

BASKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING MASTER'S PROGRAM

**TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING REVISITED: EXAMINING EFL
INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS, AWARENESS AND PREFERENCES**

BY
İLKNUR ACAR

MASTER THESIS

ANKARA – 2024

BASKENT UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEACHING
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING MASTER'S PROGRAM

**TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING REVISITED: EXAMINING EFL
INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS, AWARENESS AND PREFERENCES**

BY
İLKNUR ACAR

MASTER THESIS

THESIS ADVISOR

ASST. PROF. DR. SEVGİ ŞAHİN

ANKARA – 2024

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı çerçevesinde İlkur ACAR tarafından hazırlanan bu çalışma aşağıdaki jüri tarafından yüksek lisans tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Tez Savunma Tarihi: 06 / 06 / 2024

Tez Adı: Görev Tabanlı Dil Öğretimi Yaklaşımına Yeniden Bir Bakış: İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Algıları, Farkındalıkları ve Tercihleri

Tez Jüri Üyeleri (Unvanı, Adı - Soyadı, Kurumu)

İmza

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Sevgi Şahin, Başkent Üniversitesi

.....

Prof. Dr. Nuray Alagozlu, Hacettepe Üniversitesi

.....

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Gözde Balıkcı, Başkent Üniversitesi

.....

ONAY

Prof. Dr. Servet ÖZDEMİR

Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Müdürü

Tarih: .../.../2024

BAŞKENT ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ORJİNALLİK RAPORU

Tarih: 28/ 06/ 2024

Öğrencinin Adı, Soyadı : İlknur ACAR
Öğrencinin Numarası : 22120306
Anabilim Dalı : Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
Programı : İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı
Danışmanın Adı, Soyadı : Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sevgi Şahin
Tez Başlığı : Görev Tabanlı Dil Öğretimi Yaklaşımına Yeniden Bir
Bakış: İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Algı, Farkındalıkları ve Tercihleri

Yukarıda başlığı belirtilen Yüksek Lisans tez çalışmamın; Giriş, Ana Bölümler ve Sonuç Bölümünden oluşan, toplam 93 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 30.05.2026 tarihinde şahsım/tez danışmanım tarafından Turnitin adlı intihal tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan orijinallik raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı % 11'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

1. Kaynakça hariç
2. Alıntılar hariç
3. Beş (5) kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

“Başkent Üniversitesi Enstitüleri Tez Çalışması Orijinallik Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Usul ve Esasları”nı inceledim ve bu uygulama esaslarında belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına tez çalışmamın herhangi bir intihal içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Öğrenci İmzası

ONAY

Tarih:

Öğrenci Danışmanı Unvan, Ad, Soyad, İmza:

*To my dearest nieces and nephews;
Kuzey, Enis, Eymen, Uras, Defne, Ela, Deniz, Sarp, Aybars*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my eternal gratitude to the following individuals, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. Their invaluable guidance and unwavering support have been instrumental in bringing this work to fruition.

First and foremost, I extend my heartfelt thanks to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Sevgi Şahin, for her encouragement, guidance, and steadfast support throughout the entirety of this thesis. Her significant contributions, insightful criticism, and sessions of encouragement during the most challenging times were crucial. This study owes its completion to her support and her profound passion for research. It has been an honor to embark on my academic journey with her mentorship, which has been a source of immense motivation.

I am also deeply grateful to my superiors, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Abdullah Ertaş and Dr. Reza Vahdani SANAVİ, for their exceptional guidance and support. Their encouragement and invaluable input were always available whenever I needed assistance, both during my thesis writing process and beforehand. Their willingness to spare their valuable time for me has been greatly appreciated.

Moreover, I would like to express my profound gratitude to the distinguished members of my thesis advisory committee, Prof. Dr. Nuray Alagözlü and Assistant Professor Dr. Gözde Balıkçı, for their helpful criticism, thought-provoking questions, and incredibly helpful suggestions, all of which have greatly aided in the completion of this dissertation.

My deepest thanks go to my family, who have been my unwavering support throughout this process. Their understanding, motivation, and encouragement enabled me to persevere and complete this thesis. Their presence provided me with the calm and inspiration needed to achieve my goals. Thank you for believing in me and for not letting me give up on myself. I would like to extend a special thanks to my sisters, who always believed in me throughout this process and never let me fall during times of exhaustion and weariness. Thank you a thousand times for believing in me more than I believed in myself. Life would always be much harder without you.

I am profoundly grateful and want to extend my heartfelt thanks to my dearest friends, Seda Fulya Yakut, Duygu Dalaslan, Yasemin Arşın, Merve Öksüzoğlu, Pınar Kalkan, Sema Gündoğdu, and Demet Ünal. They spent countless hours soothing,

encouraging, and uplifting me during difficult times. Their endless understanding, support, and positive comments at every step of the way have been invaluable throughout the entire process of this thesis. They were always there to cheer me up during the hardest moments and patiently showed their understanding when I was in need. Your presence during this process was so important to me, reminding me repeatedly of the friendships I have built and how fortunate I am. I am grateful to all of you for this.

ÖZET
GÖREV TABANLI DİL ÖĞRETİMİ YAKLAŞIMINA YENİDEN BİR BAKIŞ:
İNGİLİZCE EĞİTMENLERİNİN ALGILARI, FARKINDALIKLARI VE
TERCİHLERİ

Başkent Üniversitesi
Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

2024

Görev Tabanlı Dil Öğretimi (GTDÖ), yabancı dil öğretiminde öne çıkan bir yaklaşımdır ve gerçek hayat dil kullanımını teşvik etmede etkilidir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmanın amacı yabancı dil öğretimi yapan öğretim elemanlarının GTDÖ'nün Türkiye'deki hazırlık okullarında uygulamasına ilişkin farkındalıklarını, tercihlerini ve bakış açılarını araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla, araştırmacı bir Likert ölçeği anketi oluşturmuş ve Ankara, Türkiye'deki farklı hazırlık okullarında çalışan 201 EFL öğretmeninden bilgi toplamıştır. Veriler, tanımlayıcı ve çıkarımsal istatistikler kullanılarak analiz edilmiş ve bulgular, GTDÖ eğitimi konusunda farkındalığın yüksek olan katılımcılar ile GTDÖ hakkındaki olumlu algı arasında bağlantılı olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, çalışma, öğretmenlerin GTDÖ ile ilgili olumlu görüşlerinin, öğrenci merkezli bir metodoloji olaması, işbirlikçi öğrenme ve gerçek dünya iletişimini teşvik eden bir yöntem olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Tam tersine, olumsuz görüşler arasında ise kalabalık sınıflar, GTDÖ'ye ya da grup çalışmasına aşına olmayan öğrenciler, ve sınıfta GTDÖ uygulaması için kaynak eksikliği yer almıştır. Öğretim görevlilerinin tercihlerine göre, özellikle GTDÖ eğitimi almış öğretmenler arasında, konuşma dersleri GTDÖ uygulamak için en çok tercih edilen beceri olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Her şey göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, çalışma, Türkiye'deki EFL öğretmenlerinin GTDÖ hakkındaki görüşleri, deneyimleri ve tercihleri hakkında değerli bilgiler sunmaktadır. Dil eğitimi müfredatlarının ve mesleki gelişim programlarının tasarımı bu verilerden faydalanabilir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Görev Tabanlı Dil Öğretimi, GTDÖ, İngilizce Dil Öğretimi, İngilizce Öğitmenleri, Nicel Araştırma.

ABSTRACT

TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING REVISITED: EXAMINING EFL INSTRUCTORS' PERCEPTIONS, AWARENESS AND PREFERENCES

**Başkent University
Institute of Educational Sciences
Department of Foreign Language Teaching
English Language Teaching Master's Program**

2024

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a prominent approach to teaching foreign languages and is effective in encouraging real-world and authentic language use. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the awareness, preferences, and perspectives of EFL instructors about TBLT and its implementation in Turkey. To this end, the researcher constructed a Likert-scale survey and gathered information from 201 EFL teachers employed by different preparatory schools in Ankara, Turkey. Data were analyzed through descriptive and inferential statistics and the findings show that greater familiarity and favorable perceptions were connected with TBLT training. Besides, the study highlighted the teachers' favorable opinions of TBLT as a student-centered methodology that fosters collaborative learning and real-world communication. Conversely, negative views included big class sizes, students who weren't familiar with TBLT or group work, and a lack of resources for TBLT implementation in the classroom. In line with their preference, speaking lessons were found to be the most desirable skill to apply for TBLT, particularly among teachers who had received formal TBLT training. All things considered, the study provides valuable insights into the views, experiences, and preferences of EFL instructors in Turkey about TBLT. The design of language education curricula and professional development programs may benefit from the use of this data.

Keywords: Task-Based Language Teaching, TBLT, EFL Instructors, Quantitative Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | VI |
| ÖZET | VIII |
| ABSTRACT | X |
| CHAPTER 1..... | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1. Background Of The Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2. Statement Of The Problem..... | 3 |
| 1.3. Purpose Of The Study..... | 6 |
| 1.4. The Significance Of The Study..... | 7 |
| CHAPTER 2..... | 10 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW | 10 |
| 2.1. Introduction | 10 |
| 2.2. History of Learning English as a Foreign Language | 11 |
| 2.3. Task-Based Language Teaching | 11 |
| 2.4. Definition and Characteristics of a Task | 13 |
| 2.6. Stages of Tasks | 19 |
| 2.7. Task Components | 20 |
| 2.9. Syllabi | 23 |
| 2.10. Principles of TBLT | 24 |
| 2.11. Implementations of TBLT | 25 |
| 2.12. Benefits of TBLT | 26 |
| 2.13. Possible Challenges of TBLT | 27 |
| 2.14. Teacher Cognition | 27 |
| 2.15. Relevant Studies | 29 |
| CHAPTER 3..... | 35 |
| METHODOLOGY | 35 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 3.1. Introduction | 35 |
| 3.2. Research Design | 35 |
| 3.3. Setting | 37 |
| 3.4. Sampling | 38 |
| 3.5. Participants | 40 |
| 3.6. Data Collection Instrument | 42 |
| 3.6.1 Questionnaire | 42 |
| 3.7. Data Collection Procedure | 44 |
| 3.7.1 Constructing and piloting the data collection tool | 44 |
| 3.8. Data Analysis Procedure | 48 |
| CHAPTER 4..... | 50 |
| FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION | 50 |
| 4.1.1. Research Question 1: To What Extent Are ELF Instructors Working At Preparatory Schools In Türkiye Familiar With TBLT? | 53 |
| 4.1.2. Research Question 2: What Are The Perceptions Of ELF Instructors Working At Preparatory Schools In Türkiye On TBLT? | 55 |
| 4.1.3. Research Question 3: Are There Any Statistically Significant Differences In The Instructors' Familiarity With TBLT, As Well As Positive And Negative Perceptions Of TBLT, Depending On The Following Variables? | 59 |
| Research Question 3.1.1: Years Of Teaching Experience | 59 |
| 4.1.4. Research Question 3.1.2: The Status Of Professional Development In TBLT | 61 |
| 4.1.5. Research Question 3.1.3: Educational Background | 62 |
| Research Question 3.1.3.1: Type Of Degree | 62 |
| 4.1.6. Research Question 3.1.3.2: Department For Each Degree (BA And MA) | 64 |
| 4.1.7. Research Question 4: Are There Any Statistically Significant Differences Between The Instructors' Preferences For Applying TBLT In Teaching Grammar, Vocabulary, Reading, Listening, Speaking, And Writing Skills, Depending On The Following Variables? | 66 |
| Research Question 4.1.1: Years Of Teaching Experience | 67 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Research Question 4.1.2: The Type Of The Institution Currently Working: Private Or Public | 68 |
| Research Question 4.1.3: The Status Of Professional Development In TBLT | 69 |
| Research Question 4.1.4: Educational Background | 71 |
| Research Question 4.1.4.1: Type Of Degree | 71 |
| Research Question 4.1.4.2: Department For BA And MA Degree | 73 |
| 4.2. Discussion | 76 |
| 4.2.1. Research Question 1: To What Extent Are ELF Instructors Working At Preparatory Schools In Türkiye Familiar With TBLT? | 76 |
| 4.2.2. Research Question 2: What Are The Perceptions Of ELF Instructors Working At Preparatory Schools In Türkiye On TBLT? | 78 |
| 4.2.3. Research Question 3: Are There Any Statistically Significant Differences In The Instructors' Familiarity With TBLT And Positive And Negative Perceptions Of TBLT, Depending On The Following Variables? | 80 |
| Research Question 3.1.1: Years Of Teaching Experience | 80 |
| 4.2.4 Research Question 3.1.2: The Status Of Professional Development In TBLT..... | 81 |
| 4.2.5 Research Question 3.1.4: Educational Background | 82 |
| Research Question 3.1.4.1: Type Of Degree | 82 |
| 4.2.6. Research Question 3.1.4.2: Department For Each Degree (BA And MA) | 83 |
| 4.2.7. Research Question 4: Are There Any Statistically Significant Differences Between The Instructors' Preferences For Applying TBLT In Teaching Grammar, Vocabulary, Reading, Listening, Speaking, And Writing Skills, Depending On The Following Variables? | 84 |
| Research Question 4.1.1: Years Of Teaching Experience | 84 |
| Research Question 4.1.2: The Type Of Institution Currently Working: Private Or Public | 85 |
| 4.2.8. Research Question 4.1.3: The Status Of Professional Development In TBLT | 85 |
| 4.2.9. Research Question 4.1.4: Educational Background | 86 |
| Research Question 4.1.4.1: Type Of Degree | 86 |
| 4.1.10. Research Question 4.1.4.2: Department For BA And MA Degree | 87 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| CHAPTER 5 | 88 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 88 |
| 5.1 Overview Of The Study | 88 |
| 5.2. Pedagogical Implications Of The Study | 89 |
| 5.2.1. Implications For Educators And Policymakers | 90 |
| 5.3. Limitations Of The Study And Suggestions For Further Research | 93 |
| REFERENCES | 94 |
| APPENDICES | 111 |
| APPENDIX 1- ETHIC COMMITTEE APPROVAL..... | 111 |
| APPENDIX 2 – FIRST DRAFT OF AWARENESS, PERCEPTION, AND PREFERENCES SURVEY ON TBLT FOR INSTRUCTORS WORKING AT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN ANKARA TURKİYE | 113 |
| APPENDIX 3 – FINAL VERSION OF AWARENESS, PERCEPTION, AND PREFERENCES SURVEY ON TBLT FOR INSTRUCTORS WORKING AT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN ANKARA TURKİYE | 119 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|----------------|--|----|
| Table 3.3.1. | The List of Preparatory Schools of Universities in Ankara Attending the Survey | 37 |
| Table 3.3.2. | Institution Types of the Preparatory Schools of Universities in Ankara... | 38 |
| Table 3.5.1. | The Demographic Information of the Participants | 40 |
| Table 3.5.2. | The Degree Department Information of the Participants | 41 |
| Table 4.1. | Normality Tests of Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT | 50 |
| Table 4.1.2. | Research Questions and Data Analysis | 50 |
| Table 4.1.1.1. | Descriptive Statistics of Familiarity with TBLT | 53 |
| Table 4.1.1.2. | Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Awareness of ELF Instructors Working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT | 54 |
| Table 4.1.2.1. | Descriptive Statistics of Familiarity with TBLT and the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Years of Experience | 55 |
| Table 4.1.2.2. | Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Positive Perspective of ELF Instructors working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT | 56 |
| Table 4.1.2.3. | Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Negative Perspective of ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT | 58 |
| Table 4.1.3.1. | Descriptive statistics of Familiarity with TBLT and the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Years of Experience | 60 |
| Table 4.1.4.1. | Descriptive Statistics of the Descriptive Statistics Related to the Instructors' Familiarity with TBLT, and Positive and Negative Perceptions Related to TBLT Based on the Status of Professional Development in TBLT..... | 61 |
| Table 4.1.5.1. | Descriptive Statistics of the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having an MA Degree or Not. | 63 |
| Table 4.1.5.2. | Descriptive Statistics of the Familiarity with TBLT, and Both Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having a Ph.D. Degree or Not. | 63 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 4.1.6.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Positive and Negative Perception of the Instructors ... Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having a BA Degree in ELT or Not..... | 64 |
| Table 4.1.6.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Familiarity and Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Having an MA Degree in ELT or Not..... | 65 |
| Table 4.1.7.1 Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Instructors' Preferences of ELF Instructors Working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT | 66 |
| Table 4.1.7.2. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Years of Experience | 67 |
| Table 4.1.7.3. Cross-tabulation of All skill preferences and Years of Experience..... | 69 |
| Table 4.1.7.4. Cross-tabulation of all Skills Preferences to Use TBLT and the Status of Professional Development in TBLT | 70 |
| Table 4.1.7.5. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a MA Degree or Not | 71 |
| Table 4.1.7.6. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a Ph.D. Degree or Not | 72 |
| Table 4.1.7.7. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a Ph.D. Degree or Not | 73 |
| Table 4.1.7.8. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having an MA Degree in the ELT Department..... | 75 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|---|----|
| Figure 1. A Triadic of Task Complexity, Task Conditions, and Task Difficulty Factors (Robinson, 2005: 5) | 15 |
| Figure 2. Taxonomy of Task Types in Willis and Willis (2007)..... | 19 |

SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|----------------|---|
| FLL: | Foreign Language learning |
| SLA: | Second Language Acquisition |
| TBLT: | Task-Based Language Teaching |
| EFL: | English as a foreign language |
| CLT: | Communicative Language Teaching |
| SPSS: | Statistical Package for the Social Sciences |
| MANOVA: | Multivariate Analysis of Variance |
| BA: | Bachelor of Arts |
| MA: | Master of Arts |
| Ph.D: | Doctor of Philosophy |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses the background of the study, the statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study, and the research questions.

1.1. Background of the Study

Foreign language learning (FLL) is highly sought upon a global scale. As just a direct consequence, much research has been conducted on how to effectively provide learners with high-quality language instructions. In response to societal changes and the rapidly growing demands of learning a foreign language, approaches to teaching or learning a foreign language have evolved over time and a number of academics in the domain of second language acquisition (SLA) and second language (L2) pedagogy (e.g., Skinner, Chomsky, Long, Ellis, and Larsen-Freeman) have debated alternatives to traditionally defined linguistic units of curriculum content and sequencing (Robinson, 2005).

In recent years, considering communication is so crucial and a language is a tool that we mainly utilize in our daily lives to interact orally, the focus of language instruction has changed to building communication skills. In addition, the status of English as a lingua franca, therefore, the growing demand for English study has led countries to update their language policies with new implementations and strategies in response to this need. This has shifted the focus of language study toward oral competency rather than structural-based, empirical descriptions of form-oriented, teacher-dominated second language instructional practices (Long & Norris, 2000). Under these asserts, TBLT has drawn a lot of interest from scholars and educators in recent decades, and its application has been a significant global educational policy project. (TESOL International Association, n.d.).

TBLT has been pinned on a theory of language learning and acquisition rather than simply presuming language structure and puts an emphasis on meaning rather than grammatical rules in the target language (Skehan & Foster, 2001). As a result, it's regarded as a fluency-based method that emphasizes the importance of meaning in language learning, with tasks designed to promote communication and meaning negotiation (Riestenberg & Sherris, 2018). Furthermore, TBLT adjusts language learning by

emphasizing students' active participation. It emphasizes the "student-centered" and "learning by doing" models, demands language use or production through interaction, and makes language training significantly more realistic and empirical by providing students with real-world tasks. (Liu, Huang, 2017).

Furthermore, as reported by Long (2016), TBLT is still an innovative concept that successfully meets the demands of learners and might even be highly advantageous for language learners when implemented appropriately. Success is more likely in programs offered by organizations with a student group that is generally eager and a teaching staff that is talented, resilient, and experienced. It is also more likely in cultures where language learning is valued and supported precisely (Brown & Lee, 2007). Because of this, the understanding and perception of teachers on TBLT gains more importance to implement it via suitable tasks.

On the other hand, even though task-based learning is widely used in language instruction, there are still many obstacles to overcome, such as crowded classrooms, developing real task-based materials, class management issues, and structuring efficient syllabi. (Sparks, 2010) These problems are critical to TBLT's success but have not been fixed yet (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). Many Second Language Acquisition (SLA) scholars are reorienting their attention from task definition to improved task sequencing and implementation based on real-world classroom observations to solve these challenges (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). Nonetheless, Butler (2011) asserts that despite an increasing amount of research detailing diverse TBLT implementation initiatives in distinct places, our comprehension of the most effective ways to apply or adapt it in classrooms remains restricted.

In a similar vein, officials in Turkey's National Education system have prioritized English language acquisition, particularly in recent times. Indeed, the curricula have been restructured to include English instruction starting in the second grade of elementary school. Unfortunately, the success of students in foreign languages is much behind expectations considering hundreds of hours of English instruction from elementary school to university education (Arslan, Akbarov, 2010) High school English teachers tend to pay less attention to speaking, listening, and writing since these areas are not evaluated on the university entrance exam as noted in the research by Erten and Altay (2009). Due to this, students usually have few opportunities to improve their speaking, listening, and writing skills outside of the classroom. As a result, when students get to university, they either

don't learn English to the appropriate level or, even if they do, they feel unqualified to demonstrate the abilities required for communication, despite having adequate knowledge of grammar and vocabulary.

Furthermore, while analyzing the objectives of students enrolled in university preparation courses, it is important to note that they are learning English not just for general language proficiency but also for use in certain professional or academic contexts. In this line, teaching students the necessary language skills and helping them become competent speakers of the target language to communicate well will be quite effective for their future careers (Demiray, 2009). All in all, the aforementioned circumstance would suggest that university preparatory school students discern a demand for more interactive and communicative language instruction, such as TBLT.

To conclude, TBLT enhances language output in a more advanced and consistent way (Willies, 1996) and it may be regarded as a very useful instrument for strengthening language instruction and has a great deal of potential to improve foreign language education in Türkiye as well considering all of the above information. However, it is apparent that further study is required to fully understand the difficulties, attitudes, and use of TBLT. Thus, the main focus of this study is to examine the perceptions, awareness and preferences of TBLT among EFL instructors, how they utilize TBLT in the classroom, and the factors that enable or hinder its implementation.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

TBLT is a method that emerged from discontent with traditional teaching methodologies, which placed a strong emphasis on explicit grammar and vocabulary. It is based on a combination of principles originating from education philosophy, second language acquisition theories, and the communicative need for language instruction in current society. Task-based learning has a direct impact on students' performance and proficiency in the English language and engages them in real-life communication tasks for language acquisition. Hence, tasks are crucial because they improve the foreign language curriculum by motivating students and focusing both instructors' and learners' attention on meaningful, communicative language usage (Sánchez Pérez, 2004). As a result, task-based activities encourage authentic language usage, while also developing collaborative

behaviors and providing opportunities for real-world usage that are required for genuine English language use.

However, Seven states that many universities still employ traditional teaching approaches (2007). Conventional classroom procedures and practices are the primary cause of students' inability to utilize or create the target language at all because Language acquisition entails more than simply comprehending rules and structures; it necessitates the capacity to utilize language effectively to convey and communicate intended meanings. Embracing a teacher-centered learning environment in which the instructor functions as a leader and transmitter of information to students lowers their participation, causes a lack of engagement in such classes, and leads to a drop in their success rate. Comprehensive, precise, and well-organized courses and preparation are required to instruct a foreign language to a group of students. The lessons must be structured in such a way that nearly every student in the class gets the opportunity to put into practice their language while also being motivated to join in and get involved in the exercises because language learning occurs only when students become active participants (Long & Doughty, 2009). Therefore, tasks that are organized properly and meet both the needs of learners and educational goals will be beneficial to deal with these problems. Students will enhance communication abilities by attempting to speak as interaction engages the mental systems involved in input and output processing, resulting in acquisition (Long, 1996).

Similarly, in Türkiye, the general objective of preparatory schools is to teach English to young adults at a level that will be required over the following years at university and after graduation. However, the findings reveal that English language learning has not achieved the expected results in Türkiye (Akyel & Ozek, 2010), students in foreign language preparation programs cannot attain the desired level of English and are deficient in the outputs of four major skills, which are listening, writing, reading and particularly speaking (Karcı Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020). The fundamental reason is that the foreign language education system in Turkey primarily stresses linguistic structures and forms, resulting in a particular emphasis on grammar lessons. According to Kırtaş (2016), despite learning English throughout their life, students do not have adequate knowledge of the language during their first year of university or preparatory school, which provides either mandatory or optional English study. (Tümen Akyıldız & Tayşı, 2017; Karcı Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2018). Another key aspect contributing to this problem is poor classroom involvement, which affects pupils' success levels. Learners tend to remain mute out of

anxiety about humiliation since traditional teaching approaches further decrease their engagement. That's why, learning a language becomes a test of memorization of structures and error avoidance instead of being a meaningful communicative activity.

Instructors who are conscious of this also stated emphatically that such skill-based sessions are insufficient (Karcı Aktaş & Gündoğdu, 2020). Even though there are acknowledged issues with the application of traditional techniques, some instructors appear to disregard TBLT simply because they aren't entirely familiar with its principles and find it hard to select, produce, or deploy appropriate tasks and carry them out in classrooms (Long, 2016). These ideas are frequently the result of a lack of awareness about TBLT. It is acceptable for instructors to shun the TBLT method if they do not completely grasp it and do not feel equipped to implement it in a language learning context, despite its deficiencies in ways that they have become acquainted with. Another reason for this mindset is that instructors recognize that Turkey's current assessment system may not be ideal for implementing TBLT in classrooms. When considering the subject of language testing and evaluation in Turkey, it is noticed that the educational system is particularly exam-oriented (Hatipoğlu, 2010, as cited in Şahin, 2019), because students are required to take various types of tests at nearly every stage of the educational system. To illustrate, their comprehension and skills are evaluated through required in-class assessments like quizzes and midterms, as well as through the use of conventional evaluation methods like fill-in-the-blank, matching, true-false, short-answer, and multiple-choice questions when evaluating the proficiency of learners in languages (Han & Kaya, 2014; Haznedar, 2012; Köksal, 2004; Kömür, 2018). Also, it is indisputable that one of the main motives why students attempt to study a foreign language in Turkey is to succeed in future exams, which then leads to a negative washback effect for learners. As a result, certain instructors opt to simply prepare learners for impending examinations by giving them just enough material to pass such exams. This results in productive skills like speaking or receptive skills like listening being overlooked, even though they are critical for communication, which ought to be the centerpiece of the acquiring process, but unfavorably they do not generally have a place in the tests listed above.

