



T.C.

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ YABANCI DİLLER

EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

**EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON TASK-BASED
LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE CONTEXT OF A
PREPARATORY SCHOOL**

MASTER'S THESIS

Gülpınar SARMAN

0000-0001-6110-1639

BURSA- 2022



T.C.

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ

EĞİTİM BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ YABANCI DİLLER

EĞİTİMİ ANA BİLİM DALI

İNGİLİZ DİLİ EĞİTİMİ BİLİM DALI

**TURKISH EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS AND
IMPLEMENTATIONS OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE
TEACHING IN THE CONTEXT OF A PREPARATORY
SCHOOL**

MASTER'S THESIS

Gülpınar SARMAN

0000-0001-6110-1639

BURSA- 2022

BİLİMSEL ETİĞE UYGUNLUK

Bu çalışmadaki tüm bilgilerin akademik ve etik kurallara uygun bir şekilde elde edildiğini beyan ederim.

Gülpınar Sarman

Tarih: 08.06.2022

TEZ YAZIM KILAVUZU'NA UYGUNLUK ONAYI

“EFL Teachers’ perceptions and implementations of task-based language teaching in the context of a preparatory school” adlı Yüksek Lisans tezi Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü tez yazım kurallarına uygun olarak hazırlanmıştır.

Tezi Hazırlayan
Gülpınar Sarman

Danışman
Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana
Bilim Dalı Başkanı
Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ



EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YÜKSEK LİSANS BENZERLİK YAZILIM RAPORU

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI BAŞKANLIĞI'NA

Tarih: 08/06/2022

Tez Başlığı / Konusu:

İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Bir Hazırlık Sınıfı Bağlamında Görev Odaklı Dil Öğretimi Algıları

Yukarıda başlığı gösterilen tez çalışmamın a) Kapak sayfası, b) Giriş, c) Ana bölümler ve d) Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler kısımlarından oluşan toplam 64 sayfalık kısmına ilişkin, 09/05/2022 tarihinde şahsım tarafından *Turnitin* adlı benzerlik tespit programından aşağıda belirtilen filtrelemeler uygulanarak alınmış olan özgünlük raporuna göre, tezimin benzerlik oranı %7'dir.

Uygulanan filtrelemeler:

- 1- Kaynakça hariç
- 2- Alıntılar hariç/dahil
- 3- 5 kelimedenden daha az örtüşme içeren metin kısımları hariç

Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Tez Çalışması Özgünlük Raporu Alınması ve Kullanılması Uygulama Esasları'nı inceledim ve bu Uygulama Esasları'nda belirtilen azami benzerlik oranlarına göre tez çalışmamın herhangi bir benzerlik içermediğini; aksinin tespit edileceği muhtemel durumda doğabilecek her türlü hukuki sorumluluğu kabul ettiğimi ve yukarıda vermiş olduğum bilgilerin doğru olduğunu beyan ederim.

Gereğini saygılarımla arz ederim.

08/06/2022

Adı Soyadı: Gülpınar SARMAN

Öğrenci No: 801893006

Anabilim Dalı: Yabancı Diller Anabilim Dalı

Programı: İngiliz Dili Eğitimi

Statüsü: Yüksek Lisans

Danışman

Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ 08/06/2022

T.C.
BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ MÜDÜRLÜĞÜNE,

Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Ana Bilim Dalı'nda 801893006 numara ile kayıtlı Gülpınar Sarman'ın hazırladığı “EFL Teachers’ perceptions and implementations of task-based language teaching in the context of a preparatory school” konulu Yüksek Lisans çalışması ile ilgili tez savunma sınavı, 18/05/2022 günü 15:00-16:00 saatleri arasında yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin başarılı olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verilmiştir.

Sınav Komisyonu Başkanı

Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

Üye

Doç Dr. Kürşat Cesur
Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi

Üye

Dr. Öğrt. Üyesi Pınar Salı
Uludağ Üniversitesi

ÖZET

Yazar Adı ve Soyadı	Gülpınar Sarman
Üniversite	Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi
Enstitü	Eğitim Bilimler Enstitüsü
Ana Bilim Dalı	Yabancı Diller Eğitimi
Bilim Dalı	İngiliz Dili Eğitimi
Tezin Niteliği	Yüksek Lisans Tezi
Sayfa Sayısı	XI + 75
Mezuniyet Tarihi	08/06/2022
Tez Danışman(lar)ı	Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN BİR ÜNİVERSİTE HAZIRLIK SINIFI BAĞLAMINDA GÖREV TEMELLİ DİL ÖĞRETİMİ ALGILARI VE UYGULAMALARI

Bu çalışma bir üniversite hazırlık sınıfında yabancı dil olarak İngilizce eğitimi veren öğretmenlerin görev temelli dil eğitimi hakkındaki algılarını ve uygulama konusundaki düşüncelerini araştırmak ve bu öğretmenlerin görev temelli yöntem hakkındaki fikirlerini ve bu yöntemi sınıflarında kullanıp kullanmadıklarını nedenleriyle birlikte ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla yapılmıştır. Bu amaçlara ulaşmak için çalışmada Jeon ve Hahn (2006) tarafından geliştirilen öğretmen anketi çalışmaya katılan elli öğretmen üzerinde uygulanmıştır. Sonuçlar IBM SPSS 22.0 kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Katılımcılar arasından gönüllülük esasına dayanarak seçilen beş kişi ile mülakatlar gerçekleştirilip, sonuçlar tematik analiz yöntemiyle analiz edilmiştir. Nitel ve nicel verilerden elde edilen sonuçlara göre çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin çoğunluğunun görev temelli dil eğitimi hakkında pozitif görüşlere sahip olduğu ve sınıflarında uyguladıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. Analiz sonucunda çıkan diğer bilgilere göre görev temelli dil eğitiminin sınıflarda uygulanmasını engelleyen faktörler arasında en yaygın olanların sınıflardaki öğrenci sayılarının yüksekliği ve ders materyallerinin görev temelli dil eğitimi için uygun olmayışı olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Çalışmanın ortaya koyduğu çıkarımlar arasında var olan eğitim sisteminin önerdiği müfredat ve materyallerde yapılabilecek geliştirmeler ile üniversitenin altyapı kaynaklı problemlerinin çözülmesi sonucunda görev temelli dil eğitiminin tercih edilmeme nedenlerinin çoğunlukla ortadan kalkabileceği bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Görev, görev temelli dil eğitimi (TBLT), İngiliz dili eğitimi, yaklaşım

ABSTRACT

Name and Surname	Gülpınar Sarman
University	Bursa Uludag University
Institution	Institute of Educational Sciences
Field	Foreign Language Teaching
Branch	English Language Teaching
Degree Awarded	Master
Page Number	XI + 75
Degree Date	08/06/2022
Supervisor (s)	Prof. Dr. Zübeyde Sinem GENÇ

EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS AND IMPLEMENTATIONS OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE CONTEXT OF A PREPARATORY SCHOOL

This study was conducted to investigate the perceptions and practice preferences of teachers who teach English as a foreign language in a university preparatory class, about task-based language education, and to reveal their ideas about the task-based approach and preferences about using this approach in their classrooms or not, along with the reasons. In order to achieve these goals, the teacher questionnaire developed by Jeon and Hahn (2006) was applied to fifty teachers who participated in the study. The results were analyzed using IBM SPSS 22.0. Interviews were conducted with five people selected on a voluntary basis among the participants, and the results were analyzed by thematic analysis method. According to the results obtained from the quantitative and qualitative data, it was revealed that the majority of the teachers participating in the study had positive views about task-based language education and applied it in their classrooms. According to the other information obtained as a result of the analysis, it was understood that the most common factors preventing the implementation of task-based language education in classrooms were the high number of students in the classrooms and the inadequacy of course materials for task-based language education. Among the implications of the study, there are the reasons for not preferring task-based language education can be eliminated as a result of the improvements that can be made in the curriculum and materials proposed by the existing education system and the solution of the infrastructure-related problems of the university.

Keywords: English language teaching, task, task-based language teaching, approach

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To my little sister

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bilimsel etiğe uygunluk.....	i
Tez yazım kılavuzuna uygunluk.....	ii
Özet.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Acknowledgement.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	x

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Problem.....	3
1.3. Research Questions.....	4
1.4. Aim	5
1.5. Significance	5
1.6. Assumptions	6
1.7. Limitations.....	6
1.8. Definitions	7

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1. Introduction	8
2.2.1 History of Foreign Language Learning	8
2.2.2. Task-based Language Teaching.....	10
2.2.3. Various Definitions of a Task.....	10
2.2.4. Characteristics of a Task.....	11
2.2.5. Task Types	12
2.2.6 Efficacy of Task-based Method	13
2.3. Stages of TBLT	14
2.3.1. Pre-task Phase	14
2.3.2. Task Cycle	14
2.3.3. Post-task Phase	15

2.4. Task Elements.....	15
2.5. Syllabi.....	17
2.6. Implementations of TBLT	17
2.7. Possible Obstacles and Ways to Deal with Them	18
2.8. Previous Studies on TBLT around the world	20
2.9. Previous Studies on TBLT from Turkey	23
CHAPTER 3	
METHODOLOGY.....	27
3.1. Research Design	27
3.2. Participants	28
3.3. Data Collection.....	29
3.4 Data Collection Tools.....	29
3.5. Data Analysis.....	31
3.6. Trustworthiness of the Qualitative Data.....	32
CHAPTER 4	
FINDINGS	33
4.1. Quantitative Data Analysis	33
4.1.1.Frequency Analysis.....	33
4.1.2. Descriptive Statistics and Normal Distribution Test Statistics.....	39
4.1.3. Regression Analysis.....	41
4.1.4. Difference Analysis	42
4.1.4.1 Gender Difference Analysis:	42
4.1.4.2 Difference Analysis Based on Professional Experience.....	46
4.2.Qualitative Data Analysis.....	52
CHAPTER 5	
DISCUSSION.....	57
5.1. EFL instructors' perceptions of Task-based Language Teaching in university preparatory programs	57
5.2. EFL instructors' implementations of Task-based Language Teaching in university preparatory programs	58
5.3. The effect of gender on EFL instructors' preferences to apply TBLT.....	60
5.4. The effect of professional experience on EFL instructors' preferences to apply TBLT.....	61

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS.....	62
6.1. Conclusion.....	62
6.2. Suggestions for Further Research.....	63
REFERENCES.....	65
APPENDICES.....	70
Appendix A.....	70
Appendix B.....	72
Appendix C.....	73
Appendix D.....	74
Curriculum Vitae.....	75

List of Tables

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Classification of participants.....	28
2. Cronbach's Alpha Reference Values.....	30
3. Reliability Analysis.....	30
4. Teacher Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching Frequency Analysis.....	33
5. Teacher Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching Frequency Analysis..	35
6. Frequencies of Using TBLT in Education.....	38
7. Percentages of Reasons for Using TBLT.....	38
8. Percentages of Reasons for not Using TBLT.....	39
9. Variable Descriptive Statistics.....	39
10. Normal Distribution Statistics.....	40
11. Regression Analysis Findings.....	41
12. Mann Whitney U Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching by Gender.....	42
13. Mann Whitney U Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Views on the Application of Task-Based Language Teaching to Gender.....	44
14. Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Concepts Regarding Task-Based Language Teaching Based on Professional Experience.....	46
15. Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Examining the Differences in Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching Based on Professional Experience.....	49
16. TBLT understandings and perceptions of instructors (codes and categories).....	52
17. TBLT understandings and perceptions of instructors.....	53

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The process of teaching a foreign language requires thoroughly designed course plans which can engage learners. Each lesson should be constructed in a way that enables students to have the chance to use the target language. Another crucial part of the organization of the lessons is that they need to provide learners with the motivation to be an active participant of the learning process. In order to maximize the learner participation, implementing the appropriate materials and methods suitable for the objectives of the course and the levels of the students is necessary.

One approach that could benefit learners, if applied properly, is Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). Task-based language teaching is established on the notion that learners should be presented with the opportunity of having an experience with the usage of the target language in real life conditions in their learning environments. In order to achieve this goal, tasks could be used. Richards & Rodgers (2001) suggest that with the help of tasks the process of learning the target language could be expedited as tasks are supposed to be authentic which means they resemble the real-life language use. Another claim from Willis & Willis (2007) indicates that tasks are supposed to be presented in a meaningful order and complement each other since TBLT requires well-designed lessons and those lessons consist of a sequence of tasks instead of a singular task. The underlying reason behind this requirement is that a well-organized lesson could easily grab learners' attention and encourage them to participate actively in their language learning process. With the help of tasks, students could be directed to practice the target language in a meaningful way.

When designing and preparing the tasks, the needs of the target audience and the educational necessities must be taken into consideration (Long & Doughty, 2009). Careful selection of the tasks that the specific course requires and putting those tasks in a proper order are two crucial parts of the language learning process. Thus, the first step that is supposed to happen is choosing the topic and the appropriate tasks for it. If the chosen tasks cater to the requirements of the particular topic, the second phase of the designing process, which is sequencing the tasks, could proceed. According to Ellis et al. (2019), in task-based approach there is not only one methodology or syllabus design that is superior to all the others, and this

is actually a beneficial quality since that means TBLT could be adapted to be applicable in various learning environments. In other words, TBLT is not an approach that imposes a single procedure or specific actions within set limits, instead it is a flexible approach which can be shaped according to the needs and skills of the learners. Since Task-based language teaching is considerably similar to Communicative Language Teaching, it necessitates the active participation of the students which could be ensured through meticulously designed lessons that draw the attention of the learners. According to Skehan (2000), engagement of the learners is of high importance with TBLT, and it can be assured by preparing or choosing the tasks that have several important characteristics. One of those characteristics is that a task needs to focus on meaning rather than the grammatical rules of the target language. The second important feature of a task is that there should be an end result to achieve. Providing the learners with a sensible goal to reach creates a feeling of completion among students which motivates them to participate actively in the process. Another aspect of a successful task is that it is relatable to real world situations since authenticity is one of the most fundamental bases for TBLT.

Authenticity of tasks assures learner participation by providing students with the understanding that all their efforts throughout the process are not in vain and will be beneficial in the real world. Assigning the learners with responsibilities in their own language learning processes encourages them to be involved more instead of being passive recipients. According to Brown & Lee (2007), learners of a language should get an opportunity to use the target language since they need to gain experience to increase their pragmatic competence and TBLT prioritizes the pragmatic aspects over the forms of a language.

Designing, adapting or selecting the appropriate tasks for their learners is one of the responsibilities of teachers. In order to fulfill this duty teachers are supposed to start with a needs analysis which is considered as a process requiring meticulous approach. According to Long and Doughty (2009), needs analysis requires concentrating on learner needs and once they are defined, converting them into learning objectives. Identifying the needs and establishing the goals constitute an important part of the learning process as selection and preparation of the tasks and materials depends on needs of the learners and goals of the courses. Selecting appropriate tasks and materials according to the needs, abilities and skills of the learners ensures active learner participation as the students are more likely to respond if they feel the tasks serve a purpose. As it is already mentioned, learner participation is of high importance for any language learning process. Another role of the teachers that use TBLT in their classrooms is becoming a guide for the learners. According to Prabhu (1987), teachers need to control and

guide the learners as they work with the given tasks with a purpose of reaching a meaningful outcome. What Prabhu (1987) suggests also implies that the learners should be provided with the chance to participate in and take responsibility for their own learning processes.

TBLT could be very helpful for language learners as long as it is implemented properly. The correct application of TBLT with appropriate tasks depends mostly on teachers' understanding and perceptions about TBLT. Therefore, this current study concentrates on the EFL teachers' perceptions on TBLT. The study also focuses on whether those teachers apply TBLT in their learning environments or not along with the factors that encouraged and discouraged TBLT usage.

