Sakarya University Journal of Education Faculty

Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi
e-ISSN: 2717-6401

İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildiği Bir Ortamda Öğretmenlerin Görev Temelli Dil Öğretimine Karşı Tutumları

Muhammet Öcel [*], Ayfer Su-Bergil[**]

Makale Bilgisi

Geliş Tarihi: 07.02.2022

Kabul Tarihi: 18.06.2022

Basım Tarihi: 30.06.2022

ÖZET

Görev temelli dil öğretimi metodu İngiliz dili öğretiminde çok önemli bir yere sahiptir ve İngiliz Dili Eğitimi alanında uzun süredir üzerine çalışmalar yapılmaktadır. Bu metot Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı tarafından mevcut İngilizce öğretim programında benimsenen bir metot olmuştur. Ancak Türkiye'de görev temelli dil öğretimi üzerine çalışmalar henüz arzulanan seviyede değildir. Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, öğretmenlerin görev temelli dil öğretimine karşı tutumlarını ve öğrenme ortamlarında kullanıp kullanamamalarının nedenlerini ortaya koymaktır. Bu doğrultuda, nicel araştırma yöntemleri kullanarak veriler toplanıp analizi yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında ve hazırlık sınıflarında çalışan 130 öğretmen oluşturmuş, bunların tamamına öğretmenlerin görev temeli dil öğretimine karşı tutum ve algılarını ölçen, likert tipi ve çoktan seçmeli "Öğretmen Anketi" uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın bulguları, her ne kadar bazı öğretmenler belirli faktörlerden dolayı görev tabanlı dil öğretim yaklaşımını kullanmasa da çoğunun görev tabanlı dil öğretim yöntemleri konusunda olumlu tutumlara sahip olduğunu ve öğretme ortamlarında kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Buna ek olarak, bu çalışma ileride araştırmacıları görev temelli dil öğretimi üzerinde daha kapsamlı ve uygulamaya yönelik çalışmalar yapmaya sevk edecektir. Ayrıca Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı otoriteleri ile İngilizce Öğretmenliği programlarındaki akademisyenlerin görev temelli dil öğretiminin uygulanmasının önemini ve uygulamadaki engellerini derinlemesine anlamaya teşvik edecektir.

Anahtar kelimeler: Görev temelli dil öğretimi, İngiliz dili öğretimi, Öğretmen tutumları

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

[*] Res. Asst., Karabük University, Karabük - Turkey, muhammetocel@karabuk.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3552-2517
[**] Asst. Prof. Dr., Amasya University, Amasya -Turkey, ayfersubergil@amasya.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9277-2862

Kaynakça Gösterimi: Su-Bergil, A. & Öcel, M.(2022). İngilizcenin Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğretildiği Bir Ortamda Öğretmenlerin Görev Temelli Dil Öğretimine Karşı Tutumları. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 22*(1), 68-82. doi: 10.53629/sakaefd.1069149

Citation Information: Su-Bergil, A. & Öcel, M.(2022). Teachers' Attitudes towards Task-Based Language Teaching in an EFL Context. *Sakarya University Journal of Education Faculty, 22*(1), 68-82. doi: 10.53629/sakaefd.1069149

Teachers' Attitudes towards Task-Based Language Teaching in an EFL Context

Article Information

Received: 07.02.2022

Accepted: 18.06.2022

Published: 30.06.2022

ABSTRACT

Task-based language teaching method has a very significant place in English language teaching and has long been studied in the field of English Language Teaching. In the current English curriculum, this method is adopted by the Ministry of National Education in Turkey. However, the studies on task-based language teaching in Turkey have not been at the desired level. This study mainly aims to reveal teachers' attitudes towards task-based language teaching and the reason why they implement it in their teaching or not. Accordingly, the data were collected and analyzed by using quantitative research methods. The sample of the study consisted of 130 English teachers working in state schools and prep schools in Turkey, and all of them were administrated a questionnaire measuring teacher's attitudes towards task-based language teaching consisting of Likert-type and multiple-choice items. The overall findings of the study showed that most of the teachers have positive attitudes about task-based language teaching methods and they used it in their teaching although some of them did not use task-based language teaching because of certain factors. In addition, this study will motivate further researchers to make larger extent and practical studies that will make the authorities of the Ministry of National Education and the academics in the field of English Language Teaching deeply understand the importance and the obstacles in implementing task-based language teaching.

Keywords: Task-based language teaching, English language teaching, Teachers' attitudes

Article Type: Research Article

1. INTRODUCTION

In foreign language teaching, task-based language teaching (TBLT) is seen as an influential method of communicative language teaching in the literature, and second language acquisition (SLA) authorities, curriculum designers, educationalists, academics, and foreign language teachers all over the world has been interested in it over the past 30 years (Ellis, 2003). As a method implemented in teaching a second or foreign language, it was first implemented in the project of Bangalore in India (Prabhu, 2013). Due to its relationships with communicative language teaching (CLT) and taking the attention of some of the foremost authorities of SLA, it has gained considerable attention in the field of applied linguistics worldwide (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

TBLT has taken the attention of Turkish curriculum designers of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). Thus, curriculum designers have put emphasis on TBLT in the English curriculum while designing it. Accordingly, the English curriculum (MoNE, 2018), especially for high school education, emphasizes the great importance of TBLT in English language teaching. In Turkey, there have been some studies on the effectiveness of TBLT on language skills, resulting that TBLT enhances students' reading, grammar competencies (Demir, 2008; Yıldız, 2012). However, in learning environments in Turkey, previous studies have shown that there have been a set of obstacles not to implement TBLT such as crowded classrooms, the pressure of the examination system, or learners coming from low socio-economic status (Geneyikli, 2020). Although the methodological courses are taken as both theoretical and practical and great emphasis on such courses are given at the university level; beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of the teachers may change after starting to experience in the real language teaching environments because of the reasons mentioned beforehand (Kırtaş, 2016). This problem relates not only to Turkey, but it also is seen in other countries such as South Korea (Jeon & Hahn, 2006); Malaysia, Japan, China (Nunan, 2003). TBLT occupies a tremendously wide place in foreign language teaching; however, it has not yet been adequately researched or proven scholarly concerning its implementation and the attitudes and perceptions of the teachers; especially in Turkey as a country adopting TBLT as one of the major teaching methods in its Englihsh curricula (MoNE, 2018).