To put it simply, even while EFL teachers understand the need to use a variety of teaching strategies to promote successful real-world communication, there are still not enough studies that are especially concerned with TBLT in Turkey. Few studies have examined EFL instructors' opinions on TBLT in their instructional practices, despite the

increasing corpus of research on TBLT (Liu & Ren, 2021). Therefore, it is crucial to accept the legitimacy of teachers' perspectives about TBLT in the real world (Barnard & Nguyen, 2010). This disparity remains despite various research on ELT methodologies in general. Similarly, there has been limited research on EFL instructors' perspectives on TBLT in Türkiye. Furthermore, these investigations have just recently emerged. In this regard, there is a considerable need for additional studies in this field, particularly to acquire insights into teacher cognition. Comprehending teacher cognition is crucial at this point because it has a significant impact on the practices, preferences, and choices that instructors make in the classroom.

As Sánchez Pérez (2004) pointed out, before using TBLT in the classroom, further study is urgently required to produce fresh ideas and strong proof. It is critical to concentrate on comprehending the ideas underpinning TBLT, investigating how instructors perceive employing it in their teaching, and figuring out why they opt to use or avoid this method. Additionally, Both Liu and Ren (2021) and Aliasin et al. (2019) underlined the importance of larger-scale research including several EFL instructors from different locations to better understand how EFL teachers perceive TBLT. This draws attention to a serious absence in the research on EFL instructors' opinions on TBLT and its use. Evidence from the analysis of research must be produced to determine with accuracy if TBLT is perceived negatively or positively in Turkey. Furthermore, knowing why teachers choose to use TBLT might help direct future studies and enhancements to methods of teaching. Therefore, this study is important because it attempts to close this knowledge gap and offers insightful information on how TBLT is used and perceived by EFL teachers in Turkey.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate EFL instructors' perceptions, awareness and preferences of TBLT and their perceived TBLT practices in their classrooms. It also tries to clarify the factors that hinder or encourage instructors' use of TBLT in their classrooms. In this respect, the study seeks to find answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent are EFL instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye familiar with TBLT?
2. What are the perceptions of EFL instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT?

3. Are there any statistically significant differences in the instructors' familiarity with TBLT and perception of TBLT, depending on the following variables?
 - 3.1.1. Years of teaching experience
 - 3.1.2. The status of professional development in TBLT
 - 3.1.3. Educational background
 - 3.1.3.1. Type of degree
 - 3.1.3.2. Department for BA and MA degree
4. Are there any statistically significant differences between the instructors' preferences of applying TBLT in teaching grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills, depending on the following variables?
 - 4.1.1. Years of teaching experience
 - 4.1.2. The type of the institution currently working: private or public
 - 4.1.3. The status of professional development in TBLT
 - 4.1.4. Educational background
 - 4.1.4.1. Type of degree
 - 4.1.4.2. Department for BA and MA degree

1.4. The Significance of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to carry out a thorough analysis of the perceptions and comprehension levels of TBLT among teachers in preparatory schools. This study uses a Likert scale survey to examine several facets of TBLT from the viewpoint of EFL teachers in preparatory schools. It also investigates professional experience, educational background, and institutional environment to determine their influence on teachers' views, knowledge, and preferences about TBLT. Thus, especially in light of Türkiye, this study contributes significantly to the body of knowledge on foreign language instruction in preparatory schools in several ways.

Firstly, this research offers insightful information on teaching EFL in preparatory schools, which is particularly relevant given Türkiye's present focus on enhancing foreign language instruction to fulfill national goals for raising the quality of education. The findings provide a basis for future EFL instruction advancements by investigating how EFL teachers perceive and employ TBLT in actual classroom contexts.

Second, this study aims to considerably expand professional knowledge by diving into the fundamental reasons why university preparatory schools in Türkiye either use or avoid TBLT as a method for teaching English as a foreign language. Through a detailed analysis, the study also sheds light on the several variables impacting instructors' perceptions and awareness including institutional type, educational background, and years of experience. At that point, policymakers and educators who are committed to improving the quality of English language instruction in Turkish preparatory schools can benefit greatly from this current research's findings to shape more successful educational policies and teaching practices that address both national educational goals and the practical realities of classroom instruction.

Third, this research fills a key gap in the literature by examining how Turkish EFL instructors perceive TBLT across a range of school grades and educational levels. This gap has been noted in an earlier study by Akbulut (2014), suggesting that a more thorough comprehension of Turkish EFL instructors' perspectives and interactions with TBLT is necessary. This study presents a complete investigation of teachers' understanding and views of TBLT, focusing on how these instructors perceive the utility and implementation of TBLT in their classrooms. Furthermore, it dives into the particular challenges that Turkish EFL teachers have while attempting to use TBLT. The study raises awareness of the practical challenges faced by educators, including few resources, inadequate training, and packed classrooms while implementing innovative teaching techniques. This comprehensive investigation provides illumination on the current status of TBLT implementation in Turkish preparatory schools along with offering valuable data that can be used to develop curriculum, teacher training programs, and educational policies that will improve TBLT's utilization and efficacy in Türkiye's different educational settings.

Finally, the study emphasizes the importance of instructors in language learning classrooms, which is sometimes surpassed by a focus on pupils. Teachers have a big impact on students' language learning processes since they serve as facilitators, participants, evaluators, tutors, motivators, organizers, and resource providers (Harmer, 2007). Creating a favorable learning environment requires them to make decisions and behave in ways that are influenced by their experiences, beliefs, and perceptions (Borg, 2006). As a result, the study examines the multiple aspects of teacher cognition (Li, 2020), examining how external and internal factors influence teachers' decisions and practices in

the classroom as a result of the interaction between teacher cognition and classroom practices, which impacts instruction for language teachers (Borg, 2019).

In conclusion, TBLT incorporates beneficial methods into communicative language education, and this study gives important academic insights into TBLT implementation. The findings are significant because they provide a foundation for more investigation into instructors' knowledge, perspectives, and pragmatic explanations for embracing or avoiding TBLT in the classroom. All things considered, this study not only improves EFL instructors' comprehension of TBLT but also has practical implications for enhancing language teaching practices and regulations at preparatory schools in Türkiye.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides an in-depth review of task-based language teaching (TBLT), encompassing details regarding its foundation, benefits challenges, utilization, and implementation in the teaching of English. The paper additionally delves into research on EFL instructors' views on TBLT. After delivering an overview of the history of English language learning as a foreign language, the literature review presents the key concepts regarding tasks and task-based language education. The implementation of tasks in teaching practice is then described, along with an examination of the roles that instructors and students play in TBLT instruction. The chapter concludes with an examination of research on teaching English with TBLT in Turkey and abroad.

2.1. Introduction

Learning a new language has been a significant concern throughout the centuries, and it is a challenging and sophisticated, yet sometimes troublesome issue for some people due to the fact that the nature of language itself has no consistent grounds and continually shifts, revising, and renewing itself in response to changes in culture. People have always felt the need to study a foreign language, albeit the reasons have varied. Aside from the many motives for learning a foreign language, there have also been variations in the level of ability required. These modifications in the types of competencies have directly necessitated adjustments in teaching approaches. Chomsky's theory of universal grammar, for example, proposes that people have an underlying aptitude for language that permits them to acquire and utilize language despite changes in the linguistic information they receive. This concept has significance for language teaching and learning because it argues that learners may benefit from training that is personalized to their own needs and skills. Richards and Rodgers (2001) also acknowledge this by stressing the need of changing language teaching techniques throughout history as learners' needs and competencies changed. They characterized this shift as a transition from reading comprehension to communication and meaning articulation competency, along with changes in language theory and language acquisition.

2.2. History of Learning English as a Foreign Language

English as a second language (ESL) education can be traced back to the 16th century, when English-speaking colonizers began to settle in non-English speaking territories. However, it wasn't until the 20th century that ESL education became more widely recognized and formalized (Canagarajah, 2006). During the 20th century, ESL education underwent significant changes due to political and social developments. The two World Wars and the rise of globalization resulted in a need for better communication between countries, and English became the de facto language of international communication (Crystal, 2003). As a result, ESL education became more generally acknowledged as a desirable talent. The emergence of structural linguistics and behaviorist theories of language acquisition in the mid-20th century had a significant influence on the area of ESL instruction. These ideas highlighted the need for drilling and repetition, and ESL teaching techniques concentrated largely on grammar and vocabulary (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In the latter half of the 20th century, communicative language teaching (CLT) emerged as a more student-centered approach to ESL education. CLT focused on developing students' communicative competence through meaningful interactions and real-life situations (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). The approach paved the door for a wide range of methodologies and procedures. In this sense, task-based language teaching may be considered a communicative approach since it shares the majority of the concepts of communicative language teaching. (Ellis, 2003; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

2.3. Task-Based Language Teaching

The concept of TBLT was first introduced by N. Prabhu in Southern India in 1987, who put forward that students learn a second language more efficiently when they focus on meaningful tasks rather than linguistic forms. This method entails the practical application of the target language, putting students at the center of the teaching process and encouraging active communication. TBLT received widespread attention as an alternative to the Presentation, Practice, and Production (PPP) model, which had limitations in encouraging real language usage (Ellis, 2003). Many scholars such as Willis and Willis (2007) believe that TBLT is preferable due to its solid theoretical and practical basis.

In essence, TBLT is based on Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) ideas and seeks to integrate second language learning theories into methods of instruction (Richards

& Schmidt, 2010). This method views tasks as the primary unit of planning and instruction (Richards & Rodgers, 2002). TBLT is fundamentally learner-centered, viewing language as a tool for communication (Littlewood, 2004). More importantly, with the aid of TBLT, the emphasis has changed toward more learner-centered and teacher-guided techniques, and activities have grown in value since they place learners in meaningful and relevant contexts when using the language, they are attempting to learn. This viewpoint has resulted in an increase in interest in TBLT since the 1980s and has received more attention in the field of foreign language instruction (Hismanoğlu, 2011).

The other significant aspect of TBLT is that it is a method of teaching language that stresses meaning while ignoring form since students do not solely study grammatical rules and linguistic specifics; instead, they should rely on the language itself to accomplish their aim and convey the meaning (Nunan, 2004). This allows teachers to use a powerful type of CLT while also assisting students in achieving communicative objectives by exposing them to real and understandable material. In TBLT classes, students work on activities in pairs or small groups and utilize their own target language experiences. The accomplishment of these tasks results in the application of learners' knowledge and experience in a meaningful conclusion (Hung, 2014). It shows the significance of engaging learners' natural abilities for acquiring language because they interact with language as a creating meaning tool. Through activities, this approach gives students the chance to communicate how they use language (Douglas & Kim, 2014; Le & Nguyen, 2012; Lin & Wu, 2012). This means that learning a language is a process of development that encourages students to communicate and participate in the process rather than focusing on memorization of language drills. It also means that students can effectively use the target language if they are engaged in natural scenarios. Pre-task preparation, prior performance, and post-task feedback are the three cycles that those engaged in task-based lessons cycle experience while engaging in a collaborative learning environment (Skehan, 1996, 2014; D. Willis & Willis, 2007; J. Willis, 1996).

All in all, TBLT has grown to be a prominent method that has captivated the interest of numerous instructors, educational planners, and researchers in the area of the study. TBLT has just been highlighted from multiple perspectives centered around meaning, real-world language usage, and communicative-oriented activities to combine four language abilities and its key feature is fluency in four skills (Ellis, 2003). This common trend has developed into an appropriate model for interactive education and language instruction

approaches. Besides this, TBLT is frequently considered to be a highly successful teaching strategy that outperforms conventional strategies and has been backed by theory and research (Swan, 2005).

2.4. Definition and Characteristics of a Task

A number of linguists and scholars have defined the term task by centering on certain features such as meaning, goal, consequence, or job completion. In line with this, a task has become a more widely recognized phrase in language teaching and learning, resulting in a wide range of meanings. Long (1985) defines a task as “a piece of work which can be performed easily for self or for others to get the benefit” (p. 89). Willis (1996), states a task is “an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose in order to achieve an outcome” (p. 23). According to this view, tasks can help learners use a language meaningfully since language usage is more significant than language practice (Nunan, 2004). A task might be a response to a query or requesting instruction to a get certain location. Similarly, Ellis (2003) defines tasks as meaning-focused language use activities (Lin & Wu, 2012). Nunan (2006) adds that a task as a classroom activity engaging students in processing language with an emphasis on creating meaning for communicative goals. In the same vein, according to Samuda & Bygate (2008), “A task is a holistic activity which engages language use to achieve some non-linguistic outcome while meeting a linguistic challenge, with the overall aim of promoting language learning, through process or product or both” (p. 69). Despite differences in the task definition, communication and meaning-making processes are conceptualized as important regarding all definitions in terms of the nature and successful implementation of task-based language instruction.

Although there are several definitions of a task, they all have some essential characteristics. By modeling real-life scenarios, a task should develop language proficiency and the communicative features of a language. To do this, educators must employ the right resources, according to Skehan (2000). It aids students in comprehending the goal of acquiring the target language, which may boost their enthusiasm and achievement. As students understand the procedure and outcome, they are prompted to participate actively. Students' learning may be hampered if they believe the information has little bearing on their day-to-day activities. As a result, it is essential to make sure that a job is designed with the requirements and interests of the learners in mind. Activities that

involve different communication styles, including cooperation and teamwork, or tasks that build on students' past knowledge should be engaging in the classroom to increase students' passion for learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001, p. 229).

One other feature of a task is the emphasis on meaning. Students working in pairs or groups need to express a message to one another. In other words, they are supposed to convey the meaning, and task completion is expected to be meaning-centered. Their performance is also assessed on this predetermined basis (Ellis, 2003).

Another feature associated with the definitions mentioned previously is that a task must actively involve its learners in the language-learning process. If a task is created in such a manner that it can attract the attention of its audience and ensure the engagement of students, the task's achievement is almost guaranteed (Prabhu, 1987). To motivate learners to participate actively in the language learning process, tasks must be appropriate for their skill levels, engaging, and relevant, with an outcome that contributes to a sense of fulfillment. In order to ensure that, the preparation process should be tailored to the intended audience.

A task must also have a certain organizational design. It comprises three subtasks: pre-task, task cycle, and post-task. The topic and task are carefully explained in the pre-task phase, which helps students understand the next activities and their aims while also allowing them to consider strategies to successfully complete the given task (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Learners use the target language to execute the task during the task cycle. In this section, teachers can employ a variety of activities and exercises that are suited to the lesson goals. Learners have the option to exhibit and compare their outcomes, as well as get comments, during the post-task session.

A further essential component of a task is that it requires cognitive processes. In order to complete a task, learners must choose, classify, arrange, and evaluate information rather than memorize it. According to Ellis (2003), learners attempt to apply cognitive talents such as "listing, providing solutions, classifying, ranking, ordering, and evaluating" (p.10) when performing a particular task or activity.

The discussion of cognitive demand brings up the issue of task complexity. When discussing the concept of a "pedagogical task" related to creating task-based syllabuses, Long (1985) outlines many elements that are critical for evaluating or categorizing many sorts of tasks. These variables include prior knowledge, the number of participants, the

pace, the location, and the duration. Skehan (1996) expands on this conversation by introducing a framework to characterize task complexity as well as challenge that takes into account cognitive demands, encoding complexity, and communication barriers. Further elements influencing language performance and the creation of linguistic tasks were found by Norris and colleagues (1998) and (2002), adding to Skehan's hypothesis. Norris et al. (2002) highlighted three crucial processing factors—coding command, cognitive operations, and communicative adaptability—based on Skehan's (1996) study. The complex interactions between language, cognition, and context are highlighted by these taxonomies as a whole. Robinson (2005) presents a triadic framework delineating task complexity, task conditions, and task difficulty factors, as summarized in Table 2.8.1

Figure 1. A Triadic of Task Complexity, Task conditions, and Task Difficulty Factors (Robinson, 2005: 5)

| Task Complexity (cognitive factors) | Task Conditions (interactional factors) | Task Difficulty (learners factors) |
|--|---|---|
| (a) resource-directing e.g., ± few elements ± Here-and-Now ± no reasoning demands | (a) participation variables e.g., open/closed one-way/two-way convergent/divergent | (a) affective variables e.g., motivation anxiety confidence |
| (b) resource-dispersing e.g., ± planning ± single task ± prior knowledge | (b) participant variables e.g., same/different gender familiar/unfamiliar power/solidarity | (b) ability variables e.g., working memory intelligence aptitude |

Task complexity, according to Robinson (2001), is the result of language learners' attentional, memory, reasoning, and other cognitive demands imposed on them by the structure of the task. This framework clarifies how learner-related factors affect task difficulty, cognitive factors influence task complexity, and interpersonal facets connect to task circumstances. The Triadic Componential Framework, also known as The Cognition Hypothesis, is a comprehensive set of principles that Robinson (2001, 2003, 2005, 2007) advocates for in his works to assess task complexity.

The Triadic Componential Framework, as shown in Table 2, outlines the cognitive demands that are basic to pedagogic tasks and lead to differences in their intrinsic

complexity. The number of stages needed to complete the task—single, dual, or many actions at once—may be a factor in its complexity. The framework also differentiates between how learners perceive the difficulty of a task based on their skills (like intelligence) and sentimental reactions (like anxiety). Task conditions, such as participant grouping (e.g., same vs. different gender) and information flow in the classroom (e.g., one-way versus two-way tasks), should be distinguished from these cognitive demands and assessments of difficulty.

While some critics, including Kuiken and Vedder (2007), have questioned the framework's operational and empirical viability, Robinson (2001) emphasizes the need for more research into the framework's components. He emphasizes the significance of creating criteria for task sequencing within syllabus design that are theoretically supported, empirically validated, and pedagogically practical. Robinson (2005) distinguishes well between learners' perceptions of task difficulty, cognitively defined task complexity, and the interacting factors affecting task performance and he argues that language learners' attentional, memory, reasoning, and other cognitive demands placed on them by task structure are the main reasons for task complexity. Differences in learner performance have been influenced by these variances in information processing demands, which are established by task design.

All in all, as tasks chosen by educators, the integration of their characters and their features enables the study of complex classroom learning and assessment situations in a feasible way. It also is important to look at how three major categories of complexity, difficulty, and condition variables relate to each other both in choosing a task and in preparing a TBLT-based syllabus design.

2.5. Task Types

There are several definitions of a task, but they all agree on a few features that a task should contain. All of these definitions have one thing in common: a task should strengthen learners' language skills and increase the communicative attributes of a language by replicating and modeling real-life circumstances. The instructor's use of materials is critical in TBLT as Breen (1987, p. 23) defines a task as “a range of work plans”. Hence, the major purpose of the tasks is to provide learners with an impression of consciousness and clarity about why they need to learn the target language, which may boost their motivation and, thus, their accomplishment, since involvement and

comprehension of the process and the outcomes motivate learners to be active participants. If students believe that whatever is being taught to them is pointless with no application or value in their daily lives, it might interfere with their learning processes. As a result, while designing a task, one of the most important considerations is to make sure it is suited to the needs and interests of the learners. In this sense, tasks in the classroom must be compelling in order to increase learners' desire to learn through activities that need a range of communication styles such as partnership and cooperation, or tasks that require students to utilize their prior expertise or knowledge. (Richards & Rodgers 2001, p. 229).

One other feature of a task is the emphasis on meaning. Students working in pairs or groups need to express a message to one another. In other words, they are supposed to convey the meaning, and task completion is expected to be meaning-centered. Their performance is also assessed on this predetermined basis (Ellis, 2003).

Another feature associated with the definitions mentioned previously is that a task must actively involve its learners in the language-learning process. If a task is created in such a manner that it can attract the attention of its audience and ensure the engagement of students, the task's achievement is almost guaranteed (Prabhu, 1987). To motivate learners to participate actively in the language learning process, tasks must be appropriate for their skill levels, engaging, and relevant, with an outcome that contributes to a sense of fulfillment. In order to ensure that the preparation process should be tailored to the intended audience.

A task must also have a certain organizational design. It is composed of three subtasks: pre-task, task cycle, and post-task. The topic and task are carefully explained in the pre-task phase, which helps students understand the next activities and their aims while also allowing them to consider strategies to successfully complete the given task (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Learners use the target language to execute the task during the task cycle. In this section, teachers can employ a variety of activities and exercises that are suited to the lesson goals. Learners have the option to exhibit and compare their outcomes, as well as get comments, during the post-task session.

A further essential component of a task is that it requires cognitive processes. In order to complete a task, learners must choose, classify, arrange, and evaluate information rather than memorize it. According to Ellis (2003), learners attempt to apply cognitive talents

such as "listing, providing solutions, classifying, ranking, ordering, and evaluating" (p.10) when performing a particular task or activity.

In an educational setting where TBLT is implemented, it is critical to select an appropriate task that matches the requirements and is appropriate for all learning objectives or learner profiles and it is the responsibility of the teachers to choose and implement the suitable one regarding the audience they are targeting. In the estimation of Willis and Willis (2007, p. 66-111) the list of tasks; listing, ordering, and sorting, comparing and contrasting, finding similarities and differences, problem-solving, sharing experiences, projects, and creative tasks. Willis and Willis (2007) outlines and presents task kinds as follows.

Listing types of tasks are the initial ones. They consist of brainstorming and fact-finding. This sort of task is also the foundation for many easy activities such as quizzes, memory games, and guessing games. The end result is usually a finished list or mental map. These activities can help students enhance their understanding and introductory skills.

Ordering/classifying tasks involve sequencing and hence a more complex cognitive function than listing activities. In these tasks, learners generally receive a list that has been arranged based on certain criteria. Using such activities improves the interpretation abilities of learners as the procedure requires organizing information.

Students are encouraged to assess a situation and provide a reasonable solution through problem-solving exercises. Because the tasks are meant to be realistic, the difficulties are picked to reflect real-life events. Learners are required to utilize their reasoning abilities as well as the top-down strategy to analyze the problem until they achieve a solution that is distinctive to the issue given to them.

Sharing personal experience includes actions such as telling tales and anecdotes. While students exchange their experiences, they get to be a part of other learners' language-learning processes, and this link may assist them to enhance their motivation. Comparing tasks include activities like detecting resemblances and discrepancies. These challenges teach students how to differentiate between two or more similar things. Creative projects allow students to build their own goods after engaging in cognitive processes such as brainstorming and evaluating existing data. Creative exercises also improve students' reasoning and problem-solving abilities.

Projects and creative tasks include a number of activities such as brainstorming, fact-gathering, sorting, arranging, comparing, discovering solutions, and project preparation. The ultimate result is a product. These items can be presented to others or shown publicly. These challenges help learners improve their problem-solving, thinking, and analytical skills. These creative exercises must be appropriate for learners' development of cognition. They should incorporate real-life scenarios to develop learners' communication abilities. In summary, after deciding on a topic, teachers may provide several sorts of tasks that are categorized according to the cognitive processes of the students. (Table 1).

Figure 2. Taxonomy of Task Types in Willis and Willis (2007)

| Task types | Examples of specific tasks |
|------------------------------|---|
| Listing | Brainstorming Fact-finding Games based on listing: quizzes, memory, and guessing. |
| Ordering and sorting | Sequencing Ranking ordering Classifying |
| Comparing and contrasting | Games finding similarities and differences Graphic organizers |
| Problem-solving tasks | Logic problem prediction |
| Projects and creative tasks | Newspaper Posters Survey fantasy |
| Sharing personal experiences | Storytelling Anecdotes Reminiscences |
| Matching | Words and phrases to pictures |

2.6. Stages of Tasks

The task-based language instruction process is divided into three stages (Skehan, 1996, 2014; D. Willis & Willis, 2007; J. Willis, 1996). They are the pre-task stage, the task cycle, and the post-task stage. The teacher presents the sort of activity that students will accomplish and sets the context of the task during the pre-task stage. The instructor stimulates the learner's prior knowledge through a variety of methods, including brainstorming, the use of visual aids, and the discussion of specific points (Ellis, 2003). Students work in pairs and small groups during the task stage, and they get instructed on

the steps to carry out and the directions needed to complete the task. They are engaged in the task's preparation and completion. The teacher observes the class, providing guidance and responding to queries. Learners perform what they're expected to do in writing or orally, while the teacher makes notes on some of the grammatical faults they make. In the post-task stage, learners analyze the outcomes, and the teacher provides comments on the language items to enhance the learner's mindfulness of how to utilize language accurately (Ellis, 2003). The practice of target language and concentration are required during the post-task phase. Linguistic focus entails assessing and understanding target language usage in addition to following learners' correct application of the language. To practice language, students should be given opportunities to engage in tasks that are relevant to the work they completed in the task cycle phase (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

2.7. Task Components

A task has several components. Nunan (1989) defines four key elements: objectives, input, activities, and teacher and student responsibilities. The goal of a task is the underlying reason why students do that particular activity. In simpler terms, goals are the motivations and purposes that drive pupils to complete a task. Goals can be classified based on the desired outcomes. Nunan's (1989, p.49) taxonomy divides goals into communicative goals, socio-cultural goals, learning how to learn goals, and language and cultural awareness goals. To set an example, if the desired outcome involves a development in learners' capacity to articulate their thoughts and emotions, then the goal might be classified as communicative. The term "socio-cultural" refers to an activity that makes use of everyday patterns to establish a connection between the language being studied and the student's everyday conversations. Based on the results, an additional exercise may focus on empowering students to take an active role in the language they are studying and enable them to establish individual learning objectives for every student. Since they provide students the ability to take charge of their language learning process, these objectives are known as learning how to learn goals. Tasks having a language and culture awareness purpose are those that aim to raise learners' awareness of the language they are using. Developing a common language is one basic purpose, but other more specialized goals may include language for biology, history, medicine, or literature.