1.2. Problem

Teaching a foreign language is a process that requires covering all the aspects of a language instead of providing learners with just the grammar rules and structures. Since language is a tool that is used to communicate, conveying the intended message properly is the main objective of learning a new language. According to Willis (1996), much of the learners' exposure to the target language all over the world consists of either written components such as reading texts or previously scripted dialogues which are not likely to be authentic. Taking this fact into consideration, the process of teaching a foreign language needs to be much more comprehensive than it is in most educational settings in Turkey. Unfortunately, the education system in Turkey mainly highlights the structural components of a language over the meaning and this results in excessive grammar teaching with no or little focus on content. As a result, learners gain the knowledge of the target language in terms of forms and structures, yet they experience problems when it comes to putting that knowledge into use. They face difficulties conveying their messages and explaining themselves as they lack the necessary practice in their classrooms. The underlying reason behind this situation is the lack of spoken participation in foreign language learning environments. Since traditional methods do not promote active learner participation and teachers who apply traditional methods usually do not adopt the guide role, learners generally feel reluctant to speak since they are afraid of saying something wrong and become humiliated. This decrease in learners' participation and taking responsibility in their own language learning processes impede the achievement of the desired objectives in those processes.

Even though the problems with the implementation of traditional methods are known to exist, some instructors seem to avoid TBLT since they do not completely comprehend its principles and believe that it is challenging to select, develop or apply appropriate tasks and

implement them in classrooms. These thoughts usually stem from the lack of knowledge on TBLT. Without fully understanding the TBLT approach and feeling competent to apply it in a language learning setting, it is understandable for teachers to avoid it despite the shortcomings of approaches that they are already familiar with. According to Bhandari (2020), instructors should analyze their students' interests, abilities and needs first and then choose appropriate tasks. Lui (2014) states that it is instructors' responsibility to provide learners with comfortable learning environments that would engage students in the language learning process. Another reason for this way of thinking is that teachers acknowledge that the existing testing system in Turkey may not be suitable for the application of TBLT in classrooms. It is an undeniable fact that one of the main reasons that students try to learn a foreign language in Turkey is that they need to succeed in their upcoming exams, whether it is a quiz at school or a high stakes test like university entrance exam. That's why some teachers prefer just to prepare their students for the upcoming assessments by providing them with just enough information to be successful at those exams. This causes skills like listening and speaking to be left out even though they are crucial for communication which should be the highlight of the learning process, however, unfortunately does not usually have a place in prementioned exams. The high numbers of classrooms are also an obstacle preventing teachers from implementing TBLT since they believe it does not provide each learner with the equal chance to participate combined with the limited time factor. As a solution, Wang (2010) suggests including cooperative tasks which could increase and promote speaking performance. In fact, these problems could be solved with the carefully planned lessons and tasks that are designed and chosen according to the needs of the learners and the teaching objectives.

This study seeks to identify aforementioned problems in detail, unveil to what degree they affect teachers' perceptions of TBLT and decisions on whether to use TBLT in their classrooms or not.

1.3. Research Questions

1. What are EFL instructors' perceptions on Task-based Language Teaching in a university preparatory program?
2. Do EFL instructors implement TBLT in their classes in a university preparatory program?
 - 2a. If they do, what are the main reasons that promote the application of TBLT?

2b. If they do not, what are the main factors that prevent them from implementing TBLT?

3. Is the gender of the EFL instructors a factor in their preferences to apply TBLT or not?

4. Is the length of professional experience of the EFL instructors a factor in their preferences to apply TBLT or not?

1.4. Aim

One of the objectives of this research is to explore teachers' perceptions on TBLT and its effectiveness in terms of enabling learner participation and positively affecting the language learning process. Other goals of the study include investigating those teachers' preferences in terms of whether to implement TBLT in their classrooms, checking if their perceptions and their preferences of applying TBLT or not match and finally discovering the underlying reasons for their decisions to apply or to not apply TBLT.

1.5. Significance

Despite the fact that learning English as a foreign language is a very common concept in Turkey, learners of English experience problems in terms of communication even if they possess the necessary grammatical and structural knowledge of the target language. This problem arises from the unfortunate fact that students usually do not get the chance to practice their knowledge in real life settings. However, in order for language learning to happen successfully, learners are supposed to participate actively in and take responsibility for their own learning processes. According to Nunan (1989), tasks that TBLT suggest could provide the learners with a chance to participate actively since tasks are authentic in nature and this encourages learners to be more involved in the language learning process as they feel there is a meaningful context and concrete outcome.

For tasks to be beneficial for the learner's success in the language learning process, they need to cater to the needs of learners and be appropriate for the targeted language aspect. Each aspect of the language requires tailor-made tasks. The sequence of tasks is as important as their organization. During the organization phase of the tasks, needs and levels of the learners should be taken into consideration. Another important factor that helps tasks to accelerate the learning process is that they need to be presented in a way that motivates the learners to be a part of the process. According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), following the preparation of tasks in

accordance with the aforementioned standards, learners need a positive environment that promotes their consciousness with activities that stimulate them to participate.

Taking all this information into consideration, it is obvious that for a lesson where TBLT is applied to be successful, teachers' perceptions and understandings of TBLT is of utmost importance. It is clear that if they have misconceptions about TBLT, it is highly unlikely for an educational environment to include TBLT as a teaching approach. Moreover, they are the responsible parties for the preparation of tasks which are suitable for their learners. If teachers fail to prepare tasks that are up to standards, it would be inevitable to blame TBLT for the undesired outcomes. They also need to be knowledgeable about the necessities of the process so they may react quickly if something unexpected happens.

Similar previous studies (Haque, 2012; Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011) showed the effectiveness of TBLT in different learning environments with learners from various ages. For this reason, this study sought out an answer to the question whether EFL instructors believe TBLT is also as effective in university preparatory classes.

1.6. Assumptions

In this research, it was presumed that the participant instructors would answer the items in the questionnaire willingly and honestly. It was also assumed that interviewees responded honestly to the interview questions.

1.7. Limitations

Like most studies in respective literature, there were several limitations that needed to be specified. This research was limited due to the number of participants and the inclusion of only one department, thus the findings obtained from the study cannot be generalized.

This current study was limited to the data obtained from fifty EFL teachers in a private university in İstanbul via a questionnaire that was designed to understand teachers' perceptions on TBLT and an interview which aimed at gathering more detailed data on the same subject.

Another limitation that needs to be highlighted is the triangulation. This study's data was obtained through a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, which was conducted with only a limited number of participants, and it was only concerned with the stated perceptions and implementations of instructors. For future research, it is suggested to cover classroom practices and perceptions of learners as well in order to gain a deeper understanding of the issue.

1.8. Definitions

This study acknowledges the following concepts with their definitions given below.

English as a Foreign Language (EFL): According to the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, English as a foreign language is:

Someone who learns English in a formal classroom setting, with limited or no opportunities for use outside the classroom, in a country in which English does not play an important role in internal communication (China, Japan, and Korea, for example), is said to be learning English as a foreign language (Richards & Schmidt, 2013).

Task-based Language Teaching: “An approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching.” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Task: Nunan (1989) defines task as a “a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form”.

Perception: According to Richards et al. (1986), perception is “the recognition and understanding of events, objects, and stimuli through the use of senses (sight, hearing, touch, etc.)”.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section introduces the literature on Task-based language teaching. It starts with an overview of the TBLT approach. Then, previous studies which investigated TBLT are presented.

2.1. Introduction

Foreign language learning has always been a crucial issue. While the need for learning a foreign language stayed as a never-changing constant, reasons behind this need have continued to vary. This variation in the reasons led to the appearance of different methods of teaching. Richards & Rodgers (2001) also claimed that the existence of various teaching methods is an adjustment to the alterations in foreign language learning purposes.

2.2.1 History of Foreign Language Learning: In the early years of foreign language learning, the focus was mainly on the grammatical aspects of the language. The education system was based on rote learning. In this system, learners were encouraged to memorize the grammar rules and the vocabulary items of the target language. The role of the educators was to introduce the grammar rules and the meanings of new words to the learners. The expected outcome of the language learning process was the memorization of the rules and the words so neither the actual usage of the rules nor the oral proficiency was taken into consideration when it came to the assessment part. Since learning a language was accepted as equal to memorizing its rules, the Grammar Translation Method was commonly practiced during these years. This method highlighted accuracy above all (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Translation was an important part of this approach as the main goal of language learning was seen as to be able to read the literature of that language. Thus, the learners were supposed to make as little mistakes as possible when they were translating to and from the target language. This approach also allowed the usage of native language throughout the process by both teachers and the learners.

Towards the end of 1960s, applicability and effectuality of Grammar Translation Method and other similar methods such as the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method and the Total Physical Response Approach lessened to an extinction point as the underlying reasons for learning a new language changed considerably (Howatt & Widdowson, 2004). The realization that the Grammar Translation Method and any other method which promoted rote learning and translation were unsuccessful to accomplish the most fundamental outcome of

learning a foreign language, that is communication, occurred. Then the shifted needs of learners brought another era where communicative aspects of a language were emphasized.

With this new era where communication was emphasized, new methods emerged. One of those new methods was the Silent Way. This approach suggested that the instructors should speak as little as possible to provide the learners with the opportunity of using the target language more. Silent Way, introduced by Caleb Gattegno (1963) was an alternative to the traditional methods whose active participants were the instructors instead of the learners as this approach implied that language was not composed of some information which could be transferred from one person to another. Instead, a language is acquired through active participation and experience. Even though Silent Way encouraged learner autonomy which was a crucial element in language learning in the new era, it lacked some other elements such as adequate clarifications on language forms and corrective feedback, so it was not qualified to cover all the necessities of language learning process, either. The continuing need for an approach which can address all necessary skills of a language learning process led to the development of new approaches such as Communicative Language Teaching.

Starting with the new era where communication and the actual usage of the language were highlighted, the beliefs that a good learner must memorize the rules and the vocabulary items of the target language, imitate the instructor, and talk about the language rather than using the language were confuted. Fluency also became important as well as accuracy. In addition to these changes, with the introduction of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), interaction between learners and self-awareness gained importance. Interaction between learners can be actualized through communicative activities in the language learning environment. By making these communicative activities a part of language learning routine, learners get the chance of becoming more and more self-confident in time. They become conscious about their own weaknesses and strengths which leads the way to being self-aware. By being an active participant in their own learning processes, learners will be able to find the best strategy for themselves.

Being self-aware and an autonomous learner allows a learner to maintain learning even outside of the classroom and this provides the learners with an opportunity to be more relaxed, experienced, and eventually more successful (Brown & Lee, 2007). While CLT emphasizes the significance of communication, it also does not ignore the value of accuracy in language. The main goal of CLT is to enable learners to communicate in the target language and it tries to achieve this goal by providing activities that resemble real-life situations. CLT paved the way

for various approaches and one of these approaches is the Task Based Language Teaching since it embraces similar principles as CLT does.

2.2.2. Task-based Language Teaching: The task-based language teaching approach was first established by Prabhu in 1987. According to Prabhu (1987), it is possible for learners to be more successful in learning the target language if they focus on the task instead of the language itself. Task-based language teaching is regarded as a student-centered approach, and it considers language as a communicative tool. These features allowed task-based approach to receive increased attention starting from the 1980s (Hismanoğlu, 2011). That much attention resulted in different definitions and comments from various researchers. Ellis (2003) claimed that the task-based approach is built upon CLT and the reason it was developed was to eliminate the restrictions of the PPP (presentation, practice, production) method. According to Willis & Willis (2007) task-based approach is better than traditional methods and is built on strong foundations in terms of both theory and practice. Lambert (2019) claims that TBLT is a process that meets the requirements of learners' internal syllabuses, resources, and experience. Language tasks in TBLT provide students with opportunities to interact actively in the subject matter in either pairs or groups in order to discuss an authentic topic, debate and find the best viable solutions to the problems. This feature of TBLT helps learners to improve their communicative skills along with increasing understanding content knowledge. However, to understand task-based language approach thoroughly and implement it in language learning environments, the definition of the word "task" is necessary.

2.2.3. Various Definitions of a Task: It is crucial to analyze the term "task" to understand the task-based approach. Prabhu (1987) described the task as an activity that requires learners to reach to a result by making use of the provided information. This definition implies that learners should be in charge of their language learning processes in language learning environments where task-based approach is applied.

According to another definition by Skehan (2000), a task is an activity where meaning carries the main importance. Every activity is designed to procure a result and that is why the success of an activity is based on whether the outcome is achieved or not. Another important determinant when it comes to the success of an activity is whether it resembles authentic language use or not. According to this view, learners concentrate on communicating by means of interactive activities and those activities need to have a specific outcome. Skehan (2000) also suggests that tasks should be suitable to learners' levels and needs so that they can improve their proficiencies. If the tasks do not match learners' levels, they will not fulfil their purposes.

Breen (1987) claims that a task must have a specific goal, suitable content, a particular procedure, and various outcomes. The main objective of tasks is to enable learners to start with basic activities and then move onto more complex ones. By following these phases, learners will be more motivated as they will not have the fear of not being able to use the target language.

Nunan (1989) and Richards et al. (1986) definitions have a similar feature as they all say that a task should provide a sense of completeness. That is why the requirements for the successful completion of a task are supposed to be set in the beginning and the learners should be informed about them before they start the activity. That way the language learning process gains a meaning beyond the classroom usage.

Another interpretation of a task provided by a dictionary of applied linguistics depicts a task as an endeavor which requires comprehending the language rather than just focusing on using it. According to this definition, construction of a task involves setting specific criteria so that the assessment of task's expected completion is possible.

2.2.4. Characteristics of a Task: Various definitions of a task are available, yet they agree on a few characteristics that a task should have. One feature that all those definitions have in common is that a task needs to promote the communicative aspects of a language by resembling and imitating real life situations. In order to provide this, usage of authentic materials in learning environments by the instructor is crucial (Skehan, 2000). Achievement of this requirement would provide learners with a sense of awareness and lucidity of why they need to learn the target language which could increase their motivation and, accordingly, their success since apprehension of the process and the outcomes encourages learners to be more involved. When learners feel that the topics which are being taught to them are in vain and have no use or value in their real lives, it could interfere with their learning processes. That is why when a task is being designed, one of the aspects that requires a great deal of attention is whether it is appropriate to the needs and interests of the learners.

Another common characteristic that is shared by aforementioned definitions is that a task needs to include its learners in the language learning process actively. If a task is designed in such a way that it could capture its audience's attention and ensure the participation of learners, the probability of success of the task is assured to a large extent (Prabhu, 1987). To inspire learners to take an active part in the language learning process, tasks need to be suitable to their proficiency levels, intriguing, meaningful with a proper ending that caters a feeling of completeness. To ensure that a task possesses all these characteristics, the preparations process should be structured according to the target audience.

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), a task needs to include cognitive procedures so that learners could master the language skills such as negotiation and paraphrasing. Students are supposed to receive, analyze, and select the information by themselves rather than just remembering it to complete a task.

Another feature of a task is that it has a specific organizational design. It consists of a series of subtasks called pre-task, task cycle and post-task. In the pre-task phase, the topic and the task are introduced thoroughly which helps students to have an idea about the upcoming activities and their purposes while allowing them to contemplate ways to successfully carry out the task (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). During the task cycle, learners work with the target language to complete the task. It is possible to use various activities and exercises tailored according to the objectives of the lesson in this part. In the post-task period, learners get the opportunity to show and compare their results and receive feedback as well.

