIEW</b>                                                         | <br><b>24</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction                                                                       | 24            |
| 2.2 Related Studies on Oral Communicative Competence, Motivation and Flipped Classroom | 24            |
| 2.2.1 Oral Communicative Competence and Debate in the EFL Context                      | 25            |
| 2.2.2 Motivation and Debate in the EFL Context                                         | 32            |
| 2.2.3 Flipped Classroom as a Teaching Strategy                                         | 38            |
| 2.2.4 Effectiveness of Flipped Classroom in Improving Oral Communicative Competence    | 46            |
| 2.2.5 Effectiveness of Flipped Classroom in Improving Motivation                       | 49            |
| 2.3 The Use of Debate in ESL/EFL Classes                                               | 52            |
| 2.4 Implementation of Flipped Classroom in BP Debate Teaching                          | 57            |
| 2.5 Theoretical Framework                                                              | 62            |

|          |                                                                                                       |            |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 2.5.1    | Sociocultural theory                                                                                  | 64         |
| 2.5.2    | Achievement Goal Theory                                                                               | 73         |
| 2.5.3    | Constructivist Learning Theory                                                                        | 78         |
| 2.6      | Conceptual Framework of the Study                                                                     | 85         |
| 2.7      | Summary                                                                                               | 86         |
| <b>3</b> | <b>METHODOLOGY</b>                                                                                    | <b>87</b>  |
| 3.1      | Introduction                                                                                          | 87         |
| 3.2      | Research Design                                                                                       | 87         |
| 3.3      | Setting of the Study                                                                                  | 91         |
| 3.4      | Sampling Procedure                                                                                    | 92         |
| 3.5      | Participants of the Study                                                                             | 94         |
| 3.6      | Instrumentation and Scoring                                                                           | 96         |
| 3.6.1    | BP Debate Tests                                                                                       | 96         |
| 3.6.2    | Questionnaire Survey                                                                                  | 101        |
| 3.6.3    | Focus Group Interview                                                                                 | 105        |
| 3.6.4    | Open-Ended Questionnaire                                                                              | 107        |
| 3.6.5    | Semi-Structured Interviews with Experts                                                               | 107        |
| 3.7      | Procedure of BP Debate Rater's Training                                                               | 109        |
| 3.8      | Validity, Reliability of Instruments and Pilot Study                                                  | 111        |
| 3.8.1    | Validity of Instruments                                                                               | 112        |
| 3.8.2    | Reliability of Instruments                                                                            | 113        |
| 3.8.3    | Pilot Study                                                                                           | 116        |
| 3.9      | Experimental Validity                                                                                 | 117        |
| 3.10     | The Treatment (Flipped Classroom)                                                                     | 123        |
| 3.10.1   | Lesson Plans                                                                                          | 124        |
| 3.10.2   | Presentation of Debate                                                                                | 129        |
| 3.10.3   | Assessments of Debate                                                                                 | 131        |
| 3.11     | Data Collection Procedures                                                                            | 132        |
| 3.12     | Data Analysis                                                                                         | 135        |
| 3.13     | Ethical Considerations                                                                                | 139        |
| 3.14     | Summary                                                                                               | 140        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</b>                                                                        | <b>142</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction                                                                                          | 142        |
| 4.2      | Demographic Characteristics of Participants                                                           | 143        |
| 4.3      | Exploratory Data Analysis                                                                             | 146        |
| 4.4      | Measures of Participants' Baseline                                                                    | 149        |
| 4.5      | Quantitative Findings                                                                                 | 150        |
| 4.5.1    | Research Objective 1: Effects of Flipped Classroom Teaching Strategy on Oral Communicative Competence | 150        |
| 4.5.2    | Research Objective 2: Effects of Flipped Classroom Teaching Strategy on Motivation                    | 156        |
| 4.6      | Qualitative Findings                                                                                  | 164        |
| 4.6.1    | Research Objective 3: Perceptions of the implementation of flipped classroom                          | 165        |
| 4.6.2    | Research Objective 4: Construction of a Systemic Flipped Classroom Model                              | 189        |
| 4.7      | Discussion                                                                                            | 225        |

|          |                                                                                    |            |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 4.7.1    | Flipped Classroom for Improving Oral Communicative Competence                      | 226        |
| 4.7.2    | Flipped Classroom for Improving Motivation                                         | 228        |
| 4.7.3    | Perceptions of Flipped Classroom as a Teaching Strategy                            | 230        |
| 4.7.4    | Flipped Classroom for EFL Debate Course                                            | 233        |
| 4.8      | Summary                                                                            | 235        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH</b> | <b>237</b> |
| 5.1      | Introduction                                                                       | 237        |
| 5.2      | Summary of the Findings                                                            | 237        |
| 5.3      | Implications                                                                       | 240        |
| 5.3.1    | Practical Implications of the Study                                                | 240        |
| 5.3.2    | Theoretical Implications of the Study                                              | 243        |
| 5.4      | Conclusions                                                                        | 246        |
| 5.5      | Recommendations for Future Research                                                | 248        |
|          | <b>REFERENCES</b>                                                                  | <b>251</b> |
|          | <b>APPENDICES</b>                                                                  | <b>286</b> |
|          | <b>BIODATA OF STUDENT</b>                                                          | <b>333</b> |
|          | <b>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</b>                                                        | <b>334</b> |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                                                             | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 3.1 Oral Communicative Competence Instrument                                                                                      | 99   |
| 3.2 Motivation Survey Instrument Adapted from ISM                                                                                 | 103  |
| 3.3 Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (Pre-test & Post-test)                                                                     | 115  |
| 3.4 Research Framework                                                                                                            | 123  |
| 3.5 The Primary Activities for Conventional Blended Learning of the Study                                                         | 126  |
| 3.6 The Primary Activities for Flipped Classroom Learning of the Study                                                            | 128  |
| 3.7 The British Parliamentary (BP) Debate Format                                                                                  | 129  |
| 3.8 Research Questions, Data Collection Methods and Data Analysis Methods                                                         | 138  |
| 4.1 Participants' Profile                                                                                                         | 144  |
| 4.2 Normality Test of Oral Communicative Competence and Motivation Scores                                                         | 148  |
| 4.3 Independent Samples T-test Results for English Speech Test Scores                                                             | 149  |
| 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Oral Communicative Competence Test of Experimental and Control Groups                               | 151  |
| 4.5 Comparison of Mean Scores of Oral Communicative Competence Pre-test and Post-test Within Experimental Group and Control Group | 153  |
| 4.6 Results of Independent Samples T-test for the Scores of Oral Communicative Competence at Post-test                            | 155  |
| 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of Motivation Survey of Experimental and Control Groups                                                | 158  |
| 4.8 Comparison of Mean Scores of Motivation Pre-treatment and Post-treatment Within Experimental Group and Control Group          | 160  |
| 4.9 Results of Independent Samples T-test for the Scores of Motivation at Post-test                                               | 163  |

|      |                                                                                            |     |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 4.10 | Identified themes and subthemes of the focus group interview and open-ended questionnaires | 166 |
| 4.11 | Identified significant aspects                                                             | 190 |
| 4.12 | Identified themes and subthemes of semi-structured interviews                              | 202 |





## LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure                                                                                                                         | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 2.1 Chronological evolution of 'communicative competence'                                                                      | 66   |
| 2.2 Communicative Competence Model                                                                                             | 68   |
| 2.3 The Inventory of School Motivation (ISM)                                                                                   | 77   |
| 2.4 The Flipped classroom Model of the Study                                                                                   | 81   |
| 2.5 Theoretical Framework of the Study                                                                                         | 84   |
| 2.6 Researcher's Conceptual Framework of the Study                                                                             | 85   |
| 3.1 Explanatory Sequential Mixed Methods Design                                                                                | 89   |
| 3.2 Nonequivalent Control-Group Design of the Study                                                                            | 90   |
| 3.3 Nonequivalent Control-Group Design of the Study                                                                            | 124  |
| 3.4 Data Collection Procedures of the Study                                                                                    | 133  |
| 4.1 Comparisons of participants' English speech grades between Flipped Classroom group and Conventional Blended Learning group | 145  |
| 4.2 A Deep Flipped Classroom Model in the Era of Generative Artificial Intelligence                                            | 221  |

## LIST OF APPENDICES

| Appendix |                                                  | Page |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|------|
| A        | Consent Form                                     | 286  |
| B        | Scoring Rules of BP Debate                       | 295  |
| C        | Questionnaire Survey of Motivation               | 298  |
| D        | Focus Group Interview                            | 302  |
| E        | Open-ended Questionnaire                         | 304  |
| F        | Video Recording Transcripts                      | 305  |
| G        | Semi-structured Interview                        | 305  |
| H        | Sample of Lesson Plan                            | 309  |
| I        | Classroom Debate Schedule                        | 316  |
| J        | Teaching Objectives of the English Debate Course | 317  |
| K        | Experts' / Examiners' Profile                    | 318  |
| L        | External Rater's Profile                         | 319  |
| M        | Raters' Training Material                        | 320  |
| N        | Permission Letter to Conduct Study               | 332  |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |                                              |
|-------|----------------------------------------------|
| BP    | British Parliamentary                        |
| CG    | Control Group                                |
| EDA   | Exploratory Data Analysis                    |
| EFL   | English as a Foreign Language                |
| EG    | Experiment Group                             |
| ESL   | English as a Second Language                 |
| FLTRP | Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press |
| GMOT  | General Motivation                           |
| IC    | Interactional Competence                     |
| ICT   | Information and Communications Technology    |
| ISM   | The Inventory of School Motivation           |
| MAST  | Mastery (Goals)                              |
| MOOC  | Massive Open Online Courses                  |
| PERF  | Performance (Goals)                          |
| SoC   | Sociocultural Competence                     |
| SOCI  | Social (Goals)                               |
| StC   | Strategic Competence                         |
| WDEC  | World Digital Education Conference           |

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

This chapter aims to establish the significance of the study. It begins by contextualizing the research to underscore the necessity of exploring the implementation of the flipped classroom in teaching English debate courses, with a focus on enhancing students' oral communicative competence and motivation. Subsequently, it outlines the research problem, objectives, and questions, along with hypotheses. Additionally, the chapter discusses the significance of the study and acknowledges its limitations. Finally, key terms relevant to the study are defined.

#### **1.2 Background of the Study**

Oral communicative competence is a cornerstone of language acquisition, particularly in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) (Mahdi, 2024). Mastering effective English communication is crucial for language learners in the 21st century, facilitating personal and professional success in a globalized world (Mohd Nabil et al., 2024). Enhanced proficiency in English significantly boosts graduates' employability (Sulaiman & Ambotang, 2017). However, achieving mastery in oral communication presents substantial challenges for foreign learners due to space limitations, time restrictions, and

insufficient familiarity with advanced technology and accessible digital tools (Chen, 2022).

EFL educators often face hurdles in cultivating students' oral communicative competence. These include comprehending the concept of communicative competence (Gałajda, 2017), selecting appropriate teaching strategies and identifying effective methods in a contemporary context defined by rapid technological evolution and an increasingly volatile, complex, and ambiguous global landscape (Sabbah, 2023; Yessenbekova, 2024; Ghasemi & Mozaheb, 2021; Hishan, 2020; Sherine et al., 2020; Yeh et al., 2021), and striving for high proficiency levels (Ankeny, 2024; Ankeny & Oslick, 2021; Barros et al., 2021). Additionally, researching spoken language corpora is fraught with difficulties due to the complexities of data collection and the labor-intensive nature of transcription (Römer, 2011). To overcome these challenges, innovative instructional methods are essential.

Among various instructional methods, debate stands out for its effectiveness in enhancing communicative competence in EFL classrooms. Debate fosters the development of oral English proficiency, critical thinking skills, and other competencies valuable in real-world scenarios (Alghamdi Hamdan & Aldossari, 2021; Mumtaz & Latif, 2017; Chikeleze et al., 2018). It empowers EFL learners by enabling them to articulate their viewpoints on diverse issues, leveraging their English language skills comprehensively (Walker & Kettler, 2020). Participation in debates also heightens students' enthusiasm, preparedness, and motivation (Najafi et al., 2016; Adeyemi & Oderinde, 2019). Hence, using

debate as a pedagogical strategy holds promise for enhancing students' oral communicative competence and fostering proactive motivation toward communication.

This growing emphasis on enhancing educational practices aligns with broader trends in educational innovation. In recent years, technological advancements have significantly transformed various aspects of life, particularly education (Sari & Wahyudin, 2019; Rind et al., 2024; Javed, 2024; Lytras et al., 2024; Dhingra et al., 2024; Sengupta et al., 2020). Integrating digital technologies into learning processes has been particularly transformative (Chan & Ng, 2024; Lehmann et al., 2022; ElSayary, 2023; Ng et al., 2022). A prime example of this technological integration is flipped learning, a pedagogical approach that blends traditional methods with online resources. The flipped classroom strategy has been extensively researched and implemented across diverse educational settings (Sergis et al., 2018; Pakpahan, 2020; Smith, 2021; de Bem Machado et al., 2023; Cladera, 2024; Errabo et al., 2024; Ngo, 2024; Hwang, 2023; Abdekhoda et al., 2020; Lantu et al., 2023; Chowdhury, 2020).