The second component of a task, input, is critical since it is necessary to start the activity. According to Nunan (1989), the input should be as explicit as it can be to ensure

learners do not get demoralized. If the input is not made clear, learners may be discouraged from accomplishing the activity, or it might impair their performance along with the entire process. In order to encourage learners, the input should adhere to several fundamental criteria, such as being suited to their needs and proficiency levels. Second, the material should be drawn from real-world scenarios, as this will reassure students that mastering the language, they are studying serves a purpose and that their efforts are worthwhile and not in vain. Hoover (1986) created a list of the input to name certain of them, letters, newspaper extracts, memo notes, magazine quizzes, high school yearbooks, curriculum vitae, shopping lists, recipes, weather forecasts, etc. The list makes it obvious that the resources utilized to provide input stem from daily life, so students will be convinced of the usefulness of the learning process and the educational opportunities they have had.

The activities applied to task-based education are outlined on the basis of how the students will perform. Some fundamental principles are required to be embedded in the activities. Tasks can be designated as pedagogical and target tasks. Given that TBLT emphasizes the communicative facets of the language, activities must additionally provide learners opportunities for practicing the target language in authentic contexts rather than merely conjuring made-up scenarios. Instead of passively absorbing information, students should be actively engaged in the process.

The significance of communication is emphasized by the task-based approach; thus, the activities should be as engaging as possible whilst placing equal emphasis on accuracy and fluency. Some of the many sorts of communicative action were proposed by Clark (2015, p. 238–239). According to him, activities should promote problem-solving through interpersonal connection, such as grasping vital knowledge through dialogue. Students may look for specialized information during various tasks, among which is the quickest route to an airport. It's possible to write an assignment on what one has learned after several listening and reading exercises. regardless of the activity chosen, it always aims to encourage students to actively participate in social interaction. To accomplish the aforementioned goals, teachers can employ a wide range of activities, including drawings, puzzles, discussions, and role-playing games.

2.8. Teachers' and Students' Roles in TBLT

In Task-Based Learning, learners and instructors play diverse roles. Based on Richards and Rodgers (2002), these roles have been explicitly laid out in order to support

successful learning. The teacher's primary role in TBLT is to guide while they also have a variety of additional duties (Nunan, 1989). Teachers are responsible for selecting, changing, or designing tasks that are tailored to the needs, interests, and skills of their students. In the pre-task stage, they make sure that students comprehend the demands of the assigned task and offer the required clarifications and vocabulary assistance. They aid students in acquiring important words and phrases for task completion and serve as monitors or language advisers throughout the task cycle. Instead of fixing every mistake, teachers encourage students and foster a good learning environment. They additionally provide concise feedback to help students feel more confident. They increase learners' awareness of linguistic elements by utilizing attention-focusing activities, supervised exposures to related tasks. After completing a task, teachers examine language items and activities with the class, providing further practice tasks as needed to improve students' performance. Teacher proficiency in the target language and task-based teaching expertise are prerequisites for carrying out these responsibilities successfully.

Similarly, Nunan (1989) believes that students in a TBLT setting ought to be actively involved in the process of learning by considering and interpreting tasks, particularly throughout the task cycle and post-task stages. Learners actively participate and contribute to their language learning journey by familiarizing themselves with vocabulary items required for task fulfillment. Also, Willis (2007) claims that TBLT students are expected to do tasks and interact with others in the target language. Collaborating and negotiating meaning with peers is encouraged for learners. He also emphasizes how important it is to provide students agency in the classroom by letting them decide how to complete an assignment because they should have freedom during the learning process so they may decide how to complete the assignment and take ownership of their language development and actively participate in their education (Skehan, 1998; Willis, 2007).

To put it simply, in TBLT, there is a collaborative and interactive relationship between teachers and students. Teachers and students work closely together to offer projects that are both hard and meaningful. They offer feedback and support to students to help them advance their language skills. In response, students actively participate in their education by working together to complete tasks and conversing in the target language with their peers. Together, educators and learners assess the educational process and highlight areas in need of development.

Overall, it is made clear that TBLT is a learner-centered methodology in which both teachers and students are crucial players. While students should actively participate in the learning process by collaborating to accomplish projects and utilizing the language to communicate with others, teachers should provide relevant and interesting tasks.

2.9. Syllabi

A syllabus, according to Brown and Lee (2007), is a document that provides a clear emphasis on the subject matter to be studied, as well as a justification for its selection and sequencing. This implies that a syllabus not only defines the topics and materials that are supposed to be covered in the class but also explains why these specific parts have been selected and in which sequence they will be taught. Similar to this, Richards & Rodgers (2001) describe a syllabus as an extensive document that offers in-depth details on a course. It comprises the educational goals, which explain what students should understand at the end of the course. It also provides a clear outline of the content by listing the topics, themes, or units that will be addressed within the syllabus. Additionally, a logical progression that enhances students' learning is ensured by the syllabus, which outlines the topics' presentation sequence.

A TBLT syllabus, on the other hand, differs from traditional syllabi in that it prioritizes grammatical precision and lexical knowledge, to establish a basis in language structure before promoting practical application. Task-based syllabuses are intended to teach the functions of language together with grammar rules and lexical items, as stated by Richards et al. (1986). A TBLT syllabus includes exercises that simulate real-world scenarios, such as completing a restaurant order, making a phone call, asking for directions, or comparing and contrasting concepts. The tasks are designed to foster students' interpersonal abilities as well as their capacity to apply the language in relevant contexts, not only their understanding of its forms.

A TBLT syllabus that incorporates real-life tasks is advantageous since it gives learners an immediate sense of aim. Learners are more inclined to interact with the content when they perceive the connection between their language studies and real-world scenarios. One of the main objectives of language acquisition is to enable people to utilize the language successfully in everyday situations, and this practical application aids in that development.

As a result, a syllabus created for a TBLT-based learning environment has to follow the guidelines of the task-based approach. It should put a lot of effort into incorporating exercises that mimic authentic communication situations, encouraging students to utilize the language in a useful and practical way. By giving their learning experiences meaning and relevance, this method not only improves students' communication ability but also maintains their motivation.

2.10. Principles of TBLT

Nunan (2004) suggested seven principles that must be observed when employing a task-based approach in the learning environment. The first term is scaffolding, which means that classes and materials should create supportive frameworks for learning. The second is the task dependence principle, which is demonstrated in the instructional sequence by demonstrating how each task exploits and builds on the previous one preceding it. In some ways, the sequence tells a 'pedagogical' tale, as learners are guided through seven principles for task-based language education until they are able to complete the last pedagogical activity in the sequence. Recycling is the third principle. If it is assumed that learners will not attain complete mastery of an aspect of language the first time they encounter it, then the topic must be taught to them repeatedly over time. The following principle is active learning. First fundamental principle of this idea is that learning occurs best when students actively create their own knowledge instead of having it imparted to them by the teacher. Integration is the name given to the fifth principle. According to TBLT, teachers must use techniques that clearly illustrate the connections between language structure, communicative function, and semantic meaning. Most language teaching approaches used until recently relied on a synthetic approach, teaching phonological, grammatical, and lexical parts of language separately. This led to a dispute between supporters of meaning-based teaching and form-based education, with meaning-based instruction proponents arguing that while grammatical proficiency is vital for effective communication, a heavy focus on form is redundant.

The sixth principle is focused on reproduction to creation. In reproduction activities, students replicate language models supplied by the teacher, textbook, or recording. These activities are meant to provide learners with competence in form, meaning, and function. The last principle added to the list is reflection. Learners should be provided

an opportunity to reflect on what they have learned and how they are progressing. Nunan also adheres that including a reflective component in education can assist students to appreciate the rationale behind these tasks.

2.11. Implementations of TBLT

The task-based method outperforms traditional techniques because it emphasizes the communicational components of a language rather than directing learners to a memorization-based process where the structures and linguistic rules of a language are prioritized. Learners who receive instruction in a new language using traditional methods frequently face the same issue: they know the language but are unable to utilize it. If properly implemented, TBLT has the ability to solve that problem. There are various challenges to consider when using a task-based approach in classroom environments in order to achieve this.

According to Ellis (2003), one of the most important factors to consider is the preparation process, which includes selecting, modifying, or creating activities. For students to progress, the tasks must correspond to the competency level of the intended audience. On top of that, there should be clearly defined objectives, and tasks designed to support those aims. Obviously, the goals selected must be appropriate for the needs of the course and students. Each activity should be designed to maximize student involvement. Tasks are also designed to emphasize the communication features of a language rather than the forms. Instructors should lead and inspire students throughout the process rather than worrying them by focusing on and explaining linguistic rules that aren't actually essential.

According to Candlin (2009), tasks should provide students clear instructions and guidelines while encouraging them to explore, negotiate meaning, collaborate, and rely on one another. These exercises ought to take into account the variations in learners, test classroom procedures and language learning methodologies, and efficiently oversee language acquisition. For TBLT to be implemented successfully, it is imperative to identify necessary and advantageous tasks that satisfy learners' requirements and promote meaningful language usage. These activities are intended to promote communication not just for language production but also for the exchange of ideas and feelings, attaining individual goals, or working toward a shared target, according to Pica, Kanagy, and

Falodun (1993). It's possible that conventional language exercises won't be enough to provide this kind of setting for productive language usage.

The task-based language teaching is intended to be learner-centered, hence the entire process must be focused on learners' backgrounds, skills, and interests. By taking these elements into account, the language learning experience for pupils might be made more pleasurable, which will definitely enhance motivation. With learners being intrinsically driven and willing to be an active part of the process, success will be unavoidable when compared to alternative teaching methodologies.

2.12. Benefits of TBLT

Task-based language training has several advantages (Ellis et al., 2009). To begin, in a task-based class, the instructor can keep students interested and involved in their studies. Cooperative learning can result in a high degree of motivation. In addition, students can be exposed to meaning-focused input through a model listening and reading text, which can help them utilize or produce meaning-focused language through writing and speaking. As a result, skill integration is a component of language usage. Following that, the instructor may assist students in learning how to comprehend information by using metacognitive methods such as task preparation, monitoring, and assessment.

What's more, while students provide their tasks, the teacher makes notes on any grammatical, vocabulary, or pronunciation failures they make. However, because this is a fluency-based exercise, the teacher never interrupts the task presentation and prefers to provide feedback at the post-task stage. Teachers are further urged to utilize or generate language in real settings by taking on the role of risk-takers. TBLT can make them more inclined to communicate. Furthermore, using TBLT, learners may create positive learning outcomes, allowing them to succeed in learning English and attaining a decent level. Also, students are enjoying the language learning process since they can communicate a message and interact with their peers during the activities.

Aside from that, students might become fluent in English because the instructor will engage them in interesting, fluency-based activities that entail reaching a goal and being open-ended. When learners are involved in any communication action, it allows them to enhance fluency while not disregarding accuracy as well. Finally, TBLT is a learner-centered approach to language acquisition since tasks and activities are planned or suited to learners' needs or goals (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

2.13. Possible Challenges of TBLT

Since communicative language teaching (CLT) evolved, tasks have been a regular feature of EFL instruction and learning (Skehan, 1996, 2014; J. Willis, 1996). Studies have indicated that different teachers see different effects from assigning tasks to their students' learning. While TBLT can be quite successful, there are drawbacks as well. Case examples from Asia show potential implementation difficulties as well as the benefits of TBLT on materials, activities, and feedback.

Studying 228 teachers from 38 Korean high schools, Jeon and Hahn (2006) discovered that although teachers were aware of TBLT, they were cautious about its applicability in the classroom because of problems with student evaluation, classroom management, large class sizes, low language proficiency, and other issues (Lin & Wu, 2012; Pohan et al., 2016). Carless (2007) investigated the viability of TBLT in eleven teachers' and ten teacher educators' Hong Kong high schools, highlighting issues with inexperienced teachers, exam-focused curricula, and class sizes.

When McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) looked at a task-based EFL course in Thailand, they discovered that students needed extra grammar teaching and target language forms, as well as time to adjust from traditional techniques to TBLT. In a 2011 study, Xiongyong and Samuel polled EFL teachers in Chinese secondary schools. While most of them had an optimistic outlook toward their work, they highlighted two main concerns: big class sizes and evaluation challenges.

When Tabatabaei and Hadi (2011) polled 51 EFL instructors in Iran, they discovered that while some were dubious about TBLT's applicability, the majority had favorable opinions of the technique. In a study of 136 Taiwanese high school teachers, Lin and Wu (2012) noted favorable attitudes and task comprehension, but they also identified problems, including tight curricula, big class sizes, exam-focused procedures, constrained instructional time, and the substantial preparation needed for high-quality assignments.

2.14. Teacher Cognition

Teacher cognition, as defined by Li (2020), is a multidimensional concept that is critical to teachers' professional lives and development. While research frequently highlights the role of students, it is critical to understand the considerable influence instructors have on students' language learning paths. Teachers undertake duties as motivator, facilitator, organizer, assessor, participant, tutor, and resource supplier

(Harmer, 2007). Their role is to provide a pleasant learning environment that caters to students from all backgrounds and motives. This includes time management, material selection, classroom arrangement, and instructional objectives. Understanding their experiences, perceptions, and beliefs is critical because it has a substantial impact on their classroom practices and student language acquisition achievements (Borg, 2006). Every facet of classroom dynamics, including course planning, delivery, assessment, curricular standards, selection of instructional materials, and use of instructional methodologies and assistance for students, is influenced by instructors' interpretation, views, attitudes, and understanding (Li, 2017; Williams & Burden, 1997).

A theoretical framework referred to as teacher cognition has attracted a lot of academic interest in ELT and the number of the research based on teacher cognition which investigates the impact of external and internal variables on teachers' perspectives has increased over the last three decades. The studies relating teacher cognition to classroom behaviors, impacted by teachers' views of teaching and learning, also confirm the results aforementioned and emphasize the interrelationships of teacher cognitions and behaviors, dependent on the surroundings. (Barcelos, 2016; Borg, 2006; Farrell, 2015; Farrell & Ives, 2015; Li & Walsh, 2011; Mangubhai et al., 2004; Ng & Farrell, 2003).

Drawing on these insights, the primary objective of this study is to conduct a thorough analysis of the perceptions and understanding levels of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) among instructors who teach in preparatory schools. Also, the study aims to fully examine a variety of factors, such as teachers' educational backgrounds, professional experiences, and types of institutions where they work, to ascertain how these factors affect instructors' opinions and preferences about TBLT. The study aims to gain a better understanding of how teacher cognition affects the adoption and use of TBLT in various educational situations by looking at these factors. As a result, learning more about teachers' perspectives can help identify obstacles that hinder and facilitate the use of cutting-edge teaching strategies like TBLT. It assists curriculum developers, teacher educators, and educational policymakers in creating educational opportunities and customized assistance strategies that cater to the needs of teachers and improve their methods of instruction. Aligning instructional methods with teachers' beliefs and attitudes enhances the chance for profitable implementation and long-term application of powerful instructional approaches, resulting in better language acquisition outcomes for students.

2.15. Relevant Studies

2.15.1. TBLT Studies Conducted Abroad

Beglar and Hunt (2002), Carless (2002), Ellis (2003), Littlewood (2004), Nunan (2004), Johnson (2003), Murphy (2003), Richards and Rodgers (2001), Skehan (1998), and numerous other studies have been conducted on task-based language instruction that describe tasks and explain TBLT's methodology and concepts. These and several other works show how the TBLT approach is becoming increasingly popular. Numerous studies have also examined TBLT in language schools in great detail. While some of those studies focused mostly on defining the task-based approach or examining its effectiveness, especially in terms of various specific characteristics, others set out to investigate how instructors and students perceive TBLT.

Xiongyong and Samuel (2011) utilized a questionnaire to assess the task-based approach perceptions and implementations of 132 teachers at a secondary school in China. The survey included both a Likert scale and open-ended questions. The study's findings revealed that the instructors were mainly proficient in implementing TBLT and preferred the task-based approach. The survey also found that the three most prevalent challenges that instructors encountered were connected to student motivation, crowded classrooms, and assessment. Based on the study's findings, two major recommendations for measures to take to improve the effectiveness of the TBLT implication process were made. The initial suggestion was to provide teachers enough opportunity to become acquainted with various aspects of TBLT, such as developing, executing, and assessing. The following proposal was to eliminate problems such as high-class sizes and assessment-related challenges that inhibited the use of TBLT in schools.

Haque (2012) carried out a study to determine the views and TBLT adaptations of eighty Bangladeshi secondary school teachers. Both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered via surveys and interviews. The study's conclusions show that, despite their wide awareness and positive opinions of adopting TBLT in language classes, teachers found it challenging to put the technique into practice because of both motivational factors and the grammar-based grading system in place in their nation. Different implications for educators, administrators, and curriculum designers were provided as a result of these findings. To begin, instructors were emboldened to attend TBLT training promoted by the school authorities so that they could comprehend and practice the ideas and methods of

task-based language teaching. Following that, curriculum designers should include TBLT and relevant tasks in English textbooks.

Rahman (2016) also collected data from fifty eleventh-grade Iraqi students to investigate the relationship between TBLT and its effects on vocabulary performance. To test the hypothesis that the experimental group would do tasks more successfully than the control group, the researcher divided the students into two groups: experimental and control. The researcher employed a pre-test and post-test technique, teaching the same vocabulary - 22 items - to both groups using distinct approaches - traditional for the control group and TBLT for the experimental group - to corroborate that assertion. The hypothesis was validated by the study's results, which showed that TBLT was a useful strategy for increasing vocabulary.

Pham and Nguyen (2018) used a combination of questionnaires and interviews to gather information regarding the beliefs and usage of TBLT among 68 Vietnamese university teachers. Their results were more comprehensive since they combined qualitative and quantitative methodology. The task-based method was seen well by the instructors, who were eager to use it to improve their language teaching environments, according to the study's findings. However, a dearth of high-quality resources and a high student population presented certain difficulties.

Rasheed (2021) carried out further research that examined how TBLT affected Iraqi EFL students' writing skills as well as their perceptions and comprehension of the technique. It was a quantitative study with a pre-test/post-test design that also gathered information from forty college students via questionnaires. This four-week study showed that the experimental group was able to complete writing tasks with greater accuracy. The majority of the pupils had a basic understanding of TBLT, according to the poll. The results then showed that most students had positive opinions regarding TBLT for two main reasons: TBLT promotes student academic development and a collaborative learning environment.

2.15.2. Previous Studies on TBLT conducted in Türkiye context

Kurt (2004) conducted a study to investigate the impact of TBLT on vocabulary acquisition and reading and writing aptitude was investigated using vocabulary checklists and a questionnaire. The study involved 88 Turkish EFL students in the sixth grade, who were divided into experimental and control groups to compare their performance. The

results indicated that the experimental group performed better in learning and using vocabulary items, as well as in their reading and writing tasks, compared to the control group. These results imply that TBLT may be applied successfully in schools with younger students.

The impacts of task-based learning on reading instruction in a university setting were investigated in a research by Demir (2008). Fifty low-intermediate university preparation school students participated in the study, completing a variety of exercises and interviews. The findings demonstrated that using TBLT in reading sessions increased students' participation and engagement in the classroom. One other effect of TBLT was that it made students more independent in their reading assignments.

Yıldız (2012) conducted another study to examine how task-based learning affects students' comprehension of grammar. A control group (an alternative method of teaching grammar) and an experimental group (TBLT) of thirty-two eighth-graders were established. The pre-test and post-test designs were used to assess the progress of both groups. The results validated the hypothesis that TBLT is more effective than conventional methods of teaching language forms, showing that the experimental group improved their grasp of grammar more than the control group.

Akbulut (2014) carried out an action research study to ascertain if TBLT is appropriate for younger students. Throughout the course of the 10-week research, which included 21 sixth-graders, curriculum-based tasks were used. Both qualitative and quantitative methods, including surveys and interviews, were utilized to gather data. The results showed that TBLT supported young students' language explorations.

In a TBLT learning scenario, Demirtaş (2015) investigated the effect of group autonomy on learners' speaking abilities. The study used a pre-test and post-test research methodology, and 335 participants who attended classes at a public university gave quantitative and qualitative data. The findings demonstrated that improving students' speaking abilities by appropriately implementing autonomy principles and the interactive, real-world tasks required by TBLT was quite effective.

Another research by Ceylan (2016) investigated the effects of TBLT on students' speaking and writing skills as well as instructors' and students' attitudes about TBLT using a mixed-methods approach. Thirty instructors and eighty-four students in the university preparatory program conducted surveys and interviews after completing treatment

activities. Along with quantitative and qualitative assessments, an analysis of the students' assignments and midterm results was carried out to examine the data. The results showed that TBLT was well-liked by both teachers and students and that there was a positive relationship between TBLT implementation and writing assignments as well as midterm grades. However, the study was unable to find any meaningful correlation between speaking tasks or midterm grades and TBLT.

Kırtaş (2016) looked into the implementation and understanding of TBLT among Turkish EFL instructors. The research included 40 EFL teachers from primary, secondary, and high schools. Data were gathered through questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations. The results indicated that most teachers employed TBLT in their classes and that their opinions toward it were positive, even with the difficulties they encountered.

Page Halıcı (2016) looked at a different study that looked at the impact of traditional and TBLT methods on students' vocabulary growth and motivation in a primary school setting. Two instructors and forty-eight seventh-graders participated in the quasi-experimental investigation. Data was acquired by means of questionnaires and interviews. The results of the study showed that TBLT was superior to the conventional method in terms of raising student motivation and vocabulary development. They also favored TBLT over the standard approach.

Mavili (2018) carried out research to find out how well TBLT combined with technology can help students become more proficient writers and vocabulary users. Pre- and post-test results were used to split the 38 fifth-grade children into experimental and control groups. The results demonstrated that combining TBLT with technology greatly enhanced students' language and writing skills.

The impact of task categories on teamwork in a TBLT context was investigated by Aksoy (2018). Fifteen university students participated in a speaking club and performed two different kinds of activities for the study: converging and diverging. It was determined that interactions that occurred during task completion were either task- or language-related. The results showed that students engaged in more task-related activities during divergent tasks and more language-related behaviors during convergent tasks, suggesting that TBLT enhances university students' collaborative behavior.

Günel Şahan (2019) investigated how TBLT affected students' attitudes toward EFL lessons and academic advancement. The researchers employed a mixed methods strategy

to gather data from 53 children enrolled in high school preparatory programs using achievement evaluations and an attitude scale. The results of the study showed that TBLT enhanced students' attitudes toward English lessons as well as their academic success. Similar to this, Akin (2020) assessed how TBLT affected students' self-efficacy beliefs in ESP classes and how they felt about it. 64 students majoring in English for aviation management were involved in the study. Data was collected via questionnaires, interviews, and surveys over a period of six weeks. By the end of the study, the results showed that students' perceptions of TBLT were positive and that they had developed much stronger self-efficacy beliefs.

Mehmood (2021) evaluated the opinions of Turkish EFL instructors on task-based language instruction and how they would like to utilize this method using a questionnaire. 102 instructors from universities, high schools, and secondary schools participated in the survey. The results showed that most teachers were aware of the fundamentals of TBLT and were eager to implement it in their classes since they thought it was an effective approach to teaching English to speakers of other languages. But because teaching a big class of children presents challenges, several teachers were reluctant to use TBLT.

Recent research conducted in a university preparation class by Sarman (2022) examined the opinions and preferences of English as a foreign language teachers regarding task-based language instruction. The study had five interviews, and theme analysis was used to look at the participants' answers. The findings showed that most teachers utilized TBLT in their lessons and had good opinions about it. However, the study also found that having a high number of students in the classroom and having insufficient TBLT course materials were two significant obstacles to the application of TBLT. The research suggests that these issues might be resolved by addressing institutional infrastructure issues and enhancing the curriculum and resources provided by the educational system.

Finally, Quinto's research in Türkiye (2022) and its results show that the participating instructors had favorable views on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and its potential use in Turkish classrooms. It also draws attention to a major gap in previous research, stating that teacher perspectives have received little attention in studies on TBLT perceptions in Türkiye, with a majority of the focus being on students. As stated by Quinto (2022) the only research to examine teachers' perspectives was İlin et al. (2007), who used a case study to show that although instructors understood the TBLT concepts, the actual

classroom assignments tended to emphasize form over meaning. This shows that there may be a disconnect between instructors' theoretical understanding of TBLT and how it is used in the classroom.

Based on the aforementioned papers, TBLT studies have been undertaken in Türkiye with students of varying competence levels. The majority of research looked at how TBLT affected students' vocabulary acquisition, reading and writing skills, grammatical comprehension, speaking abilities, motivation, self-efficacy views, and overall academic achievement. These studies' findings typically point to positive results with TBLT and the learners in TBLT groups outperform control groups in areas such as vocabulary development, reading and writing skills, grammatical understanding, and speaking ability. TBLT has also been shown to improve students' motivation, self-efficacy views, and overall academic success. However, other research implies that the influence of TBLT on speaking ability may be limited. Furthermore, some teachers are hesitant to utilize TBLT owing to constraints such as large class numbers and a lack of TBLT materials.

In closing, studies conducted in Türkiye on TBLT show that motivation among learners and different levels of language competence is typically improved by this method. To maximize its efficacy, instructors require assistance in overcoming obstacles such as large class numbers and inadequate TBLT resources. Despite substantial studies on TBLT's effectiveness, there is a significant void in the literature discussing EFL instructors' opinions of TBLT. Addressing this gap is essential because knowing teachers' perspectives can reveal us a lot about the real-world obstacles and assistance needed to adopt TBLT successfully. Thus, this study is to investigate the perspectives and familiarity of EFL teachers employed at Turkish preparatory schools on TBLT. The result will also be analyzed with relation to some variables such as years of experience, educational background, the type of institution they have been working, and their professional development in TBLT.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter aims to provide an in-depth presentation of the study's research methodology. It presents and discusses the research design, research setting, participants, data gathering tools, data collection processes, and data analysis.

3.2. Research Design

The current study utilized a quantitative research design to address the research questions and comprehensively understand the topic. By employing a quantitative research design, this study aims to collect the familiarity, perception, and preferences of teachers working in preparatory schools on TBLT in Türkiye. The major purpose of this research is to provide a thorough knowledge of the reasons and factors that lead ELF teachers to employ or avoid TBLT in their classrooms, as well as their preferences for implementing TBLT in grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing classes. The secondary purpose of the research is to determine whether there was any correlation between the way EFL teachers perceived TBLT and how it related to their educational background, the type of institution they have been working for—a private or public university—the status of professional development in TBLT and their working experience.