In summary, a task needs to place focus on semantics and communication rather than emphasizing just the forms of a language. In order to achieve that authentic material chosen or prepared specifically for the lesson and its objectives at issue should be utilized. Since task-based approach highlights the importance of the usage of the target language outside the classroom environment, a task needs to provide the learners with the opportunity to be an active part of the learning process by mirroring the real-life situations. To take an active part in their own learning processes, students need to be encouraged and motivated. Learner motivation could be ensured by taking their backgrounds, needs and interests into consideration. To be able to fulfil these requirements, it is necessary for the instructor to be competent in both the target language and the application of TBLT since the instructor has the role of a facilitator in that environment.

2.2.5. Task Types: In a learning environment where TBLT is applied, it is of high importance to choose the appropriate task which serves the needs and interests of the learners since not all tasks are suitable for all learning objectives or learner profiles. Various types of tasks exist, and it is the instructors' duty to select and adopt them in accordance with their target audience. According to Willis & Willis (2007), there are six types of tasks called listing, ordering/classifying, problem solving, sharing personal experience, comparing and creative tasks.

Willis & Willis (2007) define listing tasks as activities that include brainstorming. They are named as listing activities since their final product usually consists of a table of things or a mind map. Listing tasks can enhance the inference skills of learners. Ordering/classifying

activities require sequencing and thus include a more complicated cognitive process compared to listing activities. After the completion of ordering/classifying activities, learners usually get a list organized based on some criteria. Since the process includes organizing the information, usage of these activities helps interpretation abilities. Problem solving activities encourage students to analyze a situation and propose a suitable solution for it. Since the tasks are supposed to be authentic, the problems that are chosen to resemble real life situations. While analyzing the problem, learners are expected to apply their reasoning skills as well as to use the top-down method until they reach a solution that is specific to the issue in hand. Tasks that are named as sharing personal experience consist of activities such as telling stories and anecdotes. When learners share their experiences, they become a part of other learners' language learning processes and this connection may help all parties increase their motivation. Comparing tasks include activities like detecting resemblances and discrepancies. Thanks to these tasks learners gain the ability to discriminate between two or more similar items. Creative tasks provide the learners with an opportunity to create their own products after a process that involves cognitive activities such as brainstorming and analyzing the existing data. Creative tasks also foster learners' ability to reason, and problem solve.

2.2.6 Efficacy of Task-based Approach: The main purpose of task-based language teaching is to enhance the communicational abilities of students via implementing authentic materials and activities. Thus, it is an interactive approach of language teaching and active usage of the target language constitutes a major part of the whole process. In that sense, task-based approach recommends the application of materials that are specifically tailored to the needs of the learners to make the process more effective. The use of personalized items will help learners to focus on the meaning and successful completion of the tasks rather than the forms of the language. Once the emphasis is on the communication itself, the acquisition of the rules and structures will occur subconsciously. Furthermore, since with the implementation of task-based approach learners receive numerous chances to use the target language, their assertiveness will be promoted (Willis & Willis, 2007). Task-based language teaching environment is expected to be relaxed so that the learners do not fear making mistakes. Otherwise, fear may create problems during the language learning process by inhibiting communication which conflicts with the principles of task-based approach.

According to Brown & Lee (2007), task-based language teaching approach possesses a few certain characteristics and in order to be an effective approach all these aspects must be taken into consideration while preparing the tasks. The first feature of TBLT is that the tasks

which are used should highlight the communication related purposes. Second issue to be considered should be the resemblance of the tasks to real world situations. Another characteristic of TBLT is that it requires an elaborate and detailed preparation period since the tasks need to be designed carefully. In TBLT, the objectives are clear from the start, so it is possible to assess whether the tasks and the overall process was a success. Finally, the tasks need to involve learners in cognitive activities.

2.3. Stages of TBLT

Task-based language teaching comprises three phrases. They, respectively, are pre-task stage, task cycle and post-task stage.

2.3.1. Pre-task Phase: The subject matter and the task are presented in this stage. In this stage, the topic is introduced by the teacher and the teacher also enables learners to form connections between the previous subject matters which are in connection with the current one, if there are any. According to Ellis (2003), the pre-task stage aims to prepare the learners to complete the task and in order to achieve that goal teachers may start a discussion related to the topic and lead students as they are brainstorming and forming connections with their previous knowledge. Alongside reminding the previous knowledge which helps learners to successfully complete the task, this stage also provides students with an opportunity to contemplate about the upcoming tasks and stages. According to Larsen-Freeman & Anderson (2011), instructors could assign learners with a current social problem and ask them to present several possible solutions. It is suggested to highlight fluency over accuracy during these exercises. Instructors are supposed to help their students to use their imagination and creativity. Learners could prepare a report and present it to the class once they complete the task in a meaningful and communicative way. That way they could receive feedback from their instructors and work on their tasks in terms of both content and form in the post-task phase.

2.3.2. Task Cycle: Ellis (2003) states that in this stage students are expected to complete the task whilst focusing on the communicative aspects of the language. Another expectation is that students use the target language and enhance their communicative skills in this phase. They may complete the task individually or as a pair or group. The role of the teacher is to monitor the students and provide feedback if needed at this stage. The focus is placed on fluency instead of accuracy and the environment is supposed to make students feel relaxed and open to learning. Once the task is dealt with, learners may proceed to prepare a report which summarizes their performance throughout the task and present it to either the teacher or the classroom.

2.3.3. Post-task Phase: According to Richards & Rodgers (2001) and Ellis (2003), the post-task stage involves focusing on and practicing the target language. Focusing on the language means analyzing and comprehending the usage of target language and reflecting back at how learners use the target language themselves. Practicing the language includes enabling learners to engage in activities which are related to the task they completed in the task cycle phase.

2.4. Task Elements

In addition to characteristics and stages of a task, it is crucial to comprehend the elements that constitute the task. Although the definition of a task may vary, all of them share some basic features. Similar to the definition of a task, there are several components which are suggested that a task should consist of. According to Nunan (1989), four fundamental elements, namely the purposes, the input, the activities along with the functions of learners and the instructor exist. Purpose of a task is the underlying reason why learners perform that specific task. A task may serve multiple goals at the same time. Goals could be categorized according to their desired outcomes (Nunan, 1989). If the expected outcome includes an improvement in learners' abilities to express their thoughts and emotions, that aim can be labelled as a communicative goal. If a task requires the usage of daily life patterns to create a relationship between the target language use and social lives of the learners, the purpose of that task can be classified under socio-cultural group. Another type of task according to their outcomes is the one that focuses on teaching learners how they can be an active part of their own language learning process by understanding their processes and setting their own personal goals. This type of task is named as learning how to learn goals as they allow students to be in charge of their language learning journey. If a task is designed to make the learners aware of the language they are using, they are categorized as a task with a language and cultural awareness purpose.

The second element of a task, namely input, is of high importance since it is required to initiate the task. Input needs to be as clear as possible for learners to comprehend it and not get demoralized. If the input is not made clear, this could discourage students from being willing to continue the process and complete the task and that negative feeling will affect their performances throughout the whole process. Another quality that input needs to possess is being appropriate to the needs and interests of the target audience. Suitable input will encourage and motivate students. In addition, input should represent real life situations as this will convince students that learning the target language is necessary by reminding them that what they are trying to learn and accomplish is valid, useful, and not in vain.

As the activities are the main components of a task, they are expected to carry several basic qualities. First, the activities which are presented to the learners should be suitable to the objectives of the lesson. Since TBLT's focus is on communicative aspects of the language, activities should also present chances for learners to use the target language in an authentic way rather than just creating artificial scenarios. Another criterion that activities should meet is that they need to enable and encourage learners to play an active role in their learning processes instead of being passive recipients. Task-based approach highlights the importance of communication so the activities should be as interactive as possible while emphasizing fluency as well as accuracy.

In TBLT, the role of the teacher mostly consists of being a guide yet there are many other duties an instructor should fulfil while applying this approach. Teachers are supposed to choose, modify, or prepare the task while taking the needs, interests, and abilities of the learners into consideration. It is also teachers' responsibility to make sure that learners comprehend what is required by them so that they can begin the process without any problems. Thus, during the pre-task phase, teachers could introduce the subject and provide clarifications on the task. They may also present helpful vocabulary items for the completion of the task. Throughout the task cycle phase, teachers are supposed to observe and supervise the learners. Another duty of the teachers during this stage is to ensure a safe and comfortable environment for the learners and motivate them as well. When it is necessary, teachers could support learners with various types of feedback so that learners can realize their mistakes and work on them to be more successful. Also, giving feedback may help with increasing the confidence of the learners. Since in TBLT learners are expected to be active throughout the whole learning process, teachers are supposed to enhance students' understanding of the process and the target language. Once the task is finished, teachers may revisit some topics or reinforce the existing knowledge with extra activities. Naturally, to accomplish these expected duties, teachers need to be competent in the language that they are teaching and informed about the TBLT approach.

According to Nunan (1989), learners also have specific roles to perform in a language learning environment where TBLT is applied. As TBLT is an approach which emphasizes the participation of learners, it requires learners to contemplate and interpret throughout the process, especially in task cycle and post-task stages. The learners may try to get familiarized with the vocabulary items they will use to complete the task. They may collaborate with their classmates and take initiatives to use the target language whenever it is possible. The learners are also supposed to concentrate on both the semantics and the forms of the target language.

Another crucial role of the learners is to ask for help when they need it. TBLT positions learners as the center of the learning process, so students need to perform their share of the task and take responsibility for their learning processes. Each learner is unique, and they need to find the best route for themselves by taking their background knowledge, interests, needs and skills into consideration. Finally, students are also expected to learn from their mistakes by reflecting on them.

2.5. Syllabi

Brown & Lee (2007) states that “A syllabus provides a focus for what should be studied, along with a rationale for how that content should be selected and ordered.” According to Richards & Rodgers (2001), a syllabus is “A specification of the content of a course of instruction [which] lists what will be taught and tested”. A TBLT syllabus, however, is dissimilar from the syllabi of approaches that emphasize the forms of a language. Richards et al. (1986) claims that a task-based syllabus is designed to include functions along with the grammatical rules and vocabulary items. The advantage of such a syllabus is that it will allow learners to use the language in a meaningful manner to express their messages by mimicking real life situations like ordering at a restaurant or booking a hotel. Including these features is important because it will create a sense of purposefulness among the learners and motivate them as well. Thus, a syllabus for a learning environment where TBLT is implemented needs to be in accordance with the characteristics of task-based approach.

2.6. Implementations of TBLT

Task-based approach proves to be superior to the traditional approaches as it places more importance on communicational aspects of a language rather than leading learners to a memorization-based process where forms and grammatical rules of a language are given the most attention. Learners who are taught a new language by the usage of a traditional method usually suffer from the same problem, namely knowing the language but not being able to use it. TBLT has the potential to fix that problem if it is implemented correctly. In order to achieve that there are several issues to take into consideration while applying task-based approach in language learning environments.

According to Ellis (2003), one of the most crucial matters to be taken into account is the preparation process where tasks are chosen, modified or created. The tasks need to match the proficiency level of the target audience so that progress can be made. In addition, there should be clearly set objectives and tasks are supposed to serve those objectives. Obviously, the chosen goals are expected to be suitable for the necessities of the lesson and the students. Each task

should be designed in a way that it enables learner participation to a maximum degree. Tasks are also supposed to highlight the communicative aspects of a language instead of focusing on the forms. Instructors need to guide and motivate the learners throughout the process rather than disrupting them by overly focusing on and explaining the rules of the language where it is not really necessary.

Task-based language teaching approach is supposed to be a learner centered approach that is why the whole process needs to be based on backgrounds, abilities, and passions of learners. By taking those factors into consideration, the language learning process could be more enjoyable for the students which undoubtedly will increase motivation. With learners being intrinsically motivated as well as volunteering to be an active part of the process, the increased level of success compared to other teaching approaches will be inevitable. When motivated learners are combined with an environment which represents real life and provides opportunities to use the target language by highlighting and conveying the meaning but not ignoring the rules completely, the success rate also increases. By allowing the learners to make mistakes and learn from them instead of scaring them into not saying anything with a fear of saying something incorrect, learners' participation and contribution are ensured. In fact, they may establish and improve their own learning plan of action in time. Fulfilling these requirements of TBLT would result in a successful language learning journey.

2.7. Possible Obstacles and Ways to Deal with Them

Even though TBLT is a potentially highly successful approach, there might be some problems throughout the process. One of those challenges is that instructors may lack the necessary time they need to organize a TBLT lesson since selection, adaptation or preparation of quality tasks consumes a large amount of time. Due to this fact, some instructors may choose to use the provided textbooks as the only source for their lessons (Willis & Willis, 2007). Since success of TBLT depends mostly on the usage of appropriate tasks, this problem may hinder learners from acquiring the target language. According to Willis & Willis (2007), one solution to this problem is that instructors should examine the sources they have and break them into their components since those materials might include tasks that may be useful for their learners and thus, they will not have to develop tasks from scratch. Another possible answer to this issue might be a collaboration among instructors in order to create tasks. That way time spent on the preparation of tasks will be reduced and time dedicated to the implementation of TBLT will be increased. Another possibility is to ask learners to prepare some vocabulary related materials for themselves before they attend their classes. Since learners are supposed to be an active part

of the language learning process, it would be a good idea for them to create a word list specific to their own needs.

Another problem that may be encountered during the process is under qualified instructors. Without comprehending the principles and requirements for TBLT in detail, implementation of task-based approach is bound to fail. In order to prevent that problem, prior to the implementation of TBLT in language learning environments, training for instructors could be provided. In addition to knowing how to implement TBLT in a language learning environment and being able to design appropriate tasks, instructors are also supposed to be informed about how to assess the learners as traditional ways of assessments may not always be applicable in TBLT classes.

Improving and sustaining learner motivation is another obstacle that might emerge in an environment that applies TBLT. Lack of motivation may stem from learners' previous language learning experiences or their unfamiliarity with task-based approach. Learners may consider language learning as an equivalent of learning the grammatical rules of a language and so TBLT will not enable them to excel at the target language. This might also lead to avoiding using the language they are trying to learn. To solve this problem, learners need to be assured that they will be able to use the language if they keep trying. Another crucial factor to be considered to motivate the learners is the learning environment. If students feel threatened, they are likely to behave timidly and refrain from speaking with a fear of making mistakes. In order to prevent that, it is important to arrange a relaxed and safe environment where learners are allowed to make mistakes and encouraged to learn from them. Tasks which are used throughout the process also carry big importance in increasing the motivation of students. By either choosing or designing the appropriate tasks, willingness of learners to participate may be increased substantially.

Another potential problem with TBLT is that some instructors might worry about not being able to manage their classes since most of the time classes include a large number of students. However, this issue could be easily solved with the help of suitable and quality tasks. If the learners are motivated and participate in classroom activities voluntarily, managing a classroom will no longer pose a problem. Classes could be divided into pairs or groups to enhance the control over the learners.

2.8. Previous Studies on TBLT around the world

There is numerous research on task-based language teaching (Beglar and Hunt, 2002; Carless, 2002; Ellis, 2003; Littlewood, 2004; Nunan, 2004; Johnson, 2003; Murphy, 2003; Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Skehan, 1998) which provide a definition of a task and explain the process and principles of TBLT. These books among many others prove the increasing interest on TBLT approach. Even though each book may contain a slightly different version of a task's definition, most of them agree on several characteristics that task-based language teaching approach possesses. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), Ellis (2003) and Nunan (2004), one of the most important qualities that task-based language feature is that it is in line with the characteristics of student-centered educational ideology. Unlike traditional approaches which promote the dominance and contribution of instructors, task-based language teaching approach highlights the participation and efforts of learners which is proven to be vital for the successful components for being able to actually use the language thanks to many previous studies. Another important characteristic of TBLT according to Skehan (1998), Murphy (2003) and Nunan (2004) is that it provides learners with clearly defined aims, procedures and outcomes which allows learners to be aware of their current positions and whether or not they reach to their goal as well as possible solutions if they fail to achieve what is initially targeted. Moreover, Beglar and Hunt (2002), Carless (2002) and Littlewood, (2004) suggests that TBLT is appropriate for communicative purposes since it embraces activities that are content-oriented rather than linguistic forms.