Despite the potential of flipped classrooms to enhance general language skills in EFL students, research on their effectiveness in improving oral communicative competence and motivation, particularly in English debate courses, remains limited. Most studies focus on general EFL contexts, lacking targeted investigations into the specific demands of debate, which include critical thinking and structured argumentation (Alghamdi & Al Dossari, 2021; Mumtaz & Latif, 2017; McGee et al., 2020). Existing research tends to be short-

term and quantitative, providing insufficient longitudinal studies and qualitative insights into the nuanced impacts on student engagement and performance (Hung, 2014; Hamdan Alghamdi et al., 2022). Furthermore, the optimization of various technological tools and pedagogical strategies for debate courses has not been thoroughly explored, indicating a significant gap in the current literature (O'Flaherty & Phillips, 2015; Georgallis & Bruijn, 2022; Cariñanos-Ayala et al., 2021; Gunasilan, 2022).

Building upon the context of English education in China, where English proficiency is a national priority (Liu, 2016; Hamid & Luo, 2016), this study delves into the specific challenges faced by Chinese EFL learners. Despite English being a mandatory subject in schools and its significant role in global communication (Pan, 2015; Gong et al., 2020), oral communicative competence among Chinese learners remains notably deficient (Xing & Bolden, 2019; Liao, 2020). Smith (2017) reported that fewer than 1 percent of the Chinese population, about 10 million individuals, are conversant in English. Furthermore, data from the 2022 IELTS test indicates that mainland Chinese candidates averaged a speaking score of 5.6, ranking 38th among 40 high-volume test regions (IELTS performance for test takers, 2022). This deficiency in oral communicative competence is a pressing concern for both educators and learners.

In response, educational reforms in China have increasingly emphasized developing students' oral communicative competence (Liu et al., 2021). The national English Debate Competition, known as the "FLTRP Cup" (Foreign

Language Teaching and Research Press Cup), initiated in the 1990s, marked a significant turning point by integrating English debate into English education (Yang, 2021). Over the past decade, prestigious international and national debate competitions have driven the establishment of English debate courses as standalone subjects in numerous colleges and universities across China. Renowned institutions such as Beijing Foreign Studies University, Fudan University, and Renmin University of China have pioneered offering English debate courses (Tian, 2019). Consequently, many universities offering English majors in China have incorporated debate courses into their curriculum. In 2018, the inclusion of the English debate course as a core component of English majors in the “National Standards for Teaching Quality of Undergraduate Majors in Ordinary Colleges and Universities” underscored its importance (Yang, 2021). This development prompted instructors to delve into teaching strategy research and curriculum development of English debate course.

The Chinese Ministry of Education has vigorously promoted smart education, digital education, data empowerment, and AI empowerment. The Minister of Education has emphasized the necessity of deeply integrating AI technology into all aspects and stages of education, teaching, and management, with the goal of cultivating a large number of digitally literate teachers (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2024). Numerous higher education institutions in China have been proactively implementing reforms in English language pedagogy, with substantial scholarly advancements in instructional models such as the flipped classroom (Ho, 2020; Lee & A.



Wallace, 2018; Cao, 2020; Huang & Liao, 2021; Sun et al., 2020; Li & Chen, 2023; Zhang & Chen, 2021). Nevertheless, despite the accelerated evolution of educational technologies, prevailing EFL classroom practices often fail to systematically incorporate intelligent learning systems and contemporary pedagogical innovations. There is a pressing need for innovative teaching strategies that can actively engage students and improve their oral communicative skills and motivation (Wang, 2017).

In order to improve teaching effectiveness and meet the needs of learners at different levels, especially in the context of college students' increasing reliance on online learning (Allen & Seaman, 2017; Azman Ong & Ibrahim, 2024; Ironsi, 2022; Tong & Zhan, 2023; Saikia et al., 2024; Swain et al., 2023; Carter Jr et al., 2020) and the transformative impact of the accelerated adoption of digital resources on education (Arora & Srinivasan, 2020), this study aims to integrate the flipped classroom strategy into English debate courses through empirical research and explore the potential of AI-driven tools and technologies in teaching. Acknowledging challenges such as limited class hours and large class sizes (Chen & Goh, 2011; Mukesh et al., 2023; Knifsend, 2018), the study seeks to optimize students' participation opportunities, enhance their oral communicative competence, and ignite their motivation to communicate within the constraints of restricted classroom time. By implementing the flipped classroom strategy, students can delve deeper into course content outside of class, paving the way for more meaningful and productive in-class discussions and activities. Consequently, this strategy holds significant potential to transform traditional EFL debate courses by

fostering an engaging and interactive learning environment that enhances both oral communicative competence and student motivation.

### **1.3 Statement of the Problem**

Oral communicative competence is primarily affected by various 'environmental' factors, particularly those related to teaching methods. Additionally, its development is hindered by 'personal' challenges, such as nervousness, hesitation, and anxiety; 'linguistic' challenges, including limited vocabulary and grammatical errors; and 'social' challenges, such as the fear of making mistakes and facing criticism (Asratie et al., 2023; Haidara, 2016; Al Nakhalah, 2016; Dana & Aminatun, 2022; Anandari, 2015; Chand, 2021).

The traditional lecture-based methodology in EFL education has been widely criticized for its limited effectiveness in enhancing oral communicative competence (Rajeh, 2023; Masood & Haque, 2021). This approach often leaves learners struggling to use the language freely outside the classroom (Alrabai, 2022; Mahdi, 2024). Many EFL students face challenges in oral communication due to insufficient opportunities for practice in engaging and effective learning environments, which are crucial for language development (Ercan, 2020; Mahdi, 2024; Albahiri & Alhaj, 2020; Muftah, 2023). They often lack access to authentic language experiences necessary for developing these skills, limiting their ability to nurture their oral communicative competence (McCallum, 2024). The traditional lecture format does not provide enough real-life communication practice, leading to limited improvement in speaking

abilities (Samarji, 2020). Emphasizing knowledge transmission over active student engagement and meaningful interactions further hinders communication skill development (Chang & Hwang, 2018), reducing opportunities for autonomy and personalized learning, which are essential for effective oral communication (Chen, 2022; Anikina, 2022).

Traditional teaching methods often fail to engage students, resulting in low motivation levels that significantly hinder the achievement of communicative competence in English. These methods prioritize rote learning over interactive and critical engagement (Yang & Gamble, 2013). The passive nature of lecture-based learning does not encourage student participation or enthusiasm, which are critical for language acquisition and performance in dynamic settings such as debates (Chen et al., 2016). Additionally, the subdued atmosphere typical of such classes induces boredom, an underexplored negative emotion in EFL/ESL contexts (Derakhshan et al., 2022; Li & Dewaele, 2020; Pawlak et al., 2020; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020). This boredom, marked by disengagement or withdrawal from classroom activities, further hampers language development.

In addition to issues related to teaching methods, several other factors hinder the improvement of oral communicative competence. Speaking is widely recognized as the most anxiety-inducing skill (Sahoo & Sinha, 2020), with anxiety significantly impeding performance, particularly during individual or group presentations. Contributing factors include lack of vocabulary, low English proficiency, lack of preparation, lack of practice, fear of making

mistakes, fear of losing face, fear of being the focus of attention, fear of being unable to follow and understand others, inability to express ideas, and memory disassociation (Liu, 2005). Many students express a sense of helplessness regarding their anxiety when communicating in English during class. These multifaceted challenges create significant barriers to improving oral communicative competence among EFL learners.

Current research on oral communicative competence in EFL settings extensively explores various challenges and corresponding pedagogical strategies. Among these, debate emerges as a potent tool for enhancing students' English communicative skills, integrating reading, writing, presenting, and argumentation (Akerman & Neale, 2011; Ginther, 2012; Zafar, 2011; Wang, 2014; Onen, 2016). Despite its recognized benefits in promoting literacy and critical thinking, the integration of debate into classrooms, especially in non-English-speaking countries, remains underexplored, highlighting the need for research into its effectiveness and practical applications (Mirra et al., 2016; Hlavacik et al., 2016; Shapiro & Brown, 2018; Zorwick & Wade, 2016; Aclan & Aziz, 2015). Existing studies predominantly focus on oral communication in English speech classes, overlooking the specific dynamics of debate sessions. This oversight is critical as debates necessitate distinct instructional models for effective course design, teaching methods, and assessments (Yang, 2021). Furthermore, the literature lacks sufficient tailored communicative competence models specifically designed for debate courses, which is compounded by a deficiency in practical recommendations for teaching and assessment procedures in English debate courses.

Currently, numerous education experts and scholars are actively exploring the role of technology in education reform (Haleem et al., 2022; Nkomo et al., 2021), especially as the impact of AI-driven tools and technologies continues to accelerate. Likewise, the field of foreign language teaching has begun to address issues such as technology-driven educational innovation and transformation (Healey, 2016; Ihnatova et al., 2021). There is substantial research on the impact of technology on oral English instruction (Asratie et al., 2023; Akkara et al., 2020; Sosas, 2021; Chau, 2021; Sarıçoban et al., 2019; Kudratilloev & Akhmedov, 2021). There is an urgent need for innovative teaching strategies that actively engage students, enhance their oral communicative skills, and boost their motivation (Wang, 2017). While existing research demonstrates the transformative potential of educational technology, substantial implementation challenges persist. Addressing critical barriers, particularly digital literacy disparities and inequitable access to online resources, could enhance the practical applications of such technological interventions.

In recent years, flipped classrooms have gained popularity in EFL education, where they cater to learners requiring frequent practice and immediate feedback to enhance language skills (Bin-Hady & Hazaea, 2022; Rajeh, 2023; Zhang, 2024). However, empirical studies specifically focusing on their impact on oral communicative competence and motivation within EFL contexts, especially in Chinese colleges, remain limited. To advance both theoretical understanding and practical application, it is imperative to systematically investigate how psychological factors and sociocultural dimensions collectively

shape student motivation in flipped learning environments. Addressing these gaps is crucial for effectively implementing flipped classroom strategies in Chinese educational contexts, necessitating further exploration into these impacts and the underlying mechanisms (Cai et al., 2019).

Flipped learning has demonstrated potential to enhance language acquisition by providing extensive exposure to English and facilitating regular practice, particularly advantageous in English debate courses where independent preparation time is essential. While research suggests that flipped classrooms hold promise for enhancing various language competencies, such as speaking proficiency, writing skills, reading comprehension, pronunciation, and translation abilities (Teng, 2018; Buitrago & Díaz, 2018; Karimi & Hamzavi, 2017; Bakla, 2018; Nguyen, 2021; Vaezi et al., 2019; Alghasab, 2020), their effectiveness in English debate courses remains underexplored. Despite the growing body of literature on flipped learning in EFL contexts, little empirical research has addressed its potential impact on debate instruction, a gap that is particularly significant given the unique cognitive and communicative demands of debate. These demands differ markedly from those of other language learning activities. Furthermore, few studies have investigated how flipped classroom methodologies might be adapted to cultivate debate-specific skills, such as structured argumentation, rebuttal strategies, and spontaneous critical response. Notably, the literature lacks rigorous comparative studies examining the differential efficacy of conventional blended learning and flipped classroom approaches in EFL debate instruction, particularly in terms of their effects on oral communicative competence, motivation to communicate, and

student perceptions. A comprehensive, methodologically robust comparison of these instructional models could provide valuable empirical insights across multiple dimensions.

It is imperative for educators to develop tailored communicative competence models specifically designed for English debate courses, providing practical recommendations for effective teaching and assessment practices. Integrating flipped learning with debate classes offers educators a unique opportunity to customize the learning environment to better cater to the needs of EFL students. This research aims to provide robust empirical evidence on whether the flipped classroom model significantly enhances students' oral communication skills and motivation to participate in English debates. By addressing these gaps, the study aims to contribute to innovative teaching methodologies in EFL education, offering evidence-based recommendations.

#### **1.4 Research Objectives**

The study aims to evaluate the effects of the flipped classroom teaching strategy on the oral communicative competence and motivation of EFL college students in China, compared to a conventional blended learning strategy. Additionally, it seeks to investigate the impact of the flipped classroom approach in the English debate course from the perspectives of EFL learners after experiencing this teaching method. The research objectives of the study are presented below:



1. To determine the effectiveness of flipped classroom in improving the oral communicative competence in English debate for EFL college students in China.
2. To determine the effectiveness of flipped classroom in improving the motivation in English debate for EFL college students in China.
3. To examine the perceptions of the implementation of flipped classroom in English debate among EFL college students in China.
4. To develop a systemic flipped classroom model specially for English debate in the EFL context.