Questionnaires, according to Brown and Lee (2007), are any written instruments that offer respondents a series of questions or statements to which they must reply, either by writing out their replies or picking from a list of pre-existing answers. According to Dörnyei and Taguchi (2009), it is feasible to acquire information about people's thoughts and actions on a certain issue by using questionnaires in research. Since the intent of this study is to disclose teachers' perceptions of and implementations of the task-based approach, data will be collected employing a questionnaire specifically designed to bring answers to the issues mentioned above of concern. In pursuing this objective, a quantitative research design is used in the methodology that was chosen to gather structured, exacting, and focused data.

The research methodology assumes a central role in any research project as a fundamental framework that provides essential insights into a range of aspects, including the procedures controlling data collection and processing, the researcher's methodologies, collaboration, and the theoretical basis of the study (Creswell, 2012). Considering that the main goal of this study is to explore teachers' awareness and perceptions, it becomes necessary to have a "standardized procedure to assess objective reality" (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 34).

To collect the essential data for this study, the participants were given a questionnaire. As outlined by Creswell (2012), before the research begins, prepared questions and associated alternatives to responses are formulated as part of the process used for quantitative data collection. The systematic approach facilitates the collection of numerical data, hence enabling a generalization of findings from a small sample size to a larger population.

The understanding, perspectives, and preferences of task-based language instruction by EFL instructors in preparatory schools in Ankara are the particular focus of this study. Therefore, a large participant group was required due to the research's vast scope. As an outcome, the use of online surveys emerged as a logical choice because of their unmatched ability to collect vast amounts of data rapidly and their ease of design (Dörnyei, 2007, p. 101). Online questionnaires are highly valued in modern research procedures due to their wide applicability and efficiency in terms of both time and expense. As noted by Creswell (2012), these surveys take advantage of the broad use of the internet, including its function as a social networking platform, and enable the quick collection of large amounts of data by using sample questions and tested forms (p. 383). Moreover, the use of online surveys is consistent with the changing field of research methodology, recognizing the revolutionary influence of the digital age on data collection methods. This methodology not only aligns with current technical developments but also improves accessibility and convenience for participants, demonstrating a deliberate attempt to adjust to the present state of research. Online questionnaires are widely acknowledged as a useful instrument for their capacity to collect data effectively, send surveys to a large number of respondents quickly, and capture a range of opinions.

3.3. Setting

The research was conducted at 17 preparatory schools at universities in Ankara, Türkiye, (Table 3.3.1.) and includes participation from both the public and foundational universities to achieve the research objectives (Table 3.3.2.). To determine the efficacy of the current approach, the researcher chose volunteers from both the public and private sectors in Ankara. In a large city like Ankara, more schools from various parts were included in the study, making it easier to generalize the findings to the entire city. This is because larger cities yield more effective results and enable the researcher to analyze the data more successfully.

Table 3.3.1. The List of Preparatory Schools of Universities in Ankara Attending the Survey

| Universities | F | % |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| Ankara Bilim Üniversitesi | 2 | 1 |
| Ankara Medipol Üniversitesi | 17 | 8.5 |
| Ankara Üniversitesi | 8 | 4 |
| Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi | 3 | 1.5 |
| Ankara Sosyal Bilimler Üniversitesi | 6 | 3 |
| Atılım Üniversitesi | 75 | 37.5 |
| Başkent Üniversitesi | 30 | 15 |
| Çankaya Üniversitesi | 1 | .5 |
| Gazi Üniversitesi | 20 | 10 |
| Hacettepe Üniversitesi | 4 | 2 |
| Jandarma ve Sahil Güvenlik Akademisi | 8 | 4 |
| Polis Akademisi | 7 | 3.5 |
| Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi | 1 | .5 |
| Ted Üniversitesi | 6 | 3 |
| Türk Hava Kurumu Üniversitesi | 3 | 1.5 |
| TOBB Üniversitesi | 3 | 1.5 |
| Ufuk Üniversitesi | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Note. One participant was working at a university, which is not in the scope of the study.

Table 3.3.2. Institution Types of the Preparatory Schools of Universities in Ankara

| | | F | % | Valid % | Cumulative |
|-------------------------|---------|----------|----------|----------------|-------------------|
| Institution type | Public | 58 | 28.9 | 28.9 | 28.9 |
| | Private | 142 | 70.6 | 70.6 | 99.5 |
| Total | | 200 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 99.5 |

Note. One participant was not working at a university which is not the scope of the study.

The participants were from either public and private universities. Of 28.9 them were working in public while of 70.6% them were in private universities. The proportion of private university students was almost three times higher than the participants in public universities.

3.4. Sampling

In simple terms, the population is the group of people that the survey attempts to comprehend, whereas the sample is the group of people whom scholars have individually researched. (Dörnyei, 2007). The selection of research participants, also called sampling, is one of the most important phases in the planning process (Creswell, 2009). To study the entire population would be impractical in most situations, such as when administering a questionnaire. Using sampling, a researcher can deduce information about a population without having to examine every single person by analyzing the results of a subset of the population. It may be simpler to gather high-quality data and less expensive to try to minimize the number of study participants.

As Kyriazos suggested (2018), finding real correlations in a dataset is facilitated by having sufficient statistical power. An appropriate but not excessive sample might be found with careful power analysis. However, this has to be weighed against the need to provide a big enough sample size and adequate power to identify a true correlation. Scientific investigations employ the technique of sampling to choose units from a target population that is representative of the total research population (Berndt, 2020; Singh & Masuku, 2014; Taherdoost, 2016). In order to assess the characteristics of the population by examining sample characteristics, researchers typically use sampling (Walters, 2021). Instead of focusing solely on the sample itself, when researchers choose a sample for a

study, their main objective is to comprehend the characteristics of the complete population from which the sample was selected.

This study employed a convenience sampling method, and instructors from various universities in Ankara were specifically sought out and invited to participate. By contacting the secretaries of each department within these institutions, an eclectic group of participants for the study could be gathered. This approach helped the study gather perspectives from various ELF teachers in the designated area, which expanded the study's breadth and improved its intricacy.

The investigator attempted to incorporate EFL instructors working at Ankara's both private and public preparatory schools into her study to reinforce the representativeness and richness of the collected. The selection of the participants was done voluntarily. Every EFL teacher received a questionnaire from the researcher to fill out. To obtain comprehensive insights and fully explore the perspectives and perceptions of EFL teachers regarding TBLT, the researcher sought out volunteers with a variety of teaching levels, experiences, and educational backgrounds. This allowed the researcher to gather opinions about TBLT from a wide range of EFL instructors, which improved the study's generalizability.

The required numbers of participants were calculated based on the following formula for simple random sampling when the population size is unknown (Daniel, 1999; Naing et al., 2006).

$$n = \frac{Z^2 P(1 - P)}{d^2}$$

Z: Z statistic for a level of confidence,

P: expected prevalence or proportion (in proportion of one; if 20%,
P = 0.2), and

d: precision (in proportion of one; if 5%, *d* = 0.05)

For this study, *Z* was 1.96, *P* was 0.5 (50%), and *d* was 0.07 (7%), so the sample size was 196. After data collection, the total number of participants was 201, meaning that the sample was sufficient to represent the study population.

3.5. Participants

The present study collected data from EFL instructors who work at Preparatory Schools in both private and public universities in Ankara. The EFL teachers were asked to fill out a questionnaire given by the researcher. To attain this goal, the researcher picked volunteers from three distinct teaching levels with various experiences and educational backgrounds. This method is used to elicit the views of a large number of EFL instructors on TBLT.

The demographic information of the participants is summarized in Table 3.5.1. The majority of the participants were female (n = 146, 72.6%). The age group of the participants was between 50 + and 20 +. The most crowded group for the age was 30-39 years old (n = 92, 45.8%), whereas the least crowded group was the group more than 50 years old group (n = 14, 7.0%). The highest frequency was in the 10 to 15 years of experience of the participants (n = 59, 29.4%). The groups with other years of experience were distributed in Table 3.5.1 accordingly. The majority of the participants were from private universities (n = 142, 70.6%). The most often taught proficiency level was B1, with 43 participants (21.4%). Almost nearly half of the participants (n = 99, 49.3%) had received formal training in TBLT. The other groups were distributed uniformly.

Table 3.5.1. The Demographic Information of the Participants

| Demographic information | F | % | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|------|
| Gender | Female | 146 | 72.6 |
| | Male | 54 | 26.9 |
| | Prefer Not to Respond | 1 | .5 |
| Age | 20-29 | 61 | 30.3 |
| | 30-39 | 92 | 45.8 |
| | 40-49 | 34 | 16.9 |
| | 50+ | 14 | 7.0 |
| Years of experience | Less than five years | 45 | 22.4 |
| | 5 to 9 years | 38 | 18.9 |
| | 10 to 15 years | 59 | 29.4 |
| | 15 to 20 years | 29 | 14.4 |
| | 20+ | 30 | 14.9 |
| Institution types the instructors currently working | Public | 58 | 28.9 |
| | Private | 142 | 70.6 |

Table 3.5.1. Cont'd

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------|------|
| Proficiency Levels Instructors Teaching | A1 | 11 | 5.5 |
| | A1, A2 | 2 | 1.0 |
| | A1, A2, B1 | 17 | 8.5 |
| | A1, A2, B1, B2 | 8 | 4.0 |
| | A1, A2, B1, B2, C1 | 3 | 1.5 |
| | A2 | 14 | 7.0 |
| | A2, B1 | 2 | 1.0 |
| | A2, B1, B2 | 1 | .5 |
| | B1 | 43 | 21.4 |
| | B2 | 19 | 9.5 |
| All of them | 81 | 40.3 | |
| Professional development status of the instructors on TBLT | Formal training in TBLT | 99 | 49.3 |
| | Informal training in TBLT | 60 | 29.9 |
| | No formal training in TBLT | 42 | 20.9 |

Note. One participant was not working at a university which is not the scope of the study.

Moreover, the participant's B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. departments are illustrated in Table 3. As can be seen, more than half of the participants had a B.A. in ELT ($n = 109$, 54.2%). The second was the Literature department ($n = 75$, 37.3%). The highest frequency of the ELT department remained the same for the M.A. department ($n = 90$, 44.8%). In the Ph.D. department, there are a few participants, and again, Ph.D. degree holders in the ELT department had the highest frequency ($n = 19$, 9.5%), as illustrated in Table 3.5.2.

Table 3.5.2. The Degree Department Information of the Participants

| | | F | % |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|
| B.A. Department | ELT | 109 | 54.2 |
| | Linguistics | 9 | 4.5 |
| | Literature | 75 | 37.3 |
| | Translation & Interpretation | 5 | 2.5 |
| | Others | 2 | 1.0 |
| M.A. Department | No degree | 39 | 19.4 |
| | ELT | 90 | 44.8 |
| | Linguistics | 6 | 3.0 |
| | Literature | 30 | 14.9 |
| | Translation & Interpretation | 9 | 4.5 |
| | Others | 27 | 13.4 |

Table 3.5.2. Cont'd

| Ph.D. Department | | | |
|-------------------------|--|-----|------|
| No degree | | 167 | 83.1 |
| ELT | | 19 | 9.5 |
| Linguistics | | 2 | 1.0 |
| Literature | | 5 | 2.5 |
| Others | | 8 | 4.0 |

3.6. Data Collection Instrument

Instruments serve as tools for gathering, measuring, and analyzing data about a subject. Numerous instrument versions are available for use in the study; the selection of an appropriate version relies on the type of research being conducted. These instrument versions include surveys, field notes, interviews, observations, and so forth. A well-designed questionnaire was employed in this study as a tool to collect data from the participants.

3.6.1 Questionnaire

Questionnaires are frequently used primarily because they are incredibly efficient in terms of researcher time, researcher effort, and money resources. By distributing a questionnaire to a group, a significant amount of data can be quickly gathered in less than an hour, with much less human involvement needed. Moreover, they work well with a wide range of people, in various contexts, and on a wide range of subjects. Their capacity to access hidden attitudes that respondents might not be completely aware of is highlighted by Bryman (2008). A well-designed questionnaire further reduces the influence of interviewer bias, improving the consistency and dependability of the findings. Therefore, according to Dörnyei (2003), most study proposals in behavioral and social sciences eventually call for data collection through questionnaires.

The present research employed a questionnaire distributed to instructors working at preparatory schools of universities in Ankara to obtain data on their perceptions of TBLT, their views on its application, and the factors influencing their decision to employ or not implement TBLT in their classrooms. The researcher created the questionnaire (see Appendix 2) explicitly for this study to gather information from instructors regarding their understanding and views of TBLT, ensuring that it was in alignment with the present research's distinctive goals and objectives. The survey questions were developed by

reviewing the literature, focusing on TBLT, and considering EFL instructors' knowledge, perceptions, and preferences for this teaching method.

The researcher acknowledged the need for a precise item design that is customized to the goals of the study. Consequently, she had to consider the development of an efficient and reliable questionnaire carefully. The items for the method surveys were diligently constructed, drawing upon the provided strategies and ideas elucidated in the works of Larsen-Freeman (2000) and Richards and Rodgers (1986).

In a similar vein, the items related to Task-Based Language Teaching were developed drawing on viewpoints put forth by Willis (1996), Ellis (1994, 2014, 2018), Long (1985, 2005), Prabhu (1987), Nunan (1989), Breen (1989), Candlin (1987), Skehan (1998), Branden (2006), Edwards (2008), Leaver and Willis (2004), Edwards and Willis (2005), Long et al. (1996) and Larsen-Freeman (2000).

There were three sections to the questionnaire (See Appendix 3). The first component includes questions regarding the participants' teaching level, gender, faculty background, the institution they have been working right now, and teaching experience. The first component includes eight questions regarding the participants' teaching level, gender, age, faculty and education background, the institution they have been working in, the level of students they have been teaching, and their teaching experience. This section aims to see if there are any disparities in the outcomes based on variances in teaching level, the type of institutions they have been working in, private or state, years of teaching English, gender, and the sorts of faculties or departments from which participants graduated. The second component has 17 items designed to measure instructors' comprehension of tasks and TBLT. This part focuses on how instructors grasp the ideas of TBLT. To align with the objective of this section, a 3-point Likert scale was employed with the options “agree, undecided, and disagree.” The final part of the questionnaire mainly focused on the perceptions of the instructors and their reasons for implementing or avoiding TBLT in their classes. In this part, components use a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging from strongly agree to disagree strongly, to evaluate teachers' overall perceptions of TBLT and includes 39 items since the researcher aimed to provide the participants with a chance to express their thoughts in the most detailed and comprehensive way possible by carefully

going over all the aspects that were obtained from a thorough investigation and evaluation of the literature.

3.7. Data Collection Procedure

To carry out the investigation, the researcher performed numerous steps. Initially, the researcher completed an official form to ensure ethical compliance, and the questionnaire's administration was approved by the university's ethics committee (See Appendix A). Furthermore, the investigator gained prior approval from the designated educational institutions and notified potential subjects of the study's objectives. In this investigation, the questionnaire served as a research tool.

3.7.1 Constructing and piloting the data collection tool

The first step to ensure the validity and reliability of the data-collecting instrument is that the content of questionnaire items must be properly defined from the outset (Dörnyei, 2003). Reducing this risk requires clearly and thoroughly defining the construct under study. This comprehensive explanation ensures that the survey's questionnaire addresses every targeted issue area, preserving the survey's content validity. To meet these expectations, the researcher conducted a thorough literature review and incorporated all possible items in her questionnaire to assess participants' understanding and opinions of TBLT.

A variety of strategies can be employed to accomplish the difficult task of ensuring the reliability of questionnaire items. On the other hand, Presser and Blair's (1994) study highlighted the importance of utilizing expert panels in the pretesting phase. Furthermore, Olson (2010) outlined the typical process that survey researchers adhere to, which typically involves assembling teams of experts to review questionnaires in order to identify potential issues, flaws in the question-answering process, and extra measurement errors in survey results. Consistent with this approach, the reliability of every questionnaire item was meticulously checked by three subject matter experts who had specific expertise in language instruction methodologies and procedures.

Before the questionnaire was sent, three subject matter experts were engaged to review its appropriateness and verify the items' relevance. After that, modifications were made in response to their feedback to ensure that it complied with the study's objectives and enhanced the instrument's validity and reliability. Three subject-matter experts—assistant professors with a combined teaching background of fifteen, twenty-six, and thirty-seven years—carefully review each questionnaire item to ascertain its

appropriateness and effectiveness for this specific survey. After that, the specialists offer in-depth analysis while following a precise process to evaluate the items' applicability and efficacy before adding them to the final survey. The meticulous assessment procedure validates compliance with the quality of the method, ascertains the validity of the study's equipment, and highlights the dedication to obtaining accuracy and precision in the data obtained.

With the assistance of expert opinions, the researcher confirmed the content validity. According to these opinions, part two of the questionnaire "seems to effectively cover various aspects of task-based language teaching (TBLT) while taking into account the general objective of the questionnaire." These statements do an excellent job of summarizing several facets of TBLT and its underlying ideas, offering a thorough rundown of the main ideas and methods related to this teaching methodology. The questionnaire's component on TBLT seems to be well-structured to elicit information from respondents. It is suitable to use a Likert scale with the options "Agree," "Not Sure," and "Disagree" to record respondents' differing levels of agreement or disagreement with the statements supplied. Moreover, for part three, "Taking into account the questionnaire's overall goal, which centers on the instructors' opinions of TBLT, the statements provided adequately address a range of the instructors' viewpoints.

Dörnyei & Taguchi (2010) point out that although respondents are indeed frequently insincere, careless, hurried, and unmotivated, it is also a known fact that thoughtful and creative questionnaire design can produce a tool that encourages respondents to provide answers that are comparatively truthful and well-considered and can then be analyzed in a way that is consistent with science. He adds that a methodical strategy encompassing several processes and procedures is necessary to develop a successful questionnaire. First, decisions must be made about the overall elements of the questionnaire, including its format, length, and primary components. With this aim, the researcher conducted a thorough examination of the literature and examined previous studies, theses, and surveys that were written about TBLT as a part of comprehensive research. Subsequently, an item pool was generated and composed of intriguing queries or items. Then, a logical order was selected, and these items were arranged. Harkness (2008b) asserts that for participants to grasp the directions, they must be clear and include pertinent examples. A careful translation is required if the questionnaire was not initially written in the target language. Hence, after the questionnaire was completed, thorough proofreading was done, and the researcher also obtained input from the pilot test participants.

An item analysis is done to evaluate the efficacy and reliability of the questionnaire, and a pilot test is carried out to make any revisions (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). This thorough procedure guarantees that the survey is well-designed and able to produce useful information. Hundley et al. (2000) claim that piloting the questionnaire at different phases of development on a group of individuals who are representative of the intended audience for which it was created. It goes under the name of feasibility studies as well, which are “small scale version(s), or trial run(s) done in preparation for the major study” (Polit et al., 2001). The purpose of these trial runs is to gather input from the researcher regarding the functionality and suitability of the instrument, and the completed questionnaire may be revised and polished in light of this information. Following that, the researcher carried out a pilot study, which was essential in ensuring thorough coverage of relevant topics, improving the general structure of the survey, and reducing any possible uncertainties included in the questionnaire. Cognitive walkthroughs and think-aloud techniques were used at this phase. While think-aloud techniques necessitate that participants articulate their ideas and interpretations as they interact with the questionnaire, cognitive walkthroughs entail individuals methodically navigating through the questionnaire to detect possible usability concerns. This process aims to seek to extract insightful information about how participants understood and interpreted the questionnaire items, which helped to guide the required adjustments to improve the questionnaire's efficacy and clarity. As Dörnyei (2010) has underlined, being present during this process allowed us to see how participants react, and if they pick up on any hesitations or uncertainties with the help of spontaneous inquiries or comments. For this process, it is suggested that you select three or four people whose perspectives you respect and who are prepared to give you their time (Creswell, 2012). Presser (1986) adds that, at this point, "colleagues, friends, and family" are frequently our main sources of support. Hence, this stage includes the participation of 11 EFL instructors having similar characteristics to the actual sample group. People who are not experts in the topic can help to cut out superfluous jargon, and those who have done survey research before or are familiar with the target audience can offer insightful commentary. Therefore, for this particular study, the researcher selected 11 colleagues who have been working at preparatory schools belonging to both private and state universities as instructors in Ankara and requested them to complete the form, provide their answers, and discuss their thoughts and feelings.

Dörnyei (2010) also underlines that being present during this process will allow you to see how they react, pick up on any hesitations or uncertainties, and respond to spontaneous inquiries or comments. Once the pieces are finished, ask for general input and start a brainstorming session to make additional improvements. The researcher actively collaborated with the participants during the pilot testing to ensure the most accurate and healthy completion of this process. When filling out the questionnaire, she asked participants to "think aloud." She then carefully wrote down all of the questions and comments without interfering, offering clarification only when participants came across something that they did not understand. The investigator noted these occurrences and, when the respondents had finished the questionnaire, asked about particular sections, seeking input on how some of the topics could be made clearer. A second noting of the responses was subsequently made. This pilot test highly helped in noticing the wording of some items that may be ambiguous or confusing for the respondents to understand. To guarantee the items' clarity and comprehension, the following alterations were made in response to the input received during the pilot study.

The third section's item 7, which originally said, "TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language," was updated. (See Appendix 3). Adding the term "in class" was the enhancement. Since the original text did not make it clear if the relaxed environment was for teachers or students, this addition was to clarify the actual intended context for the participants. By adding "in class," the researcher aimed to convey that the relaxed atmosphere applies to both students and teachers in the instructional setting. Similarly, Items 14, 15, 18, and 19 in the identical section incorporate the term "not" in the statements. To enhance visibility and ensure clarity, it was suggested that these components be highlighted in capital letters type and underlined in the format. The rationale behind this recommendation is based on their general observations and feeling that, since respondents often skim surveys, it is important to draw attention to negations. Neglecting to highlight these components could result in misunderstandings and poor decisions, which could negatively affect the accuracy of the findings.

Item 25, which was the last adjustment that was added to the third section, originally said, "I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance." However, the feedback in piloting revealed that it lacked specificity regarding whether it was speaking or writing performance. The question was modified by dividing it into two separate statements since some educators could find it difficult to assess only one of these variables.

The revised version notably states: "I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance in speaking" and "I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance in writing." The general clarity of the survey data is improved by this change, which ensures clarity and eliminates ambiguity, enabling respondents to make more accurate and exact replies.

After the survey was developed, Google Forms made the survey administration easier. The online questionnaire was accompanied by a consent form that included a summary of the research under ethical requirements. Participants were given a set amount of time to complete the survey. After the data was collected, the analysis began. Numerical ratings were assigned to Likert-type items: 1 denoted strongly agree (SA), two agreed (A), three indicated uncertain (N), four indicated disagree (D), and five indicated severely disagree (SD). Data collected via surveys was analyzed using Microsoft Excel and the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The data were compiled into tables that allowed for a comprehensive overview to adhere to research standards and make the information easier to understand.

3.8. Data Analysis Procedure

Utilizing IBM SPSS 26, a thorough data analysis was conducted to address the research objectives of the study. Descriptive statistics, which comprised measures of central tendency including mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and median, were first used to analyze the first two research subjects. According to Field (2017), these analyses provided a descriptive assessment of the variables' present status.

The third and fourth study subjects were then chosen using the features of the independent and dependent variables as a reference for the statistical studies that were chosen. The best analytical technique was determined to be multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), given three dependent variables and independent variables with two or more categories. The equivalency of covariance matrices was examined using Box's M test before doing MANOVA, with a significance level of $p < .000$.

Following that, cross-tabulations and correlation analyses focused on ordinal variables were used to address the fourth study question. Wagner (2006) suggested determining the strength and direction of correlations between ordinal variables by using metrics like Somersd and Gamma.

Lastly, to achieve the goals of the study, more descriptive and inferential statistics were employed. Descriptive statistics were used to identify similarities and differences among participants based on characteristics such as job experience, educational background, professional development status in TBLT, and institutional affiliation. Mean scores, standard deviations, and frequency values were evaluated to understand the characteristics of the sample better.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents each research question established for this thesis, along with the study's findings and comprehensive discussions. The qualitative data acquired from EFL teachers in Ankara, Türkiye via a survey covering items on awareness, perception, and preferences about TBLT is complemented with illustrative remarks and quotations, offering complete and comprehensive results.

In the first place, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normalcy was applied to fully comprehend the instructors' perspectives on TBLT. The instructors' positive and negative perceptions related to TBLT were examined for normality, skewness, and kurtosis, and depicted in Table 4.1.1

Table 4.1.1. Normality Tests of Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT

| Variables | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | .131, $p < .001$ | -.384 | .133 |
| Positive Perception about TBLT | .96, $p < .001$ | -1.687 | 7.990 |
| Negative Perception about TBLT | .57, $p = .200$ | .359 | .374 |

Note. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test $df = 202$

Based on the normality results, familiarity with the TBLT normality test was significant, Kolmogorov-Smirnov = .131, $p < .001$, and the skewness and kurtosis values were -.384 and .133. Moreover, Positive Perception scores were not normally distributed. Thus, the potential impact of outliers was checked, and an outlier with a lower than minus three standard deviations was detected. It was excluded from the dataset, and the normality tests were re-run for Positive Perception. The results revealed that Kolmogorov-Smirnov = .91 ($df = 201$), $p < .001$. However, the skewness and kurtosis values were -.524 and -.196. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), when skewness and kurtosis values are

between ± 1.5 values, even though Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results which are very sensitive to a higher number of sample sizes, the distribution of the variables can be accepted normally distributed. For this reason, both variables were accepted as normally distributed with the exclusion of one outlier case. The rest of the statistical analyses will be parametric analyses (Büyüköztürk, 2018; Çokluk et al., 2018; Field, 2017).

Table 4.1.2. Research Questions and Data Analysis

| Research Questions | Data Analysis |
|---|--|
| <p>1. To what extent are ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye familiar with TBLT?</p> | <p>Descriptive statistics: central tendency measures, mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and median</p> |
| <p>2. What are the perceptions of ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT?</p> | <p>Descriptive statistics: central tendency measures, mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and median</p> |
| <p>3. Are there any statistically significant differences in the instructors' familiarity with TBLT, positive and negative perceptions of TBLT, depending on the following variables?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">3.1. Years of teaching experience</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">3.2. The type of the institution currently working: private or public</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">3.3. The status of professional development in TBLT</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">3.4. Educational background</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3.4.1. Type of degree</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">3.4.2. Department for BA and MA degree</p> | <p>MANOVA</p> <p>Scheffe or Dunnett's C for post-hoc tests</p> |
| <p>4. Are there any statistically significant differences between the instructors' preferences of applying TBLT in teaching grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills, depending on the following variables?</p> | <p>Cross-tabs and ordinal variables correlation analyses, Somers' d and Gamma for ordinal variables</p> |

Table 4.1.2. Cont'd

-
- 4.1. Years of teaching experience
 - 4.2. The type of the institution currently working:
private or public
 - 4.3. The status of professional development in
TBLT
 - 4.4. Educational background
 - 4.4.1. Type of degree
 - 4.4.2. Department for BA and MA degree
-

The first two research questions of the study were analyzed using central tendency measures, mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and median (Table 4.1.2.). These analyses descriptively explain data and underline the current status (Büyüköztürk, 2018; Çokluk et al., 2018; Field, 2017).