There are also many studies which analyzed TBLT in language classrooms. While some of those studies focused on either defining the task-based approach or deciding whether it is a useful approach or not, especially in terms of one or more specific aspects, some of them attempted to discover the perceptions of TBLT from either the instructors' or students' perspectives.

Xiongyong and Samuel (2011) used a questionnaire to investigate the beliefs and implementations of 132 instructors who worked in a secondary school in China regarding task-based approach. The questionnaire consisted of both Likert scale items and open-ended questions. The Likert scale items were to investigate instructors' competencies on TBLT and their preferences regarding the implementation of task-based approach. Open-ended questions were included to provide a chance for instructors to explain their reasons for either applying or not applying TBLT in their classrooms. The results of the research showed that the instructors were mostly competent in using TBLT and they had favored the implementation of task-based

approach. The study also revealed that the three most common difficulties the instructors had were related to motivation of the learners, crowded classes, and assessment. Based on the outcomes of the study two main suggestions regarding the steps to take in order to make the TBLT implication process more effective were proposed. The first one of those recommendations was to provide instructors with enough opportunities to be familiarized with different phases of TBLT such as designing, implementing and assessing. The second suggestion was related to the elimination of factors such as large class size and assessment related difficulties which discouraged the implementation of TBLT in classes.

Another study by Haque (2012) was designed to discover the perceptions and implementations of 80 secondary school instructors in Bangladesh on task-based approach. Data collection was performed both quantitatively and qualitatively by including a survey and interviews together. According to the findings of this study, even though instructors had clear understanding and positive feelings regarding the usage of TBLT in language classrooms, they faced difficulties implementing it due to the grammar-based assessment system practiced in their nation and motivational problems. As a result of these findings, several implications were proposed to teachers, school authorities and curriculum designers. First, teachers were encouraged to participate in trainings related to TBLT in order to be able to understand and apply the principles and procedures of task-based language teaching. Next, these trainings should be organized and promoted by school authorities. Finally, curriculum designers should incorporate TBLT and appropriate tasks for it in English books.

In Harris' study (2016), an online questionnaire was administered to 78 teachers in Japan to unveil their perceptions of TBLT. The teachers who participated in this research were all members of Task-based Language Learning Special Interest group which was formed by members of Japanese Association for Language Teachers in order to defend TBLT against criticism that mostly comes from local teachers. The questionnaire consisted of Likert scale and open-ended items so that instructors could provide details about their beliefs. Findings of the study demonstrated that the instructors highly appreciated the task-based approach and were content with the implementation of TBLT in their classrooms.

Another study by Rahman (2016) examined the relationship between TBLT and its effects on vocabulary performance by obtaining data from 50 11th grade students in Iraq. The researcher divided learners into two groups as experimental and control, hypothesizing that experimental group would be more successful in completing their tasks. In order to prove that hypothesis, the researcher applied pre-test and post-test design by teaching the same vocabulary

items to both groups with different approaches – TBLT for experimental and traditional for control group. The results of the study proved the hypothesis right and showed that TBLT was an effective approach to enhance vocabulary skills.

Pham and Nguyen (2018) administered interviews as well as a questionnaire to find out about understandings and implementations of 68 university instructors on TBLT in Vietnam. They connected qualitative and quantitative methods together to procure a more detailed result. The results of the research indicated that the instructors had positive attitudes towards task-based approach and were disposed to apply TBLT in their language teaching environments. Yet they encountered some problems with large numbers of students and lack of quality materials. Based on the findings of the research, several implications were nominated including teacher-trainings which will expand instructors' knowledge about TBLT and thus improve their perception of it as well and curriculum modifications that could adjust language learning process and materials that are used throughout the process in accordance with the principles and requirements of task-based language teaching.

A very recent study by Rasheed (2021) explored the impact of TBLT on writing abilities of Iraqi EFL students along with the understandings and views of the same students on TBLT. It was a quantitative study which adopted pre-test/post-test design and also collected data from 40 university students via questionnaires. At the end of this four-week study, the outcomes demonstrated that experimental group showed statistically better results in terms of their writing tasks. The study also showed that most of the students had a satisfactory level understanding of TBLT. Finally, the findings indicated that the majority of the students had positive attitudes towards TBLT because of two main reasons. Those reasons, respectively, were that TBLT promotes collaborative learning environment and learners' academic progress.

2.9. Previous studies on TBLT from Turkey

Kurt (2004) studied the effects of TBLT on vocabulary acquisition and reading & writing aptitude by collecting data through vocabulary checklists and a questionnaire from 88 sixth grade Turkish EFL students. The researcher divided students into experimental and control groups to be able to compare the results. The findings of the study indicated that experimental group outperformed the control group in terms of learning vocabulary items and using them appropriately. Another outcome of the study was the experimental group did better on their reading and writing tasks. Those findings led to the implication that TBLT could be applied in classes where young learners are educated.

A study by Demir (2008) investigated the consequences of implementing the task-based approach in reading lessons in a university environment. The study was conducted with 50 low-intermediate level university preparatory school students via various tasks and interviews. The findings of the research demonstrated that the application of TBLT in reading lessons help learners to become more active during the classes. Another outcome of the study was that when TBLT is implemented, students became more autonomous in their reading processes.

Another study by Yıldız (2012) focused on determining the effects of task-based approach on learners' grammatical knowledge. Participants of the research were thirty-two students who were attending the eighth grade at that time. The study was based on comparing two groups of students in reference to their grammatical improvement after implementing TBLT in one group (experimental) and another approach in the second group (control) to teach grammar. The research applied pre-test and post-test design to assess the progress. The results indicated that students in the experimental group developed their knowledge about grammar more than the students who were in the control group. That outcome supported the idea that TBLT is more functional than other traditional approaches in terms of teaching forms of a language.

In 2014 Akbulut performed action research to determine whether TBLT was applicable to young learners. The study included 21 students who were attending sixth grade at the time and lasted 10 weeks. Tasks which were used in this study were designed based on the syllabus that was already being used by the school. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were applied in this research via questionnaires and interviews. The findings of the study showed that TBLT helped young learners in their language learning journeys.

Another study by Demirtaş (2015) was carried out to investigate whether group autonomy had an impact on learners' speaking skills in a learning environment where TBLT is applied. The study consisted of a pre-test post-test research design and included both quantitative and qualitative data from 335 participants who were enrolled at a state university at the time of the research. The results of the study indicated that appropriate implementation of autonomy principles along with the interactive and authentic tasks that TBLT requires was highly effective in improving students' speaking abilities.

Ceylan (2016) investigated the effects of Task-based Language Teaching on learners speaking and writing skills along with the perceptions on TBLT by both students and instructors. For this mixed-methods study, the data was collected via questionnaires which were delivered after treatment tasks and interviews which are held after the treatment tasks from 84 university preparatory program students and 30 instructors. In addition to the analyzes of quantitative and qualitative data, a comparison of students' task and midterm results was made in order to interpret the results properly. The findings of the research illustrated that both learners and instructors possessed positive attitudes towards TBLT, and a positive relationship existed between implementation of TBLT and writing task and midterm grades. However, the study was not able to determine a meaningful relationship between TBLT and speaking task or midterm grades.

Another study by Kırtaş (2016) explored Turkish EFL teachers' understandings and practices of task-based language teaching. The study was conducted by the participation of 40 EFL teachers who taught at primary, secondary or high school level. The study relied on a questionnaire, classroom observations and interviews. The outcomes of the study showed that participants were knowledgeable about and exhibited positive attitudes towards TBLT. Another finding of the study was that most of the teachers applied TBLT in their classrooms despite the challenges such as unsuitable materials and crowded classes.

Page Halıcı (2016) compared TBLT and traditional approaches in terms of their impact on students' motivation and vocabulary development in a primary school environment as well as teachers' preferences related to the implementation of those two approaches in their classes. The study adopted a quasi-experimental design, and the data was collected through questionnaires and interviews from 48 7th graders and 2 teachers who taught 7th graders. The findings of the study revealed that TBLT promoted students' motivation and vocabulary development. Another finding of the study was that the teachers preferred TBLT as they thought it was more effective than the traditional method.

Another study by Mavili (2018), investigated the effects of combining TBLT with technology on learners' writing and vocabulary skills. The study included data collected from 38 5th grade students who were categorized as either the experimental or the control group through a pre-test and a post-test. The findings of the study showed that integrating TBLT with technology created a positive statistically important difference between the students' writing and vocabulary abilities.

A study by Aksoy (2018) investigated the impact of task type on collaborative behavior in a language learning environment where TBLT was applied. 15 university preparatory program students participated in the study, and they joined a speaking club in three different groups as a part of the research. All the students were allocated with two types of tasks called convergent and divergent. The interactions which occurred during the completion of these tasks were categorized as behaviors that are related to task and behaviors related to language. Findings of the study demonstrated that the students show mostly language related behaviors during convergent tasks and mostly task related behaviors during divergent tasks. Those results led to the overall implication that TBLT increased collaborative behaviors among university prep students.

Another study by Koçak (2018) explored students' attitudes towards instructors' roles in TBLT. The data for the study was obtained from 52 university students who were freshmen at the time of the study via a questionnaire and interviews. The results of the study showed that students believed communication should be given importance to whenever possible and instructors should facilitate this by being encouraging. Students expected their instructors to have some certain characteristics such as awareness of personal differences, patience, and flexibility. Study also revealed that the students did not want instructors to be the only authority while managing the classrooms and making decisions about the learning process.

Günel Şahan (2019) investigated the effects of TBLT on learners' academic success in and attitudes towards EFL lessons. The study adopted a mixed methods design where the data was collected with achievement tests and an attitude scale from 53 high school prep students. According to the findings of the study, TBLT had a positive impact on students' both academic success and attitude towards English lessons.

Similarly, Akın (2020) explored the students' attitudes towards TBLT and the effects of their attitudes on their self-efficacy beliefs in ESP classes. The study included 64 participant who studied English for aviation management. The data for the study was collected through a

survey, a questionnaire, and interviews over six weeks. The results of the study showed that students had positive attitudes toward task-based language teaching and there was an increase in their self-efficacy beliefs at the end of the research.

A very recent study by Mehmood (2021) researched Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching and their preferences about whether to implement this approach or not by administering a questionnaire to 102 teachers. Participants of the study taught at secondary schools, high schools, and universities. The findings of the study revealed that most teachers had basic understanding about the principle of TBLT and showed an interest in applying it in their classroom since they believed TBLT was an effective approach in teaching English as a foreign language. The results also showed that some instructors avoided using TBLT because of problems related to classes with high numbers of students.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

In order to provide answers to the research questions, a mixed-methods research design was implemented in this study. Mixed-methods approach is a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods. One of the purposes of implementing a mixed-methods approach is to triangulate the data to increase the validity of the results and to obtain more reliable outcomes (Greene et al., 1989). Triangulation includes evaluating an occurrence in two or more separate ways to procure a more precise measure of it. If a study is conducted based on a single data collection method, the data which is collected and the results which are acquired might be insufficient and distorted (Cohen et al., 2002; Tedlie & Tashakkori, 2011).

More specifically, this study adopts a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design. According to Ivankova et al. (2006), a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design starts with a quantitative data collection process and is followed by a qualitative data collection process with a smaller number of participants.

Thus, to obtain necessary data for this study, first a questionnaire was administered to the participants. According to Brown & Lee (2007), "Questionnaires are any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting from among existing answers". Dörnyei & Taguchi (2009) suggest that by implementing questionnaires in a study, it is possible to gather information about opinions and behaviors of people on a particular subject. Since this study attempts to reveal teachers' perceptions on and implementations of task-based approach, a questionnaire specifically designed to provide answers to above said issues of concern was used for data collection. Questionnaires have been preferred by other researchers too because of their advantages in terms of time, cost and efficiency (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009). Thanks to questionnaires, large amounts of data could be gathered in a very short time for a very little price. A well-designed questionnaire provides the research with all the necessary data.

After the questionnaire, 10% of the participants were interviewed to gather more detailed data. According to Tetnowski & Damico (2001), interviews enable researchers to obtain richer and more authentic data. Therefore, the combination of quantitative data and qualitative data is a convenient way of investigating the research topic in depth. Driscoll et al. (2007) states "The qualitative data provide a deep understanding of survey responses, and

statistical analysis can provide detailed assessment of patterns of responses. Thus, in this research mixed methods research design was preferred to reach the desired outcomes.

3.2. Participants

Table 1

Classification of participants

General Information

		Frequency (N)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	16	32
	Female	34	68
Teaching Experience	Less than 5 years	20	40
	5 to 9 years	20	40
	10 to 19 years	8	16
	More than 20 years	2	4

The data for the current research was collected from 50 university instructors who worked at a private university in İstanbul. All the participants worked at the English preparatory division of the university at the time of the study. Participants were chosen on a voluntary basis.

Thirty-four (%68,) of the teachers were female and sixteen (%32) were males. Twenty participants (%40) had less than five years of teaching experience. Another twenty (%40) teachers had five to nine years of teaching experience. Eight of the participants (%16) had ten to nineteen years of experience while only two instructors (%4) had more than twenty years of experience in teaching.

3.3. Data Collection

Two data collection instruments – a questionnaire and interviews – were used in this study. The process for data collection consisted of two phases. In the first phase, a questionnaire was given to participants to gather quantitative data and in the second phase, to obtain qualitative data individual interviews were done on a voluntary basis with previous participants who showed an interest. Prior to both phases, participants were informed about their answers' confidentiality and asked for consent.

3.4. Data Collection Tools

Within the scope of the research, first a questionnaire designed by Jeon and Hahn's Teacher Questionnaire (2006) was used as the quantitative data collection method. The language of the questionnaire was English. Participants were reached via an online platform which enabled the participants to answer the questions on the questionnaire. The questionnaire form, which was designed to investigate EFL instructors' understandings and preferences on the implementation of TBLT, consists of 3 parts. The first part consists of items related to demographic and descriptive information, the second part consists of items about teacher insights on task-based language teaching, and the third part consists of items about teacher opinions on the implementation of task-based language teaching.

In this part of the research, reliability analyses for the second part and the third part, consisting of 5-point, Likert-type questions, are included. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability analyses were applied to the parts separately in order to check the reliability levels of the mentioned parts.

Cronbach's Alpha is obtained by dividing the sum of the variances of questions on a scale by the overall variance. With the alpha coefficient, it is attempted to determine whether the questions on a scale constitute a homogeneous structure in certain groups. A value between 0 and 1 is expected to be obtained. A negative alpha value means that reliability is deteriorating. For the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, the intervals in table 1 are generally taken as the level of reliability in social sciences.

Table 2*Cronbach's Alpha Reference Values*

Range	Reliability Level
Alpha <0.50	Insufficient Reliability Level
0.50<Alpha<0.70	Generally Accepted Reliability Level
0.70<Alpha<0.80	Highly Reliable
0.80<Alpha<0.90	Very Reliable
0.90<Alpha	Perfectly Reliable

Source: (Özdamar, 2016)

The results of Cronbach's Alpha reliability analysis for part 1 and part 2 are as in table 3.