### **1.5 Research Questions and Hypotheses**

This study aims to determine whether the implementation of the flipped classroom can influence students' oral communicative competence and motivation in the English debate course. To achieve this, three research questions and corresponding null hypotheses are statistically tested in the present study. The research questions, as well as the null hypotheses, are presented below:

1. Does the flipped classroom strategy have any effects on the oral communicative competence in English debate for EFL college students in China?

Ho1: There is no significant difference between the oral communicative competence pre-test and post-test scores within the experimental and control groups.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the oral communicative competence post-test scores between the experimental and control groups.



2. Does the flipped classroom strategy have any effects on the motivation in English debate for EFL college students in China?

Ho3: There is no significant difference between the motivation survey scores before and after the treatment within the experimental and control groups.

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the motivation survey scores after the treatment between the experimental and control groups.

3. What are the perceptions of the implementation of flipped classroom in English debate among EFL college students in China?
4. What type of systemic flipped classroom model can be developed specially for English debate in the EFL context?

## **1.6 Significance of the Study**

This study explores the impact of implementing a flipped classroom teaching strategy in an English debate course on the oral communicative competence of EFL learners. The research evaluates the improvement in learners' oral communicative competence by analyzing their sociocultural competence, interactional competence, and strategic competence, and comparing these aspects with a control group. Additionally, the study investigates student motivation by assessing changes in mastery goals, performance goals, social goals, and general motivation, again using a control group for comparison. To further understand the effects, learners' opinions on the flipped classroom teaching strategy are collected and analyzed.

This study aims to make three contributions to the literature. First, it expands the currently limited research on employing the flipped classroom teaching strategy in English debate courses in China. Addressing the lack of extensive knowledge in this domain, it provides educators with a comprehensive and structured approach for implementing the flipped classroom in EFL English debate classes. This includes a proposed flipped classroom model, detailed learning modules, and engaging activities. Additionally, the study introduces a practical method for teaching communicative English using the British Parliamentary Debate format, specifically designed for EFL college students in China. It is anticipated that teachers will be able to use the flipped classroom strategy to alleviate their workload. Moreover, participants in the study may benefit from a novel learning experience tailored to their individual learning styles, thereby enhancing their potential for English language acquisition.

Secondly, this research gathers data on EFL learners' oral communicative competence, their self-reported motivation to communicate, and their perceptions of the flipped classroom after participating in debate lessons using this teaching strategy. These insights provide educators with a deeper understanding of the flipped classroom's effectiveness in enhancing oral communicative competence and stimulating motivation to communicate. By recognizing the different aspects of communicative competence, motivational factors, and learners' attitudes, teachers can identify strengths and areas needing improvement, enabling them to select activities that further engage students. Understanding the weaknesses of EFL learners helps pinpoint obstacles and areas requiring additional focus. Additionally, it is hoped that

these results will inspire curriculum developers, course designers, textbook authors, English teachers, and other stakeholders to design and implement more effective methods for improving the oral communicative competence and motivation of EFL learners by efficiently allocating learning time and selecting appropriate activities and assessments for their courses.

Thirdly, this study examines the evolving landscape of digital-era education and emphasizes the integration of 'teacher-technology-student' interactions, exploring the potential of artificial intelligence to enhance EFL oral teaching. By embedding AI-driven tools and technologies within the revised flipped classroom model, the research ventures into new dimensions of personalized learning and real-time feedback. This innovative approach aims to elevate the overall teaching and learning experience, equipping both educators and students with advanced resources to boost language proficiency and promote active engagement. The findings and refined model underscore AI's transformative impact in enabling more effective and interactive EFL instruction, thereby emphasizing the study's significance in advancing language education in contemporary contexts.

### **1.7 Scope and Limitations of the Study**

This study aims to address the issues of oral communicative competence and motivation to communicate in the current English debate course for Chinese college students, with the goal of effectively implementing the flipped classroom model in the teaching process. The participants in this study are

second-year English language majors from the 7th-ranked public university in Sichuan Province, China. These young college students, aged 19-20, have studied English as a foreign language for at least eight years, exhibiting various levels of English proficiency.

A limitation of this study is its location: data were collected from only one Chinese university, limiting the generalizability of the findings to other universities in China. Another limitation pertains to the participants involved. Not all English majors in the same grade at the same university participated in the study, which means the survey responses cannot represent the entire population of EFL Chinese students and teachers. However, reasonable sampling helps to mitigate these limitations.

Additionally, the study's applicability is constrained by the use of a purposeful sampling technique. As a result, the findings are not intended for broad generalization to students across various universities in China but are specifically applicable to the participants of this study and those with similar academic backgrounds and oral communicative competence in English. The necessity to use intact groups due to administrative reasons further restricts the generalizability of the results to a larger population. Nonetheless, this limitation does not diminish the significance of the results, as the study intentionally focuses on EFL learners at this particular university.

## **1.8 Definitions of Key Terms**

In this section, five key terms related to the study are defined both theoretically and operationally. These terms encompass the independent and dependent variables that are crucial to the research. By operationalizing these terms, the study clarifies the methods used for measuring these variables.

### **1.8.1 Oral Communicative Competence**

The notion of 'communicative competence' was introduced by Dell Hymes in the 1960s (Hymes, 1964, 1972) to emphasize that the knowledge of grammatical rules is not sufficient for speaking a language and for communicating. According to Marji et al. (2015), oral communicative competence is defined as the ability to use spoken English effectively and accurately. In this study, the concept is examined based on Celce-Murcia's (2007) model, which outlines various components of communicative competence in language learners. These six major components are divided into two dimensions and applied to the English speech course and the English debate course. For the English speech course, the focus is on linguistic, formulaic, and discourse competence, which are essential for delivering public speeches. In contrast, the English debate course emphasizes sociocultural, interactional, and strategic competence, which are crucial for debating.

Based on the objectives and content of the English debate course, this study discusses the following aspects of oral communicative competence:

- a. Sociocultural Competence: This refers to the speaker's pragmatic knowledge and includes knowledge of language variation with reference to sociocultural norms of the target language, such as social contextual factors, stylistic appropriateness, and cultural factors.
- b. Interactional Competence: This includes actional competence, conversational competence, and non-verbal/paralinguistic competence.
- c. Strategic Competence: This encompasses learning strategies and communication strategies.

### **1.8.2 Motivation**

Colman (2015) defines motivation as the driving force behind behavior directed towards achieving a goal, encompassing the commencement, persistence, direction, and vigor of such behavior. Different studies offer various definitions of motivation. In this study, motivation is discussed in terms of achievement goals, one of the most widely accepted theories of student motivation (Meece & Anderman, 2006).

The present study measures motivation in terms of mastery, performance, and social goals, as well as general motivation, using the Inventory of School Motivation (ISM) by McInerney et al. (2001). After adaptation, the Motivation Survey Instrument used in this study comprises a diverse array of meticulously designed scales, each aimed at capturing nuanced facets of motivation within the context of students' engagement in debate activities. These scales include subscales for Task, Effort, Competition, Social Power, Praise, Token, Social Concern, and Affiliation. Each subscale is represented by a set of carefully crafted items that probe into students' preferences, attitudes, and behaviors related to their engagement in debate activities.

### **1.8.3 British Parliamentary Debate Format**

The British Parliamentary (BP) style of debate is an academic format that originated in Liverpool during the mid-1800s. It involves eight speakers divided into two groups: the “government” and the “opposition”, which either support or oppose the motion, respectively. Modeled after British parliamentary procedure, each side consists of two teams known as “benches”, with an opening team and a closing team. Each side has two “proposition” teams supporting the motion and two “opposition” teams opposing it, with one team opening and one team closing the debate for each side (Competitive Debating - The Cambridge Union, 2023). Speeches generally last between five to seven minutes. BP is the format used in the World Universities Debating Championship (WUDC) (Debate Guides, 2022.) and the FLTRP national debate competition in China.

In this study, students will be divided into groups of four debaters based on speaking proficiency to ensure balanced teams. Each group will consist of four debaters who will support or oppose the debate motion, collaboratively preparing and delivering the debate speeches. Debate skills, motions, and scoring rules will be adapted according to the requirements of the BP debate format and the communicative competence model.

### **1.8.4 Flipped Classroom**

The flipped classroom is a teaching strategy based on the principle of inverting the traditional teaching process. In this model, lectures or instructional content



are delivered in a digital format for students to watch at home as homework, while face-to-face class time is dedicated to activities, practice assignments, and targeted assistance (Davies et al., 2013).

For this study, the Tai Chi Ring Flipped Classroom Model, developed by Zhong et al. (2013) at Tsinghua University, was adapted. This model integrates the flipped classroom concept, traditional Chinese Tai Chi culture, and Benjamin Bloom's classification theory of educational objectives proposed by Bloom (1956). The English debate course is designed and implemented based on the flipped classroom model, structured into four distinct stages:

- a. Teaching Preparation Stage: This foundational stage is critical for ensuring the smooth progress of subsequent learning activities. In this study, it involves the teacher completing the instructional design before the in-person class.
- b. Knowledge Comprehension Stage: During this stage, students acquire essential knowledge and skills, enabling them to attend the offline class with confidence and preparedness. In this study, students initially memorize and understand the course content under the teacher's guidance before the in-person session.
- c. Application Analysis Stage: In this stage, students apply their newly acquired knowledge to problem-solving scenarios, promoting the internalization of the material. In this study, this stage involves class presentations, teacher evaluations, peer evaluations, and immediate feedback in the offline classroom.
- d. Synthesis Evaluation Stage: This final stage focuses on students reflecting on and evaluating their learning process and outcomes. Activities include personal narration, study reports, self-evaluation, group evaluations, and other reflective practices. In this study, students refine their speeches and write reflective journals, while the teacher provides delayed evaluations after the in-person class.



### 1.8.5 Conventional Blended Learning

Blended learning is the combination of traditional face-to-face teaching and Web-based learning (Osguthorpe & Graham, 2003). Different elements of Web-based learning such as digital textbooks, video, audio, interactive Web exercises, synchronous and asynchronous online teaching, may be applied (AL-Hunaiyyan & Al-Sharhan, 2009; Precel et al., 2009). The definition of the concept has been discussed by different authors (Driscoll, 2002; Jones, 2006), and the most common position is that “blended-learning environments combine face-to-face instruction with technology-mediated instruction” (Graham, 2006). In this approach, online teaching activities combine with traditional face-to-face class activities to offer a planned, integrated delivery (le Roux and Nagel, 2018).

For this study, the researcher developed the main activities for conventional blended learning in the control group, aligning them with the course’s teaching objectives. The framework is organized into four stages:

- a. **Teaching Preparation Stage:** In this initial phase, the teacher completes the instructional design for the upcoming sessions before the in-person class. In this study, this involves the teacher finalizing the instructional design of the debate class.
- b. **Classroom Teaching Stage:** During this stage, the teacher provides detailed explanations of relevant knowledge and skills. In this study, the teacher focuses on explaining debate skills and announcing the weekly debate motion.
- c. **Classroom Practice Stage:** In this phase, students engage in practical activities in the offline classroom. In this study, eight volunteers assume various roles in the BP debate, delivering speeches that are recorded on video. During this time, students prepare and deliver their debate speeches.

- d. **After-class Stage:** This final stage emphasizes deepening students' understanding through online learning, reflection, and evaluation of their learning process and outcomes. Activities include personal narration, study reports, self-evaluation, group evaluations, and other reflective practices. In this study, all students engage with online materials related to the week's debate motion and skills. Those not among the eight volunteers record their speeches after class and upload them to an online platform for review. Students deepen their understanding through online MOOCs, record and upload their speeches, and write reflective journals, while the teacher provides delayed evaluations after the in-person class.

## **1.9 Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher introduces the concept of oral communicative competence and discusses its significance. The study's primary inquiry revolves around investigating whether the flipped classroom affects the oral communicative competence and motivation of EFL Chinese college students enrolled in the English debate course. The chapter also describes the nature of the proposed study, including its rationale, objectives, and how it will be carried out. Furthermore, it justifies the research's value in enhancing teaching practices and student outcomes. The next chapter outlines the theoretical framework of the study, examining previous research that demonstrates how the flipped classroom and English debate have been utilized to enhance oral communicative competence and motivation.