The selection of statistical analyses was based on the available independent and dependent variables to respond to the study's third and fourth research questions (Table 4.1.2.). There were three dependent variables and independent variables with two or more categories. For that reason, multivariate ANOVA was performed (Field, 2017). Before MANOVA analysis, the equality of covariance matrices was also checked for the assumption with Box's M test, so when the test generated a significant result at $p < .000$ level, the assumption was violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). If not, it is not violated and safe to run MANOVA. When there was a significant difference in the multivariate test, the univariate analysis was checked to understand which variable(s) was the main reason for this result (Büyüköztürk, 2018; Çokluk et al., 2018; Field, 2017). Finally, in univariate analysis, if the independent variable has more than two categories, a post-hoc test was run to reveal which category of the variable was the underlying reason for the significant difference. Levene's test verified error variance homogeneity before post-hoc tests. This test's significance indicates that the error variances are not homogeneous, hence Dunnett's C test is needed. Scheffe test can be used if the test is not significant and error variances are homogeneous (Büyüköztürk, 2018; Çokluk et al., 2018; Field, 2017). These methods were used for every analysis.

The fourth research question responded with cross-tabs and ordinal variables correlation analyses (Table 4.1.2.), as well as Somers'd and Gamma for ordinal variables, as suggested by Wagner (2006). The purpose of these analyses is to reveal the degree and direction of the relationship between ordinal variables.

In this part, the results of the analyses are presented under the corresponding research questions.

4.1.1. Research Question 1: To what extent are ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye familiar with TBLT?

For this research question, central tendency measures were estimated and illustrated in Table 4.1.1.1.

Table 4.1.1.1. Descriptive Statistics of Familiarity with TBLT

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD | Median |
|----------------------------------|----------|----------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|
| The Familiarity with TBLT | 201 | 31,3 | 100,0 | 72,5 | 13,7 | 75.00 |

The minimum score for the familiarity was 31.3, and the maximum score was 100.00. The average was 72.5 (SD = 13.7). Based on these results, it can be stated that the instructors' level of familiarity with TBLT was high.

Combined with a maximum score of 100, the mean familiarity score of 72.5 reveals that teachers are generally knowledgeable about TBLT. This indicates that most teachers have a solid understanding of TBLT, which is important for its effective application in educational contexts. As illustrated in Table 4.1.1.2., high levels of familiarity among teachers probably translate into a more certain and successful application of TBLT techniques in the classroom, which may improve student learning. The minimum score of 31.3 and a standard deviation of 13.7 indicate substantial variety in familiarity despite the high average familiarity. This implies that while some teachers have a great deal of experience with TBLT, others may not have as much. This variation may result in a diverse implementation of TBLT techniques, which might impact the general standard and consistency of language instruction between teachers. The necessity for focused

professional development programs to assist teachers with lesser degrees of familiarity is highlighted by this variance, ensuring that all instructors possess the knowledge and abilities required to apply TBLT successfully.

Besides this, based on these findings in Table 4.1.1.2, we may conclude that the teachers have a strong comprehension of what a task entails, how to give feedback in TBLT classes and how to select materials. According to the responds of the participants, TBLT is a communicative goal-directed activity, requires real world content, materials should be meaningful and purposeful, which meets the needs of the students and outcome is prioritized in this method. However, in task-related item 2, 50% of respondents agree that the task is a meaning-focused activity, which diminishes familiarity since TBLT necessitates prioritizing meaning above form (Nunan, 1989). At that point, we can notice the demand of 50 percent of EFL teachers in terms of precision in vocabulary and grammatical usage in their classes. In the definition of the task, 50% of respondents to item related to the task is a meaning-focused activity according to TBLT lowers familiarity since the expected answer is a lot more according to TBLT. It demands that students pay more attention to meaning than form (Nunan, 1989). At this point, we can still notice that EFL teachers have high standards for grammar and vocabulary correctness in TBLT. Besides this, while almost %82.2 of instructors agree that the role of the students is to communicate with their peers to complete a task, only % 34.7 of them are aware that the role of the teacher is not a “presenter” but a facilitator in the TBLT learning setting.

Table 4.1.1.2. Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Awareness of ELF Instructors Working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT

| Items | Agree | Undecided | Disagree |
|---|--------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1. A task is a communicative goal-directed activity. | 90.1% | 6.4% | 3.5% |
| 2. A task mainly focuses on meaning. | 49.5% | 26.6% | 23.6% |
| 3. A task has a clearly defined communicative outcome. | 81.7% | 11.9% | 6.4% |
| 4. A task is any activity in which the learner uses the target language for a communicative purpose to achieve an outcome. | 93.6% | 3.9% | 2.5% |
| 5. Tasks are only done in pairs or groups. | 15.8% | 17.3% | 66.8% |

Table 4.1.1.2. Cont'd

| | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| 6. A task has a clear relationship to real-world language needs. | 87.1% | 10.9% | 2.0% |
| 7. Task selection is based on an analysis of students' needs. | 85.6% | 9.9% | 4.4% |
| 8. TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful. | 98% | 1% | 1% |
| 9. "Task-based" and "Task-supported" language teaching are the same. | 9.9% | 41.6% | 48.5% |
| 10. TBLT is a derivative of the Communicative Approach and Second Language Acquisition. | 64.9% | 33.7% | 1.5 |
| 11. In TBLT, the role of the teacher is that of a presenter. | 43.1% | 22.3% | 34.7% |
| 12. In TBLT, the role of the students is to communicate with their peers to complete a task. | 82.2% | 12.9% | 5.0% |
| 13. TBLT fosters a positive attitude towards language learning. | 89.1% | 10.4% | 5% |
| 14. TBLT encourages using scaffolding techniques to support learners in completing tasks. | 29.2% | 39.1% | 31.7% |
| 15. In TBLT, error correction is done through explicit feedback. | 1.5% | 5.4% | 93.1% |
| 16. TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom. | 62.4% | 24.8% | 12.9% |
| 17. The assessment of the task is done in terms of outcome. | 65.8% | 27.4% | 6.8% |

4.1.2. Research Question 2: What are the perceptions of ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT?

Measures of central tendency, such as mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and median, were used to provide an answer to the second question. The outcome is shown in Table 4.1.2.1. below.

Table 4.1.2.1. Descriptive Statistics of Familiarity with TBLT and the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Years of Experience

| | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | SD | Median |
|---------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|------|--------|
| Positive Perception about TBLT | 201 | 60.00 | 100,0 | 87,2 | 8.95 | 88.24 |
| Negative Perception about TBLT | 201 | 25,0 | 100,0 | 59,5 | 12,3 | 58.75 |

The minimum score for the positive perception was 60.00, and the maximum score was 100.00. The average was 87.2 (SD = 8.95). Based on these results, it can be stated that the instructors' positive perception of TBLT was at a very high level. Besides, the minimum score for the negative perception was 25.00, and the maximum score was 100.00. The average was 59.5 (SD = 12.3). Based on these results, it can be stated that the instructors' negative perception of TBLT was slightly higher than that of the medium level.

The final component of the survey consists of topics designed to gauge instructors' thoughts on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) on a 5-point Likert scale, indicating both positive and negative views. Each item fulfills this objective and aids in understanding various points of view. Nonetheless, it may be possible to deduce the reasons for instructors' most favorable and negative opinions by looking at the items that received the highest percentage of "agree" and "strongly agree" responses. Analyzing the frequency of replies to each item makes this clear. It is implied that the most often chosen components for positive viewpoints on TBLT are on the collaborative learning environment, helping learners to prepare for a real-world communication, to use the language in a meaningful conversation, encouraging both learners' autonomy and also intrinsic motivation, and providing interesting and fun tasks for learning the target language as summarized in Table 4.1.2.2.

Table 4.1.2.2. Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Positive Perspective of ELF Instructors working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT

| Items | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 1. TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation. | 48.5% | 41.6% | 7.9% | 1.0% | 1.0% |
| 2. TBLT encourages learner autonomy. | 66.3% | 29.2% | 3.5% | 5% | 5% |
| 3. TBLT promotes a collaborative learning environment. | 71.3% | 25.2% | 2.5% | 5% | 5% |
| 4. TBLT provides tasks that challenge learners to use the target language creatively. | 69.3% | 25.2% | 3.0% | 2.0% | 5% |

Table 4.1.2.2. Cont'd

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| 5. TBLT activates learners' needs and preferences. | 57.9% | 30.2% | 10.9% | 5% | 5% |
| 6. TBLT provides interesting and fun tasks for learning the target language. | 55.9% | 37.6% | 5.9% | 0% | 5% |
| 7. TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere in class to promote the target language use. | 55.4% | 33.2% | 9.9% | 1.0% | 5% |
| 8. TBLT helps learners prepare for real-world communication. | 65.3% | 31.2% | 2.5% | 5% | 5% |
| 9. TBLT helps learners use the target language in meaningful conversations. | 72.3% | 23.8% | 3.5% | 0% | 5% |
| 10. TBLT affords learners a rich input of the target language. | 47.5% | 32.7% | 16.8% | 2.5% | 5% |
| 11. TBLT encourages the integration of cultural elements and perspectives into language learning tasks. | 54.0% | 33.7% | 10.9% | 1.0% | 5% |
| 12. TBLT enhances learners' cultural awareness and understanding through authentic language tasks. | 49.0% | 31.2% | 17.3% | 2.0% | .5% |
| 17. TBLT is applicable to learners of various proficiency levels. | 41.1% | 38.1% | 9.4% | 7.4% | 4.0% |
| 25. I have an interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom. | 38.1% | 42.1% | 16.8% | 1.0% | 2.0% |
| 26. I find TBLT to be an innovative approach to language teaching. | 39.6% | 41.6% | 14.9% | 3.5% | .5% |

Table 4.1.2.2. Cont'd

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|------|------|
| 27. I believe that I can define the basic principles of TBLT. | 32.2% | 38.6% | 23.3% | 4.0% | 2.0% |
|--|-------|-------|-------|------|------|

Regarding the negative perceptions, as displayed in Table 4.1.2.3, the most commonly agreed upon or strongly agreed upon items are opinions that TBLT is appropriate for small group work and large class size is an obstacle to apply TBLT; learners may be reluctant to work in a group because they are not accustomed to task-based learning, and students overs use L1 as they are performing tasks; textbooks are not appropriate for TBLT materials, as a consequence, it requires more preparation time from teachers than other approaches, and TBLT is not suitable for the exams that students need to get prepared. Hence, it can be concluded that all items perceived negatively can be seen as an explanation of one another and they all go hand in hand, and are consistent with each other.

Table 4.1.2.3. Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Negative Perspective of ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT

| Items | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 13. TBLT is appropriate for small group work. | 29.7% | 33.7% | 24.3% | 9.4% | 3.0% |
| 14. TBLT classes result in noise and discipline problems. | 6.9% | 10.9% | 27.2% | 33.2% | 21.8% |
| 15. TBLT puts a psychological burden on the teacher as a facilitator. | 6.4% | 13.4% | 27.2% | 35.1% | 17.8% |
| 16. TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches. | 20.8% | 33.7% | 28.7% | 12.9% | 4.0% |
| 18. TBLT is <u>NOT</u> quite suitable for the exams that students need to prepare for. | 18.8% | 23.3% | 32.7% | 18.8% | 6.4% |
| 19. TBLT resources are limited to find. | 7.4% | 21.3% | 31.7% | 28.2% | 11.4% |
| 20. The students might be reluctant to work in a group. | 17.8% | 39.1% | 23.3% | 15.3% | 4.5% |
| 21. Students are <u>NOT</u> used to task-based learning. | 22.8% | 35.6% | 19.3% | 15.8% | 6.4% |

Table 4.1.2.3. Cont'd

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 22. Materials in textbooks are <u>NOT</u> proper for using TBLT. | 11.4% | 33.7% | 32.7% | 18.8% | 3.5% |
| 23. Large class size is an obstacle to using task-based methods. | 20.3% | 29.2% | 30.2% | 16.8% | 3.5% |
| 24. Students overuse the L1 when performing tasks. | 19.8% | 34.7% | 29.2% | 13.4% | 3.0% |
| 28. I have difficulty assessing learners' task-based performance in speaking. | 5.9% | 13.4% | 27.7% | 42.6% | 10.4% |
| 29. I have difficulty assessing learners' task-based performance in writing. | 6.4% | 8.4% | 22.3% | 49.0% | 13.9% |
| 30. I am uncertain about how grammar should be handled in TBLT. | 9.9% | 13.9% | 25.7% | 39.1% | 11.4% |
| 31. I find it hard to decide on task difficulty. | 6.4% | 13.9% | 25.2% | 42.6% | 11.9% |
| 32. I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction. | 5.0% | 14.4% | 24.8% | 35.1% | 20.8% |
| 33. I have some concerns about implementing TBLT due to classroom management issues. | 7.4% | 17.3% | 25.2% | 35.6% | 14.4% |

4.1.3. Research Question 3: Are there any statistically significant differences in the instructors' familiarity with TBLT, as well as positive and negative perceptions of TBLT, depending on the following variables?

Research Question 3.1.1: Years of teaching experience

The choice of statistical analyses was made in light of the available independent and dependent variables in order to address the third research question. Three independent variables, each having two or more categories, were paired with three dependent variables. Consequently, multivariate ANOVA was carried out. The Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant, $M = 39.936$, $F(24, 68478.991)$, $p = .035$, and the p-value was not .000, so the assumption was accepted as not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A MANOVA indicated that there was no impact of the instructors' years of experience on their both positive and negative perception related to TBLT, Wilk's $\lambda =$

.892, $F(12, 513.567) = 1.891$, $p < .05$, multivariate partial $\eta^2 = 0.037$ indicating 3.7% of total variance explained and small effect size. The descriptive statistics related to familiarity with TBLT, positive and negative perceptions associated with TBLT, and distribution across the categories of years of experience are illustrated in Table 4.1.3.1.

Table 4.1.3.1. Descriptive statistics of Familiarity with TBLT and the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Years of Experience

| Variables | Experience | Mean | SD | N |
|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | Less than five years | 67,9 | 15,2 | 45 |
| | 5 to 9 years | 70,9 | 12,5 | 38 |
| | 10 to 15 years | 76,0 | 12,1 | 59 |
| | 15 to 20 years | 70,5 | 14,9 | 29 |
| | 20+ | 76,3 | 12,6 | 30 |
| | Total | | 72,5 | 13,7 |
| Positive Perception about TBLT | Less than five years | 87,9 | 8,5 | 45 |
| | 5 to 9 years | 87,3 | 8,9 | 38 |
| | 10 to 15 years | 86,9 | 8,5 | 59 |
| | 15 to 20 years | 87,1 | 9,6 | 29 |
| | 20+ | 86,7 | 10,4 | 30 |
| | Total | | 87,2 | 8,9 |
| Negative Perception about TBLT | Less than five years | 63,1 | 9,8 | 45 |
| | 5 to 9 years | 61,9 | 10,9 | 38 |
| | 10 to 15 years | 57,7 | 13,7 | 59 |
| | 15 to 20 years | 56,6 | 10,3 | 29 |
| | 20+ | 57,4 | 14,8 | 30 |
| | Total | | 59,5 | 12,3 |

The results in Table 4.1.3.1. demonstrated that the average scores of the instructors' positive and negative perceptions based on their years of experiences were not significantly different, $F(4, 196) = .107$, $p = .980$, and $F(4, 196) = 2.361$, $p = .055$. On the other hand, the average scores for the familiarity with TBLT appear to be a significant difference, $F(4, 196) = 3.182$, $p < .05$, univariate partial $\eta^2 = 0.061$, indicating 6.1% of total variance explained and small effect size. In order to reveal the main reason for this significant difference among the years of experience categories, the Scheffe posthoc test was performed, which was chosen explicitly since the homogeneity of error variances was confirmed by Levene's Test, $F(4, 196) = 1.246$, $p = .293$. The Scheffe test results pointed out that none of the categories of the year of experience generated a significant pairwise difference; thus, the significant difference found in the univariate analysis may be due to chance. The effect size also approved this situation with a small value. In conclusion, it

can be inferred that the instructors' years of experience did not have any impact on their familiarity with TBLT, and both positive and negative perceptions related to TBLT.

4.1.4. Research Question 3.1.2: The status of professional development in TBLT

The Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant, $M = 12.001$, $F(12, 84121.415) = .975$, $p = .470$, and the test was not significant, so the assumption was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A MANOVA indicated that there was a significant impact of the instructors' status of professional development in TBLT on their familiarity with TBLT, and both positive and negative perceptions related to TBLT, Wilk's $\lambda = .926$, $F(6, 392) = 2.555$, $p < .05$, multivariate partial $\eta^2 = .038$ indicating that 3.8% of total variance explained and small effect size. The descriptive statistics related to familiarity with TBLT, positive and negative perceptions associated with TBLT, and distribution across the categories of years of experience are illustrated in Table 4.1.4.1.

Table 4.1.4.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Descriptive Statistics Related to the Instructors' Familiarity with TBLT, and Positive and Negative Perceptions Related to TBLT Based on the Status of Professional Development in TBLT

| Variables | Experience | Mean | SD | N |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------|------------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT. | 74,5 | 12,0 | 99 |
| | I have informally acquired knowledge about TBLT. | 72,5 | 13,3 | 60 |
| | No, I have not received formal training in TBLT. | 67,6 | 16,8 | 42 |
| | Total | 72,5 | 13,7 | 201 |
| Positive Perception | Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT. | 88,8 | 8,4 | 99 |
| | I have informally acquired knowledge about TBLT. | 86,5 | 8,7 | 60 |
| | No, I have not received formal training in TBLT. | 84,4 | 10,0 | 42 |
| | Total | 87,2 | 8,9 | 201 |
| Negative Perception | Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT. | 58,3 | 12,4 | 99 |
| | I have informally acquired knowledge about TBLT. | 58,9 | 12,4 | 60 |
| | No, I have not received formal training in TBLT. | 63,1 | 11,6 | 42 |
| | Total | 59,5 | 12,3 | 201 |

The univariate follow-up of the familiarity with TBLT and both positive and negative perceptions revealed that the significant difference caused because of the familiarity and positive perception, respectively, $F(2, 198) = 3.890$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .038$ indicating that 3.8% of total variance explained and small effect size and $F(2, 198) = 4.024$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = .039$ indicating that 3.9% of total variance explained and small effect size and, but not negative perception, $F(2, 198) = 2.376$, $p = .096$. A post hoc examination, Dunnett's C on familiarity, and Scheffe's test on Positive Perception in TBLT were performed. The Levene Test for the equality of error variances was significant in terms of the familiarity scores, $F(2, 198) = 3.094$, $p = .047$, and the same test for the positive perception was not significant, $F(2, 198) = .420$, $p = .657$. The test about both familiarity and positive perception revealed that a significant difference emerged due to the considerable difference between the average of Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT group, and No, I have not received formal training in TBLT groups ($p < .05$) in favor of received the professional training. The results of the analysis indicated that those who received formal training in TBLT had a more familiarity and positive perception than those who had not received any formal training. It can be inferred that the professional development status of the instructors had an increasing impact on their familiarity and positive perception of TBLT.

4.1.5. Research Question 3.1.3: Educational background

Research Question 3.1.3.1: Type of degree

To respond to this research question, the instructors were classified as those who either have an MA degree or not and either have a Ph.D. degree or not. Only one instructor did not have a BA degree, and the rest of the participants had a BA degree; it was not possible to perform any statistical analysis.

The instructors' familiarity with TBLT and positive and negative perceptions about TBLT based on having an MA degree or not descriptive statistics are illustrated in Table 4.1.5.1. The Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant, $M = 5.713$, $F(6, 27705.598) = .924$, $p = .476$, and the test was not significant, so the assumption was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Table 4.1.5.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having an MA Degree or Not.

| | MA degree | Mean | SD | N |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | No | 71,0 | 14,4 | 39 |
| | Yes | 72,8 | 13,5 | 162 |
| | Total | 72,5 | 13,7 | 201 |
| Positive Perception | No | 85,8 | 9,4 | 39 |
| | Yes | 87,5 | 8,8 | 162 |
| | Total | 87,2 | 8,9 | 201 |
| Negative Perception | No | 61,5 | 13,4 | 39 |
| | Yes | 59,0 | 12,0 | 162 |
| | Total | 59,5 | 12,3 | 201 |

Since the average scores of the familiarity and both perceptions were found very close in the two groups, MANOVA did not yield any significant difference, Wilk's $\lambda = .987$, $F(3, 197) = .857$, $p = .464$ and. This result indicates that it does not matter whether having an MA degree or not the impact or influence on the familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions of the instructors.

The instructors' familiarity with TBLT and both positive and negative perceptions about TBLT based on having a Ph.D. degree or not descriptive statistics are illustrated in Table 4.1.5.2.

Table 4.1.5.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Familiarity with TBLT, and Both Positive and Negative Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having a Ph.D. Degree or Not.

| | Ph.D. degree | Mean | SD | N |
|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | No | 72,6 | 14,0 | 167 |
| | Yes | 71,9 | 12,4 | 34 |
| | Total | 72,5 | 13,7 | 201 |
| Positive Perception | No | 87,0 | 9,2 | 167 |
| | Yes | 88,0 | 8,0 | 34 |
| | Total | 87,2 | 8,9 | 201 |
| Negative Perception | No | 60,3 | 11,8 | 167 |
| | Yes | 55,4 | 13,8 | 34 |
| | Total | 59,5 | 12,3 | 201 |

Since the average scores of the familiarity and both perceptions were found very close in the two groups, MANOVA did not yield any significant difference, Wilk's $\lambda = .968$, $F(3, 197) = 2.139$, $p = .097$. The difference between the groups is about five points in the negative perception; however, it was not sufficient to yield significant results. This result indicates that it does not matter whether having a Ph.D. degree or not influences the familiarity with TBLT and both positive and negative perceptions about TBLT of the instructors.

4.1.6. Research Question 3.1.3.2: Department for each degree (BA and MA)

To respond to this research question, BA and MA degrees departments were recoded into different variables, such as ELT vs. other departments, and since the number of participants who had Ph D. is quite a few, their departments were not possible to run any statistical analysis. The data were analyzed with MANOVA. This procedure was necessary because the frequency of the participants in other departments was very low and not capable of running any mean comparison analysis.

Table 4.1.6.1. illustrates the descriptive statistics for the familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions about TBLT based on having a BA degree in ELT or not.

Table 4.1.6.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Positive and Negative Perception of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Whether Having a BA Degree in ELT or Not

| | Having a BA in ELT | Mean | SD | N |
|------------------------------|--------------------|------|------|-----|
| Familiarity with TBLT | No | 69,6 | 14,4 | 91 |
| | Yes | 75,2 | 12,2 | 109 |
| | Total | 72,6 | 13,5 | 200 |
| Positive Perception | No | 86,1 | 8,8 | 91 |
| | Yes | 88,4 | 8,6 | 109 |
| | Total | 87,3 | 8,8 | 200 |
| Negative Perception | No | 60,4 | 11,3 | 91 |
| | Yes | 58,7 | 13,1 | 109 |
| | Total | 59,5 | 12,3 | 200 |

The Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant, $M = 8.241$, $F(6, 260637.682) = 1,351$, $p = .231$, and the test was not significant, so the assumption was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The MANOVA analysis revealed that there were significant differences, Wilk's $\lambda = .952$, $F(3, 196) = 3.275$, $p < .05$, multivariate partial $\eta^2 = .048$, indicating 4.8% of total variance explained and small effect size. The univariate

ANOVA results pointed out that the significant difference emerged due to the familiarity scores, $F(1, 198) = 8.858, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .043$, indicating 4.3% of total variance explained and small effect size. Those who had a BA in ELT had a higher familiarity with TBLT than those who did not have a BA in ELT. For both positive and negative perceptions, there was no significant impact, respectively, $F(1, 198) = 3.314, p = .070$, and $F(1, 198) = 1.008, p = .317$. This result indicates that having a BA degree in ELT impacted the instructors' familiarity, whereas it impacted the instructors' neither positive nor negative perceptions about TBLT.

Table 4.1.6.2. illustrates the descriptive statistics for the familiarity with TLBT and both positive and negative perceptions about TBLT based on whether they have an MA degree in ELT or not.

Table 4.1.6.2. Descriptive Statistics of the Familiarity and Perceptions of the Instructors Related to TBLT Based on Having an MA Degree in ELT or Not

| | MA in ELT | Mean | SD | N |
|------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Familiarity with TBLT | No | 69,3 | 14,4 | 72 |
| | Yes | 75,6 | 12,1 | 90 |
| | Total | 72,8 | 13,5 | 162 |
| Positive Perception | No | 85,7 | 8,9 | 72 |
| | Yes | 89,0 | 8,6 | 90 |
| | Total | 87,5 | 8,8 | 162 |
| Negative Perception | No | 62,0 | 11,1 | 72 |
| | Yes | 56,6 | 12,2 | 90 |
| | Total | 59,0 | 12,0 | 162 |

The Box's M test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was significant, $M = 5.156, F(6, 1622908.384) = .841, p = .538$, and the test was not significant, so the assumption was not violated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Table 14. demonstrates that there were certain differences in terms of average scores related to familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions related to TBLT. The MANOVA analysis revealed that these differences were significant, Wilk's $\lambda = .903, F(3, 158) = 5.681, p < .01$, multivariate partial $\eta^2 = .097$, indicating that 9.7% of total variance explained and small effect size. This result indicates that having an MA degree in ELT impacted the instructors' familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions related to TBLT. In univariate follow-up tests, the familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions generated significant differences, respectively, $F(1, 160) = 9.720, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .055$ indicating that 5.5% of total variance explained and

small effect size, $F(1, 160) = 5.761, p < .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .035$ indicating that 3.5% of total variance explained and small effect size, and $F(1, 160) = 8.371, p < .01, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .050$ indicating that 5.0% of total variance explained and small effect size. It can be inferred that having an MA degree in ELT had an impact on the familiarity and both positive and negative perceptions of the instructors related to TBLT. Those who had an MA in ELT scored higher average values than those who did not. The reverse situation was true. Those who did not have any MA scored higher on average negative perception than those who had an MA in ELT.