As an English as a foreign language (EFL) country in Turkey, pre-service English teachers are taught English language teaching (ELT) methodology courses both theoretically and practically (Kunt & Özdemir, 2010). However, due to the differences in teaching contexts, some of the teachers have difficulties in implementing the methodological competencies gained in their university education. These difficulties can derive from learners, teachers themselves, and the educational system (Ozsevik, 2010). TBLT as a method are covered in methodology courses in ELT programs and this study seeks to explore whether in-service teachers implement TBLT in their

teaching or not. Moreover, it also focuses on the reasons for teacher's implementing or avoiding TBLT in their teaching.

Literature Review

Theoretical framework

In TBLT, tasks constitute the core of the instruction. According to the literature a task can be defined it has a communicative aspect to use target language (Willis, 1996); is a learning activity in which students involve in for onward learning (Williams & Burden, 1997); interact with innate language mechanisms and develops it by expanding (Skehan, 1998); enables learners to practice language in a meaningful context (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2004). That is, pedagogical tasks are classroom activities that lead students to be exposed to communicative learning activities to practice the essentials of language by activating interlanguage, for achieving to understand or communicate in the target language. Within a task learners try to express meaning rather than to focus on structure; moreover, convey meaning they focus on manipulating their grammatical competence instinctively. Thus, a task should be thought of as a communicative act and have a sense of completeness (Nunan, 2004).

TBLT, developed in the communicative era, is method that implements tasks as the key elements of instruction and of planning in foreign language teaching (Willis, 1981). The key assumptions of TBLT are (1) production is much more important than the process; (2) tasks and purposeful activities are the key elements emphasizing communication and meaning; (3) while learners get involved in the activities and the tasks, they can easily learn the language through interacting communicatively and purposefully; (4) activities and tasks can be real-life like or have pedagogic objectives specific to learning environment; (5) syllabuses based on TBLT have activities and tasks which are sequenced regarding their difficulties; (6) tasks difficulties may be because of some issues such as the complexity of the task learners' previous experiences, and the degree of support available (Feez & Joyce, 1998).

Pre-Task

Teacher explores the topic Students note down useful words and phrases, spend time preparing for the individual task

Task Cycle

Task	Planning	Report
Students do the tasks in pairs or small groups Teacher monitors and encourages communication	Students prepare to report to the class Teacher provides language advice	Students present reports Teacher acts as a chairperson and provides feedback

Language Focus

Analysis	Practice
Students examine and discuss features of the text enter new words or phrases Teacher reviews and analyses the activity	Teacher conducts practice of new words, phrases Students practice the task

Figure 1. *Task-Based Instructions (TBI) framework (Willis, 1996; as cited in Le & Huan, 2012)*

The language learning process has complexity with its several fundamentals such as interaction, materials, activities, and tasks. As it can be interpreted from Willis' (1996) framework of TBLT (Figure 1), TBLT can enable learners to engage in all the fundamentals of language learning process. These fundamentals can be integrated in TBLT's stages as pre-task, task cycle and language focus. It needs to be taken into consideration that even if in the pre-task stage teacher seem as active, in the stage of '*task cycle*' teacher is a facilitator and students are the main agent of cycling a task. This makes learners play an active role while engaging a task (Nunan, 2004). In

addition, regarding the definitions of a *task*, TBLT enables students not only fundamentals of language learning with authentic materials to implement but it also provides appropriate situations to communicate naturally in the classroom (Ellis, 2003).

Previous Studies

In the literature in Turkey there were several studies about teacher's perceptions, views, attitudes towards TBLT, they were stated in this section. Firstly, Karakoç and Bay (2016) intended to investigate positive and negative views of teachers on TBLT in their qualitative research by implementing a semi-structured interview to four EFL teachers working in a middle school in Turkey. Content analysis results of the interview showed that positive themes were preparing and implementing different contexts for each lesson, creating a natural context, being an effective method, increasing students' motivations, ensuring long-term learning, making students use the target language by practicing it, expanding word knowledge, and having positive attitudes towards English course. On the other hand, teachers had negative views on TBLT such as problems related to permission and transportation problems for out-of-classes tasks, lack of activities in coursebooks, timing issues, crowded classrooms. In addition, in their qualitative study, Torusdağ and Tunç (2020) conducted a semi-structured interview to six high school EFL teachers in Turkey to found out their perceptions, interpretations, and implementations. The finding of their study concluded that (1) teachers' knowledge about TBLT was limited; (2) they could not implement TBLT's basic principles in their teaching; (3) some activities in their classrooms could be evaluated as a task, though. And also, teachers' views on TBLT were not positive since they were not familiar with the theoretical aspect of TBLT. Lastly, in their descriptive quantitative research, Mehmood and Sabuncuoğlu (2021) conducted a Likert-type scale to 102 EFL teachers in different types of schools in Turkey. The results of their study revealed that teachers mostly had known the basic principles of TBLT and many of them implement it in their teaching contexts.