## REFERENCES

- 40th world universities debating championship. (2020). [Www.wudc2020.Au.edu](http://www.wudc2020.au.edu/index.php/about-wudc-menu/about-wudc).<http://www.wudc2020.au.edu/index.php/about-wudc-menu/about-wudc>
- Aarts, H., Gollwitzer, P. M., & Hassin, R. R. (2004). Goal contagion: Perceiving is for pursuing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(1), 23–37. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.1.23>
- Abaeian H., & Samadi, L. (2016). The effect of flipped classroom on Iranian EFL learners' L2 reading comprehension: Focusing on different proficiency levels. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(6), 295–304.
- Abdekhoda, M., Maserat, E., & Ranjbaran, F. (2020). A conceptual model of flipped classroom adoption in medical higher education. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 17(4), 393–401. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-09-2019-0058>
- Abdullah, M. Y., Hussin, S., & Ismail, K. (2019). Implementation of flipped classroom model and its effectiveness on English speaking performance. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 14(9), 130–147. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i09.10348>
- Abdullah, M. Y., Hussin, S., & Ismail, K. (2019). Implementation of flipped classroom model and its effectiveness on English speaking performance. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, 14(09), 130. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i09.10348>
- Abeysekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2014). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: Definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 34(1), 1–14.
- Aclan, E. M., & Aziz, N. H. A. (2014). Exploring parliamentary debate as a pedagogical tool to develop English communication skills in EFL/ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.2p.1>
- Aclan, E. M., & Aziz, N. H. A. (2015). Why and how EFL students learn vocabulary in parliamentary debate class. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.6n.1p.102>
- Afzali, Z., & Izadpanah, S. (2021). The effect of the flipped classroom model on Iranian English foreign language learners: Engagement and motivation in English language grammar. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1870801. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2020.1870801>

- Ahmed, M. A. E. A. S. (2016). The effect of a flipping classroom on writing skill in English as a foreign language and students' attitude towards flipping. *US-China Foreign Language*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8080/2016.02.003>
- Akçayır, G., & Akçayır, M. (2018). The flipped classroom: A review of its advantages and challenges. *Computers & Education*, 126(1), 334–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.07.021>
- Akerman, R., & Neale, I. (2011). *Debating the evidence: An international review of current situation and perceptions*. CfBT Education Trust [in association with] English-Speaking Union.
- Akkara, S., Mallampalli, M. S., & Anumula, V. S. S. (2020). Improving second language speaking and pronunciation through smartphones. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM)*, 14(11), 280. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i11.13891>
- Al Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and difficulties of speaking that encounter English language students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, 5(12), 96–101.
- Alamri, M. M. (2019). Students' academic achievement performance and satisfaction in a flipped classroom in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 11(1), 103–119. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJTEL.2019.100179>
- Alasmari, A., & Ahmed, S. S. (2012). Using debate in EFL classes. *English Language Teaching*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p147>
- Alghasab, M. B. (2020). Flipping the writing classroom: Focusing on the pedagogical benefits and EFL learners' perceptions. *English Language Teaching*, 13(4), 28–40. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n4p28>
- Alharbi, A., Henskens, F.A., & Hannaford, M. (2012). Student-centered learning objects to support the self-regulated learning of computer science. *Creative Education*, 03, 773-783.
- Al-Hoorie, A., & MacIntyre, P. (2019). *Contemporary Language Motivation Theory: 60 Years Since Gardner and Lambert (1959)*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788925204>
- Al-Hunaiyyan, A. A., & Al-Sharhan, S. (2009). The design of multimedia blended e-learning systems: Cultural considerations. 2009 3rd *International Conference on Signals, Circuits and Systems (SCS)*, 1-5.
- Aliweh, A.M. (2011). Exploring Egyptian EFL students' learning styles and satisfaction with web-based materials. *the CALICO Journal*, 29, 81-99.

- Alkhoudary, Y. A., & AlKhoudary, J. A. (2019). The effectiveness of flipping classroom model on EFL secondary school speaking skills. *Indonesian EFL Journal*, 5(2), 1. <https://doi.org/10.25134/iefjl.v5i2.1811>
- Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2017). Digital compass learning: Distance education enrollment report 2017. *Babson Survey Research Group*.
- Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 56(1), 57–64. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/56.1.57>
- Alrabai, F. (2022). Teacher communication and learner willingness to communicate in English as a foreign language: A structural equation modeling approach. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 2(2), 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-03-2022-0043>
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Anandari, C. L. (2015). Indonesian EFL students' anxiety in speech production: Possible causes and remedy. *TEFLIN Journal - a Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, 26(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i1/1-16>
- Anderman, L. H., & Anderman, E. M. (1999). Social predictors of changes in students' achievement goal orientations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 24(1), 21–37. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1998.0978>
- Andujar, A., Salaberri-Ramiro, M. S., & Cruz Martínez, M. S. (2020). Integrating flipped foreign language learning through mobile devices: Technology acceptance and flipped learning experience. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031110>
- Anyanwu, I. E., & Onwuakpa, F. I. W. (2015). *Improving validity of tests through improved test development procedures*. Annual International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA) Conference, Kansas, USA.
- Archambault, L. M., & Crippen, K. J. (2009). Examining TPACK among K-12 online distance educators in the United States. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 9, 71-88.
- Ariani, D. W. (2021). How achievement goals affect students' well-being and the relationship model between achievement goals, academic self-efficacy and affect at school. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/jarhe-08-2020-0273>
- Arnold-Garza, S. (2014). The flipped classroom teaching model and its use for information literacy instruction. *Comminfolit*, 8(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2014.8.1.161>



- Arora, A. K., & Srinivasan, R. (2020). Impact of pandemic COVID-19 on the teaching – learning process: A study of higher education teachers. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 13(4), 43. <https://doi.org/10.17010/pijom/2020/v13i4/151825>
- Arslan, A. (2020). A systematic review on flipped learning in teaching English as a foreign or second language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(2), 775–797. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.759300>
- Asratie, M. G., Wale, B. D., & Aylet, Y. T. (2023). Effects of using educational technology tools to enhance EFL students' speaking performance. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11562-y>
- Astrid, S., Ester, S. de L. G., & Birgit, S. (2012). Assessment of communicative competence in a foreign language. In IX Jornadas Internacionales de Innovación Universitaria. Retrieved from <http://abacus.universidadeuropea.es>
- Awidi, I. T., & Paynter, M. (2019). The impact of a flipped classroom approach on student learning experience. *Computers and Education*, 128, 269–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.013>
- Awidi, I. T., & Paynter, M. (2019). The impact of a flipped classroom approach on student learning experience. *Computers & Education*, 128, 269–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.09.013>
- Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press
- Bachman, L. F., & Clark, J. L. D. (1987). The measurement of foreign/second language proficiency. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 490(1), 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716287490001003>
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford University Press.
- Bada, S. O. (2015). Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. *Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 5(6), 66–70.
- Bagari, V., & Mihaljevi, J. (2007). Defining communicative. *Metodika*, 8(1), 94–103.
- Bakla, A. (2018). Learner-generated materials in a flipped pronunciation class: A sequential explanatory mixed-methods study. *Computers & Education*, 125, 14–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.05.017>
- Basal, A. (2015). The implementation of a flipped classroom in foreign language teaching. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.17718/tojde.72185>

- Bashori, M., van Hout, R., Strik, H., & Cucchiarini, C. (2022). Web-based language learning and speaking anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(5–6), 1058–1089. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2021.1928226>
- Bates, A. W. (Tony). (2015). Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning. In *openlibrary-repo.ecampusontario.ca*. BCcampus. <https://openlibrary-repo.ecampusontario.ca/jspui/handle/123456789/276>
- Bednar, A. K., Cunningham, D., Duffy, T. M., & Perry, J. D. (2013). Theory into practice: How do we link? In *Constructivism and the Technology of Instruction* (pp. 17–34). Routledge.
- Bennett, D. (2019). Meeting society's expectations of graduates. *BRILL EBooks*, 1, 35–48. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004400832\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004400832_003)
- Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2012). *Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day*. International Society for Technology in Education.
- Berrett, D. (2012, February 19). *How “flipping” the classroom can improve the traditional lecture*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. <http://chronicle.com/article/How-Flipping-the-Classroom/130857/>
- Biddix, J. P. (2018, February 7). *Instrument, validity, reliability*. Research Rundowns; Research Rundowns. <https://researchrundowns.com/quantitative-methods/instrument-validity-reliability/>
- Bin-Hady, W. R. A., & Hazaea, A. N. (2022). EFL students' achievement and attitudes towards flipped pronunciation class: Correlational study. *PSU Research Review*, 6(3), 175–189. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PRR-09-2020-0029>
- Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013, June 23). *The flipped classroom: A survey of the research*. 120th ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition.
- Blair, E., Maharaj, C., & Primus, S. (2015). Performance and perception in the flipped classroom. *Education and Information Technologies*, 21(6), 1465–1482. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-015-9393-5>
- Blau, I., & Shamir-Inbal, T. (2017). Re-designed flipped learning model in an academic course: The role of co-creation and co-regulation. *Computers and Education*, 115, 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.07.014>
- Bloom, B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals* (1st ed.). Longman Group.

- Blumenfeld, P. C. (1992). Classroom learning and motivation: Clarifying and expanding goal theory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 272–281. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.272>
- Bolandifar, S. (2017). Effects of blended learning on reading comprehension and critical thinking skills of undergraduate ESL students. Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Bong, M. (2001). Between- and within-domain relations of academic motivation among middle and high school students: Self-efficacy, task value, and achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.23>
- Bozkurt, B. N., & Aydin, S. (2023). The impact of collaborative learning on speaking anxiety among foreign language learners in online and face-to-face environments. *International Journal of Virtual and Personal Learning Environments*, 13(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJVPLE.20230101>
- Brame, C. J. (2013, January 31). *Flipping the classroom*. Vanderbilt University. <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/flipping-the-classroom/>
- Brazil, D. (1995). *A grammar of speech*. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1176008>
- Brownstein, B. (2001). Collaboration: The foundation of learning in the future. *Education 3-13*, 122, 240.
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 31, 21–32.
- Buitrago, C. R., & Díaz, J. (2018). Flipping your writing lessons: optimizing time in your EFL writing classroom. In: Mehring, J., Leis, A. (eds) *Innovations in Flipping the Language Classroom*. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6968-0\\_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6968-0_6)
- Burgess, L. G., Riddell, P. M., Fancourt, A., & Murayama, K. (2018). The influence of social contagion within education: A motivational perspective. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 12(4), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mbe.12178>
- Butt, A. (2014). Student views on the use of a flipped classroom approach: Evidence from Australia. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 6(1), 33–44.



- Cai, J., Yang, H.H., Gong, D, MacLeod, J & Zhu, S. (2019). Understanding the continued use of flipped classroom instruction: a personal beliefs model in Chinese higher education. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 31, 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-018-9196-y>
- Campillo-Ferrer, J. M., & Miralles-Martínez, P. (2021). Effectiveness of the flipped classroom model on students' self-reported motivation and learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00860-4>
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2–27). Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (1997). *Exploring spoken English*. Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). The elaboration of sociolinguistic competence: Implications for teacher education. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 699–710.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning*, 41–57.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and context in language teaching: A guide for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5–35.
- Chand, G. B. (2021). Challenges faced by bachelor level students while speaking English. *IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics)*, 6(1), 45. <https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v6i1.853>
- Chang, S. C., & Hwang, G. J. (2018). Impacts of an augmented reality-based flipped learning guiding approach on students' scientific project performance and perceptions. *Computers & Education*, 125, 226–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.06.007>
- Chang, Y. H., Yan, Y. C., & Lu, Y. T. (2022). Effects of combining different collaborative learning strategies with problem-based learning in a flipped classroom on program language learning. *Sustainability*, 14(9), 5282. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095282>

- Chau, K. G. (2021). The effect of ICT on learners' speaking skills development. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, 1(1), 22–29.
- Chen Hsieh, J. S., Wu, W. C. V., & Marek, M. W. (2017). Using the flipped classroom to enhance EFL learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(1-2), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2015.1111910>
- Chen, F. (2012). A study of English speech and debate courses in colleges and universities. *Journal of Inner Mongolia Normal University (Educational Science)*, 25(7), 121–123.
- Chen, L. S. (2021). Exploration and application of debate teaching in listening class for college English majors——taking 《Advanced English Listening and Speaking》 as an example. *The Science Education Article Collects*, 5, 186–188.
- Chen, Y. C. (2022). Effects of technology-enhanced language learning on reducing EFL learners' public speaking anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2022.2055083>
- Chen, Y., Wang, Y., Kinshuk, & Chen, N. S. (2014). Is FLIP enough? Or should we use the FLIPPED model instead? *Computers & Education*, 79, 16–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2014.07.004>
- Chen, Z., & Goh, C. (2011). Teaching oral English in higher education: challenges to EFL teachers. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(3), 333–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2010.546527>
- Cho, H., & Chiu, W. (2021). The role of leisure centrality in university students' self-satisfaction and academic intrinsic motivation. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30\*(2), 119–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-020-00519-9>
- Cho, M. H., Park, S. W., & Lee, S. (2019). Student characteristics and learning and teaching factors predicting affective and motivational outcomes in flipped college classrooms. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(8), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1643303>
- Chomsky, N. (2014). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Cladera, M. (2024). Enhancing econometrics instruction: A study on student acceptance of the flipped classroom. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-04-2024-0180>
- Clark-Ibáñez, M., & Scott, L. (2008). Learning to Teach Online. *Teaching Sociology*, 36(1), 34-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X0803600105>
- Colman, A. M. (2015). *A dictionary of psychology* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.