4.1.7. Research Question 4: Are there any statistically significant differences between the instructors’ preferences for applying TBLT in teaching grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills, depending on the following variables?

Based on the independent and dependent variables that were accessible, statistical studies were chosen to address the study's fourth set of questions. Three independent variables with two or more categories and three dependent variables were present. For this reason, an ANOVA with multiple variables was conducted. Before responding, a summary table that lists the classes in which teachers most usually opt to use TBLT is displayed. Table 4.1.7.1. shows that "speaking" is the most preferred skill for implementing this method, obviously, with writing, listening, vocabulary, reading, and grammar coming next respectively.

Table 4.1.7.1 Summary of the Descriptive Statistics of Instructors’ Preferences of ELF Instructors Working at Preparatory Schools in Türkiye on TBLT

| Items | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 34. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching grammar in my classes. | 15.8% | 30.2% | 27.7% | 22.8% | 3.5% |
| 35. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching vocabulary in my classes. | 23.8% | 43.1% | 21.8% | 9.9% | 1.5% |

Table 4.1.7.1 Cont'd

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 36. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching reading skills. | 22.8% | 36.1% | 26.2% | 12.4% | 2.5% |
| 37. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching listening skills. | 25.7% | 30.7% | 27.7% | 13.9% | 2.0% |
| 38. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching speaking skills. | 47.0% | 31.2% | 14.9% | 5.0% | 2.0% |
| 39. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching writing skills. | 29.7% | 36.6% | 22.8% | 8.4% | 2.5% |

Research Question 4.1.1: Years of teaching experience

Table 4.1.7.2. illustrates the English skills preferences for TBLT, and the years of experience were cross-tabulated and checked for their relationships using Somers' d and Gamma for ordinal variables as suggested by Wagner (2006), according to results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.2. The instructors' years of experience did not yield any significant correlation between English skill preferences.

Table 4.1.7.2. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Years of Experience

| | Preference scale | Less than five years | 5 to 9 years | 10 to 15 years | 15 to 20 years | 20+ | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------|----------------|----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 | .052, p = .365 | .067, p = .365 |
| | 2 | 7 | 8 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 46 | | |
| | 3 | 15 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 8 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 17 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 9 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 32 | | |
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | .051, p = .376 | .069, p = .376 |
| | 2 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 19 | | |
| | 3 | 11 | 6 | 9 | 12 | 6 | 44 | | |
| | 4 | 24 | 15 | 25 | 8 | 15 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 8 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 8 | 48 | | |

Table 4.1.7.2. Cont'd

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----------------|----------------|
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | .021, p = .698 | .028, p = .698 |
| | 2 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 10 | 7 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 52 | | |
| | 4 | 23 | 12 | 23 | 8 | 7 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 6 | 12 | 13 | 4 | 11 | 46 | | |
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | .054, p = .334 | .070, p = .334 |
| | 2 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 28 | | |
| | 3 | 13 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 10 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 19 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 11 | 52 | | |
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | .105, p = .059 | .147, p = .059 |
| | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 30 | | |
| | 4 | 18 | 12 | 21 | 6 | 6 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 23 | 19 | 25 | 12 | 16 | 95 | | |
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | .055, p = .348 | .073, p = .348 |
| | 2 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 17 | | |
| | 3 | 12 | 6 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 46 | | |
| | 4 | 17 | 17 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 11 | 60 | | |
| | Total | 45 | 38 | 59 | 29 | 30 | 201 | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 201

i. Research Question 4.1.2: The type of the institution currently working: private or public

Table 4.1.7.3. illustrates that the English skills preferences for TBLT and the institution types currently working were cross-tabulated, and their relationships were checked using Somers'd and Gamma for ordinal variables, as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.3., the institution types currently working of the instructors did not yield any significant correlation between all English skills preferences.

Table 4.1.7.3. Cross-tabulation of All skill preferences and Years of Experience

| | | Public | Private | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|-------|----------------|----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 2 | 5 | 7 | .073, p = .236 | .136, p = .236 |
| | 2 | 18 | 28 | 46 | | |
| | 3 | 14 | 40 | 54 | | |
| | 4 | 15 | 46 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 9 | 23 | 32 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | .065, p = .338 | .119, p = .338 |
| | 2 | 9 | 10 | 19 | | |
| | 3 | 14 | 29 | 43 | | |
| | 4 | 18 | 69 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 16 | 32 | 48 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | .034, p = .598 | .063, p = .598 |
| | 2 | 9 | 16 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 16 | 35 | 51 | | |
| | 4 | 15 | 58 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 16 | 30 | 46 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | .076, p = .231 | .141, p = .231 |
| | 2 | 11 | 17 | 28 | | |
| | 3 | 16 | 38 | 54 | | |
| | 4 | 14 | 48 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 15 | 37 | 52 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | .050, p = .454 | .096, p = .454 |
| | 2 | 5 | 5 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 7 | 22 | 29 | | |
| | 4 | 17 | 46 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 27 | 68 | 95 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | .037, p = .559 | .069, p = .559 |
| | 2 | 6 | 11 | 17 | | |
| | 3 | 11 | 34 | 45 | | |
| | 4 | 23 | 51 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 16 | 44 | 60 | | |
| | Total | | 58 | 142 | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 200. One participant was working in neither public nor private institutions.

ii. Research Question 4.1.3: The status of professional development in TBLT

Table 4.1.7.4. illustrates that the English skills preferences for using TBLT and the status of professional development in TBLT were cross-tabulated, and their relationships were checked using Somers' d and Gamma for ordinal variables, as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to the results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.4. the only speaking skill preferences, as shown italicized for using TBLT of the instructors and the status of

professional development in TBLT, were associated, Somers'd = .158, $p < .05$ and Gamma = .242, $p < .05$. It appears that the participants who had a formal professional training were more inclined to use TBLT in their speaking skills improvement classes. The rest of the skills did not yield any significant relationships.

Table 4.1.7.4. Cross-tabulation of all Skills Preferences to Use TBLT and the Status of Professional Development in TBLT

| Preference scale | | Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT. | I have informally acquired knowledge about TBLT. | No, I have not received formal training in TBLT. | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|--|--|-------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| Grammar preference | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 7 | .081, $p = .188$ | .118, $p = .188$ |
| | 2 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 46 | | |
| | 3 | 24 | 17 | 14 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 31 | 19 | 11 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 21 | 8 | 3 | 32 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | .068, $p = .271$ | .102, $p = .271$ |
| | 2 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 19 | | |
| | 3 | 16 | 17 | 11 | 44 | | |
| | 4 | 48 | 22 | 17 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 25 | 15 | 8 | 48 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | -.075, $p = .220$ | -.111, $p = .220$ |
| | 2 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 25 | 15 | 12 | 52 | | |
| | 4 | 35 | 23 | 15 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 21 | 16 | 9 | 46 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | -.045, $p = .471$ | -.066, $p = .471$ |
| | 2 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 28 | | |
| | 3 | 26 | 15 | 14 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 27 | 20 | 15 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 27 | 17 | 8 | 52 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | .158, $p = .011$ | .242, $p = .011$ |
| | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 30 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 18 | 15 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 55 | 24 | 16 | 95 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | .074, $p = .235$ | .110, $p = .235$ |
| | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 17 | | |
| | 3 | 17 | 16 | 13 | 46 | | |
| | 4 | 43 | 17 | 14 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 31 | 20 | 9 | 60 | | |
| | Total | 99 | 60 | 42 | 201 | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 201.

iii. Research Question 4.1.4: Educational background

Research Question 4.1.4.1: Type of degree

Table 4.1.7.5. illustrates the English skills preferences for TBLT and whether or not they have an MA degree. These were cross-tabulated, and their relationships were checked using Somersd and Gamma for ordinal variables, as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to the results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.5, having an MA degree or not did not yield any significant correlation between English skill preferences.

Table 4.1.7.5. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a MA Degree or Not

| | Preference scale | No | Yes | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|------------------|----|-----|-------|----------------|----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | .009, p = .865 | .021, p = .865 |
| | 2 | 7 | 39 | 46 | | |
| | 3 | 15 | 40 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 11 | 50 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 5 | 27 | 32 | | |
| | Total | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | .062, p = .282 | .144, p = .282 |
| | 2 | 3 | 16 | 19 | | |
| | 3 | 13 | 31 | 44 | | |
| | 4 | 16 | 71 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 7 | 41 | 48 | | |
| | Total | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | .020, p = .735 | .045, p = .735 |
| | 2 | 4 | 21 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 15 | 37 | 52 | | |
| | 4 | 11 | 62 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 9 | 37 | 46 | | |
| | Total | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | .029, p = .738 | .042, p = .738 |
| | 2 | 3 | 25 | 28 | | |
| | 3 | 17 | 38 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 10 | 52 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 9 | 43 | 52 | | |
| | Total | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | .079, p = .200 | .180, p = .200 |
| | 2 | 0 | 10 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 12 | 18 | 30 | | |
| | 4 | 12 | 51 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 15 | 80 | 95 | | |
| | Total | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |

Table 4.1.7.5. Cont'd

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|----|-----|-----|----------------|----------------|
| Writing preference | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | .042, p = .473 | .095, p = .473 |
| | 2 | 2 | 15 | 17 | | |
| | 3 | 14 | 32 | 46 | | |
| | 4 | 13 | 61 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 10 | 50 | 60 | | |
| Total | | 39 | 162 | 201 | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 201.

Table 4.1.7.6. displays the English skills preferences for TBLT and whether having a Ph.D. degree or not were cross-tabulated and checked for their relationships using Somers'd and Gamma for ordinal variables as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to the results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.6, having a Ph.D. degree or not did not yield any significant correlation between all English skill preferences.

Table 4.1.7.6. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a Ph.D. Degree or Not

| | Preference scale | No | Yes | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----|-----|-------|----------------|----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | .028, p = .646 | .066, p = .646 |
| | 2 | 38 | 8 | 46 | | |
| | 3 | 54 | 1 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 43 | 18 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 28 | 4 | 32 | | |
| Total | | 167 | 34 | 201 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | .028, p = .763 | .045, p = .763 |
| | 2 | 15 | 4 | 19 | | |
| | 3 | 40 | 4 | 44 | | |
| | 4 | 70 | 17 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 40 | 8 | 48 | | |
| Total | | 167 | 34 | 201 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | .050, p = .409 | .123, p = .409 |
| | 2 | 21 | 4 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 47 | 5 | 52 | | |
| | 4 | 60 | 13 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 36 | 10 | 46 | | |
| Total | | 167 | 34 | 201 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | .008, p = .900 | .019, p = .900 |
| | 2 | 22 | 6 | 28 | | |
| | 3 | 48 | 7 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 52 | 10 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 42 | 10 | 52 | | |
| Total | | 167 | 34 | 201 | | |

Table 4.1.7.6. Cont'd

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|----|-----|----|----------------|----------------|
| Speaking preference | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | .089, p = .392 | .137, p = .392 |
| | 2 | 7 | 3 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 28 | 2 | 30 | | |
| | 4 | 54 | 9 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 76 | 19 | 95 | | |
| Total | 167 | 34 | 201 | | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | .034, p = .580 | .084, p = .580 |
| | 2 | 13 | 4 | 17 | | |
| | 3 | 43 | 3 | 46 | | |
| | 4 | 61 | 13 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 48 | 12 | 60 | | |
| Total | 167 | 34 | 201 | | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 201.

iv. Research Question 4.1.4.2: Department for BA and MA degree

Table 4.1.7.7. illustrates the English skills preferences for using TBLT and whether or not having a BA degree in the ELT department were cross-tabulated and checked for their relationships using Somers's and Gamma for ordinal variables as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.7., the only speaking skill preferences, as shown italicized for using TBLT of the instructors and having a BA degree in the ELT department were associated, Somers' d = .149, p < .05 and Gamma = .110, p < .05. It appears that the participants who had a degree in ELT department were more inclined to use TBLT in their speaking skills improvement classes. The rest of the skills did not yield any significant relationships.

Table 4.1.7.7. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having a BA Degree in ELT or Not

| | | No | Yes | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|---------------------------|---|----|-----|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | -.041, p = .514 | -.068, p = .514 |
| | 2 | 15 | 30 | 45 | | |
| | 3 | 30 | 25 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 31 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 13 | 19 | 32 | | |
| Total | | 91 | 109 | 200 | | |

Table 4.1.7.7. Cont'd

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----|-----|-----|----|-----------------|-----------------|
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | .002, p = .981 | .003, p = .981 |
| | 2 | 4 | 14 | 18 | | |
| | 3 | 24 | 20 | 44 | | |
| | 4 | 43 | 44 | 87 | | |
| | 5 | 19 | 29 | 48 | | |
| Total | 91 | 109 | 200 | | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | -.033, p = .607 | -.055, p = .607 |
| | 2 | 6 | 18 | 24 | | |
| | 3 | 28 | 24 | 52 | | |
| | 4 | 35 | 38 | 73 | | |
| | 5 | 20 | 26 | 46 | | |
| Total | 91 | 109 | 200 | | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | -.069, p = .272 | -.115, p = .272 |
| | 2 | 8 | 19 | 27 | | |
| | 3 | 26 | 29 | 55 | | |
| | 4 | 33 | 29 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 23 | 29 | 52 | | |
| Total | 91 | 109 | 200 | | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | .149, p = .022 | .260, p = .022 |
| | 2 | 5 | 4 | 9 | | |
| | 3 | 19 | 11 | 30 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 33 | 63 | | |
| | 5 | 36 | 59 | 95 | | |
| Total | 91 | 109 | 200 | | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | .043, p = .509 | .072, p = .509 |
| | 2 | 7 | 9 | 16 | | |
| | 3 | 25 | 21 | 46 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 44 | 74 | | |
| | 5 | 27 | 33 | 60 | | |
| Total | 91 | 109 | 200 | | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 200.

Table 4.1.7.8. illustrates the English skills preferences for using TBLT and whether having an MA degree in the ELT department or not were cross-tabulated and checked for their relationships using Somers' d and Gamma for ordinal variables as suggested by Wagner (2006). According to results illustrated in Table 4.1.7.8., having an MA degree in the ELT department did not yield any significant correlation between all English skills preferences.

Table 4.1.7.8. Cross-tabulation of All Skills Preferences and Whether Having an MA Degree in the ELT Department

| | | No | Yes | Total | Somers'd | Gamma |
|------------------------------|--------------|----|-----|-------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Grammar preference | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | -.006, p = .933 | -.010, p = .933 |
| | 2 | 16 | 23 | 39 | | |
| | 3 | 22 | 18 | 40 | | |
| | 4 | 23 | 27 | 50 | | |
| | 5 | 10 | 17 | 27 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |
| Vocabulary preference | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | .011, p = .879 | .019, p = .879 |
| | 2 | 5 | 11 | 16 | | |
| | 3 | 18 | 13 | 31 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 41 | 71 | | |
| | 5 | 18 | 23 | 41 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |
| Reading preference | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | .047, p = .503 | .079, p = .503 |
| | 2 | 10 | 11 | 21 | | |
| | 3 | 18 | 19 | 37 | | |
| | 4 | 30 | 32 | 62 | | |
| | 5 | 13 | 24 | 37 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |
| Listening preference | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | .033, p = .635 | .116, p = .635 |
| | 2 | 10 | 15 | 25 | | |
| | 3 | 19 | 19 | 38 | | |
| | 4 | 27 | 25 | 52 | | |
| | 5 | 15 | 28 | 43 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |
| Speaking preference | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | .103, p = .158 | .181, p = .158 |
| | 2 | 3 | 7 | 10 | | |
| | 3 | 13 | 5 | 18 | | |
| | 4 | 24 | 27 | 51 | | |
| | 5 | 31 | 49 | 80 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |
| Writing preference | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | .111, p = .114 | .187, p = .114 |
| | 2 | 6 | 9 | 15 | | |
| | 3 | 21 | 11 | 32 | | |
| | 4 | 26 | 35 | 61 | | |
| | 5 | 18 | 32 | 50 | | |
| | Total | 72 | 90 | 162 | | |

Note. Preference scale 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly agree. N = 162.

4.2. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate EFL instructors' understandings and perspectives of TBLT in Ankara, Türkiye's preparatory schools. It examined instructors' comprehension of TBLT principles, their opinions on its application, and the factors influencing their decisions to use or reject TBLT in the classroom. The results showed that the participating instructors had a positive perception of TBLT, which is consistent with other studies of a similar nature. Overall, the study questions are taken into consideration while presenting the results and discussions.

4.2.1. Research Question 1: To what extent are ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye familiar with TBLT?

Based on the findings, it may be inferred that the teachers have a solid understanding of the several facets of TBLT. They have a thorough grasp of what is the definition of a task, how to provide effective feedback in TBLT classes, and how to choose appropriate materials. It is acknowledged by the respondents that TBLT is a goal-oriented, communicative activity that requires the utilization of real-world content. The materials used for those tasks should be meaningful and purposeful, meeting the needs of the students and prioritizing the outcome.

However, just half of the respondents agreed that the work is a meaning-focused activity. This indicates a probable lack of knowledge of TBLT concepts, as TBLT prioritizes meaning above form (Nunan, 1989). This suggests that correct vocabulary and grammar usage are highly valued by half of EFL teachers, which may go against the fundamental principles of TBLT. According to the task features and components, a larger number of respondents are anticipated to report that the activity is meaning-focused. The fact that only 50% of respondents agree upon this might imply that EFL teachers continue to place a high value on grammatical accuracy and lexical precision, despite the TBLT framework's requirement that students focus more on meaning than form (Nunan, 1989).

Moreover, the answers point to an intriguing dynamic in how the roles of teachers and students are seen within the TBLT framework. While 82.2% of teachers concur that students' main responsibility is to interact with their classmates in order to finish a work, only 34.7% of them acknowledge that the role of teachers is to facilitate learning rather than to deliver or to be presenters in class. This suggests a serious lack of knowledge in teaching roles required by TBLT. The facilitator role of instructors is essential to TBLT to help students engage with tasks in a way that promotes interaction and communication over direct teaching.

All in all, with an average score of 72.5 out of 100, the results show that EFL teachers employed by Türkiye's preparatory schools have a high degree of expertise in TBLT and this implies that an important percentage of instructors have an excellent grasp of TBLT concepts and techniques. When these findings are examined in accordance with the previous studies in the respective literature, it could be concluded that these findings are consistent with the results of many earlier studies (Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011; Haque, 2012; Harris, 2016; Pham and Nguyen, 2018; Kırtaş, 2016; Page Halıcı, 2016; Mehmood, 2021; Sarman, 2022), which noted that many teachers are aware of the principles of this method and choose to implement it in their instruction. This is probably because TBLT integrates a variety of language skills to promote fluency, interaction, communication, and meaning-centered training.

There might be several reasons for the teachers' high degree of TBLT knowledge. For instance, it can be a reflection of the increased focus on communicative language teaching strategies in EFL programs around the world, including in Türkiye. Because TBLT emphasizes meaningful communication and task completion, it is consistent with the ideas of communicative language teaching. Teachers may have learned about TBLT concepts through professional development programs, courses, or instructional materials. EFL teachers are aware of the core ideas of TBLT, particularly its emphasis on communicative, interactive, meaning-focused language acquisition. They acknowledge that TBLT is an approach that places emphasis on allowing pupils to communicate ideas, promotes engagement via pair or group works, and develops communication and fluency abilities. Participants are also aware that TBLT is an outcome-based approach, and they recognize the principles of TBLT, acknowledging that it prioritizes meaningful real-world tasks and fluency in communication.

Overall, the high degree of TBLT knowledge among EFL teachers in Türkiye's preparatory schools highlights the possibility of this method's widespread acceptance and application in language classes. It is possible that institutional encouragement and support for introducing cutting-edge teaching strategies like TBLT inspired teachers to become familiar with this methodology. Institutions that place a high priority on professional development opportunities and offer training workshops to support the adoption of new pedagogical techniques may encourage a culture of ongoing experimentation and learning among their teaching staff members. However, more study might go more deeply into the particular instruction and experiences that help teachers become familiar with TBLT, as

well as the advantages and disadvantages that are thought to come with putting it into practice. Additionally, the stress on grammatical accuracy and lexical precision, as well as a misunderstanding of the teacher's function as a facilitator, highlight areas for potential professional development. This might assist instructors in better matching their methods with the communicative and meaning-focused aspect of TBLT, thereby improving the efficacy of language teaching and learning in their classrooms.

4.2.2. Research Question 2: What are the perceptions of ELF instructors working at preparatory schools in Türkiye on TBLT?

Findings from the examination of participant views on TBLT indicate noteworthy results. First, these findings show that EFL teachers employed by Türkiye preparatory schools have strong positive views of TBLT and highly approve of it. With an average positive perception score of 87.2, it appears that most teachers have a favorable view of TBLT. This demonstrates a strong conviction in the usefulness and efficacy of TBLT as a method of teaching languages. International studies yielded similar findings as well. For example, Thi et al. (2022) found that Vietnamese instructors had a favorable perception of TBLT and attributed this to their in-depth knowledge of the methodology. Despite having only a basic knowledge of TBLT, Taiwanese instructors had overwhelmingly positive sentiments regarding its implementation, as reported by Lin and Wu (2012). Xiongyong and Samuel (2011) discovered that teachers in a Chinese secondary school were adept at TBLT, and they expressed a preference for this method.

Similar to this, Kırtaş (2016) investigated the knowledge and use of TBLT among Turkish EFL teachers in Türkiye. She discovered that most instructors included TBLT in their teaching methods, even if they faced difficulties. Sarman's (2022) and Quinto's (2022) studies on the perceptions of EFL teachers revealed that most of them had a positive view of TBLT and included it in their lesson plans. Mehmood (2021) also employed a questionnaire to evaluate the opinions and preferences of Turkish EFL instructors in relation to task-based language instruction. The results showed that teachers were also interested in using it in their classrooms as they thought it was an effective method of teaching English to non-native speakers.

On the other hand, the data also reveals that the teachers' negative views of TBLT are considerably higher than moderate. The average negative perception score of 59.5 shows

that although most teachers have a positive attitude regarding TBLT, some of the instructors have some concerns or worries.

The results of the study indicate that several reasons may be contributing to the unfavorable opinions of TBLT. The most widely agreed-upon negative perspectives were that TBLT is best suited for small group work, with big class sizes constituting a substantial barrier to its implementation and utilization. Furthermore, students may be reluctant to participate in collaborative tasks because they are inexperienced with task-based learning, and they have a tendency to utilize their first language (L1) excessively while accomplishing or conducting tasks. Furthermore, typical textbooks are deemed inadequate for TBLT materials, which in return necessitates more preparation time from teachers compared to alternative methods. Finally, it's believed that TBLT is not an ideal method for getting learners prepared to take exams. These unfavorable opinions are linked together and reinforce one another, which highlights the difficulties and constraints that educators see when incorporating TBLT into the classroom.

In this regard, Jeon and Hahn (2006) discovered that even while instructors have a deeper comprehension of TBLT principles, many of them are still hesitant to implement TBLT as a teaching approach due to concerns about potential disciplinary issues that may arise in the classroom. Furthermore, Xiongyong and Samuel (2011) also found that a lack of trust in assessing students' task-based performance and high-class sizes were significant factors in their avoidance, and a large number of students in a classroom environment makes it impossible for them to complete tasks correctly. Likewise, another reason given by Thi et al. (2022) for the deployment of TBLT was the presence of conventional structure-oriented textbooks mandated by the school, large class sizes, and existing language educational policies.

In a similar line, participants in Quinto's research from 2022 on avoiding it noted that using task-based approaches in Türkiye is hindered by high-class sizes. She added that the content found in textbooks is inappropriate for use with TBLT. Hence, some students might not be used to task-based learning, as they either never or very seldom had the opportunity to do so. She continued by saying that TBLT places a significant psychological load on the facilitators because time restrictions and large class numbers of mixed-level pupils in Türkiye may drive students to become uncooperative.

All things considered, the difference between the relatively high positive impression score and the somewhat higher negative perception score points to a more sophisticated understanding of TBLT among EFL teachers. Even while most people have favorable perceptions of TBLT and acknowledge its advantages, certain concerns or objections need more research. By addressing these issues and offering assistance to teachers in implementing TBLT successfully, we may increase TBLT's implementation or adoption in Türkiye's preparatory schools.

4.2.3. Research Question 3: Are there any statistically significant differences in the instructors' familiarity with TBLT and positive and negative perceptions of TBLT, depending on the following variables?

Research Question 3.1.1: Years of teaching experience

Based on the findings of this study, the analysis of the relationship between the years of teaching experience and the instructors' perceptions of TBLT showed that the years of experience had no noticeable effect on the instructors' views of TBLT, and there was no significant variation in the mean ratings for positive and negative impressions of TBLT across all experience categories. No significant pairwise differences were found in the familiarity with TBLT across any of the categories of teaching experience ranging from 20+ to less than five years, either as determined by post-hoc analysis using the Scheffe test.

These findings are consistent with both Quinto's (2022) and Sarman's (2022) research, which show that EFL instructors' teaching experiences and their views of task-based language education are identical. There is no correlation between the variables of teaching experience and TBLT perceptions. Regarding the interview results, it was observed that there were no differences between the most experienced and the newest teachers. This suggests that, despite their lack of experience, teachers would still have positive expectations and perceptions about TBLT if they were the most experienced in their field. Additionally, these findings support the findings of Pham and Nguyen's (2018) study, which found no statistically significant difference between the groups based on the total number of years of teaching that were counted as teaching experience and TBLT. This is because, while recently hired teachers may be familiar with new approaches, methods, and techniques, they lack extensive classroom experience. In contrast, experienced educators

have years of expertise working with students in person and may have used a range of approaches and techniques to help them learn a language.