Also, there were many studies carried out in other countries seeking for teacher's attitudes towards TBLT. Firstly, Jeon and Hahn (2006) intended to explore teachers' perceptions of TBLT in Korea. They devised a questionnaire which was also used in many studies including this one. The participants of their study consisted of 228 EFL teachers working in different high and middle schools in Korea. The findings of their study revealed that teacher's had high level of theoretical concepts of TBLT; however, they avoided using it because they thought it caused classroom management problems. Tabatabaei and Hadi (2011) conducted their research to find out teacher's perceptions of TBLT in Iranian context. They applied a questionnaire to 51 EFL teachers working in an English language institute in Iran. Result showed that most of the teachers had positive attitudes to TBLT and use it in their teaching because of TBLT' collaborative an interactional side. Only a few avoided to adopt TBLT as a teaching method in their classrooms due to their deficiencies in knowing TBLT, their low English competencies and not being used to TBLT. Viet (2014) conducted a qualitative case study to investigate teachers' beliefs and implementation of TBLT in Vietnam. The data collected by using audio recordings, focus group interviews, classroom observations and stimulated recall from 11 EFL teachers working in public high schools. The findings revealed that the study confirmed the gap between intended and existing English curriculum in Vietnam. The problems related to implementation of TBLT were resulted that (1) textbooks were not appropriate to apply TBLT principles; (2) teachers had lack in having content knowledge about TBLT; that's why, their implementations intentions and beliefs did not match up with the literature about TBLT. Harris (2016) intended to seek teachers' beliefs in TBLT in Japan by applying a survey to 78 teachers affiliated to Task Based Language Learning Special Interest Group (TBLSIG). The findings revealed that most of the teachers used TBLT to teach English because they believed it was powerful method and they had theoretical knowledge on the basic principles of TBLT. In her doctoral dissertation Farfan (2019) conducted a qualitative interpretative study by implementing interview to explore secondary school EFL teacher's perceptions about TBLT in Chile. The findings showed that teachers highly perceived TBLT a beneficial method to use and they perceived TBLT as challenging because of the students' attitudes, classroom sizes, timing, and planning issues, etc. Lastly, Li and Zou (2021) carried out a study with 39 pre-service EFL teachers in a public university in China. They implemented an elicitation of metaphor and a questionnaire to collect data. The finding revealed that some of the teacher candidates had neutral attitudes toward TBLT and some of them had positive attitudes. Also, the student teachers were lack in understanding the theoretical aspects of TBLT.

The present study

In the pedagogic perspective, teachers' attitudes towards any issue of the teaching process are salient elements for understanding in teachers' thinking process, teaching experiences, and changing or learning to teach (Zheng, 2009). In the last three decades, research on teacher's attitudes, perceptions or beliefs has been interested by many researchers (Viet, 2014). Teachers' attitudes and beliefs influence their ways of teaching in the learning environment. Attitudes, also lead teachers to decide on which methods they adopt, techniques they use, materials they prepare. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to investigate attitudes and beliefs of English language teachers towards TBLT and the difficulties in implementing it in their teaching contexts.

In line with the purpose of the study, the following research questions came out and were tried to find answers under the scope of this study:

1. To what extent are English teachers familiar with its basic principles and the implementation of a task and TBLT?
2. To what extent teachers implement TBLT in their teaching?
   2.1. What are the reasons for teachers to implement TBLT in the classroom?
   2.2. What are the reasons for teachers not to use TBLT in the classroom?
3. What are the teachers' beliefs in TBLT?
4. Does gender have effect on using TBLT?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Design and Instrument

To investigate attitudes and beliefs of English language teachers towards TBLT and the difficulties in implementing it in their teaching contexts, this research mainly adopted quantitative research methods. This study was designed as a descriptive survey-based design by using questionnaire. Dörnyei (2007) emphasizes that the quantitative research method has some important characteristics such as being systematic, involving accurate measurement, producing replaceable and reliable data which can be generalized to other contexts.

2.2. Participants and Setting

The participants of this study were non-native English as foreign language teachers instructing in different levels and different types of schools in Turkey. To recruit the participants, the *snowball sampling* method of non-probability sampling design was implemented. Because the data was collected during the pandemic, the respondents were reached via mobile phone calls and text message and asked them to distribute the online questionnaire to English teachers if they knew. The sample consisted of 130 English teachers from different cities and regions of Turkey and almost all of them worked in public school. of all the participants, 47 of them were male and 83 were female.

Table 1.
Age and Teaching Level Cross Tabulation

		Teaching Level					
		Primary School	**Secondary School**	**High School**	**Prep schools**	**Total**	**Total**
		f	***f***	***f***	***f***	***f***	**%**
Age	20-29	12	37	18	9	76	58.5
	30-39	5	16	22	1	44	33.8
	40-49	0	2	5	0	7	5.4
	50+	0	0	2	1	3	2.3
Total (%)		17(13.1%)	55 (42.3%)	47 (36.2%)	11 (8.5%)	130 (100%)	100

As demonstrated in Table 1, of all participants, 13.1% (f=17) were primary school teachers, 42.3% (f=55) were secondary school teachers, 36.2% (f=47) were high school teachers, and 8.5% (f=11) were prep school instructors and in total 130 teachers participated in the questionnaire (Table 2). As to the range of their ages, 58.5% of the

participants were between the ages of 20-29, 33.8% were 30-39, 5.4% were 40-49 and lastly, 2.3% were more than 50 years old.

Table 2.
Total Years in Teaching

Years of Teaching	f	%
<5	59	45.4
5-9	44	33.8
10-20	22	16.9
20+	5	3.8
Total	130	100.0

As indicated in Table 2, the item asking the total years in teaching of participants in the questionnaire was in range such as 1-2, 3-5 etc., the mean of participants' total years in teaching was not obtained precisely; however, 15.4% (f=20) of the respondents had 1-2 years experienced in teaching, 30% (f=39) had less than 5 years, 33.8% (f=44) had 5-9 years, 16.9% (f=22) had 10-20 years and 3.8% (f=5) had more than 20 years of experience in teaching.

2.3. Data Collection

2.3.1. Instrument

To collect data, a survey devised by Jeon and Hahn's (2006) was adapted in Turkish EFL context and was implemented to obtain teachers' attitudes towards TBLT with respect to their thought of a task and TBLT's key elements, their understandings, and views. It consists of 15 Likert-type items with 2 multiple choice ones, in total with three sections which the second section has two sub-sections: (1) "General and Demographic Information", (2) (a) "Teachers' Understandings of Task and TBLT" (7 items), (b) "Teachers' Views on Implementing TBLT" (8 items), (3) "Reasons Teachers Choose or Avoid Implementing TBLT" (Yes/No). In the second section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to answer the items using a five-point Likert-type which ranges from strongly agree to strongly disagree. In the third section of the questionnaire, teachers were asked the reasons why they implement or avoid using TBLT in their teaching by using multiple-choice items (12 items).

