

# Chinese Language Teachers' Perceptions and Implementation of Task-based Language Teaching in the US

Miao-fen Tseng  
*University of Virginia*

## Abstract

This study explores Chinese language teachers' responses to task-based language teaching (TBLT) in the US. It investigates their perceptions and understanding of the approach, views on and confidence in implementing tasks in the classroom. Two hundred and eighty Chinese language teachers at the secondary and post-secondary levels participated in an online questionnaire, and their responses were analyzed quantitatively through the Fisher's exact test. These data were complemented by qualitative input from the respondents. The results of the study showed that both secondary and post-secondary school teachers had appropriate understanding of tasks and task-based language teaching. Although secondary school teachers tended to recognize more pedagogical and curricular values of implementing tasks than did post-secondary teachers, overall secondary teachers demonstrated a lower level of confidence in creating and implementing tasks than did post-secondary teachers. Limitations of the study and future research directions are discussed at the end of the paper.

*Key words:* task-based language teaching, tasks, perceptions, confidence, and Chinese language teachers.

## 1. Introduction

Globally, interest in task-based language teaching (TBLT) has burgeoned among second language acquisition researchers. After almost three decades of theoretical and practical development, TBLT continues to inspire further research and to exert progressive influence on pedagogical paradigm transformation and on educational and administrative decisions in foreign language education worldwide. Beginning with Prabhu's pioneering work on the Communicative Language Teaching Project conducted in Bangalore, India, in 1987, TBLT has evolved from theory to practice in book publications (see Leaver and Willis, 2004; Van den Brander, 2006). Theoretical frameworks and hypotheses relating to TBLT have been tested and often reworked or revisited, resulting in empirical studies that focus on aspects and implications of TBLT including effects of task variables on learners' language performance, motivation, inter-language development (Robinson, 2011); independent measures of task complexity (Revesz, Sachs, and Hama, 2012); and grammar teaching through focus-on-form instruction (Hosseini and Fotos, 2011; Fotos and Nassaji, 2007).

Still, very few studies have investigated task-based language education from the perspective of its practitioners (Van den Brander, Bygate, and Norris, 2009). There is a great need for research into teachers' perceptions of TBLT and into TBLT's place in language curricula, as well as assessments of full-scale TBLT language programs, policies, and initiatives (Sasayama, 2013). East's (2012) book on TBLT in New Zealand is one of the few to meet this call: one chapter focuses on EFL teachers' beliefs about TBLT and their responses to TBLT actions in class. Task-based language teaching was initially shaped by theory rather than by practice, and now we need theory-led practice and practice-led theory. Teachers' perceptions of TBLT merit empirical inquiry; their engagement and appraisals are crucial.

Following on questions first raised in East's book, this study aims to bridge the gap between theory and practice in the field of

teaching Chinese as a foreign language in the US. It investigates Chinese language teachers' perceptions of TBLT and their views on and confidence in implementing it in secondary and post-secondary educational settings. Related to this main goal, the study also aims to provide preliminary insights into the reasons for teachers' pedagogical decisions to implement or not to implement TBLT.

## 1.1 Tasks and TBLT

While TBLT advocates unanimously agree that tasks are the core component in the TBLT framework, there is no single agreed-upon definition of "task." Perhaps most frequently cited are the generalizations of task characteristics formulated by Skehan (1998) and Ellis (2009), two loose definitions that also coincide with and complement each other. In their views, a task is a communicative problem to resolve, and thus has a primary focus on meaning. It is performed in a real-life situation, and assessment of whether a task is completed is based on learners' language outcomes. Since language use is neither pre-determined nor controlled by the teacher, learners choose their own language resources.

TBLT arose in the 1980s to 1990s as an alternative to the present, practice, and produce (PPP) teaching method; instructors following this method adhere to a sequence in which they present an aspect of language, practice it with their students, then expect them to produce that learned aspect. As Skehan (1996) concludes, the demonstrated ineffectiveness of the PPP approach calls for a change. TBLT advocates believe that connecting learners with authentic experiences is pivotal for genuine language learning to take place. Thus, curricula should be meaning-driven focally and form-driven peripherally, and tasks and task performance therefore become central foci in language learning (Skehan, 1996; Nunan, 2004; Willis and Willis, 2007). In recent years, researchers and practitioners have witnessed a shift from structure-focused to meaning-focused instruction in research endeavors, curricular design, and foreign language classrooms. TBLT has been theorized and utilized most often in what we will call its weak version. This emergence of the weak version of TBLT on the theoretical side thus adds to the

elasticity, diversity, and sustainability of the implementation of TBLT in actions.

Thomas (2015) holds that the “adoption” of TBLT in its original form has been gradually replaced by the “adaption” of TBLT in the Asian context. These two words, adoption and adaptation, refer to, respectively, strong and weak versions of TBLT. They might be considered the “two arms of the task-based teaching enterprise” (p. 9, Van den Branden, Bygate, and Norris, 2009). The weak version is also called “task-supported language teaching” (TSLT; Skehan, 1998; Ellis, 2003; Littlewood, 2007; Samuda and Bygate, 2008). Advocates of the strong version of TBLT suggest that successful language teaching requires adherence to the overarching principle that target tasks are central units of operation, not only for syllabi and teaching but also in program development and assessment (Long and Crookes, 1992). Tasks are the primary focus of a language class, and the occurrence of linguistic structures and meaning negotiation turn out to be incidental in nature. The weak version, TSLT, does not place tasks as central instructional modules. Instead, tasks are supplementary to whatever type of syllabus or curriculum practitioners feel fits their teaching contexts and programmatic decisions. In other words, tasks are central vehicles in the strong version, but they fill a supporting role in the weak version. As Ellis (2003, 2009) puts it, tasks in TSLT can be flexibly used in any traditional approach locally, but they cannot function as an alternative to these approaches. This allows PPP-based teachers to adopt tasks as manipulative units in the production stage of teaching. TBLT is thus inherently flexible and multifaceted; it manifests in many ways in pedagogical practice (Ellis, 2009; Willis and Willis, 2007). The versatile operative models of the weak version of TBLT create viable options that are enthusiastically welcomed by practitioners.