Ultimately, the results indicate that the number of years instructors had spent teaching did not significantly affect how familiar they were with TBLT or how they perceived it in general. This suggests that teachers' views and beliefs on TBLT are mostly unchanged, irrespective of how long they have been teaching. These findings offer insightful information for educational policymakers and administrators, showing that efforts to encourage the acceptance and implementation of TBLT should concentrate on issues beyond years of teaching. Instead, the focus should be on resolving issues with TBLT familiarity and fostering positive mindsets among teachers of various backgrounds.

4.2.4 Research Question 3.1.2: The status of professional development in TBLT

The results of this study provide insight into the relationships between the professional development status of TBLT teachers, their familiarity with the method, and their positive and negative perceptions of it. First, the MANOVA results showed that teachers' familiarity with TBLT and their favorable and negative perceptions of it were highly impacted by the state of professional growth in TBLT. This implies that teachers' perceptions and interactions with this teaching style are influenced by their degree of knowledge and training in TBLT.

The distribution of familiarity and views across several categories of professional growth status was thoroughly outlined by descriptive statistics. Significantly, teachers who had undertaken formal training in TBLT had more familiarity and more positive opinions than instructors who had not. This suggests that teachers' awareness and knowledge of TBLT might be improved through an organized training program.

These results were supported by further univariate analyses, which highlighted the notable variations in familiarity and favorable impressions according to the degree of professional growth. These findings were corroborated by post-hoc testing, which demonstrated the advantage of formal training over informal information acquisition in creating familiarity and positive perceptions of TBLT.

Day (1999) asserts that instructors have a crucial role in determining the standard of education and that they are essential to the learning process. This idea is also echoed by Guskey (2002), who claims that improving schools requires improving the talents and

skills of the teachers who work there. This basically emphasizes how important the "teacher factor" is in shaping students' motivation, attitudes, and academic results. Teachers can have a significant impact on their students' learning experiences based on their educational approaches and interpersonal skills.

Therefore, funding for teachers' professional growth and support is crucial to raising educational standards and creating effective learning environments. Consequently, these findings pose significant outcomes for instructors as well as educational institutions. Specific efforts aiming at improving the quality and efficacy of instruction can be grounded in an understanding of how professional development affects teachers' beliefs and behaviors. Institutions might think about making investments in extensive training programs to provide teachers with the abilities and understanding to successfully apply TBLT in the classroom since, based on the data presented, it can be concluded that educators who have had formal training in TBLT are becoming more familiar with the method, and as a result, they are also becoming more favorable in their perspectives toward it.

In conclusion, this study's result emphasizes how important professional development is in influencing teachers' knowledge of and opinions of TBLT. Institutions of higher learning can enable teachers to adopt innovative teaching practices and enhance the student learning process by offering an encouraging atmosphere that promotes the improvement of their skills and knowledge.

4.2.5 Research Question 3.1.4: Educational background

Research Question 3.1.4.1: Type of degree

The purpose of this inquiry was to investigate how the academic degrees of the instructors (Ph.D. and MA) affected their knowledge of TBLT and their opinions of it, both positively and negatively. The findings for both MA and Ph.D. degrees revealed no discernible variations in familiarity or perspectives among those possessing the degrees and those lacking them. Even though mean scores varied slightly, these changes were not great enough to provide statistically significant findings.

The results indicate that teachers' knowledge of TBLT and their positive and negative perceptions of it are not significantly influenced by holding an MA or Ph.D. This suggests that teachers' opinions and comprehension of TBLT may not be well predicted by their degrees alone. The lack of statistically significant variations according to

academic degrees emphasizes how crucial it is to take into account additional variables that might affect the views of educators and methods of teaching languages. The way that instructors feel about TBLT may be more influenced by elements like pedagogical training, teaching experience, and professional development.

Notably, these results cannot be compared to the results of any comparable research that is currently available in the literature. Further research with a bigger sample size may provide different results. In this sense, this research highlights its novelty and emphasizes the need for more investigation into the variables influencing instructors' opinions of TBLT.

4.2.6. Research Question 3.1.4.2: Department for each degree (BA and MA)

TBLT and instructors' favorable impressions of it were examined in relation to the impact of academic degrees, namely Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Master of Arts (MA) degrees in ELT. Due to the low frequency of participants in non-ELT departments, this was addressed by recoding BA and MA degrees into separate variables and comparing ELT departments with other departments. Additionally, these statistics do not contain the departments of the participants because the proportion of individuals obtaining a PhD is relatively low.

Comparing teachers with and without BA degrees in ELT, the results on TBLT familiarity showed a substantial difference. BA holders in ELT had a greater level of knowledge with TBLT. Nonetheless, there were no significant differences in the two groups' either positive or negative views. This implies that although a bachelor's degree in English language teaching may improve teachers' understanding of TBLT, it has little effect on their opinions of it as a whole.

The results showed that teachers with and without MA degrees in ELT had significantly different levels of knowledge with TBLT and had both positive and negative evaluations of the approach. Compared to instructors without MA degrees, individuals with ELT MAs showed greater familiarity with TBLT and more favorable perspectives. In contrast, teachers who did not hold an MA in ELT had higher average negative perception ratings. These findings suggest that teachers' familiarity with and perspectives of TBLT are significantly influenced by holding an MA in ELT. Overall, these findings highlight how crucial it is for educators to continue their professional development and

receive specialized training in ELT in order for them to adopt and understand novel teaching approaches such as TBLT.

4.2.7. Research Question 4: Are there any statistically significant differences between the instructors' preferences for applying TBLT in teaching grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing skills, depending on the following variables?

Research Question 4.1.1: Years of teaching experience

Across all English skill preferences (grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing), years of teaching experience did not appear to be statistically significantly correlated with any of the preferences for English language abilities. The absence of association indicates that teachers' choices for particular English skills in TBLT are not significantly influenced by their years of teaching experience. As an illustration, when it came to grammatical preference, which is the least preferred one on the list, there was little but no significant difference in the distribution of preferences between experience levels. Likewise, no noteworthy relationships were discovered about vocabulary, reading, speaking, listening, or writing preferences. These findings are consistent with a study by Pham and Nguyen (2018), which found no statistically significant difference between groups based on the total number of years of teaching that were counted as teaching experience and TBLT.

Furthermore, the lack of statistically significant connections suggests that instructors' preferences for their instructions may be impacted by a variety of factors rather than just their years of teaching experience, such as student needs and demographics, ways to teach, possibilities for professional growth, and personal teaching philosophies.

However, it is important to recognize the study's shortcomings, such as its dependence on self-reported preferences. Furthermore, even though this study did not find any significant associations, more extensive and more diverse sample sizes in future research may shed light on the variables impacting teachers' preferences for English proficiency in TBLT.

Research Question 4.1.2: The type of institution currently working: private or public

The findings show that the preferences of teachers for their English proficiency in TBLT did not significantly correlate with the kinds of institutions in which they are employed (private or public). The overall distribution of preferences across instructors working in public and private institutions did not substantially differ across all English skills preferences (grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing).

A related research on EFL instructors' opinions of TBLT was carried out by Quinto (2022). Furthermore, she discovered no distinction in teachers' favorable and unfavorable views of TBLT depending on the kind of institution they work for (private or public). Similarly, this study finds no differences in the TBLT preferences of TBLT teachers for speaking, reading, writing, listening, grammar, and vocabulary classes.

These results imply that teachers' preferences for English proficiency in TBLT may not be significantly influenced by the sort of workplace where they serve. Instructors' choices may be more heavily influenced by other variables, such as institutional regulations, curricular requirements, resources utilized in the classroom, test or exam contents, the course book they have been using, or specific teaching philosophies they gain.

Ultimately, more studies involving more extensive and more varied sample sizes and qualitative methods to investigate the underlying causes of instructors' choices may offer a better knowledge of the variables determining instructors' preferences for English proficiency in TBLT in various institutional settings.

4.2.8. Research Question 4.1.3: The status of professional development in TBLT

The findings suggest a strong correlation between teachers' professional growth in TBLT and their inclination to use TBLT in speaking skills enhancement classes. Specifically, teachers were more likely to implement TBLT in their speaking skills lessons if they had undergone formal professional training in the technique. This study demonstrates the significance of professional development programs in influencing instructors' educational methods and preferences.

However, no connections were found between the level of professional growth in TBLT and the inclination to use TBLT for other English language abilities, such as vocabulary, grammar, reading, writing, and listening. This implies that rigorous TBLT training may affect teachers' preferences in some domains, such as speaking abilities, but not necessarily in other subject matter of language proficiency.

These results demonstrate the apparent positive effects of supporting TBLT-specific professional development programs for language teachers, especially when it comes to improving their use of task-based and communicative learning strategies. Additionally, results highlight the need for more investigation into the elements impacting teachers' preferences and practices in TBLT across various language proficiency levels and educational settings. Building and carrying out successful professional development initiatives aimed at improving language instruction methods and student learning outcomes can be guided by these kinds of findings.

4.2.9. Research Question 4.1.4: Educational background

Research Question 4.1.4.1: Type of degree

The findings show that there was no significant link between all English skill preferences and having an MA or Ph.D. degree or not. Put differently, the preference of teachers for using TBLT in various language skills—such as grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing—was unaffected by their MA degree. The educational preferences and activities of instructors may be more significantly influenced by other factors, such as pedagogical views, teaching experiences, professional development, and contextual considerations.

These findings also highlight the significance of taking into account a variety of characteristics outside of academic credentials when creating professional development programs and educational strategies intended to improve the efficacy of language training. Acknowledging the various factors influencing educators' pedagogical decisions helps educational stakeholders better design professional development programs that cater to the needs and preferences of language teachers. This, in turn, leads to more efficient second language teaching and better educational results for students.

4.1.10. Research Question 4.1.4.2: Department for BA and MA degree

The findings show that instructors' preferences for utilizing TBLT in speaking skills are significantly correlated with holding a BA in the ELT department. In particular, teachers with degrees from ELT departments have displayed an increased tendency to use TBLT to improve their students' speaking abilities. Having a BA in the ELT department did not, however, appear to be significantly correlated with preferences for other English language proficiency, such as grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, listening, or speaking.

On the other hand, teachers' preferences for using TBLT did not show any significant link between holding an MA in the ELT department and English skills preferences for utilizing TBLT. To put it another way, having an MA in the ELT department had no influence on the teachers' choices for TBLT in terms of particular language skills.

Later studies may delve into the fundamental causes of the noted relationship between a BA in ELT and a preference for TBLT for enhancing speaking abilities. Furthermore, looking into the variables that affect teachers' preferences for TBLT across various language proficiency levels may yield insightful information for developing curricula and teacher preparation programs in language education.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the overview of the study, limitations of the study and suggestions for further research, pedagogical implications of the study, and implications for educators and policymakers in detail.

5.1 Overview of the Study

TBLT emerged as an increasingly common variant of CLT in the 1980s. It is a robust version of the communicative approach in which language is acquired by usage (Ellis et al., 2020; Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011)—since then, EFL with TBLT has gained much popularity (Shehadeh & Coombe, 2012).

This study addressed the perspectives, preferences, and understanding of TBLT among EFL teachers in preparatory schools in Ankara, Türkiye, by conducting a survey designed with great diligence and devotion to be fit for purpose. The data instrument focused on the teachers' comprehension of the principles of TBLT, their thoughts on its implementation, and the variables that influenced their preference for TBLT in the classroom. The results shed light on how TBLT is perceived and applied in the Turkish EFL environment.

With an average positive perception score of 87.2, instructors' opinions of TBLT were predominantly positive. This high acceptance rating demonstrates how much the teachers believe TBLT may improve language acquisition, especially in terms of helping students become more proficient speakers. A significant amount of unfavorable perception was also present, with an average score of 59.5, indicating some issues. Common problems were packed classrooms, difficulties with classroom management, and students' lack of experience with TBLT. These worries are consistent with findings from previous research that highlight the practical challenges of applying TBLT in various educational contexts, such as Jeon and Hahn (2006) and Thi et al. (2022).

The influence of educational background on teachers' awareness and familiarity with TBLT was also investigated in this study. There were no discernible differences between the MA and Ph.D. holders and the non-holders. Teachers who held a BA or MA in ELT,

however, were better knowledgeable about TBLT. The implication is that, although it does not significantly alter teachers' perceptions of TBLT in general, specific ELT training at the undergraduate or graduate level can improve instructors' comprehension of the methodology.

Based on years of teaching experience, the study showed no statistically significant differences in familiarity with or views of TBLT. However, the familiarity and views of instructors with TBLT were shown to be significantly influenced by professional development. TBLT-trained instructors were more acquainted with the method and held more favorable opinions of it. This demonstrates how crucial organized training programs are to improving instructors' comprehension and willingness to implement cutting-edge teaching strategies like TBLT.

Professional growth in TBLT was also substantially connected with an interest in using TBLT in speaking skills classes based on instructors' preferences for applying TBLT across different English skills (grammar, vocabulary, reading, listening, speaking, and writing). This suggests that, even though it may not have a significant impact on preferences across all skill sets, focused training can influence instructors' instructional decisions in particular domains.

In conclusion, the results offer insightful information to administrations and school officials who seek to facilitate the successful application of TBLT in Türkiye's preparatory schools. Subsequent studies must remain active in investigating the factors that impact the adoption of TBLT and address common challenges faced by instructors in their teaching process.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications of the Study

EFL instructors' opinions, preferences, and comprehension of TBLT at preparatory schools Ankara, Türkiye are the subject of research that sheds light on the usefulness of this technique in real-world settings. The findings point to a generally favorable opinion of TBLT and highlight its potential advantages for language learning, especially for improving speaking abilities. Nevertheless, the study also draws attention to issues including classroom management and students' lack of TBLT experience. Resolving these

problems calls for well-planned educational initiatives. This post examines the pedagogical ramifications of these discoveries and provides suggestions for improving TBLT application in EFL classes.

5.2.1. Implications for Educators and Policymakers

It is indisputable that TBLT has a beneficial effect on students' language learning processes, teachers, and the classroom atmosphere. Based on the study's findings, we can see that instructors at preparatory schools are highly aware of TBLT, and have a very positive impression of TBLT. The factors influencing their preferences and perceptions have also been found. Accordingly, the following is the most noteworthy pedagogical implication found in the data collected.

First and foremost, the findings suggest that administrators and policymakers in the field of education need to address certain negative aspects that were drawn to attention by the participants in the study. The responders cited the difficulties of adopting TBLT in big class sizes as one major problem. Teachers often feel that TBLT works better in small groups and that working in big classrooms is a significant challenge. This viewpoint emphasizes how important it is that educational institutions think about rearranging class sizes or adding additional technology and collaboration tools to help small group discussions in bigger classrooms. To ensure that TBLT can be used effectively even in bigger groups, several ways to replicate the advantages of small group work include employing breakout rooms in online environments or forming smaller, more manageable clusters inside the physical classroom. School administrators might think about reducing class sizes or adding more teaching assistants to help with these. Implementing TBLT may be greatly improved by instructors in a supportive classroom with the smaller size of students in class. Additionally, it would enable teachers to provide each student with more individualized attention, creating a more favorable learning environment.

Secondly, limited resources for TBLT in coursebooks and other material sources was another issue raised by the teachers. Typical textbooks are deemed inadequate for TBLT, necessitating greater preparation time from teachers. This difficulty emphasizes the necessity for institutions to create or embrace textbooks and materials particularly suited for TBLT. They implied that sufficient resources are needed for the successful application

of TBLT. In this sense, access to task-based teaching materials, including textbooks, digital resources, and other instructional aids, should be made available to instructors. Material unit members working at preparatory schools may also be assigned to prepare tasks to be implemented in the classroom. With the help of these, teachers may create engaging and dynamic classes that follow the concepts of TBLT with the help of readily available materials.

Another problem is students' unwillingness to participate in collaborative tasks and their proclivity to overuse their first language (L1) during activities, showing a lack of experience with TBLT procedures. To remedy this, students must be exposed to TBLT ideas and practices through orientation workshops. Gradually incorporating TBLT exercises into the curriculum can help students become comfortable and familiar with the method. Providing precise instructions and repeatedly stressing the significance of utilizing the target language throughout activities can assist reduce L1 overuse, resulting in a more intensive language learning environment. Furthermore, the problem of students overusing their first language during activities can be solved by providing a classroom atmosphere that supports the exclusive use of the target language. Target language use can be organically encouraged by explicit rules and regulations, constructive feedback, and interesting, context-rich tasks. By providing scaffolding and modeling appropriate language use, instructors may foster a more comprehensive and productive learning environment for their students.

Furthermore, the misconception that TBLT is ineffective for test preparation must be addressed. Incorporating test-relevant tasks that emphasize communication and engagement while simultaneously getting students ready for tests can be facilitated by matching TBLT activities with exam criteria. Developing evaluation techniques that emphasize both form and meaning guarantees that TBLT may be utilized as a successful test preparation aid while remaining true to its primary ideas.

On the other hand, the study's crucial conclusion is that extensive teacher preparation programs with a TBLT emphasis are required. Targeted professional development on TBLT concepts and practices must be incorporated into pre-service and in-service teacher education programs. Teachers would be guaranteed, via this kind of training, to be knowledgeable about both the theoretical foundations of TBLT and the practical tactics that make it work. Workshops, conferences, and practical training sessions may give educators the tools they need to plan and carry out task-based learning activities.

The report also emphasizes how crucial it is for teachers to continue their professional growth. Teachers may stay current on research and best practices by creating opportunities for continuous learning that are centered on TBLT. Frequent seminars, workshops, and cooperative learning groups can promote a culture of creativity in teaching approaches and continuous enhancement of quality. Furthermore, establishing forums where educators may communicate and exchange their TBLT experiences helps promote a community of practice. Teachers may improve their methods and address obstacles together by exchanging ideas and best practices via online forums, in-person meetings, and peer reviews.

Moreover, focused training and resources must be allocated toward this field, as the study revealed that TBLT is very successful in improving speaking abilities. Teachers may enhance their methods of teaching speaking skills through TBLT by attending practical seminars on crafting speaking assignments, participating in peer observation sessions, and developing feedback systems.

Another significant educational consequence is probably the incorporation of TBLT concepts into curriculum design. Tasks that are interesting and pertinent and that follow TBLT approaches should be included in curriculum designs. Schools may offer a coherent learning environment that encourages active language usage and acquisition by including task-based activities in the curriculum.

Lastly, as previously advised by İlin et al. (2007) and Quinto (2002), it is highly recommended for in-service teacher development programs that focus on teachers' experience and knowledge of newly adopted English language teaching approaches like TBLT and others. To put it another way, schools should provide extensive consideration to staff development.

To conclude, the results of the study may offer a guide for the effective application of TBLT in EFL classes. Schools and educational administrators may assist instructors in implementing TBLT by attending to the pedagogical implications mentioned above. This will eventually result in better language learning results for students, and to fully utilize TBLT in improving language teaching, several needs must be met, including efficient training, encouraging surroundings, resource allocation, and ongoing professional growth.

5.3. Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

Numerous suggestions exist for more investigation. First and foremost, future research might try to include a more extensive and more varied sample of EFL teachers from other parts of Türkiye and other nations. Raising the sample size and boosting the demographic diversity would help get a more profound knowledge of how TBLT is perceived and applied in different educational situations. In order to better understand how ongoing professional development and real-world classroom experiences affect teachers' attitudes and practices, longitudinal studies might also be helpful in monitoring changes in teachers' views and implementation of TBLT over time.

In addition, utilizing qualitative research techniques like focus groups, interviews, and classroom observations may help delve further into the experiences, difficulties, and varied motivations that instructors have for their preferences and perspectives of TBLT. To comprehend TBLT's influence on students' learning experiences and results, it is also essential to investigate students' viewpoints on the method itself. This can demonstrate TBLT's efficacy from the learner's point of view and bring out areas in need of development. Also, further research may focus on efficient classroom management techniques designed especially for TBLT settings to ease instructors' significant concerns about possible disciplinary problems. Besides, to better understand how ongoing professional development and real-world classroom experiences affect teachers' attitudes and practices, longitudinal studies might also help monitor changes in teachers' views and implementation of TBLT over time.

REFERENCES

- Akbulut, N. (2014). *Teaching English to young learners through task-based language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Pamukkale University, Denizli.
- Aksoy, K. (2018). *An investigation into collaborative behaviors in task-based foreign language peer interactions* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Arslan, M., & Akbarov, A. (2015). Türkiye’de Yabancı Dil Öğretiminde Motivasyon-Yöntem Sorunu ve Çözüm Önerileri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*(24), 179-191.
- Asma, B. (2018). Examining the Role of Task-Based Language Teaching in Fostering EFL Learners’ Attitudes and Motivation. *Eğitim ve Yeni Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 1 (1), 53-60. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jena/issue/42984/519752>
- Barcelos, A. M. F. (2016). Student teachers’ beliefs and motivation, and the shaping of their professional identities. In P. Kalaja, A. M. F. Barcelos, M. Aro, & M. Ruohotie-Lyhty (Eds.), *Beliefs, agency and identity in foreign language learning and teaching* (pp. 71– 96). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barnard, R. and Nguyen, G.V. (2010) “Task-based language teaching (TBLT): A Vietnamese case study using narrative frames to elicit teachers beliefs,” *Language Education in Asia*, 1(1),pp. 77–86. Available at https://doi.org/10.5746/leia/10/v1/a07/barnard_nguyen.
- Beglar, D., & Hunt, A. (2002). Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice. In Richards, J.C. & Renandya, W. (Eds.). *Implementing task-based language teaching* (pp.96-106). Cambridge University Press.
- Beglar, D., & Hunt, A. (2002). Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice. In Richards, J.C. & Renandya, W. (Eds.). *Implementing task-based language teaching* (pp.96-106). Cambridge University Press.
- Berndt, A.E. (2020) ‘Sampling methods’, *Journal of Human Lactation*, 36(2), pp. 224–226. doi:10.1177/0890334420906850.

- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Borg, S. (2015). *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Borg, S. (2019). Language teacher cognition: Perspectives and debates. In X. Gao (Ed.), *Second handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 1–23). Springer International Publishing https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-58542-0_59-1
- Branden, K., Bygate, M. & Norris, J. (2009). Chapter 1. *Task-based language teaching: introducing the reader*.
- Branden, K., Bygate, M. & Norris, J. (2009). Chapter 1. *Task-based language teaching: introducing the reader*.
- Branden, K.V. den (2006) *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Thematic analysis*. American Psychological Association.
- Breen, M. P. (1987). “Learner contributions to task design.” In Candlin, C. N. and Murphy, D. (Eds.). *Tasks in Language Learning*. Prentice Hall International.
- Brown, H. D. & Lee, H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Brown, H. D. & Lee, H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Bryman, A. (2008) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2018). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. *Pegem Atıf İndeksi*, 1–214.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 9-34. doi: 10.2307/40264573

- Candlin, C. (1987). Towards task-based language learning. In M. Bygate, K van den Branden & J. M. Norris (Eds.) *Task-based language teaching: A reader* (pp. 21-40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Carless, D. (2002). *Implementing task-based learning with young learners*. *ELT journal*, 56(4), 389-396.
- Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *The system*, 35(4), 595-608. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2007.09.003
- Ceylan, T. (2016). *The effectiveness of task based instruction in improving students' writing and speaking skills* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ufuk University, Ankara
- Chu, X. (2022) "The practice of TBLT in teaching oral language in Asian Primary Schools," *Proceedings of the 2022 6th International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences (ISEMSS 2022)*, pp. 1802–1812. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-31-2_211.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Press.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2018). Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları. *Pegem Atıf İndeksi*, 1–414.
- Converse, J.M. and Presser, S. (1986) *Survey questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills u.a.: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Daniel, W. W. (1999). *Biostatistics: A Foundation for Analysis in the Health Sciences*. (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

- Day, Christopher (1999), *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*, The Falmer Press, London.
- Demir Ayaz, A., Ozkardas, S. and Ozturan, T. (2019) “Challenges of English language teaching in high schools in Türkiye and possible suggestions to overcome them,” *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, pp. 41–55. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.543778>.
- Demir, A. (2008). *The Influence of task-based reading activities on EFL learners’ attitude and learning outcomes from the students’ perspective* [Unpublished master’s thesis]. Çukurova University, Adana.
- Demiray, F. (2009) *Oral Communicative Skills While Teaching English On the Basis Of Lingua Franca Term At University Preparatory Schools*. [Unpublished master’s thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Demiray, F. (2009) *Oral Communicative Skills While Teaching English On the Basis Of Lingua Franca Term At University Preparatory Schools*. [Unpublished master’s thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara.
- Demirtaş, A. (2015). *The impact of group autonomy on learners’ speaking skill in English: A task-based social constructivist perspective*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Gazi University, Ankara
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education Limited.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003) *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2010) *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. 2nd Edition, Routledge, London.
- Dörnyei, Z. and Taguchi, T. (2010) *Questionnaires in Second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge Press.
- Doughty, C.J. and Long, M.H. (2009) *The handbook of language teaching*. Malden: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Douglas, S. R., & Kim, M. (2014). Task-based language teaching and English for Academic Purposes: An investigation into instructor perceptions and practice in the Canadian context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(8), 1-22.
- Edwards, C. (2008) *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Edwards, C., & Willis, J. (2005). *Teachers Exploring Tasks in English Language Teaching*.
- Ellis, R. (1997). The empirical evaluation of language teaching materials. *ELT Journal*, 51(1), 36-42. doi: 10.1093/elt/51.1.36
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 19, 221–246
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 13-41. doi:10.1111/ijal.12163
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2020). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Erten, İ. H., & Altay, M. (2009). The effects of task-based group activities on students' collaborative behaviors in EFL speaking classes. *Journal of Theory & Practice in Education (JTPE)*, 5(1), 33–52.
- Falodun, J., Kanagy, R., & Pica, T. (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction. In M. Bygate, J. Norris & Van den Branden (Eds.),

- Task-based language teaching: A reader* (pp. 171-192). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). It's not who you are! It's how you teach! Critical competencies associated with effective teaching. *RELC Journal*, 46(1), 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214568096>
- Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(5), 594–610.
- Field, A. (2017). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E. and Hyun, H.H. (2023) *How to design and evaluate research in Education*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Graves, V., Hill, Y. and Shoen, B. (2007) “Book review: Corony Edwards and Jane R. Willis, editors, 2005: Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 298 pp. \$31.95 (PB). ISBN 1-4039-4557-8,” *Language Teaching Research*, 11(3), pp. 373–378. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688070110030602>.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3), 255–274.
- Günel Şahan, S. (2019). *The effects of task-based language teaching technic in English course on students' academic achievement and attitude towards the course* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Akdeniz University, Antalya.
- Guskey, T. R. (2002, August). Professional Development and Teacher Change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3), 381–391. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000512>
- Han, T. & Kaya, H. İ. (2014). Turkish EFL teachers' assessment preferences and practices in the context of constructivist instruction. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 4(1), 77-93.