Reliability score of the adapted questionnaire in this study was counted by using Cronbach's Alpha reliability analysis from SPSS and it was .82 in total. Moreover, the validity of the scale was approved as sufficient by two experts conducting research in the target field of this study. Besides, to reveal if the collected data by questionnaire is appropriate for factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), and Bartlett's Test were run. If KMO value is greater than 0.60, it means that factor analysis can be implemented on the data (Pallant, 2020).

Table 3.
KMO and Bartlett's test results

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.776
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	751.228
	df	105
	Sig.	0.000

According to Table 3, for the present study KMO value was .776 which means it is significant and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was $p<0.01$. That is, sample size is appropriate for factor analysis and the collected data were obtained from a multivariate normal distribution.

2.3.2 Procedure

Since the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak had been all around the world including Turkey, the data were collected through the online survey service "Google forms". Data collection process lasted about 6 weeks in the 2019-2020 spring semesters. All the respondents were reached via mobile phone calls and text messages because the

schools were closed by MoNE within the restrictions against pandemic. Because the participants were English teachers and competent in English, the questionnaire was not translated into Turkish and distributed in its original language which was English. The link of the online survey was sent to the participants individually and asked them for distributing it to their English teacher colleagues if they had.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data belonging to this study were analyzed quantitatively. The data analysis process has two phases. After giving numerical scores to each item, the Likert-type and multiple-choice items from the questionnaire were analyzed by using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. One-Sample t-test was used to analyze teachers' understanding and views sub-sections of the instrument; to understand whether there is a significant difference between the genders in terms of understanding and views of the respondents, Independent Samples t-test was used; and lastly, it was also used to find out and display the significance of the scale scores in terms of using and not using TBLT according to the normality results of the variables taken into accounts. Thus, t-tests were used because the normality of the target variable was reached. In addition, the p values of the findings are controlled and explained with the Cohen d effect size. The following table involves the kurtosis and skewness of the normality results for the variables calculated in this study. When the Skewness-Kurtosis values were considered, it was seen that they were between -2.00 and +2.00. Since the Skewness-Kurtosis values between -2.00 and +2.00 indicate that the data are normally distributed (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 4.
Descriptives of variables

Variables	N	Min	Max	Sd	X̄	Skewness	Kurtosis	p
Gender	130	1	2	.48	1.64	-.583	-1.69	.000
Understanding sub-section	130	19	35	3.43	30.49	-.610	.362	.000
View sub-section	130	23	40	3.88	32.97	-.096	-.047	.003
Using/Not using TBLT	130	1	2	.40	1.21	1,46	.128	.000

3. FINDINGS

In this part of the study, the findings based on four research questions are presented by revealing the test results of data analysis.

3.1. Findings for RQ.1: To what extent are English teachers familiar with its basic principles and the implementation of a task and TBLT?

Table 5.
One Sample T-Test Results for Items of 'Understanding' Sub-Section of the Scale

Sub-Section	Items	N	X̄	S	Sd	t	p
UNDERSTANDING	*i1*	130	4.45	.59	129	86.73	.000
	i2	130	4.13	.89	129	52.77	.000
	i3	130	4.27	.80	129	61.21	.000
	i4	130	4.32	.91	129	54.26	.000
	i5	130	4.37	.75	129	66.56	.000
	i6	130	4.48	.63	129	81.64	.000
	i7	130	4.46	.75	129	67.95	.000

Table 5 demonstrates the answers given to the seven questions asked upon teachers' understanding of the main concepts of task and TBLT. According to the findings shown in Table 3, teachers responded to each of the items as they mostly agreed or strongly agreed compared with the other options. Mean values in this table referred to mean scores of respondents' answers to each item. The responses are given item 1 to showed that most of the respondents understood that *a task has a communicative goal* (x̄=4.45), *a task primarily focuses on meaning* (x̄=4.13), *a task clearly defines an outcome* (x̄=4.27), that *learners use target languages in any activity can be defined as a task* (x̄=4.32). The responses were given to items five to seven which asked for some key concepts of TBLT, *TBLT is coherent to the principles of CLT* (x̄=4.37), *TBLT adopts student-centered instruction* (x̄=4.48), *TBLT has pre, while post stages* (x̄=4.46). Remarkably, the highest mean value is seen in the item which asked for whether *TBLT adopts student-centered instruction* or not (x̄=4.48). As the p values were .000 ($p<0.05$) for all items it showed that there was a statistically significant difference among those items in terms of mean values for each. The significant differences of the items aim to present the objective, rational and sincere manner of the participants that provide the basis for the statistical calculations of the study.

3.2. Findings for RQ.2: To what extent teachers implement TBLT in their teaching?

When the respondents were asked whether they used TBLT in their teaching or not, 79.2% (*f*=103) of them said yes whereas 20.8% (*f*=27) of them said they did not use TBLT.

Table 6.
Independent-Sample T-Test Results for the Scale Scores in terms of Using and not Using TBLT

Using and Not Using TBLT	N	X̄	S	Sd	t	p
Yes	103	64.13	6.05	128	2.39	.018
No	27	60.89	7.08	128	2.18	

Table 6 demonstrated Independent-Sample T-Test Result for the Scale Scores in terms of Using and not Using TBLT. However, the number of participants for each group differs from each other, the distribution of the data accepted as meeting the normality for the further statistics. That is to say, parametric statistical analysis was used due to the fact that the number of the respondents answering the item as NO and YES have statistically normal distribution. A meaningful difference can be seen between the respondents answering YES and No U=1009.5, $p< .05$. When the mean rank of the groups was taken into consideration, the scale score of the group answering YES is higher than the group answering NO (YES=69.20>NO=51.39). The significance of the difference was supported by Cohen d value calculated as 0.5. The t-test results for the preference of using TBLT there is highly significant in the difference, t (128) =2.39, $p<.05$ in accordance with the Cohen d value calculated as 0.5, which represents a "medium" effect size.