*Competitive Debating - The Cambridge Union*. (2023, June 24). The Cambridge Union. <https://cus.org/competitivedebating>

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Dana, M. Y., & Aminatun, D. (2022). The correlation between speaking class anxiety and students' English proficiency. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 3(2), 7–15. <https://doi.org/10.33365/jeltl.v3i2.1915>

Daniels, H. (2016). *Vygotsky and Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315617602>

Davies, R. S., Dean, D. L., & Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 563–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-013-9305-6>

Davies, R. S., Dean, D. L., & Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 61(4), 563–580. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-013-9305-6>

*Debate Guides*. (2022). [Www.worlddebating.org](https://www.worlddebating.org/debate-guides). <https://www.worlddebating.org/debate-guides>

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2013). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Dehham, S. H. (2021). Enhancing Iraqi EFL preparatory school students' speaking skill by using debate technique. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 12(7), 3189–3196. <https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i7.3957>

DeLozier, S. J., & Rhodes, M. G. (2017). Flipped classrooms: A review of key ideas and recommendations for practice. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(1), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9356-9>

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications Ltd.

Derakhshan, A., Dewaele, J., & Noughabi, M.A. (2022). Modeling the contribution of resilience, well-being, and L2 grit to foreign language teaching enjoyment among Iranian English language teachers. *System*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102890>

Dewey, J. (1929). *The quest for certainty*. Minton, Balch.

- Dimitrov, D. M., & Rumrill, Jr. P. D. (2003). Pretest-posttest designs and measurement of change. *Work*, 20(2), 159–165.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Hadfield, J. (2013). *Motivating learning*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315833286>
- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The Psychology of the Language Learner Revisited*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779553>
- Dowson D., & Jin Z-M. (2006). Metal-on-metal hip joint tribology. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part H: Journal of Engineering in Medicine*, 220(2), 107-118. <https://doi.org/10.1243/095441105X69114>
- Dowson, M., & McInerney, D. M. (2003). What do students say about their motivational goals?: Towards a more complex and dynamic perspective on student motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 28(1), 91–113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-476X\(02\)00010-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0361-476X(02)00010-3)
- Driscoll, M. (2002). Blended learning: Let's get beyond the hype. *e-Learning*, 1(4), 1–4
- Du, S. C., Fu, Z. T., & Wang, Y. (2014). The flipped classroom—advantages and challenges. *2014 International Conference on Economic Management and Trade Cooperation (EMTC 2014)*, 17–20.
- Duda, J. L., & Nicholls, J. G. (1992). Dimensions of achievement motivation in schoolwork and sport. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(3), 290–299. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.290>
- Dunn, W. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (1998). Vygotsky's zone of proximal development and Krashen's i+1: Incommensurable constructs; incommensurable theories. *Language Learning*, 48(3), 411–442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0023-8333.00048>
- Durrani, U. K., Al Naymat, G., Ayoubi, R. M., Kamal, M. M., & Hussain, H. (2022). Gamified flipped classroom versus traditional classroom learning: Which approach is more efficient in business education? *The International Journal of Management Education*, 20(1), 100595. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2021.100595>
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.
- eCampus News 2011 Year in Review - eCampus News. (2011). [www.ecampusnews.com](http://www.ecampusnews.com). <https://www.ecampusnews.com/year-in-review/2011/12/04/ecampus-news-2011-year-in-review/>
- Elliot, A. J. (2013). *Handbook of approach and avoidance motivation*. Psychology Press.



- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 × 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(3), 501–519.
- Elmaadaway, M. A. (2017). The effects of a flipped classroom approach on class engagement and skill performance in a blackboard course. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(3), 479–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12553>
- Elmaadaway, M. A. N. (2017). The effects of a flipped classroom approach on class engagement and skill performance in a Blackboard course. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(3), 479–491. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12553>
- Ercan, B. (2020). Language preparatory school students' use of modern technologies to study English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(3), 1402–1414. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.803824>
- Estaji, M., & Farahanynia, M. (2019). The immediate and delayed effect of dynamic assessment approaches on EFL learners' oral narrative performance and anxiety. *Educational Assessment*, 24(2), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10627197.2019.1578169>
- Fernando, C. (1996). *Idioms and idiomaticity: Texte imprimé*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferreri, S. P., & O'Connor, S. K. (2013). Redesign of a large lecture course into a small-group learning course. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 77(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe77113>
- Fidan, M. (2023). The effects of microlearning-supported flipped classroom on pre-service teachers' learning performance, motivation and engagement. *Education and Information Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11639-2>
- Fortuna, C., & Mohorcic, M. (2009). Trends in the development of communication networks: Cognitive networks. *Computer Networks*, 53(9), 1354–1376. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2009.01.002>
- Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2013). *Argumentation and debate*. Cengage Learning.
- Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2013). *Towards a new end: New pedagogies for deep learning*.
- Galajda, D. (2017). *Communicative Behaviour of a Language Learner*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59333-3>
- Galindo-Dominguez, H. (2021). Flipped classroom in the educational system: Trend or effective pedagogical model compared to other methodologies?. *Educational Technology & Society/Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 24(3), 44–60.

- Gamoran, A., Secada, W. G., & Marrett, C. B. (2000). The organizational context of teaching and learning. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Education* (pp. 37–63). Springer US. [https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-36424-2\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-36424-2_3)
- Ganotice, F. A., Bernardo, A. B. I., & King, R. B. (2012). Testing the factorial invariance of the English and Filipino versions of the inventory of school motivation with bilingual students in the Philippines. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 30(3), 298–303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282911435459>
- Gardner, R. C., & Lambert, W. E. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second-language learning. *Hispania*, 57(1), 193. <https://doi.org/10.2307/339475>
- Gardner, R. C., & MacIntyre, P. D. (1991). An instrumental motivation in language study. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263100009724>
- Gardner, R. C., & Tremblay, P. F. (1994). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks1. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02050.x>
- Gardner, R. C., Lalonde, R. N., & Moorcroft, R. (1985). The role of attitudes and motivational and experimental considerations. *Language Learning*, 35(2), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1985.tb01025.x>
- Garrison, D., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *Internet High. Educ.*, 7, 95–105.
- Ghasemi, A. A., & Mozaheb, M. A. (2021). Developing EFL learners' speaking fluency: Use of practical techniques. *Mextesol Journal*, 45(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v45n2-15>
- Gianoni-Capenakas, S., Lagravere, M., Pacheco-Pereira, C., & Yacyshyn, J. (2019). Effectiveness and perceptions of flipped learning model in dental education: A systematic review. *Journal of Dental Education*, 83(8), 935–945. <https://doi.org/10.21815/jde.019.109>
- Gillani, B., & O'Guinn, C. (2004). Cognitive theories and the design of e-learning environments. *Studies in health technology and informatics*, 109, 143–51.
- Gimeno-Sanz, A. (2023). Flipped teaching through a massive open online course and a debate project for learners of English at university: A case study. *English Language Education*, 193–216. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27825-9\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27825-9_10)
- Ginns, P., & Ellis, R. A. (2007). Quality in blended learning: Exploring the relationships between on-line and face-to-face teaching and learning. *Internet High. Educ.*, 10, 53–64.

- Ginther, A. (2012). The encyclopedia of applied linguistics. *Blackwell Publishing*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431>
- Gong, X. F. (2018). A study on flipped classroom teaching model of English public speaking. *Data of Culture and Education*, 34, 231–233.
- Gong, Y., Lai, C., & Gao, X. (2020). The teaching and learning of Chinese as a second or foreign language: The current situation and future directions. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 15(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-020-0001-0>
- Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions. In Bonk, C.J., Graham, C.R. (eds.) *Handbook of blended learning: Global Perspectives, local designs*, 13. Pfeiffer Publishing.
- Haghighi, H., Jafarigohar, M., Khoshsima, H., & Vahdany, F. (2018). Impact of flipped classroom on EFL learners' appropriate use of refusal: achievement, participation, perception. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 32(3), 261–293. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1504083>
- Haidara, Y. (2016). Psychological factor affecting English speaking performance for the English learners in Indonesia. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 4(7), 1501–1505. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040701>
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3(3), 275–285.
- Hamdan, N., McKnight, P., McKnight, K., & Arfstrom, K. M. (2013). *The flipped learning model: A white paper based on the literature review titled a review of flipped learning*. Flipped Learning Network/Pearson/George Mason University.
- Han, Y. J. (2015). Successfully flipping the ESL classroom for learner autonomy. *NYS Tesol Journal*, 2(1), 98–109.
- Hao, Y. (2016). Exploring undergraduates' perspectives and flipped learning readiness in their flipped classrooms. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 59, 82–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.01.032>
- Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524568>
- He, W., Holton, A., Farkas, G., & Warschauer, M. (2016). The effects of flipped instruction on out-of-class study time, exam performance, and student perceptions. *Learning and Instruction*, 45, 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.07.001>

- Healey, D. (2016). Language learning and technology: Past, present and future. In *The Routledge Handbook of Language Learning and Technology* (pp. 9–23). Routledge.
- Heffner, C. L. (2018). *Chapter 7.4 experimental validity*. Allpsych.com. <https://allpsych.com/researchmethods/experimentalvalidity/>
- Heigham, J., & Croker, R. A. (2009). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Springer.
- Hicks, S. D. (2011). Technology in today's classroom: Are you a tech-savvy teacher? *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 84(5), 188–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2011.557406>
- Hill, B. (1982). Intercollegiate debate: Why do students bother? *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 48(1), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10417948209372554>
- Hirata, Y. (2023). Do avatar-assisted virtual classrooms work for students with low speaking confidence? A qualitative study. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, 20(3), 335–349. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-10-2022-0142>
- Hlavacik, M., Lain, B., Ivanovic, M., & Ontiveros-Kersch, B. (2016). The state of college debate according to a survey of its coaches: Data to ground the discussion of debate and civic engagement. *Communication Education*, 65(4), 382–396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1203006>
- Ho, J. (2019). Gamifying the flipped classroom: How to motivate Chinese ESL learners? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1614185>
- Ho, J. (2020). Gamifying the flipped classroom: How to motivate Chinese ESL learners? *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 14(5), 421–435. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2019.1614185>
- Hoath, H. (2015). How do different types of goals and feedback affect student motivation in Latin? *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 16(32), 6–13. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s2058631015000136>
- Huai, Y. M., Wang, J. M., & Yuan, Q. F. (2013). On the motivation and effect of interaction in parliamentary English debate course: The alignment effect of role play of members of parliament on critical thinking and SLA. *Foreign Language and Literature*, 29(4), 153–157.
- Huang, A. Y. Q., Lu, O. H. T., & Yang, S. J. H. (2023). Effects of artificial Intelligence–Enabled personalized recommendations on learners' learning engagement, motivation, and outcomes in a flipped classroom. *Computers & Education*, 194(104684), 104684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104684>



- Huang, B., Hew, K. F., & Lo, C. K. (2019). Investigating the effects of gamification-enhanced flipped learning on undergraduate students' behavioral and cognitive engagement. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27(8), 1106–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1495653>
- Hughes, R., & Reed, B. S. (2017). *Teaching and researching speaking*. Routledge, Taylor Et Francis Group.
- Hulleman, C. S., & Senko, C. (2010). Up around the bend: Forecasts for achievement goal theory and research in 2020. In *The Decade Ahead: Theoretical Perspectives on Motivation and Achievement* (Vol. 16, pp. 71–104). Emerald Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/s0749-7423\(2010\)000016a006](https://doi.org/10.1108/s0749-7423(2010)000016a006)
- Hung, H. T. (2014). Flipping the classroom for English language learners to foster active learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 28(1), 81–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2014.967701>
- Hung, H. T. (2017). The integration of a student response system in flipped classrooms. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(1), 16–27. Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/issues/february2017/hung.pdf>.
- Hutchings, M., & Quinney, A. (2015). The flipped classroom, disruptive pedagogies, enabling technologies and wicked problems: Responding to 'the Bomb in the Basement'. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 13, 106–119.
- Hwang, W.-Y., Nurtantyana, R., & Hariyanti, U. (2023). Collaboration and interaction with smart mechanisms in flipped classrooms. *Data Technologies and Applications*, 57(5), 625–642. <https://doi.org/10.1108/DTA-04-2022-0171>
- Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication1. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6\_PART2), 1–34. [https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl\\_3.02a00010](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00010)
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–285). Penguin.
- IELTS performance for test takers 2022*. (2022). [Www.ielts.org. https://www.ielts.org/for-researchers/test-statistics/test-taker-performance](https://www.ielts.org/for-researchers/test-statistics/test-taker-performance)
- Ihnatova, O., Poseletska, K., Matiiuk, D., Hapchuk, Y., & Borovska, O. (2021). The application of digital technologies in teaching a foreign language in a blended learning environment. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S4), 114–127. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5ns4.1571>