Table 3*Reliability Analysis*

Part	Item Number	Cronbach's Alpha	Reliability Level
Part 1: Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	7	0.848	Very Reliable
Part 2: Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching	8	0.556	Generally Accepted Reliability Level

As it can be seen when the table is examined, the part of questionnaire which includes items related to the teachers' understanding of the task-based language teaching is very reliable, while the part which consists of items related to the teachers' opinions about the application of task-based language teaching is generally reliable. In the light of the aforementioned findings, it has been seen that it is possible to use this questionnaire reliably.

For the qualitative data collection, semi-structured interviews with the 10% (n=5) of the participants were carried out. Participants for the interviews were selected on a volunteer basis. Interviews consisted of five questions which intended to acquire more detailed information

about participants' perceptions of TBLT. Duration of each interview varied between five and ten minutes. All the interviews were conducted online and in English.

3.5. Data Analysis

Within the scope of the research, for the analysis of quantitative section, the data collected with the help of online questionnaires were first transferred to the Microsoft Excel program, then transferred to the IBM SPSS 22.0 version by making the necessary numerical coding, and all statistical analyzes were carried out using the said package program.

In the first part of the findings section, there are demographic statistics of the teachers included in the research. The second part includes the frequency distributions and average values of the answers given by the teachers to the questions. In the third part, there are normal distribution tests and descriptive statistics calculated over the section averages. In the fourth part, regression analysis, in the fifth part, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H test findings, which were conducted to examine the differences depending on gender and professional experience, are included.

In order to obtain qualitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted. The reason behind choosing semi-structured interviews was to have a guideline to follow while sparing some space for flexibility at the same time. According to Drever (1995), applying a semi-structured interview was an appropriate flexible technique which was suitable for small-scale research. For the analysis of qualitative section, first the data which is obtained via semi-structured interviews were fully transcribed. Afterwards, thematic analysis was conducted to determine existing codes and themes. Joffe (2012) suggests that verbal interview data forms the basis for thematic analysis. In addition, Wilkinson et al. (2004) claim that interview data which is collected via semi-structured interviews including five to seven questions that the interviewees are encouraged to talk about is appropriate for thematic analysis. By analyzing the responses obtained from the participants, once the codes were identified, they were categorized under themes. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), thematic analysis has six steps: familiarization, coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes and writing the report. The phase of familiarization consists of steps such as reading the transcripts or listening to the audio recordings in order for researchers to understand the existing obvious meanings and even beyond. Second phase includes identifying and labelling relevant components of the data regarding the research questions. The third and fourth steps include creating a mapping of essential patterns of the data and checking them to avoid any possible

mistakes. In order to provide a clarity, themes need to be defined and named which is the fifth step of thematic analysis. Finally, thanks to the sixth and the last step, researchers combine the obtained data extracts in order to reach a conclusion.

3.6. Trustworthiness of the Qualitative Data

After completing the steps mentioned in the previous part, in order to get a second opinion to ensure interrater reliability and increase the trustworthiness of the qualitative data transcriptions were shared with a colleague who had a similar educational background. Following the negotiation of codes and themes with my colleague it was seen that the themes and codes were agreed upon to a high extent.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

In this part of the research, the findings obtained from the analysis of the questionnaire data were shared with the tables and interpretations.

4.1 Quantitative Data

4.1.1. Frequency Analysis: In this part of the research, the frequency distribution of the participants' answers together with the mean and standard deviations of the questions for the sample were reported. The frequency distributions of teacher responses to the Likert-type questions in the section of teacher understandings regarding task-based language teaching are as in Table 4.

Table 4

Teacher Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching Frequency Analysis

	SD		D		U		A		SA		Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)		
A task is a communicative goal directed.	1	2.0	0	0.0	6	12.0	19	38.0	24	48.0	4.30	0.84
A task involves a primary focus on meaning.	0	0.0	3	6.0	11	22.0	23	46.0	13	26.0	3.92	0.85
A task has a clearly defined outcome.	0	0.0	2	4.0	3	6.0	19	38.0	26	52.0	4.38	0.78
A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.	1	2.0	4	8.0	7	14.0	14	28.0	24	48.0	4.12	1.06
TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.	0	0.0	1	2.0	4	8.0	28	56.0	17	34.0	4.22	0.68

TBLT is based on the student- centered instructional approach.	0	0.0	4	8.0	6	12.0	26	52.0	14	28.0	4.00	0.86
TBLT includes three stages: pre- task, task implementation, and post-task.	0	0.0	2	4.0	1	2.0	17	34.0	30	60.0	4.50	0.74

The frequency distributions of the responses given to the item “A task is a communicative goal directed.” are as follows; 2% strongly disagree (n=1), 12% undecided (n=6), 38% agree (n=19), 48% strongly agree (n=24). When the item average is analyzed (4.3 ± 0.84), it could be seen that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

For the item “A task involves a primary focus on meaning.”, frequency distributions of the responses given are as follows; 6% disagree (n=3), 22% undecided (n=11), 46% agree (n=23), 26% strongly agree (n=13). Item average, (3.92 ± 0.85), shows that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

The “A task has a clearly defined outcome.” item has the following frequency distributions; 4% disagree (n=2), 6% undecided (n=3), 38% agree (n=19), 52% strongly agree (n=26). Based on the item average (4.38 ± 0.78), it is understood that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

Another item, “A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.”, possesses the following frequency distributions; 2% strongly disagree (n=1), 8% disagree (n=4), 14% undecided (n=7), 28% agree (n=14), 48% strongly agree (n=24). According to the item average, the sample mean for the statement (4.12 ± 1.06) is close to the answer I agree.

The frequency dispersions of the answers given to the item “TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.” could be lined as; 2% disagree (n=1), 8% undecided (n=4), 56% agree (n=28), 34% strongly agree (n=17). The analysis of the item average reveals that the sample mean for the statement (4.22 ± 0.68) is close to the answer I agree.

As for the item “TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.”, distributions of the given responses are 8% disagree (n=4), 12% undecided (n=6), 52% agree (n=26), 28% strongly agree (n=14). Calculations of the item average, (4.00±0.86), discloses that the sample mean for the statement is close to the I agree answer.

The frequency dispersions of the given answers to the item “TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.” are as follows; 4% disagree (n=2), 2% undecided (n=1), 34% agree (n=17), 60% strongly agree (n=30). When the item average is examined (4.50±0.74), it is understood that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I strongly agree.

Among the items related to teacher understandings of task-based language teaching, the item with the highest level of teacher engagement was “TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.” while the item with the lowest level of participation was “A task involves a primary focus on meaning.” is the expression.

The item in which the level of participation of teachers differed the most among the items related to teacher understandings of task-based language teaching was “A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.” while the item that differs the least is “TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching”.

The frequency distributions of the answers given to the Likert-type questions in the teachers' opinions on the implementation of task-based language teaching are as in Table 5.

Table 5

Teacher Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching Frequency Analysis

	SD		D		U		A		SA		Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)	N	P (%)		
I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.0	29	58.0	17	34.0	4.26	0.60
TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	20.0	20	40.0	20	40.0	4.20	0.76

promote the target language use.													
TBLT activates learners' needs and interests.	0	0.0	2	4.0	2	4.0	31	62.0	15	30.0		4.18	0.69
TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.	0	0.0	1	2.0	6	12.0	26	52.0	17	34.0		4.18	0.72
TBLT gives much psychological burden to teachers as a facilitator.	15	30.0	23	46.0	6	12.0	5	10.0	1	2.0		2.08	1.01
TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.	13	26.0	16	32.0	12	24.0	5	10.0	4	8.0		2.42	1.21
TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.	0	0.0	7	14.0	17	34.0	15	30.0	11	22.0		3.60	0.99
TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	26.0	37	74.0		4.74	0.44

The frequency distributions of the responses given to the item "I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom." are as follows; 8% undecided (n=4), 58% agree (n=29), 34% strongly agree (n=17). According to the calculations of the item average (4.26±0.60), the sample mean for the statement is close to the I agree answer.

For the item "TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.", the frequency dispersions of the responses are 20% undecided (n=10), 40% agree (n=20), 40% strongly agree (n=20). The analysis of the item average, (4.20±0.76), shows that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

Another item, “TBLT activates learners’ needs and interests.”, has the following frequency distributions of the responses; 4% disagree (n=2), 4% undecided (n=2), 62% agree (n=31), 30% strongly agree (n=15). The examination of the item average (4.18 ± 0.69) demonstrates that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

As for the item “TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.”, frequency dispersions are as follows; 2% disagree (n=1), 12% undecided (n=6), 52% agree (n=26), 34% strongly agree (n=17). Based on the item average (4.18 ± 0.72), it is understood that the sample mean for the statement is close to the I agree answer.

The frequency distributions of the answers which are given to the item “TBLT activates learners’ needs and interests.” shows following percentages; 4% disagree (n=2), 4% undecided (n=2), 62% agree (n=31), 30% strongly agree (n=15). The analysis of the item average (4.18 ± 0.69) displays that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

The next item’s, “TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.”, frequency distributions of the given answers are 2% disagree (n=1), 12% undecided (n=6), 52% agree (n=26), 34% strongly agree (n=17). According to the item average analysis (4.18 ± 0.72), the sample mean for the statement is close to the I agree answer.

The frequency dispersions of the answers given to the item “TBLT gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator.” are as follows; 30% strongly disagree (n=15), 46% disagree (n=23), 12% undecided (n=6), 10% agree (n=5), 2% strongly agree (n=1). The examination of the item average illustrates that the sample mean for the statement (2.08 ± 1.01) is close to the disagree answer.

The “TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.” item has the following frequency distributions of the given responses; 26% strongly disagree (n=13), 32% disagree (n=16), 24% undecided (n=12), 10% agree (n=5), 8% strongly agree (n=4). When the item average is analyzed (2.42 ± 1.21), it is seen that the sample mean for the statement is close to the disagree answer.

The frequency distributions of the responses given to the item “TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.” are as follows; 14% disagree (n=7), 34% undecided (n=17), 30% agree (n=15), 22% strongly agree (n=11). When the item average is examined (3.6 ± 0.99), it is seen that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I agree.

The item “TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.” possesses the following frequency distributions; 26% agree (n=13), 74% strongly agree (n=37). The analysis of the item average (4.74 ± 0.44) shows that the sample mean for the statement is close to the answer I strongly agree.

Frequencies on the use of TBLT by the teachers in education are as in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequencies of Using TBLT in EFL Classes

Status of Using TBLT in EFL Classes	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
No	7	14%
Yes	43	84%
Total	50	100%

While 14% of the teachers stated that they did not use TBLT in education (n=7), 86% stated that they used TBLT in education. (n=43)

Percentages of the reasons for the use of teachers using TBLT are as in table 7.

Table 7

Percentages of Reasons for Using TBLT

Reason for using TBLT	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
TBLT promotes learners' academic progress	24	55.8%
TBLT improves learners' interaction skills	32	74.4%
TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation	21	48.8%
TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment	30	69.8%
TBLT is appropriate for small group work	18	42.0%

The statistics on the reasons for using TBLT by teachers (n=43) who use TBLT are as follows; 55.8% TBLT promotes learners' academic progress (n=24), 74.4% TBLT improves learners' interaction skills (n=32), 48.8% TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation (n=21), 69.8% TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment (n=30), 42% TBLT is appropriate for small group work (n=18).

Percentages of the reasons for teachers who do not use TBLT are as in Table 8.

Table 8*Percentages of Reasons for not Using TBLT*

Reason for not using TBLT	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Students are not used to task-based learning.	4	57.1%
Materials in textbooks are not proper for using TBLT.	6	85.7%
Large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods.	7	100.0%
I have difficulty in assessing learner's task-based performance.	2	25.6%
I have limited target language proficiency.	2	28.6%
I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction.	3	42.9%

The reasons for teachers not using TBLT (n=7) are as follows; 57.1% “Students are not used to task-based learning.” (n=4), 85.7% “Materials in textbooks are not proper for using TBLT.” (n=6), 100% “Large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods.” (n=7), 25.6% “I have difficulty in assessing learners’ task-based performance.” (n=2), 25.6% “I have limited target language proficiency.” (n=2), and 42.9% “I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction.” (n=3).

4.1.2. Descriptive Statistics and Normal Distribution Test Statistics: In this part of the research, there are descriptive statistics and normal distribution test statistics of the values obtained from the average of the Likert type questions in part 1 and part 2.

Variable descriptive statistics are as in Table 9.

Table 9*Variable Descriptive Statistics*

Variable	N	Min.	Max.	A	S.D
Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	50	2.286	5.000	4.206	0.598
Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching	50	2.875	4.750	3.873	0.387

N: Frequency, Min.: Minimum, Max.: Maximum, A: Average, S.D.: Standard Deviation

Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching have a minimum value of 2,286, a maximum of 5,000, a mean of 4,206, and a standard deviation of 0.5988. Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching is a variable with a minimum value of 2,875, a maximum value of 4,750, and an average of 3,873 and 0.387 standard deviations.

The normal distribution statistics, which determine the series of analyses to be used, of the variables are as in Table 10.

Table 10

Normal Distribution Statistics

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov			Shapiro-Wilk			S	K
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.		
Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	.205	50	.000	.901	50	.001	-.997	.780
Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching	.149*	50	.070	.967*	50	.182	-.490	.216

*(%5) symbolizes the normal distribution at the significance level, Df: Degree of freedom, S: Skew, K: Kurtosis

When the table is examined, it is seen that the variable of teachers' opinions on the application of task-based language teaching at the 5% significance level, according to the normal distribution test statistical significance values, conforms to the normal distribution (sig.>0.05), while the variable of teachers' perceptions of the task-based language teaching does not comply with the normal distribution (sig.<0.05). On the other hand, as it is known, it is very difficult to determine the normal distribution with the normal distribution tests in the data collected with the help of scales for social sciences. The researchers suggest that the skewness coefficients for such variables should be examined and if there is no significant skewness, it would be correct to assume that the assumption of normal distribution is met. (Tabachnick & S. Fidel, 2013)

When the variables are examined in terms of skewness coefficients, it is seen that both are less than 1 in absolute value. In this case, it can be said that the variables do not have a significant skewness and that the variables are distributed close to normal ($|S| < 1$) (Hair, 2009).

4.1.3. Regression Analysis: The findings of the simple linear regression model, which was established to examine the relationship between teachers' understanding of task-based language teaching and teachers' views on the implementation of task-based language teaching, are as in Table 11.

Table 11

Regression Analysis Findings

Dependent Variable: Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching

Variable	Not standardized		Standardized β	t	Sig.
	β	S.H			
Fixed Term	2.623	.353	-	7.428*	.000
Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	.297	.083	.458	3.573*	.001
$R_{XY}=0.458^*$			Sig.=0.001		
Diagnostic Statistics					
F Test	F(1, 48)=12.768		Sig.=0.001		
Determination	$R^2=0.210$		Fixed $R^2=0.194$		

*(%5) expresses a statistically significant relationship at the level of significance. S.E: Standard Error, R_{XY} : The correlation coefficient between the variable pair, F(test degree of freedom).

When the table is examined, it is seen that the regression model established according to the F test findings is a statistically significant model at the 5% significance level ($F(1, 48)=12.768$, $Sig.<0.05$) and the independent variable can explain approximately 19% of the change in the dependent variable.

When the estimated parameter in the model is examined, it is seen that the variable of Teachers' Perceptions on Task-Based Language Teaching has a statistically significant and positive effect at the 5% significance level on the Variable of Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching. ($\beta=0.458$, Sig.<0.05). To put it more clearly, as teachers' perceptions of Teachers' Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching increase, their perceptions of practice regarding this teaching also increase.