3.2.1. Findings for RQ.2.1: What are the reasons for teachers to implement TBLT in the classroom?

Table 7.
Frequencies and percentages of reasons for 'using TBLT'

	Yes		No		Total	
Reasons for Using TBLT	***f***	**%**	***f***	**%**	***f***	**%**
i1	64	49.2	66	50.8	130	100
i2	93	71.5	37	28.5	130	100
i3	78	60	52	40	130	100
i4	76	58.5	54	41.5	130	100
i5	58	44.6	72	55.4	130	100

According to the findings demonstrated in Table 7, 49.2% (*f*=64) of the respondents preferred using TBLT because they thought that *TBLT promotes learners' academic progress*; 71.5% (*f*=93) of them did because they thought that *TBLT improves learners' interaction skills*; 60% (*f*=78) of them thought *TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic*

motivation; 58.5% (*f*=76) of them thought *TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment*; lastly, 44.6% (*f*=58) of them thought that *TBLT is appropriate for small group work*.

3.2.2. Findings for RQ.2.2: What are the reasons for teachers not to use TBLT in the classroom?

Table 8.
Frequencies and percentages of reasons for 'not using TBLT'

	Yes		No		Total	
Reasons for not Using TBLT	***f***	**%**	***f***	**%**	***f***	**%**
i1	114	87.7	16	12.3	130	100
i2	118	90.8	12	9.2	130	100
i3	112	86.2	18	13.8	130	100
i4	123	94.6	7	5.4	130	100
i5	123	94.6	7	5.4	130	100
i6	125	96.2	5	3.8	130	100
i7	110	84.6	20	15.4	130	100

Table 8 indicates that 12.3% (*f*=16) of the respondents did not use TBLT because they thought that *students were not used to task-based learning*; 9.2% (*f*=12) of them thought that *materials in textbooks were not proper for using TBLT*; 13.8% (*f*=18) of them thought that *crowded classrooms caused difficulties in using task-based methods*; 5.4% (*f*=7) of them thought that the *assessment in students' task-based performance was difficult*; 5.4% (*f*=7) of them thought that *they had limited target language proficiency*; 3.8% (*f*=5) of them thought that *they did not have much knowledge of task-based instruction*; lastly, most of the respondents who said NO when asking them if they use TBLT or not, 15.4% (*f*=20) of them thought that *task-based language teaching was not appropriate for LGS and YKS exams*.

3.3. Findings for RQ.3: What are the teachers' beliefs in TBLT?

Table 9 includes answers to the question *What are the teachers' attitudes towards and perceptions on TBLT?* and shows the comparisons of the mean scores of the answers for each item asking teachers' views on TBLT in the questionnaire.

Table 8.
One-Sample T-Test Results for Items of 'Views' Sub-Section of the Scale

Sub-Sections	**Items**	**N**	**X̄**	**S**	**Sd**	**t**	**p**
	i8	130	4.16	.75	129	63.69	.000
	i9	130	4.21	.81	129	58.97	.000
V	*i10*	130	4.31	.70	129	69.90	.000
I	*i11*	130	4.39	.62	129	81.26	.000
E	*i12*	130	3.52	1.08	129	37.11	.000
W	*i13*	130	3.95	.94	129	48.01	.000
S	*i14*	130	3.85	.89	129	49.36	.000
	i15	130	4.58	.67	129	78.01	.000

As seen in Table 8, in response to item 8 teachers responded *they had high interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom* (X̄=4.16). The answers are given to item 9 presented teachers mostly agreed on the concept that *TBLT provides a comfortable environment for students to use the target language* (X̄=4.21). The responses for item 10 also demonstrated teachers mostly agree on the idea that *TBLT activates learners' needs and interests* (X̄=4.31). The answers given to item 11 demonstrated that teachers mostly agree on the concept that *TBLT enables students to develop their integrated language skills in the classroom setting* (X̄=4.39). The answers given to item

12 which had the least mean value showed that teachers agreed on the concept that *TBLT causes much psychological responsibility for the teacher as a coordinator* ($\bar{X}$=3.52). The responses for item 13 showed teachers mostly agreed on the idea that *TBLT requires more time in the preparation process than other approaches* ($\bar{X}$=3,95). Item 14's mean value displayed teachers thought that *TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements* ($\bar{X}$=3,85). Lastly, Item 15 emphasized that teachers mostly agreed on the concept that *TBLT materials should be reasonable and purposeful considering the real-life-like context* ($\bar{X}$=4,58). As the p values were .000 ($p<0.05$) for all items it showed that there was a statistically significant difference among the items, which underlines the order of the views of respondents on TBLT.

3.4. Findings for RQ.4: Does gender have effect on using TBLT?

Table 9.
Independent Samples T-Test Results for Understanding and Views of Scale regarding Gender

Sections of scale	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	S	Sd	t	p	Cohen's d
Understanding	Female	47	29.62	3.35	128	2.20	.030	0.4
	Male	83	30.98	3.40				
Views	Female	47	32.38	4.27	128	1.30	.195	0.2
	Male	83	33.30	3.61				

Table 9 demonstrates the independent samples t-test results for understanding and views of scale regarding gender. According to the findings illustrated in Table 9, the t-test results for understanding and views of scale regarding gender, there is highly significant in the difference between the male and the female teachers' understanding a task and TBLT, $t(128) = 2.20$, $p<.05$ in accordance with the Cohen d value calculated as 0.5. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in gender regarding the teachers' views on implementing TBLT, $t(128) = 1.30$, $p>0.05$ as the calculated Cohen d of value was 0.3.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings related to teachers' understanding of task and TBLT showed that teachers appeared to have a great amount of knowledge about task and TBLT. This can be related to the fact that they have taken high-quality methodological courses on teaching methodology including TBLT during their university education or they are familiar with the English curriculum of MoNE. These findings were consistent with the findings of Karakoc and Bay (2016), as they found that teachers had positive attitudes towards TBLT because they thought it had some positive aspects such as providing a suitable setting for teaching, enabling a natural communication setting, being an effective method. And also, teacher's having theoretical knowledge in the basic principles of TBLT was matched up with some other studies in the literature (Jeon & Hahn, 2006; Mehmood & Sabuncuoğlu, 2021). However, Torusdağ and Tunç (2020) explored that teachers' knowledge about TBLT was limited; perhaps, the fact that the participants of their study were six teachers did not reflect the overall understandings of teachers in Turkey.