- Jafarkhani, F., & Jamebozorg, Z. (2020). Comparing cooperative flipped learning with individual flipped learning in a biochemistry course. *Journal of Medicine and Life*, 13(3), 399–403. <https://doi.org/10.25122/jml-2019-0149>
- Jagacinski, C. M., Kumar, S., Boe, J. L., Lam, H., & Miller, S. A. (2010). Changes in achievement goals and competence perceptions across the college semester. *Motivation and Emotion*, 34(2), 191–204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-010-9165-x>
- Jalleh, C. M., Mahfoodh, O. H. A., & Singh, M. K. M. (2021). Oral communication apprehension among Japanese EFL international students in a language immersion program in Malaysia. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(2), 155–178. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14210a>
- Jang, H. Y., & Kim, H. J. (2020). A meta-analysis of the cognitive, affective, and interpersonal outcomes of flipped classrooms in higher education. *Education Sciences*, 10(4), 115. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10040115>
- Jo, J., Jun, H., & Lim, H. (2018). A comparative study on gamification of the flipped classroom in engineering education to enhance the effects of learning. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 26(5), 1626–1640. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.21992>
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14–26.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Tucker, S. A., & Icenogle, M. L. (2014). *Conducting mixed methods research*. 556–569. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199811755.013.022>
- Jones, K. T. (1994). Cerebral gymnastics 101: Why do debaters debate? *CEDA Yearbook*, 15, 65–75.
- Jones, N. (2006) E-College Wales, A case study of blended learning. In Bonk, C.J., Graham, C.R. (eds.) *Handbook of blended learning: Global Perspectives, local designs*, 13. Pfeiffer Publishing.
- Jurmey, P., Lham, T., Lhaden, K., Pema, T., & Rai, B. B. (2019). Flipped classroom: Prospect in freeing up classroom instructional hours, and students' attitude towards flipped classroom strategy. *ResearchGate*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332037024>
- Kaiser K. (2009). Protecting respondent confidentiality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19(11), 1632-1641. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732309350879>

- Kalra, R., & Siribud, S. (2020). Public speaking anxiety in the Thai EFL context. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 13(1), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.6017/learn.v13i1.11736>
- Kang, Q. (2019). An Analysis on the Blended Teaching Reform on English Oral Courses. *Proceedings of the 2019 3rd International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences (ISEMSS 2019)*, 655–658. <https://doi.org/10.2991/isemss-19.2019.131>
- Karabulut-Ilgü, A., Jaramillo Cherrez, N., & Jahren, C. T. (2017). A systematic review of research on the flipped learning method in engineering education. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 49(3), 398–411. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12548>
- Karaoğlu Yılmaz, F. G. (2021). An investigation into the role of course satisfaction on students' engagement and motivation in a mobile-assisted learning management system support flipped classroom. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 31(1), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939x.2021.1940257>
- Karimi, M., & Hamzavi, R. (2017) The effect of flipped model of instruction on EFL learners' reading comprehension: learners' attitudes in focus. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 8(1), 95-103, <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.1p.95>
- Karlen, Y., Suter, F., Hirt, C., & Maag Merki, K. (2019). The role of implicit theories in students' grit, achievement goals, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and achievement in the context of a long-term challenging task. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 74, 101757. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101757>
- Kennedy, R. (2007). In-Class debates: Fertile ground for active learning and the cultivation of critical thinking and oral communication skills. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 19(2).
- Kennedy, R. R. (2009). The power of in-class debates. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 10(3), 225–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787409343186>
- King, R. B., & Mendoza, N. B. (2020). Achievement goal contagion: Mastery and performance goals spread among classmates. *Social Psychology of Education*, 23(3), 795–814. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09559-x>
- King, R. B., McInerney, D. M., & Watkins, D. A. (2013). Examining the role of social goals in school: A study in two collectivist cultures. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(4), 1505–1523. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-013-0179-0>

- Kirmizi, O., & Komec, F. (2020). Secondary school EFL students' perceptions of the flipped classroom in terms of autonomy, language skills, technological attitudes, and motivation. *ÜNİVERSİTEPARK Bülten*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2020.92.5>
- Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), 75–86. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4102_1)
- Kitao, S. K., & Kitao, K. (1996). Testing communicative competence. The Internet TESL Journal, 2(5). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Articles/Kitao-Testing.html>
- Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*, 15(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012>
- Kostka, I., & Marshall, H. (2018). Flipped learning in TESOL: Past, present and future. In K. Perren, J. Byun, S. Cervantes, & S. Safavi (Eds.), *Language Learning and Literacy: Breakthroughs in Research and Practice* (pp. 223–224). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9618-9>
- Kronholz, J. (2011). Getting at-Risk teens to graduation: Blended learning offers a second chance. *Education Next*, 11(4), 24–31.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2014). *Focus groups: a Practical Guide for Applied Research* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Kudratilloev, N. A., & Akhmedov, B. A. (2021). Application of communication-cluster technologies in pedagogical institutions: interactive methods of processing graphic data. *Scientific Progress*, 1(5), 191–198.
- Kuper, G. (2000, April). *Student motivations for participating in policy or parliamentary debate*.
- Lam, C. B., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (2014). Time with peers from middle childhood to late adolescence: Developmental course and adjustment correlates. *Child Development*, 85(4), 1677–1693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12235>
- Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural theory and second language development. In *Theories in Second Language acquisition: an Introduction* (pp. 207–226).
- Lape, N. K., Levy, R., Yong, D. H., Haushalter, K. A., Eddy, R., & Hankel, N. (2014). Probing the inverted classroom: A controlled study of teaching and learning outcomes in undergraduate engineering and mathematics. *2014 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*, 24–1006.



- le Roux, I., & Nagel, L. (2018). Seeking the best blend for deep learning in a flipped classroom – viewing student perceptions through the Community of Inquiry lens. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15, 1-28.
- LeCompte, M. D., & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Ethnographic data collection in evaluation research. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4(3), 387–400. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737004003387>
- Lee, G., & Wallace, A. (2018). Flipped learning in the English as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(1), 62–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.372>
- Lee, G., & Wallace, A. (2018). Flipped learning in the english as a foreign language classroom: Outcomes and perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(1), 62–84. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.372>
- Lee, J. H. (2012). Experimental methodology in English teaching and learning: Method features, validity issues, and embedded experimental design. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 11(2), 25-43.
- Leung, C., & Lo, S. K. (2013). Validation of a questionnaire to measure mastery motivation among Chinese preschool children. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 34(1), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2012.07.023>
- Li, C., & Dewaele, J. M. (2020). The predictive effects of trait emotional intelligence and online learning achievement perceptions on foreign language class boredom among Chinese university students. *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching*, 5, 33-44.
- Li, S., & Suwanthep, J. (2017). Integration of flipped classroom model for EFL speaking. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.18178/ijlt.3.2.118-123>
- Liao, H. (2020). Study on the thinking ability of non-English majors in application-oriented universities. *Education Teaching Forum*, 47, 115–116.
- Lin, J. (2021). A study on the application of POA in college English debate class. *Journal of Fujian Medical University*, 22(4), 73–78.
- Lin, Y. (2018). The impact of peer evaluation on the evaluators in critical thinking infused English learning. *Technology Enhanced Foreign Language Education*, 184(6), 35–40.
- Lin, Y. (2019). The effects of a tool for cultivating critical thinking ability: Language template in English debate class. *Foreign Language Teaching*, 40(1), 66–71.
- Lindgren, R., & McDaniel, R. (2012). Transforming online learning through narrative and student agency. *J. Educ. Technol. Soc.*, 15, 344-355.

- Liu, I. W., & Sukavatee, P. (2019). The effects of debate instruction through a flipped learning environment on critical thinking skills of thai high school students. *Scholar: Human Sciences*, 11(1), 238–238.
- Liu, M. H. (2005). Reticence in oral English language classrooms: A case study in China. *TESL Reporter*, 38(1), 1–16.
- Liu, Y., Hau, K. T., Liu, H., Wu, J., Wang, X., & Zheng, X. (2020). Multiplicative effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on academic performance: A longitudinal study of Chinese students. *Journal of Personality*, 88(3), 584–595. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12512>
- Liu, Y., Mishan, F., & Chambers, A. (2021). Investigating EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching in higher education in China. *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(2), 131–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1465110>
- Lo, C. K., & Hew, K. F. (2017). A critical review of flipped classroom challenges in K-12 education: Possible solutions and recommendations for future research. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-016-0044-2>
- Losada, C. A. C., Insuasty, E. A., & Osorio, M. F. J. (2017). The impact of authentic materials and tasks on students' communicative competence at a Colombian language school. *PROFILE*, 19(1), 89-104.
- Luo, S., & Zou, D. (2023). K-12 teacher readiness for flipped foreign language teaching: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 55(4), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2023.2196459>
- Ma, X. L., Zhao, G. Q., & Wu, T. (2013). An empirical study of flipped classroom teaching in university information technology public courses. *Journal of Distance Education*, 31(1), 79–85.
- Maehr, M. L., & McInerney, D. M. (2004). Motivation as personal investment.
- Magson, N. R., Craven, R. G., Nelson, G. F., Yeung, A. S., Bodkin-Andrews, G. H., & McInerney, D. M. (2014). Motivation matters: Profiling indigenous and non-indigenous students' motivational goals. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 43(2), 96–112. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2014.19>
- Maharani, A., Hamamah, H., & Nurhayani, I. (2020). Indonesian undergraduate EFL students' perceptions toward flipped classroom. *Edcomtech Jurnal Kajian Teknologi Pendidikan*, 5(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um039v5i12020p001>
- Mahdi, D. A. (2024). Effectiveness of LEP activities in enhancing EFL students' oral communication skills at King Khalid University. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 4(1), 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-10-2023-0047>

- Mandrekar J. N. (2011). Measures of interrater agreement. *J Thorac Oncol*, 6(1), 6-7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JTO.0b013e318200f983>. PMID: 21178713.
- Manen, M. V. (2017). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. (Original work published 1990)
- Manjooran, L., & Resmi, C. B. (2013). Theatre performance for oral communicative competence. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 16(2), 773-782.
- Marji, A. D. H. B., Rafik-Galea, S., & Yuit, C. M. (2015). Evaluating the effects of extensive reading circles on ESL learners' oral communicative competence. *Malaysian Journal of Languages and Linguistics (MJLL)*, 4(1), 75. <https://doi.org/10.24200/mjll.vol4iss1pp75-92>
- Marlowe, C. A. (2012). *The effect of the flipped classroom on student achievement and stress*. Montana State University.
- Martínez-Jiménez, R., & Ruiz-Jiménez, M. C. (2020). Improving students' satisfaction and learning performance using flipped classroom. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 18(3), 100422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100422>
- Mason, G. S., Shuman, T. R., & Cook, K. E. (2013). Comparing the effectiveness of an inverted classroom to a traditional classroom in an upper-division engineering course. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 56(4), 430–435. <https://doi.org/10.1109/te.2013.2249066>
- Masood, M. M., & Haque, M. M. (2021). From critical pedagogy to critical digital pedagogy: A prospective model for the EFL classrooms. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 1(1), 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-03-2021-0005>
- Massey Jr, F. J. (1951). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for goodness of fit. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 46(253), 68-78.
- McGee, E. U., Pius, M., & Mukherjee, K. (2020). Assessment of structured classroom debate to teach an antimicrobial stewardship elective course. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 12(2), 220–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2019.11.013>
- McInerney, D. M., Maehr, M. L., & Dowson, M. (2004). Motivation and culture. In *Encyclopedia of Applied Psychology*, 2. Elsevier.
- McInerney, D. M., Yeung, A. S., & McInerney, V. (2001). Cross-cultural validation of the inventory of school motivation (ISM): Motivation orientations of Navajo and Anglo students. *Journal of Applied Measurement*, 2(2), 135–153.