The correlation coefficient between the variables, on the other hand, shows that there is a statistically significant positive and moderate correlation between the variables. ($0.40 \leq R_{XY} \leq 0.60$) (Akgül & Çevik, 2003).

4.1.4. Difference Analysis: In this part of the research, it was examined whether the level of participation in the items in the Teachers' Perceptions on Task-Based Language Teaching and Teachers' Opinions on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching changed depending on gender and professional seniority.

4.1.4.1. Gender Difference Analysis: Mann Whitney U test statistics, which examines the differences between male and female teachers, are as in table 12.

Table 12

Mann Whitney U Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching by Gender

Variable	Gender	N	X	S.D.	r	z	sig.
A task is a communicative goal directed.	Female	34	4.324	0.878	26.18	-	0.600
	Male	16	4.250	0.775	24.06	0.524	
A task involves a primary focus on meaning.	Female	34	4.029	0.834	27.38	-	0.155
	Male	16	3.688	0.873	21.50	1.423	
A task has a clearly defined outcome.	Female	34	4.500	0.749	27.85	-	0.064
	Male	16	4.125	0.806	20.50	1.855	
A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.	Female	34	4.059	1.153	25.09	0.313	0.754
	Male	16	4.250	0.856	26.38		
TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.	Female	34	4.324	0.684	27.75	-	0.073
	Male	16	4.000	0.632	20.72	1.796	

TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.	Female	34	4.147	0.857	28.24	-	0.034
	Male	16	3.688	0.793	19.69	2.116	
TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.	Female	34	4.500	0.826	26.32	-	0.50
	Male	16	4.500	0.516	23.75	0.675	
Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	Female	34	4.269	0.637	27.74	-	0.111
	Male	16	4.071	0.498	20.75	1.595	

X: Mean, S.D: Standard Deviation, r: Average rank, z: z test statistics

It could be seen that there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.324 ± 0.878) and male (4.250 ± 0.775) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation in the item “A task is a communicative goal directed.” ($z = -0.524$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

Another observation based on the table is that there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.029 ± 0.834) and male (3.688 ± 0.873) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation in the item “A task involves a primary focus on meaning.” ($z = -1.423$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

For the item “A task has a clearly defined outcome.” there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.500 ± 0.749) and male (4.125 ± 0.806) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z = -1.855$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

Table also indicates that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level between female (4.059 ± 1.153) and male (4.250 ± 0.856) participants in terms of the level of participation in the item “A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner”. ($z = 0.313$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

According to the table there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level between female (4.324 ± 0.684) and male (4.000 ± 0.632) participants in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching”. ($z = -1.796$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

For the item “TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.”, there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.147 ± 0.857) and male (3.688 ± 0.793) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z = -2.116$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

The table shows that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level between female (4.500 ± 0.826) and male (4.500 ± 0.516) participants in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.” ($z = -0.675$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

It could be understood from the table that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level between female (4.269 ± 0.637) and male (4.071 ± 0.498) participants in terms of the level of participation in the department of teacher understandings regarding task-based language teaching. ($z = -1.595$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

Mann Whitney U test statistics, which examines the differences between male and female teachers, are as in Table 13.

Table 13

Mann Whitney U Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Views on the Application of Task-Based Language Teaching to Gender

Variable	Gender	N	X	S.D.	r	z	sig.
I am interested in implementing TBLT in the classroom.	Female	34	4.353	0.646	27.69	-	1.771 0.077
	Male	16	4.063	0.443	20.84		
TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.	Female	34	4.265	0.751	26.68	-	0.371
	Male	16	4.063	0.772	23.00	0.895	
TBLT activates learners' needs and interests.	Female	34	4.235	0.699	26.60	-0.91	0.363
	Male	16	4.063	0.680	23.16		
TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.	Female	34	4.265	0.751	27.37	-	0.144
	Male	16	4.000	0.632	21.53	1.460	
TBLT gives much psychological burden to teachers as a facilitator.	Female	34	2.000	1.044	24.01	-	0.261
	Male	16	2.250	0.931	28.66	1.124	
TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.	Female	34	2.353	1.276	24.37	-	0.408
	Male	16	2.563	1.094	27.91	0.828	
TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.	Female	34	3.706	1.031	27.09	-	0.242
	Male	16	3.375	0.885	22.13	1.170	
	Female	34	4.735	0.448	25.38		0.913

TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.	Male	16	4.750	0.447	25.75	-	0.109
Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching	Female	34	3.908	0.425	27.46	-	0.164
	Male	16	3.797	0.292	21.34	1.393	

X: Mean, S.D: Standard Deviation, r: Average rank, z: z test statistics

Based on the table it is clear that there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.353 ± 0.646) and male (4.063 ± 0.443) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation in the item “I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.” ($z = -1.771$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

For the item “TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.”, it is understood that there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.265 ± 0.751) and male (4.063 ± 0.772) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z = -0.895$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

The table also shows that there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.235 ± 0.699) and male (4.063 ± 0.680) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT activates learners’ needs and interests.” ($z = -0.910$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

According to the table, for the item “TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.” there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.265 ± 0.751) and male (4.000 ± 0.632) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z = -1.460$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

Similarly, for the item “TBLT gives much psychological burden to teachers as a facilitator.” there is no statistically significant difference between female (2.000 ± 1.044) and male (2.250 ± 0.931) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z = -1.124$, $\text{sig.} > 0.05$).

It is also seen that there is no statistically significant difference between female (2.353 ± 1.276) and male (2.563 ± 1.094) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the

level of participation in the item “TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.” ($z=-0.828$, $\text{sig.}>0.05$).

For the item “TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.”, it could be understood that there is no statistically significant difference between female (3.706 ± 1.031) and male (3.375 ± 0.885) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z=-1.170$, $\text{sig.}>0.05$).

Furthermore, for the item “TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.” it is clear there is no statistically significant difference between female (4.735 ± 0.448) and male (4.750 ± 0.447) participants at the 5% significance level in terms of the level of participation ($z=-0.109$, $\text{sig.}>0.05$).

Finally, there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level between female (3.908 ± 0.425) and male (3.797 ± 0.292) participants in terms of the level of participation in the section of teachers' opinions on the implementation of task-based language teaching. ($z=-1.393$, $\text{sig.}>0.05$).

4.1.4.2 Difference Analysis Based on Professional Experience: The statistics of the Kruskal Wallis H test, which tests the differences between teachers according to the professional experience period, are as in table 14.

Table 14

Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Examining Differences in Teachers' Concepts Regarding Task-Based Language Teaching Based on Professional Experience

Variable	Experience	N	X	S.D.	r	χ^2	sig.
A task is a communicative goal directed.	Less than 5	20	4.050	0.759	20.325	5.856	0.053
	5-9 years	20	4.350	0.988	27.400		
	10 years and more	10	4.700	0.483	32.050		
A task involves a primary focus on meaning.	Less than 5	20	3.800	0.834	23.300	0.916	0.633
	5-9 years	20	4.000	0.973	27.350		

	10 years and more	10	4.000	0.667	26.200		
	Less than 5	20	4.250	0.910	23.775		
A task has a clearly defined outcome.	5-9 years	20	4.350	0.671	24.025	2.998	0.223
	10 years and more	10	4.700	0.675	31.900		
	Less than 5	20	4.150	1.040	25.825		
A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.	5-9 years	20	4.000	1.257	24.900	0.067	0.967
	10 years and more	10	4.300	0.675	26.050		
	Less than 5	20	4.100	0.788	23.725		
TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.	5-9 years	20	4.300	0.571	26.575	0.634	0.728
	10 years and more	10	4.300	0.675	26.900		
	Less than 5	20	3.700	0.865	20.750		
TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.	5-9 years	20	4.200	0.834	28.850	4.247	0.120
	10 years and more	10	4.200	0.789	28.300		
	Less than 5	20	4.400	0.821	23.950		
TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation	5-9 years	20	4.550	0.759	26.750	0.524	0.770
	10 years and more	10	4.600	0.516	26.100		
	Less than 5	20	4.064	0.650	21.900		
Teacher Concepts of Task-Based Language Teaching	5-9 years	20	4.250	0.601	26.425	2.694	0.260
	10 years and more	10	4.400	0.451	30.850		

X: Mean, S.D: Standard Deviation, r: Average Rank, χ^2 : Chi-Square test statistic

Based on the table it could be seen that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (4.050 ± 0.759), 5 to 9 years (4.350 ± 0.988), 10 years and more (4.700 ± 0.483) in terms of the

level of participation in the item “A task is a communicative goal directed.” ($\chi^2=5856$, sig.>0.05).

For the item “A task involves a primary focus on meaning.”, it is understood that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (3.800 ± 0.834), between 5 and 9 years (4.000 ± 0.973), 10 years and above (4.000 ± 0.667) in terms of participation level ($\chi^2=0.916$, sig.>0.05).

According to the table there is also no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (4.250 ± 0.910), between 5 and 9 years (4.350 ± 0.671), 10 years and more (4.700 ± 0.675) in terms of the level of participation in the item “A task has a clearly defined outcome.” ($\chi^2=2.998$, sig.>0.05).

Similarly, as for the item “A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.”, there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (4.150 ± 1.040), between 5 and 9 years (4.000 ± 1.257), 10 years and more (4.300 ± 0.675) in terms of the level of participation ($\chi^2=0.067$, sig.>0.05).

The table also show that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (4.100 ± 0.788), between 5 and 9 years (4.300 ± 0.571), 10 years and more (4.300 ± 0.675) in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.” ($\chi^2=0.634$, sig.>0.05).

As shown in the table, there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (3.700 ± 0.865), 5 to 9 years (4.200 ± 0.834), 10 years and more (4.200 ± 0.789) in terms of participation level in the item “TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.” ($\chi^2=4.247$, sig.>0.05).

For the item "TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.", it could be understood that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years

(4.400±0.821), 5 to 9 years (4.550±0.759), 10 years and more (4.600±0.516) in terms of participation level ($\chi^2=0.524$, sig.>0.05).

Finally, there is no significant difference ($\chi^2=2.694$, sig.>0.05) at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (4.064±0.650), 5 to 9 years (4.250±0.601), 10 years and more (4.400±0.451) in terms of the level of participation in the department of teacher understandings related to task-based language teaching.

The statistics of the Kruskal Wallis H test, which tests the differences between teachers according to the professional experience period, are as in table 15.

Table 15

Kruskal Wallis H Test Findings Examining the Differences in Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching Based on Professional Experience

Variable	Experience	N	X	S.D.	r	χ^2	sig.
I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.	Less than 5	20	4.300	0.657	26.550	0.359	0.836
	5-9 years	20	4.250	0.639	25.400		
	10 years and more	10	4.200	0.422	23.600		
TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.	Less than 5	20	4.150	0.813	24.750	0.837	0.658
	5-9 years	20	4.150	0.745	24.500		
	10 years and more	10	4.400	0.699	29.000		
TBLT activates learners' needs and interests.	Less than 5	20	3.950	0.605	20.550	5.931	0.052
	5-9 years	20	4.250	0.786	27.450		
	10 years and more	10	4.500	0.527	31.500		
TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.	Less than 5	20	3.950	0.826	21.700	3.659	0.161
	5-9 years	20	4.250	0.639	26.425		
	10 years and more	10	4.500	0.527	31.250		

TBLT gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator.	Less than 5	20	2.350	1.182	28.575	1.744	0.418
	5-9 years	20	1.900	0.912	23.075		
	10 years and more	10	1.900	0.738	24.200		
TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.	Less than 5	20	2.850	1.226	30.550	4.844	0.089
	5-9 years	20	2.250	1.251	23.500		
	10 years and more	10	1.900	0.876	19.400		
TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.	Less than 5	20	3.300	0.801	21.250	4.607	0.100
	5-9 years	20	3.650	1.089	26.100		
	10 years and more	10	4.100	0.994	32.800		
TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.	Less than 5	20	4.700	0.470	24.500	0.357	0.837
	5-9 years	20	4.750	0.444	25.750		
	10 years and more	10	4.800	0.422	27.000		
Teachers' Views on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching	Less than 5	20	3.763	0.389	21.300	4.562	0.102
	5-9 years	20	3.863	0.378	25.825		
	10 years and more	10	4.113	0.325	33.250		

X: Mean, S.D: Standard Deviation, r: Average Rank, χ^2 : Chi-Square test statistic

According to the table there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (4.300 ± 0.657), 5 to 9 years (4.250 ± 0.639), 10 years and more (4.200 ± 0.422) in terms of participation level in the item "I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom." ($\chi^2=0.359$, sig.>0.05).

For the item "TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use." there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (4.150 ± 0.813), 5 to 9 years (4.150 ± 0.745), 10 years and more (4.400 ± 0.699) in terms of participation level ($\chi^2=0.837$, sig.>0.05).

The table shows that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (3.950 ± 0.605), between 5 and 9 years (4.250 ± 0.786), 10 years and more (4.500 ± 0.527) in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT activates learners’ needs and interests.” ($\chi^2=5.931$, sig. >0.05).

As for the item “TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.” there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (3.950 ± 0.826), 5 to 9 years (4.250 ± 0.639), 10 years and more (4.500 ± 0.527) in terms of participation level in ($\chi^2=3.659$, sig. >0.05).

Based on the table there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (2.350 ± 1.182), 5 to 9 years (1.900 ± 0.912), 10 years and more (1.900 ± 0.738) in terms of participation level in the item “TBLT gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator.” ($\chi^2=1744$, sig. >0.05).

Similarly, there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (2.850 ± 1.226), between 5 and 9 years (2.250 ± 1.251), 10 years and more (1.900 ± 0.876) in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.” ($\chi^2=4.844$, sig. >0.05).

The table also indicates that there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers who have professional experience of less than 5 years (3.300 ± 0.801), between 5 and 9 years (3.650 ± 1.089), 10 years and more (4.100 ± 0.994) in terms of the level of participation in the item “TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.” ($\chi^2=4.607$, sig. >0.05).

In addition, for the item “TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.” there is no statistically significant difference at the 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (4.700 ± 0.470), 5 to 9 years (4.750 ± 0.444), 10 years and more (4.800 ± 0.422) in terms of the level of participation in ($\chi^2=0.357$, sig. >0.05).

Finally, the table shows that there is no statistically significant difference at 5% significance level among teachers with professional experience of less than 5 years (3.763 ± 0.389), 5 to 9 years (3.863 ± 0.378), 10 years and more (4.113 ± 0.325) in terms of

participation in the section of Teachers' Opinions on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching. ($\chi^2=4.562$, sig.>0.05).

4.2. Qualitative Analysis

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted with five of the participants who volunteered to take part. The semi-structured interview which was conducted with five of the instructors who volunteered to participate revealed nine codes and four categories after completing the qualitative analysis. Those codes and categories are listed in table 16.

Table 16

TBLT understandings and perceptions of participants (codes and categories)

Codes	Categories
	Perceptions towards TBLT
-Improvement of academic skills	
-Engaging learning process and environment	
-Suitability for pair and group work	
-Improvement of interactive skills	
	Perceived difficulties of TBLT implementation
-Unsuitability of materials	
-Crowded classes	
	Relationship between TBLT and students' interaction
-Authentic activities of TBLT requires interaction	
-The effect of correct task design on interaction	
	Relationship between TBLT tasks and collaboration
-Group or pair work based on appropriate tasks	

Responses given to the interview items by instructors related to their understandings and implementations of TBLT are presented in Table 17 below.