According to the findings regarding teachers' views on implementing TBLT in their teaching environments, teachers had both positive and negative attitudes towards implementing TBLT in their teaching. They thought that they had a huge interest in implementing TBLT; to use target language freely in a flexible and natural atmosphere; it activated learners' needs and interests on a large scale; it pursued the development of language skills integrated into the learning environment. The positive attitudes of respondents in this study are consistent with those of Karakoç and Bay (2016), especially in terms of TBLT's providing natural contexts and motivating learners by taking their interests. And also, Turkish teachers' attitudes towards TBLT are similar to those of Japanese, Chilian and Chinese teachers (Harris, 2016; Farfan, 2019; Li & Zou, 2021). On the other hand, teachers had some negative attitudes towards TBLT. For instance, TBLT was a much more labor-extensive method in comparison with other methods in ELT. It may have been because they did not have enough time to prepare a task, materials, lesson plans, etc. They also thought that TBLT gave much psychological difficulty to teachers as instructors. The reason they had a negative attitude as seeing TBLT as a psychological burden may have been

because they didn't understand TBLT as in Viet's (2014) or their competency level in target language was not high enough like the participants having negative attitudes towards TBLT in Tabatabaei and Hadi's (2011) study.

The findings of the last section of the questionnaire contained two multiple answer questions which asked the respondents whether they used TBLT in their teaching or not and the reason why they use/do not use TBLT in teaching. The findings of this section revealed that most of the teachers used TBLT in their teaching. The reason they used TBLT in their teaching was most of them saw TBLT as (1) improving students' interaction skills, (2) creating a collaborative learning environment, and (3) encouraging learners' motivation to the target language. This proved that their understanding of TBLT, their views, and their implementation in their teaching are quite related to each other. The other reason teachers using TBLT in their teaching which was "*TBLT promotes learners' academic progress*" was not accepted as high as three reasons mentioned above because teachers might have considered test-based examination system while answering that item or they might have underestimated TBLT's relation to other academic competencies other than communicative competence. On the contrary, task-based instruction enables learners to utilize and learn a target language while focusing on content which means that they can reinforce both their academic knowledge and their linguistic competence (Chamot & O'Malley, 1994). Another reason they used TBLT was TBLT is appropriate for small group work. The reason why less than half agreed on this opinion might have been the result of the teachers' lack of classroom management skills or related to the classroom dynamic in which students' level of academic motivation could be high or not. These results matched up with the findings of Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu (2011) as their study revealed that English teachers implemented TBLT in their instruction because it provided students with real-life like context to communicate, enabled learners comprehensible and beneficial input, increased their ability to communicate unconsciously, and enhanced students' motivation to the course.

In terms of the second section of the multiple answer items, it illustrated the reasons why the teachers did not implement TBLT in their teaching. The teachers did not use TBLT in their instructions because they mostly thought TBLT is not appropriate to make students prepared for the university and secondary education examinations. However, in the high school English curriculum (MoNE, 2018), TBLT was adopted as one of the main methods to conduct instruction. This means that neither the teachers are aware of the curriculum in details itself nor they understand TBLT much. Teachers also mostly thought that students were not used to task-based instruction, large-sized classrooms were such an obstacle that they could not use task-based methods. One the reason why teachers had negative attitudes towards TBLT in Torusdağ and Tunç (2020) study was crowded classroom. In addition, Farfan (2019) also found that one of the reasons which teacher perceived TBLT as challenging was classroom size problems. Students' characteristics and classroom size are two highly important factors in terms of implementing TBLT in classroom contexts (Jez & Wassmer, 2015). Teachers' opinions on materials in textbooks were not positive as well; they thought that the materials were not proper for task-based instruction. In Karakoç and Bay (2016) lack of activities in coursebooks was affected teachers views on TBLT negatively. Also, Viet (2014) found that one of the problems related to implementation of TBLT was textbooks' inappropriateness to TBLT's basic principles. In all the stages of task-based instruction, because focusing on content has huge importance, then, materials should be appropriate for TBLT such as authentic auditory or visual materials (Carless, 2009). Teachers may have thought the textbooks given freely to students by MoNE, did not include such content. Lastly, a small number of the teachers thought they had some difficulties in assessment, their language competence levels were not high enough, and they did not have much knowledge of task-based instruction; the last two reasons for not using TBLT are similar to the findings of many studies (Torusdağ & Tunç, 2020; Tabatabaei & Hadi, 2011; Viet, 2014; Farfan, 2019; Li & Zou, 2021)

One of the findings of the study revealed that female teachers have a higher understanding of a task and TBLT than male teachers. That was an interesting finding because both male and female prospective teachers take the same courses in the same contexts at the tertiary level. Both genders teach in the same school context despite individual differences. This result might stem from female teachers' general attitudes towards teaching because female teachers seem more enthusiastic teachers than male ones (Erten, 2009).