- McLaughlin, J. E., Roth, M. T., Glatt, D. M., Gharkholonarehe, N., Davidson, C. A., Griffin, L. M., Esserman, D. A., & Mumper, R. J. (2014). The flipped classroom. *Academic Medicine*, 89(2), 236–243. <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0000000000000086>
- Meece, J. L., Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2006). Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57(1), 487–503. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070258>
- Mehring, J. (2016). Present research on the flipped classroom and potential tools for the EFL classroom. *Computers in the Schools*, 33(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2016.1139912>
- Mehring, J., & Leis, A. (2018). *Innovations in flipping the language classroom: Theories and practices*. Springer.
- Mellefont, L. A. (2016). Student perceptions of “flipped” microbiology laboratory classes. *International Journal of Innovation in Science and Mathematics Education*, 24(1), 24–35.
- Melzer, P. (2019). Towards a holistic evaluation concept for personalized learning in flipped classrooms. In *A Conceptual Framework for Personalized Learning* (pp. 101–116). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-23095-1\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-23095-1_5)
- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Milman, N. B. (2012). The flipped classroom strategy: What is it and how can it be used? In *Distance Learning* (pp. 85–87).
- Mirra, N., Honoroff, B., Elgendy, S., & Pietrzak, G. (2016). Reading and writing with a public purpose: Fostering middle school students’ academic and critical community literacies through debate. *Journal of Language & Literacy Education*, 12(1), 1–22.
- Missildine, K., Fountain, R., Summers, L., & Gosselin, K. (2013). Flipping the classroom to improve student performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 52(10), 597–599. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20130919-03>
- Moffett, J., & Mill, A. C. (2014). Evaluation of the flipped classroom approach in a veterinary professional skills course. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 5, 415–425. <https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S70160>

- Mohd Nabil, N. S., Nordin, H., & Ab Rahman, F. (2024). Immersive language learning: Evaluating augmented reality filter for ESL speaking fluency teaching. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning*, 17(2), 182–195. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-04-2024-0111>
- Moser, C. A., & Kalton, G. (2016). *Survey methods in social investigation*. Routledge. (Original work published 1971)
- Munakata, M. (2010). The mathematics education debates: Preparing students to become professionally active mathematics teachers. *Primus*, 20(8), 712–720. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511970902870372>
- Murillo-Zamorano, L. R., López Sánchez, J. Á., & Godoy-Caballero, A. L. (2019). How the flipped classroom affects knowledge, skills, and engagement in higher education: Effects on students' satisfaction. *Computers and Education*, 141, 103608. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103608>
- Murphy, P. K., & Alexander, P. A. (2000). A motivated exploration of motivation terminology. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 3–53. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1019>
- Naem Ahmed Al-Amri, A. (2022). Saudi EFL university students' perceived linguistic gains and learning experiences in flipped classrooms. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(1), 192–204. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call8.13>
- Nguyen, N. Q., Lee, K. W., Szabo, C. Z., & Nguyen, D. N. P. (2021). Implementing the flipped classroom model in teaching a translation module in Vietnam. *Translation & Interpreting: The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 13(2), 109–135. <https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.024254461014494>
- Nkomo, L. M., Daniel, B. K., & Butson, R. J. (2021). Synthesis of student engagement with digital technologies: a systematic review of the literature. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(34), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00270-1>
- Nola, R., & Irzk, G. (2010). *Philosophy, science, education and culture*. Springer.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- O'Flaherty, J., & Phillips, C. (2015). The use of flipped classrooms in higher education: A scoping review. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 25(25), 85–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.02.002>
- Onen, D. (2016). Using debate to teach: A multi-skilling pedagogy often neglected by university academic staff. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 15(7), 110–126.

- Opening New Frontiers, Seeking Breakthroughs: Digitizing Education Paves the Way for New Developments in Higher Education*. (2023, December 15). Global MOOC and Online Education Alliance. <https://mooc.global/conference/opening-new-frontiers-seeking-breakthroughs-digitizing-education-paves-the-way-for-new-developments-in-higher-education/>
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Graham, C. R. (2003). Blended learning environments: Definitions and directions. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 4.
- Oxford Languages | The Home of Language Data. (2024). Languages.oup.com. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/debate?q5debate>
- Pallant, J. F. (2007). SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows version 15 (6th Edition). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003117407>
- Pan, L. (2015). English as a global language in China. In *English Language Education Volume 2*. Springer.
- Park, S., & Kim, N. H. (2022). University students' self-regulation, engagement and performance in flipped learning. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 46(1/2), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-08-2020-0129>
- Pawlak, M., Zawodniak, J., & Kruk, M. (2020). *Boredom in the foreign language classroom: A micro-perspective*. Springer.
- Peixoto, F., Monteiro, V., Mata, L., Sanches, C., Pipa, J., & Almeida, L. S. (2016). "To be or not to be retained... that's the question!" Retention, self-esteem, self-concept, achievement goals, and grades. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01550>
- Phoeun, M., & Sengsri, S. (2021). The effect of a flipped classroom with communicative language teaching approach on undergraduate students' English speaking ability. *International Journal of Instruction*, 14(3), 1025–1042. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14360a>
- Piaget, J. (1980). The psychogenesis of knowledge and its epistemological significance. In *Language and learning* (pp. 23–34). Harvard University Press.
- Pillar, G. (2011). A framework for testing communicative competence. *The Round Table: Partium Journal of English Studies*, 2(Fall), 24-37.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2000). An achievement goal theory perspective on issues in motivation terminology, theory, and research. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ceps.1999.1017>

- Popham, W. J. (1990). *Modern educational measurement*. IOX Assessment Associates.
- Pratiwi, D. I., Ubaedillah, U., Puspitasari, A., & Arifianto, T. (2022). Flipped classroom in online speaking class at Indonesian university context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(2), 697–714. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15238a>
- Precel, K., Eshet-Alkalai, Y., Alberton, Y. (2009). Learning by design in a digital world: Students' attitudes towards a new pedagogical model for online academic learning. In: Salvendy, G., Smith, M.J. (eds) *Human Interface and the Management of Information. Information and Interaction. Human Interface 2009. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 5618. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02559-4\\_74](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-02559-4_74)
- Putri, R. R., Khairil, K., & Safrida, S. (2022). Application of the flipped classroom model integrated with google classroom to the student's learning motivation. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 8(1), 263–268. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v8i1.1157>
- Rajeh, H. S. (2023). Saudi teachers' perspectives on flipped learning: Are they ready and willing? *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 3(4), 185–199. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SJLS-02-2023-0005>
- Rajkhova, B., & Borah, N. (2015). Strategies for developing communicative competence of engineering students. In *National Seminar on "English Language Pedagogy for Engineering and Polytechnic Students"* (pp. 1-11). Assam, India.
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. Seameo Regional Language Centre.
- Riggenbach, H. (1999). *Discourse analysis in the language classroom: Students as discourse analysts/language researchers: The spoken language*. University of Michigan Press.
- Rizos, I., Kolokotronis, G., & Papanikolaou, A. M. (2023). Investigating the effectiveness of flipped classroom model in a mathematics education course in Greece. *Journal of Mathematics and Science Teacher*, 3(1), em021. <https://doi.org/10.29333/mathsciteacher/12608>
- Roehl, A., Reddy, S. L., & Shannon, G. J. (2013). The flipped classroom: An opportunity to engage millennial students through active learning strategies. *Journal of Family & Consumer Sciences*, 105(2), 44–49. <https://doi.org/10.14307/jfcs105.2.12>
- Römer, U. (2011). Corpus Research Applications in Second Language Teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 205–225. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190511000055>



- Rosas-Maldonado, M., Bascuñán, D., & Martin, A. (2020). Potential benefits of debates: Perceptions of EFL pre-service teachers. *Lenguas Modernas*, 55(55), 133–150.
- Ross, S. M., Morrison, G. R., & Lowther, D. L. (2010). Educational technology research past and present: Balancing rigor and relevance to impact school learning. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 1(1), 17–35.
- Sahoo, P. K., & Sinha, S. (2020). Role of anxiety in speaking skills: An exploratory study. *Language in India*, 20(2), 58–61.
- Sailer, M., & Sailer, M. (2020). Gamification of in-class activities in flipped classroom lectures. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12993>
- Sailer, M., & Sailer, M. (2020). Gamification of in-class activities in flipped classroom lectures. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 52(1), 75–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12948>
- Saleh, S. E. (2013). Understanding communicative competence. *University Bulletin*, 3(15), 101–110.
- Sang, X. M., Li, S. H., & Xie, Y. B. (2012). The 21st Century college classroom: Concepts and experiments of “Tai Chi Academy” in Chinese. *Open Education Research*, 18(2), 9–21.
- Sari, F. M., & Wahyudin, A. Y. (2019). Undergraduate students’ perceptions toward blended learning through Instagram in English for business class. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1(1), 64. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.7064>
- Sarıçoban, A., Tosuncuoğlu, İ., & Kirmızı, Ö. (2019). A technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) assessment of pre-service EFL teachers learning to teach English as a foreign language. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 1122–1138. <https://doi.org/10.17263/jlls.631552>
- Savignon, S. J. (1998). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. Cambridge University Press
- Sawan, N., Al-Hajaya, K., Salem, R. I. A., & Alshhadat, M. (2024). Pre-COVID-19 student perceptions on blended learning and flipped classroom in accountancy: A case study from two emerging UK HEIs. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 16(2), 597–609. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-01-2023-0002>
- Schlairet, M. C., Green, R., & Benton, M. J. (2014). The flipped classroom: strategies for an undergraduate nursing course. *Nurse Educ*, 39(6), 321–5. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000000096>. PMID: 25290966.

- Schwinger, M., Steinmayr, R., & Spinath, B. (2016). Achievement goal profiles in elementary school: Antecedents, consequences, and longitudinal trajectories. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 46, 164–179. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.05.006>
- Sergis, S., Sampson, D. G., & Pelliccione, L. (2018). Investigating the impact of flipped classroom on students' learning experiences: A self-determination theory approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 78, 368–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.011>
- Shapiro, S. S., & Wilk, M. B. (1965). An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). *Biometrika*, 52(3-4), 591-611.
- Shapiro, S., & Brown, C. (2018). *The state of civics education*. Center for American Progress.
- Sharp, J. H. (2016). The flipped C# programming classroom: What students had to say. *Proceedings of the EDSIG Conference*, 2(4032).
- Sherine, A., Seshagiri, A. V. S., & Sastry, M. M. (2020). Impact of WhatsApp interaction on improving L2 speaking skills. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(3), 250–259. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i03.11534>
- Shih, M., Liang, J. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2019). Exploring the role of university students' online self-regulated learning in the flipped classroom: A structural equation model. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 27(8), 1192–1206. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2018.1541908>
- Shu, X. (2015). An empirical study on a flipped classroom in open university teaching based on an ecological perspective: A case study on a translation theory and practice course. *Asian Association of Open Universities Journal*, 10(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1108/aaouj-10-01-2015-b006>
- Slack, M. K., & Draugalis, J. R. (2001). Establishing the internal and external validity of experimental studies. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*, 58(22), 2173–2181. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajhp/58.22.2173>
- Smith, O. (2017, February 9). *Mapped: The world by English-speaking population*. The Telegraph. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/travel/maps-and-graphics/mapped-english-speaking-countries/>
- Somjai, S., & Jansem, A. (2015). The use of debate technique to develop speaking ability of grade ten students at Bodindecha (Sing Singhaseni) school. *International Journal of Technical Research and Applications*, 13(13), 27–31.
- Sosas, R. V. (2021). Technology in teaching speaking and its effects to students learning English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 958–970. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.66>



- Sowden, C. (2007). Culture and the “good teacher” in the English language classroom. *ELT Journal*, 61(4), 304–310. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccm049>
- Stöhr, C., Demazière, C., & Adawi, T. (2020). The polarizing effect of the online flipped classroom. *Computers and Education*, 147, 103789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103789>
- Strayer, J. F. (2012). How learning in an inverted classroom influences cooperation, innovation and task orientation. *Learning Environments Research*, 15(2), 171–193. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-012-9108-4>
- Su Ping, R. L., Verezub, E., Adi Badiozaman, I. F. bt, & Chen, W. S. (2019). Tracing EFL students’ flipped classroom journey in a writing class: Lessons from Malaysia. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 57(3), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2019.1574597>
- Subramaniam, S. R., & Muniandy, B. (2017). The effect of flipped classroom on students’ engagement. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 24(3), 355–372. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-017-9313-4>
- Sudarmaji, I., Anwar, A. A. A., & Mulyana, A. (2021). Developing students’ speaking skills through flipped classroom model. *Journal of English Education and Teaching*, 5(2), 188–200. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jcet.5.2.188-200>
- Sulaiman, G., & Ambotang, A. S. (2017). The role of basic vocational education towards students employability. *International Journal of Vocational Education and Training Research*, 3(1), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijvetr.20170301.11>
- Sun, B., & Revesz, A. (2021). The effects of task repetition on child EFL learners’ oral performance. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 24(2), 30–47. <https://doi.org/10.37213/cjal.2021.31382>
- Sun, Z., Xie, K., & Anderman, L. H. (2018). The role of self-regulated learning in students’ success in flipped undergraduate math courses. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 36, 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.09.003>
- Tavil, Z. M. (2010). Integrating listening and speaking skills to facilitate English language learner’s communicative competence. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 765–770. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.231>
- Tawfik, A. A., & Lilly, C. (2015). Using a flipped classroom approach to support problem-based learning. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 20, 299–315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10758-015-9262-8>