Table 17

TBLT understandings and perceptions of participants

Items	Responses provided by participants
Familiarity with TBLT	-Yes
Advantages of TBLT in university prep classes	<p data-bbox="820 631 1401 779">-It creates an environment that promotes student to student communication as well as student to teacher interaction.</p> <p data-bbox="724 810 1401 900">-Tasks enable group work and this increases the chance of students helping each other.</p> <p data-bbox="820 922 1401 1079">-TBLT does not just focus on rules. It also cares about the actual use of the language. So, it is good for all language skills.</p> <p data-bbox="788 1102 1401 1249">-Tasks are tailored according to the profiles of students and that makes learning more interesting for them.</p> <p data-bbox="724 1272 1401 1420">-It requires active and continuous communication among students which improves their both English and interpersonal skills.</p> <p data-bbox="564 1442 1401 1599">-TBLT makes sure that learners are contributing to their own language learning processes by using the target language to communicate.</p> <p data-bbox="788 1621 1401 1778">-Tasks are a great way to teach different level students at the same time. Students can help each other with pair or group work.</p> <p data-bbox="820 1800 1401 1944">-TBLT supports learners' general academic improvement with opportunities to use the language they are learning</p>
Disadvantages of TBLT in university	

prep classes

-We have too many students in a class and this makes it very difficult to manage the classroom while they are working on tasks.

-Classrooms are too crowded. TBLT requires enough time to be spent on individuals.

-It is compulsory to use the provided material which is not always suitable for TBLT.

-I have to finish the book the school gave me, and it is not designed for TBLT. If I want to add another material that supports TBLT then I have problems with time.

-I have so many students in just one class. It is a problem as the role of the instructor in TBLT is to provide guidance and I do not have enough time for it with so many people.

-The number of students is not making the TBLT process easier.

-Two issues. Crowded classes and materials. It is really difficult to implement TBLT with so many students. Also, materials are not very useful in terms of TBLT.

Do you implement TBLT?

-Yes.

Relationship between the students' interaction

with each other and the implementation of TBLT

-Tasks enable student interaction.

-When TBLT is implemented, interaction increases.

-If tasks are designed in a way that supports interaction, it could help.

-There is a positive relationship. TBLT prepares for real-life situations and in real-life, we need to interact with people.

-TBLT is a sure way to create and increase interaction among students and between the students and the instructor.

Connection between the tasks and

collaborative language learning

-Tasks that require pair or group work means that students must help each other out to complete the tasks.

-It depends on the task type. If some tasks are supposed to be done by joint effort, collaboration increases.

-TBLT tasks promote collaboration when the tasks are designed well. Also, the instructor should encourage students to work with each other.

-Tasks may help if they are prepared with that purpose just like any other communicative approach would do.

-If such an environment is created by the teacher, tasks can support collaboration.

When interviewees were asked to share their opinions on advantages of TBLT, they highlighted the fact that TBLT tasks are prepared in a way which imitate real-life situations, and this means in order to complete the tasks learners are supposed to communicate with each other and their instructors. This mutual communication among learners and instructors increases interaction skills of students.

One of the interviewees stated that “TBLT is good for actually using the language. It requires active and continuous communication among students which improves their both English and interpersonal skills”.

Another interviewee emphasized that “It creates an environment that promotes student to student communication as well as student to teacher interaction”.

Interviewee 3 claimed that “TBLT makes sure that learners are contributing to their own language learning processes by using the target language to communicate”.

They also emphasized that TBLT tasks promote collaboration by enabling pair or group work. One interviewee stated that “Tasks enable group work, and this increases the chance of students helping each other. Collaboration among students is important and could be achieved through group or pair works”.

Another interviewee pointed out that “Tasks are a great way to teach different level students at the same time. Students can help each other with pair or group work”.

Another characteristic of TBLT which was brought up by the interviewees was the positive effect of TBLT on learners' academic skills.

One of the interviewees said that "TBLT does not just focus on rules. It also cares about the actual use of the language. So, it is good for all language skills".

Another interviewee highlighted that "TBLT supports learners' general academic improvement with opportunities to use the language they are learning".

Finally, one of the interviewees mentioned another effect of TBLT on language learning processes by saying "Tasks are tailored according to the profiles of students and that makes learning more interesting for them".

When interviewees were asked to provide their thoughts on the disadvantages of TBLT, all of them agreed on two issues: material related problems and student number related problems. One interviewee stated that "Two issues. Crowded classes and materials. It is really difficult to implement TBLT with so many students. Also, materials are not very useful in terms of TBLT".

Interviewees were asked to explain the relationship between students' interaction and TBLT based on their implementation of TBLT in their classes. All five of the interviewees agreed that implementation of TBLT increased learner interaction. One interviewee stated that "There is a positive relationship. TBLT prepares for real-life situations and in real-life, we need to interact with people".

Finally, when interviewees were asked to clarify the connection between TBLT tasks and collaborative language learning, it was emphasized that this connection depends on the type of the tasks. One interviewee said that "It depends on the task type. If some tasks are supposed to be done by joint effort, collaboration increases".

Another interviewee claimed that "Tasks that require pair or group work means that students must help each other out to complete the tasks".

In addition, one of the interviewees mentioned the instructors' responsibility on collaboration by saying "If such an environment is created by the teacher, tasks can support collaboration".

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter introduces the findings of this research based on the results obtained by quantitative and qualitative data collection tools by referring to research questions. In order to provide a clear schema, discussion will follow the order research questions.

5.1. EFL instructors' perceptions of Task-based Language Teaching in university preparatory programs

One of the objectives of this study was to reveal the understandings of EFL instructors in a university preparatory program on TBLT. Frequency analysis of the questionnaire items related to the understandings of EFL instructors on TBLT showed that all the instructors who participated in the study possessed the basic knowledge of fundamental principles – communicative and meaning focused nature of TBLT and its tasks, phases of TBLT, clearly defined outcomes of tasks – of task-based language teaching. This finding indicates that task-based language teaching is a popular approach among EFL instructors in a university preparatory program in Turkey.

The responses obtained from the interviews were in line with the outcomes gathered from the questionnaire. That is, when participants were asked to share their understanding of TBLT, they mentioned some TBLT qualities such as being communication and meaning oriented, being student-centred and having a clear outcome.

When these findings are examined in reference to previous studies in the respective literature, it could be inferred that these findings are consistent with the outcomes of many earlier studies (Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011; Haque, 2012; Harris, 2016; Pham and Nguyen, 2018; Kırtaş, 2016; Page Halıcı, 2016; Mehmood, 2021). Findings of aforementioned studies also demonstrated that most EFL teachers are familiar with task-based language teaching and its principles. For instance, according to the study by Xiongyong and Samuel (2011) EFL teachers who participated in their study possessed clear understanding of what a task was and what qualities a task was supposed to carry. They also reached a conclusion that this knowledge of the instructors was correlated to their positive attitudes towards the implication of task-based language. However, they also stated that this connection between the perception and behaviour was dependent on optimum conditions which suggests if undesirable circumstances -which are mentioned in regard to the second research question- were to occur, instructors might choose to avoid implementing TBLT regardless of and in spite of their positive attitudes. The situation

was similar among all aforementioned studies and their findings. Similarities of these previous studies and this current study may exist due to the fact that all these studies were conducted with educators who are trained specifically to provide language education and are supposed to be knowledgeable about popular approaches such as TBLT. Numerous different teaching approaches exist throughout the foreign language education world and some of those approaches are believed to be more effective than the others under the correct circumstances. Thus, even though the existing conditions of the educational institutions of instructors who participated in previously mentioned studies do not allow TBLT to be implemented in their classrooms, it is not unexpected that those instructors were fairly familiarized with task-based language teaching.

Another reason for the similarities between this study and the studies of Kırtaş (2016), Page Halıcı (2016) and Mehmood (2021) might be the fact that all of them were conducted in a Turkish language learning context. In Turkey, the importance and the necessity of learning English is widely accepted fact and since the curriculum and materials suggested by the Education Ministry are not usually believed to be satisfactory, educators tend to search for and implement more communication-based approaches and methods. This situation may lead to several outcomes. First, since instructors are aware that they need to show individual effort in order to add to what is provided for them and their classes in terms of syllabi and materials, they become more likely to spend time on their personal and professional development. This creates a higher chance for them to encounter and get familiarized with TBLT. Secondly, as the need for such an effort is quite common across the country, it generates a community where educators support each other resulting in a higher chance of becoming acquainted with task-based language teaching.

5.2. EFL instructors' implementations of Task-based Language Teaching in university preparatory programs

Another objective of this current research was to investigate whether the participants implemented task-based language teaching in their classes or not along with their reasons. Findings of the questionnaire items related to the preferences of instructors about TBLT illustrated that a great the majority of the instructors had positive attitudes toward implementing TBLT in their classes. Only 14% stated that they were not implementing task-based language teaching while 86% stated they had interest in implementation of TBLT. Moreover, the responses that are given to the interview items related to the implementation of task-based language teaching confirm this finding. This finding suggests that even though there seems to

be some deterrents, the implementation of TBLT is highly common thanks to its advantages in terms of language learning processes.

When compared to the previous studies which investigated the same topic, it is seen that this outcome is consistent with their findings. Studies by Xiongyong and Samuel (2011), Harris (2016), Haque (2012), Kırtaş (2016), Page Halıcı (2016), Pham and Nguyen (2018) and Mehmood (2021) explored whether instructors implemented TBLT in their classes and concluded that most of them did since they believed task-based language teaching was an effective approach in terms of teaching a foreign language.

According to the findings of the studies by Xiongyong and Samuel (2011), Harris (2016), Haque (2012), Kırtaş (2016), Page Halıcı (2016), Pham and Nguyen (2018) and Mehmood (2021), the main factors why instructors chose to implement TBLT were its contribution to students' interaction skills and creating a collaborative environment. Similarly, this current study also found that those two reasons are among the three most common reasons that encourage instructors to implement TBLT. This parallelism is not surprising when the possible motives for instructors to choose a communicative approach are taken into consideration. In other words, the most basic and obvious objective of any communicative approach is to create an environment which promotes interaction and collaboration among students. Thus, since TBLT adopts the principles of communicative approach, instructors who choose to apply it in their classes must pay the most attention to those qualities.

Another similarity shared between this study and some of the aforementioned studies (Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011; Haque, 2012; Kırtaş, 2016; Page Halıcı, 2016; Mehmood, 2021) in terms of the findings related to the implementation of TBLT is that these studies revealed similar deterrents that prevented task-based language teaching from becoming a part of the classroom environments. Even though those studies took place in different cultures and settings, they seemed to have two common educational problems: high numbers of students in classrooms and suggested syllabi with materials which need to be completed and might not be suitable for TBLT. The inconvenience which was created by large class size was recognized and accepted by the vast majority of the participants in all of the above-mentioned studies. That might be because task-based language teaching is student-centered and based on tasks that sometimes necessitates pair or group work as well as supervision and feedback of instructors which requires enough time to spend on each learner since without meeting these requirements TBLT would be likely to fail. As for the difficulties caused by materials and syllabi, due to the fact that an absolute necessity for task-based language teaching is appropriate tasks which are

designed in accordance with the needs and interests of the learners, without having access to those materials or the chance to include one in a syllabus for any reason it would be understandable for instructors to avoid using TBLT.

However, unlike the findings of this current study in terms of the factors that deter instructors from implementing TBLT in their classes, majority of the participants of studies both by Harris (2016) and Pham and Nguyen (2018) claimed that large class size was not a factor that would affect the effectiveness of or cause avoidance from TBLT. This difference may stem from the fact that both studies were conducted in Asian settings which are known to have large numbers of students in their classes because of crowded population and limited facilities. The fact that crowded classes is experienced often and considered normal might be the cause why they did not consider over crowdedness as a factor which deters the implication of TBLT.

5.3. The effect of gender on EFL instructors' preferences to apply TBLT

Another issue investigated by this study was whether gender was a factor which affected the preferences of instructors in terms of applying task-based language teaching. In order to find out the answer for this question, a difference analysis was done using Mann Whitney U Test. The results of the analysis indicated that gender was not a factor in the decision-making processes of the instructors on the topic of whether to implement TBLT or not.

When these findings are examined in reference to a previous study which included the examination of gender factor in the respective literature, it could be inferred that this outcome is consistent with the findings of a study by Pham and Nguyen (2018) who also suggested that there was no statistically significant difference between female and male instructors in terms of their preferences related to the implementation of TBLT.

Unfortunately, although the effect of students' gender on different learning styles and preferences has been studied extensively in the literature, it has not been studied enough whether the gender of teachers is an influencing factor in choosing to apply task-based language teaching. The fact that that not many studies chose to examine this issue might suggest that gender is not perceived as possible determinant in a foreign language teaching approach selection process. It may also be assumed that as long as instructors are educated about TBLT and provided with the necessary resources, gender does not play a role in instructors' choices. Still, so as to make a reliable generalization, the issue of the effect of instructors' gender on their preferences in terms of whether to apply task-based language teaching or not needs to be

studied a lot more. Thanks to some studies (Aries, 1976; Ross-Feldman, 2007; Tannen, 1994) it has been known that gender of learners may affect their inclinations and choices of learning methods since females and males use language in different ways. Thus, it would be only possible to understand whether gender has any effect on instructors' choices related to their preferences to implement TBLT or not with enough studies on the topic.

5.4. The effect of professional experience on EFL instructors' preferences to apply TBLT

Finally, this research sought to find out whether length of professional experience was a determinant in instructors' decision to implement TBLT or not. So as to reveal the answer to this question, Kruskal Wallis H Test was applied. The findings of the analysis showed that the length of professional experience was not a factor in the decision-making processes of the instructors on the topic of whether to implement TBLT or not.

Two other studies which investigated the same issue were by Pham and Nguyen (2018) and Firoozkahi and Nushi (2021). They also revealed that there was no statistically significant difference among instructors with different years of teaching experience. Pham and Nguyen (2018) divided participants into four groups that categorized instructors according to the length of their professional experience: five and less, five to nine, ten to fifteen, and fifteen and above. They studied years of teaching experience as one of several possible factors that could affect the instructors' preferences related to TBLT. On the other hand, Firoozkahi and Nushi (2021) focused their study only on this aspect by examining one hundred and sixty-two instructors who were categorized as novice and experienced. Despite their differences in terms of their goals and methods, both studies reached the same result that eliminates gender of instructors from being a factor that influences instructors' decisions to implement task-based language teaching.

The finding of those two studies and this current study may not be surprising since no matter how many years of experience the participants had, they all had similar educational backgrounds where they were taught about the most popular approaches in terms of language teaching and TBLT was certainly one of them. Thus, choosing to implement TBLT or not is not dependent on a factor such as professional experience. In other words, regardless of EFL instructors' teaching experience, if they had not been introduced to task-based language teaching and its principles properly, it would be unrealistic to expect EFL instructors to apply TBLT effectively even if they had long years of professional background.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1. Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to reveal English language teachers' understanding and implementations about task-based language teaching approach. In order to achieve this goal, the study attempted to find out the factors that encouraged fifty instructors that taught at a private university in English preparatory classes to use TBLT as well as obstacles that prevented them from applying TBLT in their classrooms. As a result of the data analysis and its findings which was presented in the previous chapter, it has been clear that there are different opinions regarding the implementation of TBLT in university preparatory classes. Thus, in this chapter the outcomes of the study will be discussed to conclude the research and recommendations for further studies will be provided.