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study aimed to reveal English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers' attitudes towards task-based language teaching method in Turkey. To achieve this aim, a questionnaire implemented to 130 EFL teachers working in different types of schools from 31 different cities of Turkey. The scope of investigation to their attitudes consisted

of four aspects; (1) their understanding of a task and to what extent they are sophisticated in the key elements of TBLT; (2) their views reflecting their positive or negative attitudes towards TBLT; (3) the reasons whether they use TBLT in their instruction or not; (4) does gender affect using TBLT. The collected data was analyzed quantitatively by using descriptive and inferential statistics. The findings showed that the teachers' understanding of a task and TBLT is very high. Also, it can be asserted that teachers, in Turkey, have quite positive attitudes towards TBLT and its benefits. Nevertheless, some teachers do not implement it in their teaching environments due to some factors such as the examination system, physical factors, and lack of teaching materials. Female teachers implement TBLT in their teaching more than male ones. in addition to all of these, the limitations of this study were (1) the sample of the research consisted of 130 English teachers, mostly working in public schools, (2) only quantitative research methods were adopted in the data collection and analysis stages of the research.

Because of the Covid-19 pandemic outbreak, the data collection process was difficult because it was not easy to reach teachers in such an unexpected outbreak. The ones who want to study this field should conduct their data collection process face to face as far as possible. The questionnaire as data collection tool was applied only to teachers working in public schools, further research can be conducted with both state schoolteachers and private school teachers to see if there is a difference them. In terms of sampling, further studies can involve teachers many more teachers from all the cities in Turkey. The quantitative data collection method may not be suitable alone for such a study measuring attitudes; for further studies, data can be collected and analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively to deepen the findings.

In conclusion, TBLT should not only be seen as a subject or topic taught in ELT education by both students and professors, but it should also be deepened in practice. Especially, it would be beneficial for prospective English teacher candidates to conduct their practicum courses by creating micro and macro lesson plans by adopting this method in their practicum classroom settings. The Ministry of National Education should also provide teachers in-service trainings including new-old methods of teaching English, especially TBLT. In these trainings, of academicians who are experts in their fields and experienced in training English teachers should be recruited.

Research and Publication Ethics Statement

The study was confirmed by the ethical commission of the authors' institution with the document date and number of 19/06/2020-E.11900. Furthermore, no action was taken against scientific research and publication ethics following the Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive.

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

This study was conducted as a part of the "Scientific Research Methods and Publication Ethics" Master of Arts Course content. The study was reported with the collaboration of the researchers. M.Ö. and A.S.B. conceived of the presented idea. M.Ö. collected data and performed the computations. M.Ö. and A.S.B. carried out the data analysis process and reported the findings. A.S.B encouraged M.Ö. to investigate teachers' attitudes towards task-based language teaching in an EFL context and supervised the findings of this study. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript. Thus, the contribution rates of the authors were 60% for the first author "M.Ö." and 40% for the second author "A.S.B.".

Acknowledgment

For providing the ethical approval that forms the basis of the findings by initiating and fulfilling the data collection process of this study, we would like to thank Amasya University Social Sciences Ethics Committee.

Statement of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

5.REFERENCES

Carless, D. R. (2009). Revisiting the TBLT versus PPP debate: Voices from Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching, 19*, 49–66. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265873841

Chamot, A.U. and O'Malley, J.M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach. Reading*, MA: Addison- Wesley.

Demir, A. (2008). *The influence of task-based reading activities on EFL learner' attitude and learning outcomes from the students' perspective.* Retrieved from Council of Higher Education, Thesis Center. (AAT 220590)

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Erten, İ. H. (2009). Gender differences in academic achievement among Turkish prospective teachers of English as a foreign language. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(1), 75-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760802586113

Farfan, I. H. F. (2019). English foreign language teachers' perceptions of the implementation of task based language teaching in Chile. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta]. (AAT Pro00060932)

Feez, S., & Joyce, H. D. S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Geneyikli, B. (2020). An analysis of EFL teachers' methodological choices and their views on post method pedagogy. [Master's thesis, Gazi University]. Retrieved from Council of Higher Education, Thesis Center. (AAT 613168)

Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010) *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Educational International.

Harris, J. (2016). Teachers' beliefs about task-based language teaching in Japan. *Journal of Asia TEFL, 13*(2), 102. http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2016.13.2.3.102

Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based language teaching: what every EFL teacher should do. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15,* 46-52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049

Jeon, I. J., & Hahn, J. W. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal, 8*(1), 123-143. https://asian-efl-journal.com/March_06.pdf#page=123

Jez, S. J., & Wassmer, R. W. (2015). The impact of learning time on academic achievement. *Education and Urban Society, 47*(3), 284-306. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124513495275

Le, T. & Huan, N. (2012). Task-based language learning and student motivation in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Education in Asia. 3,* 106-120. https://doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/12/V3/I1/A10/Thanh_Huan.

Li, J. & Zou, W. (2021). A study of pre-service teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching via metaphor analysis in a Chinese context. *Journal of Education for Teaching.* https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2021.1989287

Karakoc, B., & Bay, E. (2016). Opinions of the teachers related with the positive and negative aspects of the

authentic task-based approach in foreign language education. *Journal of Education and Learning, 5*(3), 166-172. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v5n3p166

Kırtaş, G. (2016) *ELT Teachers' perceptions and practices of task-based language teaching.* Retrieved from Council of Higher Education, Thesis Center. (AAT 428407)

Kunt, N., & Özdemir, Ç. (2010). Impact of methodology courses on pre-service EFL teachers' beliefs. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 2*(2), 3938-3944. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.620

Mehmood, H. & Sabuncuoğlu, O. (2021) Exploring EFL instructors' perceptions of task-based language teaching. *International Journal of Recent Research in Social Sciences and Humanities 8*(4), 1-18. https://www.paperpublications.org/upload/book/paperpdf-1634624478.pdf

MoNE. (2018). Ministry of National Education. *MEB. (2016b)*, 15.

Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region. *TESOL Quarterly*, *(37*)4, 589-613. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588214

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Tabatabaei, O. & Hadi, A. (2011). Iranian EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language pedagogy. *Higher Education of Social Science, 1*(2), 1-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.hess.1927024020110102.1558.

Ozsevik, Z. (2010). *The use of communicative language teaching (CLT): Turkish EFL teachers' perceived difficulties in implementing CLT in Turkey.* Retrieved from Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship. (AAT 16211)

Pallant, J. (2020). *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.