- Haque, F. Z. (2012). *Perceptions and implementation of task-based language teaching among secondary school EFL teachers of Bangladesh* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Presidency University, India.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Harlow: Longman.
- Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2010). Summative Evolution of an Undergraduate ‘English Language Testing and Evaluation’ Course by Future English Language Teachers. *English Language Teacher Education and Development (ELTED)*, 13 (Winter 2010), 40-51.
- Haznedar, B. (2012). Perspectives on Pre-service Education of English Language Teachers in Turkish Primary School. In Y. Bayyurt & Y. Bektaş-Çetinkaya (Eds.). *Research Perspectives on Teaching and Learning English in Turkey: Policies and Practices* (pp. 39-57). Peterlang.
- Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 109-131. doi: 10.2307/40264397
- Hismanoğlu, M. (2011). The integration of information and communication technology into current ELT coursebooks: A critical analysis. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15(1), 37-45.
- Hover, D. (1986). *Think Twice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, C. and Liu, Y. (2017) “A study on the application of task - based approach in college English reading teaching,” *Proceedings of the 2017 7th International Conference on Education, Management, Computer and Society (EMCS 2017)* [Preprint]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2991/emcs-17.2017.423>.
- Jeon, I., & Hahn, J. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 123-143.
- Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kachru, B. (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle*. In R. Quirk and H. Widowson (Eds.), *English in the world:*

- Teaching and learning the language and literatures (p. 11-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kachru, B. (1985). *Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: English language in the outer circle*. In R. Quirk and H. Widowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (p. 11-36). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Karcı Aktaş, C. & Gündoğdu, K. (2018). Dinleme konuşma dersine ilişkin öğretim elemanları ve öğrencilerin görüşleri (Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu Örneği). *International Journal of Turkish Literature Culture Education*, 7(1), 509-527
- Karcı Aktaş, C. & Gündoğdu, K. (2020). An extensive evaluation study of the English preparatory curriculum of a foreign language school. *Pegem Eğitim ve Öğretim Dergisi*, 10(1), 169-214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14527/pegegog.2020.007>
- Kırtaş, G. (2016). *ELT teachers' perceptions and practices of task-based language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.
- Köksal, D. (2004). Assessing teachers' testing skills in ELT and Enhancing their professional development Through distance learning on the net. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education-TOJDE*, 5(1). (Retrieved from: <http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/121-published.pdf>)
- Kömür, Ş. (2018). Pre-service English Teachers' Assessment Awareness: Level of Readiness for Classroom Practice. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 8(1), 109-121.
- Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2007). Task complexity and measures of linguistic performance in L2 writing. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45(3), 261-284.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to post method*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kurt, G. (2004). *The Effects of task-based instruction on foreign language vocabulary learning and reading/writing proficiency of young EFL learners* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Marmara University, İstanbul.

- Kyriazos, T. A. (2018). Applied Psychometrics: Sample Size and Sample Power Considerations in Factor Analysis (EFA, CFA) and SEM in General. *Psychology*, 09(08), 2207–2230. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.98126>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Thomson/Heinle.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. and Anderson, M. (2018) *Techniques & principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching (3rd ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Le, T. N., & Nguyen, H. B. (2012). Task-based language learning and student motivation in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(1), 106-120.
- Leaver, B. L., & Willis, J. (2004). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education: Practices and programs*. Georgetown University Press.
- Li, L. (2017). *Social interaction and teacher cognition*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Li, L. (2020). *Language teacher cognition: A sociocultural perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51134-8>
- Li, L., & Walsh, S. (2011). ‘Seeing is believing’: Looking at EFL teachers’ beliefs through classroom interaction. *Classroom Discourse*, 2(1), 39–57.
- Lin, T. and Wu, C. (2012a) ‘Teachers’ perceptions of task- based language teaching in English classrooms in Taiwanese junior high schools’, *TESOL Journal*, 3(4), pp. 586–609. doi:10.1002/tesj.35.
- Little, D. (2009). *Learner autonomy in foreign language classrooms: Teacher, learner, curriculum and assessment*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT journal*, 58(4), 319-326.

- Liu, Y. and Ren, W. (2021) “Task-based language teaching in a local EFL context: Chinese University Teachers’ beliefs and practices,” *Language Teaching Research*, p. 136216882110442. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211044247>.
- Long, M. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp.77-99). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56. doi: 10.2307/3587368
- Long, M. H., & Norris, J. M. (2000). *Task-based language teaching and assessment*. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language teaching* (pp. 597–603). London, England: Routledge
- Long, M. H., and Doughty, C., J. (2009). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Long, M.H. (2016) ‘In defense of tasks and TBLT: Nonissues and real issues’, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, pp. 5–33. doi:10.1017/s0267190515000057.
- Lui, C. (2014). *The Effects of Task-based Instruction on English Speaking of EFL College Students in Taiwan* [Unpublished master’s thesis]. National Pingtung Institute of Commerce, Taiwan.
- Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A., & Son, J. B. (2004). Teaching a foreign language: One teacher’s practical theory. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(3), 291–311.
- Mavili, S. (2018). *The effects of technology integration in task-based language teaching on vocabulary and writing skills*. [Unpublished master’s thesis]. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.

- McDonough, K., & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Teachers' and learners' reactions to a task-based EFL course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 107-132.
- Mehmood, H. (2021). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul.
- Miao, H.-yan. (2014). The task-based teaching of writing to big classes in Chinese EFL setting. *English Language Teaching*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n3p63>
- Moeller, A.J. and Catalano, T. (2015) 'Foreign language teaching and learning', *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, pp. 327–332. doi:10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.92082-8.
- Murphy, J. (2003). Task- based learning: the interaction between tasks and learners. *ELT journal*, 57(4), 352-360.
- Naing, L., Winn, T., & Rusli, B. N. (2006). Practical issues in calculating the sample size for prevalence studies. *Archives of Orofacial Sciences*, 1, 9–14.
- Ng, J., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2003). Do teachers' beliefs of grammar teaching match their classroom practices? A Singapore case study. In D. Deterding, A. Brown, & E. L. Low (Eds.), *English in Singapore: Research on grammar* (pp. 128–137). McGraw-Hill.
- Norris, J. M., Brown, J. D., Hudson, T. D. and Yoshioka, J. 1998: *Designing second language performance assessments*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Norris, J. M., Brown, J. D., Hudson, T. D., & Bonk, W. (2002). Examinee abilities and task difficulty in task-based second language performance assessment. *Language Testing*, 19(4), 395-418. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532202lt237oa>
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for The Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D., & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Olson, K. (2010) ‘An examination of questionnaire evaluation by expert reviewers’, *Field Methods*, 22(4), pp. 295–318. doi:10.1177/1525822x10379795.
- Page Halıcı, M. (2016). *A comparative study of task-based and traditional instruction on student motivation and vocabulary development in 7th grade Turkish EFL classrooms* [Unpublished master’s thesis]. Bahçeşehir University, İstanbul.
- Pan, X. (2021) “Considering the efficacy and suitability of task-based learning in a Chinese high school English class,” *Learning & Education*, 10(3), p. 38. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.18282/l-e.v10i3.2384>.
- Pham, N. T., & Nguyen, H. B. (2018). Teachers’ perceptions about task-based language teaching and its implementation. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(2), 68-87.
- Pica, T. (2008). Task- Based Instruction. In: Hornberger, N.H. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer, Boston, MA.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_90
- Pohan, E., Andhimi, E., Nopitasari, E., & Levana, Y. (2016). *Teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching in English classroom. Paper presented at the Igniting a Brighter Future of EFL Teaching and Learning in Multilingual Societies*, Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia.
- Polit, B., Beck, C. T., & Hungler, R. (2001). *Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utilization*. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Presser, S. and Blair, J. (1994) ‘Survey pretesting: Do different methods produce different results?’, *Sociological Methodology*, 24, p. 73. doi:10.2307/270979.
- Presser, S. and Blair, J. (1994) ‘Survey pretesting: Do different methods produce different results?’, *Sociological Methodology*, 24, p. 73. doi:10.2307/270979.
- Qu, R. (2014). The implementation of Task-based language teaching approach in Vocational College English in China. *Proceedings of the 2014 International Conference on Education Technology and Information System (ICETIS 2014)*.
<https://doi.org/10.2991/icetis-14.2014.116>

- Quinto, B. (2022). *EFL teachers' perceptions of task based language teaching and its implementation in Turkish schools* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Bahçeşehir University, İstanbul.
- Rahman, S. H. (2016). *A task-based approach for teaching vocabulary skill to Iraqi EFL learners* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul.
- Rasheed, H. M. (2021). *The effectiveness of task-based instruction on improving the writing skills of Duhok university students in Iraq* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Karabük University, Karabük.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J., Platt, J., Weber, H., & Inman, P. (1986). Longman Dictionary of applied linguistics. *RELC Journal*, 17(2), 105-110.
- Riestenberg, K., & Sherris, A. (2018). Task-based teaching of indigenous languages: Investment and methodological principles in Macuiltianguis Zapotec and Salish QGISPE revitalization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 74(3), 434–459. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.4051>
- Riestenberg, K., & Sherris, A. (2018). Task-based teaching of indigenous languages: Investment and methodological principles in Macuiltianguis Zapotec and Salish QGISPE revitalization. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 74(3), 434–459. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.4051>
- Robinson, P. (2001a). Individual differences, cognitive abilities, aptitude complexes and learning conditions in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 17, 368–392.
- Robinson, P. (2001b). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 27–57.
- Robinson, P. (2003). The Cognition Hypothesis of adult, task-based language learning. *Second Language Studies*, 21, 45–107.

- Robinson, P. (2005a). Aptitude and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 45–73.
- Robinson, P. (2005b). Cognitive complexity and task sequencing: Studies in a componential framework for second language task design. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 43, 1–32.
- Robinson, P. (2007a). Aptitudes, abilities, contexts and practice. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from cognitive psychology and applied linguistics* (pp. 256–286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, P. (2007b). Task complexity, theory of mind, and intentional reasoning: Effects on L2 speech production, interaction, uptake and perceptions of task difficulty. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 45, 237–257.
- Robinson, P. (2011). *Task-based language teaching: Theoretical, empirical and pedagogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Şahin, S. (2019). *An analysis of English language testing and evaluation course in English language teacher education programs in Turkey: developing language assessment literacy of pre-service EFL teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Sánchez Pérez, A. (2004). The Task-based Approach in Language Teaching. *IJES, International Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 39–72. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.4.1.48051>
- Sarman, G. (2022). *EFL teachers' perceptions on task-based language teaching in the context of a preparatory school*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In Robinson, P. (ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seven, M. A., (2007). Importance of Communication in Language Teaching. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, vol.10, 253-268.

- Shehadeh, A. and Coombe, C.A. (2012) *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts research and implementation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Company.
- Singh, A.S. and Masuku, M.B. (2014) Sampling Techniques and Determination of Sample Size in Applied Statistics Research: An Overview. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 2, 1-22.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P. (2014). *Processing perspectives on task performance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 183–205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524780.009>
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*, 183–205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139524780.009>
- Sparks, C. (2010). Teacher Reaction to and Understanding of A Task-based Embedded Syllabus in Queensland. *Flinders University Languages Group Online Review*, 4(2), 1446–9219.
- Svalberg, A. M. L. (2009). *Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts: Research and implementation*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Tababaei, O., & Hadi, A. (2011). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language pedagogy. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 1(2), 1-9. doi:10.3968/j.hess.1927024020110102.1566
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics (5th ed.)*. Pearson Education.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016) ‘Sampling methods in research methodology; how to choose a sampling technique for research’, *SSRN Electronic Journal* [Preprint]. doi:10.2139/ssrn.3205035.

- Teddlie, C. and Tashakkori, A. (2010) ‘Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research’, *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*, pp. 1–42. doi:10.4135/9781506335193.n1.
- Tedlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2011). Mixed methods research. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, 285-300.
- TESOL International Association. (n.d.). Why TBLT? In *Task Based Language Teaching* (Issue Chapter 1, pp. 1-5).
- Tetnowski, J. A., & Damico, J. S. (2001). A demonstration of the advantages of qualitative methodologies in stuttering research. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, 26(1), 17-42.
- Tümen Akyıldız, S. and Tayşı, E. (2017) ‘Hazırlık Sınıflarındaki İngilizce öğretimine ganalı öğretmen adaylarının Bakışı’, *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, pp. 993–1009. doi:10.14686/buefad.329903.
- Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, J. M. (2009). Chapter 1. task-based language teaching: Introducing the reader. *Task-Based Language Teaching*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tblt.1.02van>
- Wagner, Q. X. D. (2006). Cross-Tabulation and Measures of Association for Nominal and Ordinal Variables. *Soc. Stud. Sci.*, 39(2), 45–54.
- Walters, W.H. (2021) ‘Survey design, sampling, and significance testing: Key issues’, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 47(3), p. 102344. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102344.
- Williams, M., & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Willis, D. & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.
- Xiongyang, C., Samuel, M. (2011). Perceptions and implementation of task-based language teaching among secondary school EFL teachers in China. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2, 292-302.

Yıldız, M. (2012). *Teaching grammar through task-based language teaching to young EFL learners* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1- ETHIC COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 19.09.2023-268575



Sayı : E-62310886-302.14.05-268575
Konu : Etik Kurul İzni (İlknur Acar)

19.09.2023

EGİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : 12.07.2023 tarih ve 248197 sayılı yazınız.

Enstitünüz İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi İlknur Acar'ın, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Sevgi Şahin danışmanlığında sürdürmekte olduğu, "Görev Temelli Dil Öğretimi Yeniden Değerlendirilmesi: Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğreten Eğitimcilerinin Algıları, Farkındalıkları ve Uygulamalarının İncelenmesi" başlıklı tez çalışması değerlendirilmiş ve bilgilerinize ekte sunulmuştur.

Prof. Dr. M. Abdülkadir VAROĞLU
Kurul Başkanı

Ek: Değerlendirme Formu

Sayı : 17162298.600-210
Konu : Tez Çalışması

11 Eylül 2023

İlgili Makama

Üniversitemiz İngiliz Dili Öğretimi Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı öğrencisi İlknur Acar'ın, Dr. Öğretim Üyesi Sevgi Şahin danışmanlığında sürdürmekte olduğu, "Görev Temelli Dil Öğretimi Yeniden Değerlendirilmesi: Yabancı Dil Olarak İngilizce Öğreten Eğitimcilerinin Algıları, Farkındalıkları ve Uygulamalarının İncelenmesi" başlıklı tez çalışması değerlendirilmiş ve yapılmasında bir sakınca olmadığı tespit edilmiştir. Bilgilerinize saygılarımızla sunarız.

Başkent Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler ve Sanat Araştırma Kurulu

| Ad, Soyad | Değerlendirme | İmza |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------|------|
| Prof. Dr. M. Abdülkadir Varoğlu | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Gözen Güner Aktaş | Olumlu/Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Sadegül Akbaba Altun | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Hasan Tahsin Fendoğlu | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Filiz Kalelioğlu | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Hidayet Hale Küniçen | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |
| Prof. Dr. Özcan Yağcı | Olumlu/ Olumsuz | |

APPENDIX 2 – FIRST DRAFT OF AWARENESS, PERCEPTION, AND PREFERENCES SURVEY ON TBLT FOR INSTRUCTORS WORKING AT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN ANKARA TURKİYE

Dear participants,

This questionnaire is designed for the survey of EFL instructors' perceptions of and awareness of TBLT, and their practices at preparatory schools in Ankara. Participation in the study must be on a voluntary basis. No personal identification information is required in the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will greatly contribute to the success of this research, and the answers collected via this survey will be utilized for academic purposes. I assure you that the answers will be completely anonymous and no names will be used throughout the research. You can reach me in case you have any comments or questions regarding the study, using the contact information below. Thank you in advance for your invaluable contributions.

İlknur Acar

Sevgi Şahin (Ph.D.)

Thesis Advisor

Consent Form

I voluntarily take part in this study, and I have been assured that my name will not be used in any way in this study or any other research paper that will be published by the researcher.

Yes No

Part I: General Information and Educational Background

1. E-mail address (optional):

2. Gender: Male Female Prefer Not to Respond

3. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50+

4. Year of Teaching Experience:

less than 5 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 15 years 15 to 20 years 20+ years

5. Educational Background:

BA Department:

EFL Literature [Linguistics](#) [Translation & Interpreting](#) Others

MA Department:

EFL Literature [Linguistics](#) [Translation & Interpreting](#) Others Not Available

PhD Department:

EFL Literature [Linguistics](#) [Translation & Interpreting](#) Others Not Available

Part III: Familiarity with TBLT.

Please tick (✓) the most suitable answer according to the statements.

| Question Items | Agree | Undecided | Disagree |
|---|-------|-----------|----------|
| 18. A task is a communicative goal-directed activity. | | | |
| 19. A task mainly focuses on meaning. | | | |
| 20. A task has a clearly defined communicative outcome. | | | |
| 21. A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose to achieve an outcome. | | | |
| 22. Tasks are only done in pairs or groups. | | | |
| 23. A task has a clear relationship to real-world language needs. | | | |
| 24. Task selection is based on an analysis of students' needs. | | | |
| 25. TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful. | | | |
| 26. "Task-based" and "Task-supported" language teaching are the same. | | | |
| 27. TBLT is a derivative of the Communicative Approach and Second language Acquisition. | | | |

| 28. In TBLT, the role of the teacher is that of a presenter. | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 29. In TBLT, the role of the students is to communicate with their peers to complete a task. | | | | | |
| 30. In TBLT, error correction is done through explicit feedback. | | | | | |
| 31. TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom. | | | | | |
| 32. The assessment of the task is done in terms of outcome. | | | | | |
| Part IV: Instructors' perceptions on TBLT. Please tick (✓) the most suitable answer for you according to the scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. | | | | | |
| Question Items | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation. | | | | | |
| 2. TBLT promotes a collaborative learning environment. | | | | | |
| 3. TBLT provides tasks that challenge learners to use the target language creatively. | | | | | |
| 4. TBLT activates learners' needs and interests. | | | | | |
| 5. TBLT provides interesting and fun tasks for learning the target language. | | | | | |
| 6. TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use. | | | | | |
| 7. TBLT helps learners prepare for real- | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| world communication. | | | | | |
| 8. TBLT helps learners use the target language in meaningful conversations. | | | | | |
| 9. TBLT affords learners a rich input of the target language. | | | | | |
| 10. TBLT is appropriate for small group work. | | | | | |
| 11. TBLT classes result in noise and discipline problems. | | | | | |
| 12. TBLT gives much psychological burden to the teacher as a facilitator. | | | | | |
| 13. TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches. | | | | | |
| 14. TBLT is not suited to low-proficiency learners who have no or very little knowledge of the L2. | | | | | |
| 15. TBLT is not quite suitable for the formal examinations that students need to prepare for. | | | | | |
| 16. TBLT resources are limited to find. | | | | | |
| 17. The students might be reluctant to work in a group. | | | | | |
| 18. Students are not used to task-based learning. | | | | | |
| 19. Materials in textbooks are not | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| proper for using TBLT. | | | | | |
| 20. Large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods. | | | | | |
| 21. Students overuse the L1 when performing tasks. | | | | | |
| 22. I have an interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom. | | | | | |
| 23. I find TBLT as an innovative approach to language teaching. | | | | | |
| 24. I believe that I can define the basic principles of TBLT. | | | | | |
| 25. I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance. | | | | | |
| 26. I am uncertain about how grammar should be handled in TBLT. | | | | | |
| 27. I find it hard to decide on task difficulty. | | | | | |
| 28. I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction. | | | | | |
| 29. I have some concerns about implementing TBLT due to classroom management issues. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>30. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching grammar in my classes.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>31. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching vocabulary in my classes.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>32. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching reading skills.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>33. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching listening skills.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>34. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching speaking skills.</p> | | | | | |
| <p>35. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching writing skills.</p> | | | | | |

APPENDIX 3 – FINAL VERSION OF AWARENESS, PERCEPTION, AND PREFERENCES SURVEY ON TBLT FOR INSTRUCTORS WORKING AT PREPARATORY SCHOOLS IN ANKARA TURKIYE

Dear participants,

This questionnaire is designed to survey the familiarity and perceptions of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors regarding Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in preparatory schools located in Ankara. We invite you to participate in the study on a voluntary basis. No personal identification information is required in the questionnaire. Your participation in this survey will greatly contribute to the success of this research, and the answers collected via this survey will be utilized for academic purposes. Rest assured, your answers will remain completely anonymous, and no names will be used in the research. You can reach me in case you have any comments or questions regarding the study, using the contact information below. Thank you in advance for your invaluable contributions.

İlknur Acar

Sevgi Şahin (Ph.D.)

Thesis Advisor

Consent Form

I voluntarily take part in this study, and I have been assured that my name will not be used in any way in this study or any other research paper that will be published by the researcher.

Yes No

Part I: General Information and Educational Background

1. E-mail address (optional):

2. Gender: Male Female Prefer Not to Respond

3. Age: 20-29 30-39 40-49 50+

4. Year of Teaching Experience:

- less than 5 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 15 years 15 to 20 years 20+ years

5. The Name of the Institution You WORK for: _____

6. At what proficiency levels do you teach English?

- A1 A2 B1 B2 C1 C2 All of them

7. Professional development in TBLT (e.g. training, workshops, seminars, conferences, etc.)

- Yes, I have received formal training in TBLT.
 No, I have not received formal training in TBLT.
 I have informally acquired knowledge about TBLT.

8. Educational Background:

BA: Name of the University: _____. Year of Graduation: _____

Department:

- EFL Literature Linguistics Translation & Interpretation Others

9. MA: Name of the University: _____. Year of Graduation: _____

Department:

- EFL Literature Linguistics Translation & Interpretation Others Not Available

10. PhD: Name of the University: _____. Year of Graduation: _____

Department:

EFL Literature Linguistics Translation & Interpretation Others Not Available

Part II: Familiarity with TBLT.

Please tick (✓) the most suitable answer according to the statements.

| Question Items | Agree | Undecided | Disagree |
|--|-------|-----------|----------|
| 1. A task is a communicative goal-directed activity. | | | |
| 2. A task mainly focuses on meaning. | | | |
| 3. A task has a clearly defined communicative outcome. | | | |
| 4. A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose to achieve an outcome. | | | |
| 5. Tasks are only done in pairs or groups. | | | |
| 6. A task has a clear relationship to real-world language needs. | | | |
| 7. Task selection is based on an analysis of students' needs. | | | |
| 8. TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful. | | | |
| 9. "Task-based" and "Task-supported" language teaching are the same. | | | |
| 10. TBLT is a derivative of the Communicative Approach and Second Language Acquisition. | | | |
| 11. In TBLT, the role of the teacher is that of a presenter. | | | |
| 12. In TBLT, the role of the students is to communicate with their peers to complete a task. | | | |
| 13. TBLT encourages the use of scaffolding techniques to support learners in completing tasks. | | | |
| 14. In TBLT, error correction is done through explicit feedback. | | | |

| 15. TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom. | | | | | |
|---|----------------|-------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| 16. The assessment of the task is done in terms of outcome. | | | | | |
| <p>Part III: Instructors' general perceptions on TBLT.</p> <p>Please tick (✓) the most suitable answer for you according to the scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.</p> | | | | | |
| Question Items | Strongly Agree | Agree | Not Sure | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
| 1. TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation. | | | | | |
| 2. TBLT encourages learner autonomy. | | | | | |
| 3. TBLT promotes a collaborative learning environment. | | | | | |
| 4. TBLT provides tasks that challenge learners to use the target language creatively. | | | | | |
| 5. TBLT activates learners' needs and preferences. | | | | | |
| 6. TBLT provides interesting and fun tasks for learning the target language. | | | | | |
| 7. TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere in class to promote the target language use. | | | | | |
| 8. TBLT helps learners prepare for real-world communication. | | | | | |
| 9. TBLT helps learners use the target language in meaningful conversations. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 10. TBLT affords learners a rich input of the target language. | | | | | |
| 11. TBLT encourages the integration of cultural elements and perspectives into language learning tasks. | | | | | |
| 12. TBLT enhances learners' cultural awareness. | | | | | |
| 13. TBLT is appropriate for small group work. | | | | | |
| 14. TBLT classes result in noise and discipline problems. | | | | | |
| 15. TBLT gives much psychological burden to the teacher as a facilitator. | | | | | |
| 16. TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches. | | | | | |
| 17. TBLT is applicable to learners of various proficiency levels. | | | | | |
| 18. TBLT is <u>NOT</u> quite suitable for the exams that students need to prepare for. | | | | | |
| 19. TBLT resources are limited to find. | | | | | |
| 20. The students might be reluctant to work in a group. | | | | | |
| 21. Students are <u>NOT</u> used to task-based learning. | | | | | |
| 22. Materials in textbooks are <u>NOT</u> proper for using TBLT. | | | | | |
| 23. Large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 24. Students overuse the L1 when performing tasks. | | | | | |
| 25. I have an interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom. | | | | | |
| 26. I find TBLT as an innovative approach to language teaching. | | | | | |
| 27. I believe that I can define the basic principles of TBLT. | | | | | |
| 28. I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance in speaking. | | | | | |
| 29. I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance in writing. | | | | | |
| 30. I am uncertain about how grammar should be handled in TBLT. | | | | | |
| 31. I find it hard to decide on task difficulty. | | | | | |
| 32. I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction. | | | | | |
| 33. I have some concerns about implementing TBLT due to classroom management issues. | | | | | |
| 34. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching grammar in my classes. | | | | | |
| 35. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching vocabulary in my classes. | | | | | |
| 36. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching reading skills. | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 37. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching listening skills. | | | | | |
| 38. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching speaking skills. | | | | | |
| 39. I prefer to apply TBLT while I am teaching writing skills. | | | | | |