One of the most crucial conclusions that can be drawn from this study is that regardless of the participants' gender or professional experience, majority of them had a satisfactory level of understanding related to the features of the task-based language teaching approach. This conclusion was in accordance with several studies (Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011; Haque, 2012; Harris, 2016). Based on the instructors' responses, it could be claimed that most of them were aware that TBLT highlights communication without neglecting the forms of a language. Similarly, most of the instructors agreed that TBLT is a learner centered approach and thus had a positive impact on learners' communicative abilities. According to the responses of the participants, all of them acknowledged the importance of authentic material usage while applying TBLT in a classroom.

Another inference that this study leads to is that a great majority of the participants showed a genuine interest in implementing TBLT in their classrooms since they believed TBLT had the potential to activate learners' needs and interest as well as to provide a safe and relaxed environment for learners to actively use the target language. This claim was also a part of many studies in the respective literature (Kırtaş, 2016; Page Halıcı, 2016; Mehmood, 2021). Most of the instructors also agreed that TBLT does not add unnecessary burden to the teacher, neither physically nor psychologically. When teachers' positive attitudes are combined with high awareness rates, the use of task-based language teaching approach in classrooms produced a predictable and understandable result.

A great majority of the participants stated that they used TBLT in their classrooms while only a small percentage claimed that they do not implement task-based approach in their teaching processes. The two reasons which urged most of the participants to implement TBLT in their classrooms were their belief that it improves learners' interaction skills and creates a collaborative learning environment. This indicated that TBLT had a positive perception among most of the English instructors at the university where the research was conducted. The two factors which deterred instructors from using TBLT in their language learning environments most were the large class sizes and materials which were not suitable for using TBLT. Unfortunately, these deterrents seemed to stem from both university's infrastructural incapacities and the suggested national syllabus for English language teaching which mostly rely on traditional methods in order to ensure learners' success at traditional assessment processes. These deterrents were also mentioned in previous studies on TBLT (Xiongyong and Samuel, 2011; Haque, 2012; Kırtas, 2016; Page Halıcı, 2016; Mehmood, 2021). The university's decision to accept more students than it can accommodate led to overcrowded classrooms which in turn resulted in an unsuitable environment for TBLT. Also, as it is commonly known, Turkish education system mostly rely on traditional methods which requires usage of materials which are not appropriate for implementation of task-based language teaching.

6.2. Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the outcomes of the study three educational implications for instructors, administrative people and curriculum designers are proposed. First of all, understandings and perceptions of instructors play a vital role in implementation and success of TBLT so trainings on TBLT should be provided to EFL educators. By doing this, instructors may gain the ability to adjust the materials they have according to the needs of task-based language teaching approach and their learners. Furthermore, the education of EFL instructors in terms of task-based language teaching should not necessarily start only after they start their careers, instead TBLT education, including the fundamentals and more advanced application techniques, could be a part of their undergraduate education. Inasmuch as EFL instructors are provided with the proper education, they could create an educational environment which is interactive and student-centered.

Secondly, institutions should try to lessen the student numbers in classes to pave the way for the implementation of TBLT. This change goal might be hard to achieve, especially in state institutions where decisions like this does not really belong to either school administrators

or instructors, yet even dividing classes into groups into study groups for extra hours would be a good start. Moreover, in private educational institutions where the number of students solely depends on the choice of school administrators, it would be more convenient to realize this aim. In situations where lessening the student numbers in classes is absolutely impossible, EFL instructors may resort to alternative solutions such as pair or group activities and tasks that are levelled.

Finally, people who are in charge of developing the curriculum and syllabi might include TBLT activities in the materials. Materials and activities which are designed in accordance with the principles of task-based language teaching would encourage both EFL instructors and language learners. Considering the need for more communicative approaches and interactive classroom environments, this kind of change seems long due. In addition, EFL instructors might and should be able to make necessary adjustments to the materials that they are provided with in order to introduce TBLT in their classes. Instructors should act as facilitators and mentors in their classes and that may only happen if they improve themselves professionally throughout their careers. Thus, improving oneself enough to be able to intervene in when it is necessary in terms of either the educational process itself or the requirements of the process such as materials and activities is crucial.

REFERENCES

- Akbulut, N. (2014). *Teaching english to young learners through task-based language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Pamukkale University, Denizli.
- Akgül, A., & Çevik, O. (2003). *İstatistiksel analiz teknikleri*. Emek Ofset.
- Akın, A. (2020). *Students' attitudes towards and beliefs about task based language teaching and its effects on language* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ufuk University, Ankara.
- Aksoy, K. (2018). *An investigation into collaborative behaviors in task-based foreign language peer interactions* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Aries, E. (1976). Interaction patterns and themes of male, female, and mixed groups. *Small group behavior*, 7(1), 7-18.
- 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.
- Bhandari, L. P. (2020). Task-based language teaching: A current EFL approach. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1), 1-5.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Thematic analysis*. American Psychological Association.
- Breen, M. (1987). Learner contribution to task design: In designing tasks for the communicative classroom. *Language learning tasks*, 7(1), 23-46.
- Brown, H. D. & Lee, H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Carless, D. (2002). Implementing task-based learning with young learners. *ELT journal*, 56(4), 389-396.
- Ceylan, T. (2016). *The effectiveness of task based instruction in improving students' writing and speaking skills* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ufuk University, Ankara.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2002). *Research methods in education*. Routledge Press.

- 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.
- 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., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing*. Routledge Press.
- Drever, E. (1995). *Using semi-structured interviews in small-scale research*. A Teacher's Guide.
- Driscoll, D. L., Appiah-Yeboah, A., Salib, P., & Rupert, D. J. (2007). Merging qualitative and quantitative data in mixed methods research: How to and why not. *Ecological and Environmental Anthropology*, 3(1), 18-26.
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2019). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Firoozkahi, A. H., & Nushi, M. (2021). An appraisal of novice and experienced Iranian EFL instructors' conceptualizations of TBLT. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 45(2), 2-16.
- Gattegno, C. (1963). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way*. Educational Solutions.
- 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.
- 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.

- Hair, F. W. (2009). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Harris, J. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about task-based language teaching in Japan. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 13(2), 102-116.
- 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.
- Howatt, A. P. R., & Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of ELT*. Oxford University Press.
- Ivankova, N. V., Creswell, J. W., & Stick, S. L. (2006). Using mixed-methods sequential explanatory design: From theory to practice. *Field Methods*, 18(1), 3–20.
- Jeon, I.J., and Hahn J. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perception of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 123-143.
- Joffe, H. (2012). Thematic analysis. *Qualitative research methods in mental health and psychotherapy: A guide for students and practitioners*, 1, 210-223.
- Johnson, K. (2003). *Designing language teaching tasks*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kırtaş, G. (2016). *ELT teachers' perceptions and practices of task-based language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Muğla.
- Koçak, U. (2018). *Students' attitudes to the roles of teachers in task-based learning method through web assisted practices* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University, Ankara.
- 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.
- Lambert, C. (2019). *Referent similarity and normal syntax in task-based language teaching*. Springer.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT journal*, 58(4), 319-326.

- Long, M. H., and Doughty, C., J. (2009). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Blackwell Publishing.
- 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.
- 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.
- Mehmood, H. (2021). *Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul.
- Murphy, J. (2003). Task-based learning: the interaction between tasks and learners. *ELT journal*, 57(4), 352-360.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Özdamar, K. (2016). *Ölçek ve test geliştirme*. Nisan Yayın Evi.
- 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.
- 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.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.
- 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., Platt, J., Weber, H., & Inman, P. (1986). Longman dictionary of applied linguistics. *RELC Journal*, 17(2), 105-110.

- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. W. (2013). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Routledge.
- Ross-Feldman, L. (2007). Interaction in the L2 classroom: Does gender influence learning opportunities. *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*, 7(1), 53-77.
- Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based instruction. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 18, 268-286.
- Skehan, P. (2000). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson.
- Tannen, D. (1994). *Gender and discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Tedlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2011). Mixed methods research. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, 285-300.
- 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.
- Wang, T. Y. (2010). *The effects of implementing different cooperative task types of TBLT course on speaking learning in college English conversation class* [Unpublished master's thesis]. The Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan.
- Wilkinson, S., Joffe, H., & Yardley, L. (2004). Qualitative data collection: interviews and focus groups. *Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology*, 5(2), 39-55.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. LongmanELT.
- Willis, D. & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task based teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- 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 A

Teacher Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to examine EFL teachers' beliefs of task-based language teaching with reference to classroom practice. Please answer all the questions as best as you can. Your answers will be kept confidential. Thank you for your cooperation.

Section I. General and Demographic Information

Gender male female

Age 20-29 30-39 40-49 50 +

Total number of years teaching English

less than 5 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 20 years more than 20 Years

Section II. Teachers' Understandings of Task and TBLT

For each of the following statements, please answer by putting **V** in a box, according to the following scale: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), U (undecided), D (disagree), SD (strongly disagree).

Questionnaire Items	SA A U D SD
1. A task is a communicative goal directed.	□ □ □ □ □
2. A task involves a primary focus on meaning.	□ □ □ □ □
3. A task has a clearly defined outcome.	□ □ □ □ □
4. A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.	□ □ □ □ □
5. TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.	□ □ □ □ □
6. TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.	□ □ □ □ □
7. TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.	□ □ □ □ □

Section III. Teachers' Views on Implementing TBLT

The following statements address teachers' views on implementing TBLT in the classroom. Please answer by putting **V** in a box that matches your position most, according to the following scale: SA (strongly agree), A (agree), U (Undecided), D (disagree), SD (strongly disagree).

Questionnaire Items	SA A U D SD
1. I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.	□ □ □ □ □
2. TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.	□ □ □ □ □
3. TBLT activates learners' needs and interests.	□ □ □ □ □
4. TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.	□ □ □ □ □
5. TBLT gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator.	□ □ □ □ □
6. TBLT requires much preparation time compared to other approaches.	□ □ □ □ □
7. TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.	□ □ □ □ □
8. TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.	□ □ □ □ □

Section IV. Reasons Teachers Choose or Avoid Implementing TBLT

Do you use TBLT in your teaching? YES NO

If yes, please put any reasons that you decide to implement TBLT.

- TBLT promotes learners' academic progress.
- TBLT improves learners' interaction skills.
- TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation.
- TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment.
- TBLT is appropriate for small group work.

If you have other reasons, please write them down.

If no, please put any reasons that you avoid implementing TBLT.

- Students are not used to task-based learning.
- Materials in textbooks are not proper for using TBLT.
- Large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods.
- I have difficulty in assessing learner's task-based performance.
- I have limited target language proficiency.
- I have very little knowledge of task-based instruction.

If you have other reasons, please write them down.

Appendix B

Participant Consent Letter

My name is Gülpınar Sarman. I am an MA student at Uludağ University English Language Teaching Department. Currently, I am working on my thesis which investigates EFL teachers' perceptions and implementations on Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT). I aim to gather information related to your understanding and preferences regarding TBLT.

The interview will take about 10-15 minutes of your time. Your answers will be kept confidential. If you want to learn more about the interview questions before deciding whether to participate or not, please contact me via my e-mail address gulpinar.sarman@gmail.com

For this purpose, I invite you to participate in the survey I have mentioned above and thank you very much for your support of my research.

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Part I. General and Demographic Information

Name/Surname

Gender male female

Total number of years teaching English

less than 5 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 14 years 15 to 19 years more than 20 years

Part II. Semi-structured Interview Questions

1. What approaches do you implement in your classes?

2. Are you familiar with TBLT approach?

3. Do you implement TBLT in your classroom?

3a. If your answer is "YES" to the previous question, what factors promote your decision?

3b. If your answer is "NO" to the previous question, what deter you from implementing TBLT in your classroom?

4. Can you tell me your opinion about the relationship between the students' interaction with each other and the implementation of TBLT in language learning environments?

5. Can you explain your understanding on the connection between the tasks that are used in a language learning environment where TBLT is implemented and collaborative language learning?

Appendix C

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 23.12.2020-2386

İSÜ | İSTİNYE
ÜNİVERSİTESİ
I S T A N B U L

HİZMETE ÖZEL
T.C.

İSTİNYE ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ



Sayı : 89636268-100-E.2386
Konu : Araştırma İzni (Gülpınar Sarman)

23/12/2020

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜNE

İlgi : a) 11/12/2020 tarihli ve E.37748 sayılı yazı'nız
b) 18/12/2020 tarihli ,89636268-900-E.892 sayılı yazınız.

Üniversiteniz Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Gülpınar SARMAN'ın "İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Hazırlık Sınıfı Bağlamında Görev Odaklı Dil Öğretimi Algıları" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında Üniversitemiz Yabancı Diller Bölümü öğrencilerine uygulama yapması Rektörlüğümüzce uygun bulunmuştur.

Gereğini arz ederim.

e-imzalıdır

Prof.Dr. Erdal KARAÖZ
Rektör v.

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : http://ebys.istinye.edu.tr/enVision/validate_doc.aspx?V=BELMB9S1

İstinye Üniversitesi Topkapı Kampüsü, Maltepe Mah. Edirne Çırpıcı Yolu, No.9 Zeytinburnu, İstanbul
WEB: www.istinye.edu.tr **TEL:** 0850 283 60 00 **FAKS:** +90 212 481 36 88
MAİL: genelsekreterlik@istinye.edu.tr **KEP:** istinyeuniversitesi@hs03.kep.tr

Bu belge, güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

BURSA ULUDAĞ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
ARAŞTIRMA VE YAYIN ETİK KURULLARI
(Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma ve Yayın Etik Kurulu)
TOPLANTI TUTANAĞI

OTURUM TARİHİ
27 Kasım 2020

OTURUM SAYISI
2020-09

KARAR NO 7: Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitü Müdürlüğü'nden alınan Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Gülpınar SARMAN'ın "İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Hazırlık Sınıfı Bağlamında Görev Odaklı Dil Öğretimi Algıları" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında uygulanacak ölçek sorularının değerlendirilmesine geçildi.

Yapılan görüşmeler sonunda; Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitü Müdürlüğü Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Bilim Dalı Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Gülpınar SARMAN'ın "İngilizce Öğretmenlerinin Hazırlık Sınıfı Bağlamında Görev Odaklı Dil Öğretimi Algıları" konulu tez çalışması kapsamında uygulanacak ölçek sorularının fikri, hukuki ve telif hakları bakımından metot ve ölçeğine ilişkin sorumluluğu başvurucuya ait olmak üzere uygun olduğuna oybirliği ile karar verildi.

Prof. Dr. Feriudun YILMAZ
 Kurul Başkanı

Prof. Dr. Abamüslim AKDEMİR
 Üye

Prof. Dr. Doğan ŞENYÜZ
 Üye

Prof. Dr. Ayşe OĞUZLAR
 Üye

Prof. Dr. Abdurrahman KURT
 Üye

Prof. Gülay GÖĞÜŞ
 Üye

Prof. Dr. Alev SINAR UĞURLU
 Üye

ÖZ GEÇMİŞ			
Adı-Soyadı	Gülpınar Sarman		
Bildiği Yabancı Diller	İngilizce		
Eğitim Durumu	Başlama - Bitirme		Kurum Adı
Lise	2008	2011	Söke Anadolu Öğretmen Lisesi
Lisans	2011	2016	Boğaziçi Üniversitesi
Yüksek Lisans	2018	2022	Uludağ Üniversitesi
Doktora			
Çalıştığı Kurum	Başlama - Ayrılma		Çalışılan Kurumun Adı
1.	2017	-	İstinye Üniversitesi
2.	2016	2017	Özel Cent Koleji
3.			
Üye Olduğu Bilimsel ve Meslekî Kuruluşlar			
Katıldığı Proje ve Toplantılar			
Yayımlar:			
Diğer:			
		Tarih	08.06.2022
		İmza	
		Adı-Soyadı	Gülpınar Sarman