Prabhu, N. S. (2013). *Second language pedagogy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Torusdağ, G. & Tunç, R. A. (2020). High school English teachers' perceptions of task based language teaching. *Social and Humanities Sciences Theory, Current Researches and New Trends, Hasan Babacan - Ruhi İnan, Editor, IVPE YAY., Cetinje,* 102-114.

Viet, N.G. (2014). Forms or meaning? Teachers' beliefs and practices regarding task-based language teaching: A Vietnamese case study. *Journal of Asia TEFL. 11*. 1-36. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285206126

Williams, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A social constructivist approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, J. (1981). *Teaching English through English: A course in classroom language and techniques.* Harlow: Longman. https://doi.org/10.3406/APLIU.1997.1201

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for task-based learning.* Harlow: U.K. Longman Addison-Wesley.

Yıldız, M. (2012). *Teaching grammar through task-based language teaching to young EFL learners.* Retrieved from Council of Higher Education, Thesis Center. (AAT 314752)

Zheng, H. (2009). A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Cambridge*

Studies, 4(1), 73-81. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.1579

6.GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Görev temelli dil öğretimi metodu İngiliz dili öğretiminde çok önemli bir yere sahiptir ve dünya çapında İngiliz Dili Eğitimi alanında uzun süredir görev temelli dil öğretimi üzerine çalışmalar yapılmaktadır. Öyle ki, bu metot Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı tarafından hazırlanmış olan mevcut İngilizce öğretim programında kendine yer bularak öğretim programının temellerinden biri olmuştur. Alan yazında görev temelli dil öğretimi metodu ile ilgili birçok çalışma bulunmasına rağmen, Türkiye'de bu metot üzerine çalışmalar henüz arzulanan seviyede değildir. Alan yazındaki bu boşluğu doldurmak ile birlikte bu çalışmanın temel amacı, öğretmenlerin görev temelli dil öğretimine karşı tutumlarını ve öğrenme ortamlarında kullanıp kullanamamalarının nedenlerini ortaya koymaktır. Bu amaca ulaşmak için, bu çalışmada aşağıdaki sorulara cevaplar aranmaya çalışılmıştır:
1. İngilizce öğretmenleri, temel ilkelerine ve bir görevin ve TBLT'nin uygulanmasına ne ölçüde aşinadır?
2. Öğretmenler öğretimlerinde TBLT'yi ne ölçüde uyguluyorlar?
2.1. Öğretmenlerin TBLT'yi sınıfta uygulama nedenleri nelerdir?
2.2. Öğretmenlerin TBLT'yi sınıfta kullanmama nedenleri nelerdir?
3. Öğretmenlerin TBLT'ye olan inançları nelerdir?
4. Cinsiyetin TBLT kullanımına etkisi var mı?

Bu sorulara cevaplar bulma amacıyla, bu çalışmada nicel araştırma yöntemleri kullanarak veriler toplanarak analizi yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini Türkiye'deki devlet okullarında ve hazırlık sınıflarında çalışan 130 öğretmen oluşturmuş, bunların tamamına öğretmenlerin görev temeli dil öğretimine karşı tutum ve algılarını ölçen, likert tipi ve çoktan seçmeli "Öğretmen Anketi" uygulanmıştır. Bu çalışmaya ait veriler nicel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Veri analiz süreci iki aşamadan oluşmaktadır. Her bir maddeye sayısal puanlar verilip kodlandıktan sonra, anketteki Likert tipi ve çoktan seçmeli SPSS versiyon 25 kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir. Ölçme aracının 'Öğretmenlerin anlayış ve görüşlerini' alt bölümüne vermiş oldukları cevapların analizi için tek örneklem t-test kullanılmıştır. Katılımcıların görev temelli dil öğretimi metodu hakkında anlayış ve görüşleri açısından cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olup olmadığını anlamak için bağımsız-örneklemler t-test kullanılmıştır. Son olarak, dikkate alınan değişkenlerin normallik sonuçlarına göre görev temelli dil öğretimi metodunu kullanma ve kullanmama açısından anket puanlarının anlamlılığını bulmak ve göstermek için de bağımsız-örneklemler t-test kullanılmıştır.
Araştırmanın bulguları, öğretmenlerin bir görev ve görev temelli dil öğretimi metodunu anlayışının çok yüksek olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca Türkiye'de öğretmenlerin görev temelli dil öğretimi metoduna ve faydalarına yönelik oldukça olumlu tutumlara sahip oldukları söylenebilir. Ancak bazı öğretmenler sınav sistemi, fiziki etkenler, öğretim materyallerinin yetersizliği gibi etkenlerden dolayı öğretim ortamlarında uygulamamaktadır. Kadın öğretmenler, öğretimlerinde erkek öğretmenlerden daha fazla görev temelli dil öğretimi metodunu uygulamaktadır. Tüm bunlara ek olarak, bu çalışmanın sınırlılıkları (1) araştırmanın örneklemini çoğu devlet okullarında görev yapan 130 İngilizce öğretmeninin oluşturduğu, (2) araştırmanın veri toplama ve analiz aşamalarında sadece nicel araştırma yöntemleri benimsenmiştir.
Araştırmanın sonuçlarından yola çıkarak, bazı pedagojik ve metodolojik tavsiyelerde bulunulmuştur. Görev temelli dil öğretimi hem öğrenciler hem de profesörler tarafından İngiliz dili eğitimi programlarında öğretilen bir ders ya da konu olarak görülmemeli, pratikte de derinleştirilmelidir. Özellikle İngilizce öğretmeni adaylarının uygulamalı ders ortamlarında bu metodu benimseyerek mikro ve makro ders planları oluşturarak uygulama derslerini yürütmeleri faydalı olacaktır. Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı da öğretmenlere görev temelli dil öğretim metodu başta olmak üzere yeni-eski İngilizce öğretim metotlarını içeren hizmet içi eğitimler vermelidir. Bu eğitimlerde alanında uzman ve İngilizce öğretmeni yetiştirme konusunda deneyimli akademisyenler istihdam edilmelidir.