- Taylor, D. S. (1988). The meaning and use of the term “competence” in linguistics and applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), 148–168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/9.2.148>
- Teng, M. F. (2018). Flip your classroom to improve EFL students’ speaking skills. In: Mehring, J., Leis, A. (eds) *Innovations in Flipping the Language Classroom*. Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6968-0\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6968-0_9)
- The international version of national smart education platform - Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China*. (2024, January 30). En.moe.gov.cn.[http://en.moe.gov.cn/features/2024WorldDigitalEducationConference/Achievements/202402/t20240203\\_1114241.html](http://en.moe.gov.cn/features/2024WorldDigitalEducationConference/Achievements/202402/t20240203_1114241.html)
- Tian, L., Yu, T., & Huebner, E. S. (2017). Achievement goal orientations and adolescents’ subjective well-being in school: The mediating roles of academic social comparison directions. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00037>
- Tian, Z. X. (2019). Conventional thinking, international vision, integration of China and the West -- The educational significance of English debate. *China University Teaching*, 1, 69–73.
- Toto, R., & Nguyen, H. D. (2009). Flipping the work design in an industrial engineering course. *Frontiers in Education Conference*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/fie.2009.5350529>
- Tourón, J., & Santiago, R. (2015). Flipped Learning model and the development of talent at school. *Revista de Educación*, 368, 176-208.
- Trapp, R., Barnes, E., Chen, X. J., Franke, M., Green, T., He, J., Kimokeo-Goes, U., Miller, J., Spring, K., & Yang, G. (2016). Building global relations through debate. In *Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Tsai, C. W., & Chiang, I. C. (2018). The flipped college classroom: conceptualized and re-conceptualized. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(6), 1317–1320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1477100>
- Tucker, B. (2012). The flipped classroom. *Education Next*, 12(1), 82–83.
- Tuominen, H., Niemivirta, M., Lonka, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2020). Motivation across a transition: Changes in achievement goal orientations and academic well-being from elementary to secondary school. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 79, 101854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2020.101854>
- Turan, Z., & Akdag-Cimen, B. (2019). Flipped classroom in English language teaching: a systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(5-6), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2019.1584117>

- UNESCO ICT Competency Framework for Teachers. (2024). Unesco.org. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-ict-competency-framework-teachers>
- Urdu, T. C., & Maehr, M. L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement: A case for social goals. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 213–243. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003213>
- Urdu, T., & Giancarlo, C. (2000). *Differences between students in the consequences of goals and goal structures: The role of culture and family obligation*. Retrieved March 9, 2007, from [http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content\\_storage\\_01/0000000b/80/26/29/a0.pdf](http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/0000000b/80/26/29/a0.pdf).
- Vaezi, R., Afghari, A., & Lotfi, A. (2019). Investigating listening comprehension through flipped classroom approach: Does authenticity matter? *\*CALL-EJ*, 20\*(1), 178–208.
- Van Alten, D. C. D., Phielix, C., Janssen, J., & Kester, L. (2019). Effects of flipping the classroom on learning outcomes and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 28, 100281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.05.003>
- Vassiou, A., Mouratidis, A., Andreou, E., & Kafetsios, K. (2014). Students' achievement goals, emotion perception ability and affect and performance in the classroom: A multilevel examination. *Educational Psychology*, 36(5), 879–897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2014.950192>
- Vaughan, N. D., Cleveland-Innes, M. & Garrison, D. R. (2013). *Teaching in Blended Learning Environments: Creating and Sustaining Communities of Inquiry*. Athabasca University Press.
- Vitta, J. P., & Al-Hoorie, A. H. (2020). The flipped classroom in second language learning: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(5), 136216882098140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820981403>
- von Glasersfeld, E. (1995). A constructivist approach to teaching. In *Constructivism in Education*. Routledge.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1997). Interaction between learning and development. In M. Gauvin & M. Cole (Eds.), *Readings on the Development of Children* (pp.29-36). W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Walker, A., & Kettler, T. (2020). Developing critical thinking skills in high ability adolescents: Effects of a debate and argument analysis curriculum. *Talent*, 10(1), 21–39. <https://doi.org/10.46893/talent.758473>

- Wang, B. J. (2019). An empirical study on the argumentative writing skills after a critical teaching approach intervention in the oral English class —— Based on PEM and POA. *Foreign Language Education*, 40(5), 51–56.
- Wang, B. J. (2020). Curriculum design of critical-thinking oriented oral English class——based on Paul-Elder critical thinking model and production-oriented approach. *Journal of Xi'an International Studies University*, 28(4), 69–72.
- Wang, F. H. (2019). On the relationships between behaviors and achievement in technology-mediated flipped classrooms: A two-phase online behavioral PLS-SEM model. *Computers and Education*, 142, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103655>
- Wang, F. Y. (2017). The action research of college oral English teaching based on BP debate model. *Research in Teaching*, 4, 82–86.
- Wang, T. (2017). Overcoming barriers to “flip”: Building teacher’s capacity for the adoption of flipped classroom in Hong Kong secondary schools. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41039-017-0047-7>
- Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 110–118.
- Watkins, D., & Biggs, J. B. (1996). *The Chinese learner: cultural, psychological, and contextual influences*. Cerc; Camberwell, Melbourne, Vic.
- Watkins, D., & Biggs, J. B. (2001). *Teaching the Chinese learner: psychological and pedagogical perspectives*. Comparative Education Research Centre, The University Of Hong Kong.
- Webb, M., & Doman, E. (2019). Impacts of flipped classrooms on learner attitudes towards technology-enhanced language learning. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 33(3), 240–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2018.1557692>
- Wen, Q., Sun, M., & Zhang, L. L. (2018). Development of critical thinking skills: a longitudinal study on foreign language majors. *Foreign Language World*, 6, 12–19.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1993). Motivation and achievement in early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 13(1), 4–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431693013001001>
- Wentzel, K. R., & Muenks, K. (2016). Peer influence on students’ motivation, academic achievement, and social behavior. *Handbook of Social Influences in School Contexts*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315769929.ch2>



- Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Harvard University Press.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: a social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, S. G. (2013). The flipped class: A method to address the challenges of an undergraduate statistics course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 40(3), 193-199. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628313487461>
- Winter, J. W. (2017). Performance and motivation in a middle school flipped learning course. *TechTrends*, 62(2), 176–183. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-017-0228-7>
- Wongsa, M., & Son, J. B. (2022). Enhancing Thai secondary school students' English speaking skills, attitudes and motivation with drama-based activities and Facebook. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 16(1), 41–52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2020.1853134>
- Woodward, H., & Padfield, L. (2021). A blended approach to flipped learning for teaching debate. *Journal of Multilingual Pedagogy and Practice*, 1, 44–55.
- Woolfolk, A., & Usher, E. L. (2023). *Educational Psychology: Active Learning Edition* (15th ed.). Pearson.
- Wormington, S. V., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2016). A new look at multiple goal pursuit: The promise of a person-centered approach. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(3), 407–445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-016-9358-2>
- Wu, W.-C. V., Hsieh, J. S. C., & Yang, J. C. (2017). Creating an online learning community in a flipped classroom to enhance EFL learners' oral proficiency. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 20(2), 142–157.
- Wünsch, U. J., Geuer, J. K., Lechtenfeld, O. J., Koch, B. P., Murphy, K. R., Stedmon, C. A., 2018. Quantifying the impact of solid-phase extraction on chromophoric dissolved organic matter composition. *Marine Chemistry*, 207, 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marchem.2018.08.010>
- Xing, D., & Bolden, B. (2019). Exploring oral English learning motivation in Chinese international students with low oral English proficiency. *Journal of International Students*, 9(3), 834–855. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v9i3.749>
- Xue, M. (2013). Effects of group work on English communicative competence of Chinese international graduates in United States institutions of higher education. *The Qualitative Report*, 18(14), 1-19. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR18/xue14.pdf>

- Yang, C. C. R., & Chen, Y. (2020). Implementing the flipped classroom approach in primary English classrooms in China. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(2), 1217–1235. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-10012-6>
- Yang, C.-H., & Rusli, E. (2012). Using debate as a pedagogical tool in enhancing pre-service teachers learning and critical thinking. *Journal of International Education Research (JIER)*, 8(2), 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v8i2.6833>
- Yang, J., & Lee, H. (2016). Exploring students' voices in the development of learner-generated rubrics for EFL debate assessment. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 16(3), 537–562. <https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.16.3.201609.537>
- Yang, X. (2021). A study on PBL teaching model in English debate class--A route of problem-critical-thinking investigation. *Foreign Language Research*, 3, 70–74.
- Yang, Y. C., & Gamble, J. H. (2013). Effective and practical critical thinking-enhanced EFL instruction. *Elt Journal*, 67, 398-412.
- Yeh, H. C., Chang, W. Y., Chen, H. Y., & Heng, L. (2021). Effects of podcast-making on college students' English speaking skills in higher education. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 69(5), 2455–2487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-10026-3>
- Yessenbekova, K. (2024). Understanding the dynamics of English-speaking challenges for students in Kazakhstan. *Asian Education and Development Studies*, 13(4), 373–385. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AEDS-04-2024-0083>
- Zafar, M. (2011). Monitoring the “monitor”: A critique of Krashen's five hypotheses. *Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 2(4), 139–146. <https://doi.org/10.3329/dujl.v2i4.6903>
- Zahra, I. A., & Suganda, S. P. (2021). Teaching integrated English productive skills using British parliamentary debate. *International University Symposium on Humanities and Arts*, 2020, 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211110.022>
- Zainuddin, Z. (2018). Students' learning performance and perceived motivation in gamified flipped-class instruction. *Computers and Education*, 126, 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2018.07.003>
- Zainuddin, Z., & Halili, S. H. (2016). Flipped classroom research and trends from different fields of study. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(3), 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v17i3.2274>



- Zainuddin, Z., & Perera, C. J. (2017). Exploring students' competence, autonomy and relatedness in the flipped classroom pedagogical model. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 43(1), 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2017.1356916>
- Zare, P., & Othman, M. (2015). Students' perceptions toward using classroom debate to develop critical thinking and oral communication ability. *Asian Social Science*, 11(9), 158–170. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n9p158>
- Zeff, B. B. (2017). The assessment process as real-life performance: rethinking assessment of pragmatic instruction in the Japanese EFL classroom. *The Asian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(1), 129-140.
- Želježič, M. (2017). Debate in EFL classroom. *ELOPE: English Language Overseas Perspectives and Enquiries*, 14(1), 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.4312/elope.14.1.39-54>
- Zhang, H. Y. (2016). An empirical study on the effect of English debate on students' critical thinking skills. *Journal of Liaoning Economic Vocational and Technical College*, 5, 111-114+118.
- Zhang, H., Du, X., Yuan, X., & Zhang, L. (2016). The effectiveness of the flipped classroom mode on the English pronunciation course. *Creative Education*, 07(09), 1340–1346. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2016.79139>
- Zhang, Z. M. (2020). Research on the application of SPOC teaching model to college English debate course from the perspective of ubiquitous learning. *English Square*, 4(2), 69–72.
- Zhang, Z. W. (2018). Research on the whole process management mode of college English classroom debate activities. *University Education*, 7, 26-29+48.
- Zhao, L., Liu, X., & Su, Y.-S. (2021). The differentiate effect of self-efficacy, motivation, and satisfaction on pre-service teacher students' learning achievement in a flipped classroom: A case of a modern educational technology course. *Sustainability*, 13(5), 2888. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052888>
- Zheng, B., Ward, A., & Stanulis, R. (2020). Self-regulated learning in a competency-based and flipped learning environment: Learning strategies across achievement levels and years. *Medical Education Online*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2019.1686949>
- Zheng, L., Bhagat, K. K., Zhen, Y., & Zhang, X. (2020). The effectiveness of the flipped classroom on students' learning achievement and learning motivation. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 23(1), 1–15.

Zheng, X., Johnson, T. E., & Zhou, C. (2020). A pilot study examining the impact of collaborative mind mapping strategy in a flipped classroom: learning achievement, self-efficacy, motivation, and students' acceptance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 68(6), 3527–3545.

Zhong, X., Song, S., & Jiao, L. (2013). Instructional design based on the idea of the flipped classroom in ICT environment. *Open Education Research*, 19(1), 58–64.

Zorwick, L. W., & Wade, J. M. (2016). Enhancing civic education through the use of assigned advocacy, argumentation, and debate across the curriculum. *Communication Education*, 65(4), 434–444. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2016.1203005>