TBLT has not permeated foreign language education without criticism. Ellis (2009) compares three approaches to TBLT, represented by Long (1985), Skehan (1998), and his own study in 2009. Ellis emphasizes that these three approaches vary in degrees of natural language use, learner-centeredness, attention to form, focused

verss unfocused tasks, and compatibility with traditional structure-oriented approaches. Any single-sided analysis of one of these approaches may lose sight of the whole picture.

Perhaps the most prevalent criticism of TBLT is that it encourages the development of fluency at the expense of accuracy. Skehan's competition model (1996) is one of the most frequently cited examples of the conflict between meaning and form observable in many interactive settings where second or foreign language learners aim to achieve various communicative goals. Seedhouse (1999) raised another concern: depending on the type of task used and how it is arranged, learners trying to accomplish that task may produce minimal language output to obtain passing scores, and interaction among learners may end up being unsatisfactorily simple and short. Similarly, Carless (2004) points out that learners might develop strategies to complete tasks quickly without fully engaging in the negotiation process.

## **1.2 Teachers' perceptions of TBLT**

Studies exploring teacher perceptions of TBLT thus far have been limited to the context of teaching English as a foreign language in countries outside of the US. For example, to explore EFL teachers' perceptions of TBLT in Korea, Jeon and Hahn (2006) utilized a checklist for assessing communicative tasks based on one created by Nunan (2004). A total of 228 teachers in 38 high schools and middle schools participated in this questionnaire. The resulting data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, with a view toward distinguishing teachers' understanding of the theory from their evaluation of its implementation. The study's results indicated that of the teacher respondents, a majority had a very high level of TBLT understanding, and approximately half held some negative views on implementing TBLT in classroom practice. This supports the assumption that teachers' conceptual understanding does not necessarily translate into proper use of tasks. Despite a good understanding of TBLT, about half of teacher respondents avoided TBLT in the classroom due to lack of confidence and perceived disciplinary problems. Cheng and Moses (2011) adopted the

questionnaire developed in Joen and Hahn's study to investigate EFL teachers' perceptions of TBLT in high schools in China and Mersin, respectively. Consistent with the research findings in Jeon and Hahn's study, Cheng and Moses also found a high level of understanding of TBLT and positive attitudes toward TBLT among 132 EFL teachers in 132 high schools in China, but they also identified constraints associated with large classes and difficulties in assessing learners' performance.

In a departure from the abovementioned studies, which rely on quantitative or a combination of quantitative and qualitative measures, Zheng and Borg (2014) documented qualitative narrative accounts to explore the understanding and implementation of TBLT by three Chinese secondary school teachers of English in China. In this study, all three teachers defined TBLT narrowly as communicative activities featuring pair and group work. While two experienced teachers were inclined to teach formal elements of grammar, the younger teacher was more committed to using tasks in class, although large class size remained a significant challenge. Carless (2004) also analyzed classroom episodes and classroom observations collected from primary teachers in Hong Kong; he concluded that teachers tended to demonstrate a poor understanding of what tasks are, and that activities wrongly perceived as tasks ended up replacing genuine communication.

While the above studies were situated in primary and secondary school settings, the following three studies were conducted at the collegiate level. Investigating the prevalence of TBLT in courses offered for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Canada, Douglas and Kim (2014) conducted a quantitative and qualitative study to analyze instructor perceptions and practice. They found that 86% of EAP instructors considered TBLT suitable for EAP programs, and 69% reported creating tasks in at least half of the topics covered in curricula. Study participants rated presentations, essays, and interviews as the most commonly used tasks, and they listed practicality, effectiveness, and student-centeredness as major

advantages of incorporating tasks; drawbacks summarized in the study were mismatched student expectations, lack of classroom time, and excessive instructor preparation. Xhaferi and Xhaferi (2014) gathered and analyzed responses to TBLT from 20 language faculty members at South East European University. Echoing the above studies, results indicated high comprehension of TBLT principles and favorable views toward the approach, while also pointing to the importance of pedagogical implications and the need for curriculum design, requiring further in-depth thinking by teachers, teacher trainers, and curriculum designers. In their analysis of interviews of EFL teachers at a university in Thailand, McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) documented both positive comments on TBLT, including reports of students' improved academic skills and increased independence in their learning, and concerns about assessing learners' performance, the amount and the type of grammar instruction, and concerns about instructional materials to be covered in their EFL classrooms when TBLT principles were balanced with local needs.

Other scholars have identified similar concerns about TBLT in view of the particular challenges encountered by EFL practitioners in an international context. While working with many EFL instructors in different countries, Willis and Willis (2007) acknowledged challenges in implementing TBLT including, but not limited to, time pressure in completing tasks; learners' attitudes, motivation, and use of the first language; integration of grammar; perceptions of learner progress; and instructors' fear of losing control of the class. Van den Branden (2009) and Carless (2007) noted similar concerns, along with teachers' lack of expertise in TBLT and a competitive examination system that generated negative washback effects. These practical issues remain crucial and widespread, and they cannot be ignored. In Asian educational settings, where EFL teaching and assessment methods are largely dictated by the college entrance examination system, instructors and students are inclined to a more traditional approach that favors paper-and-pencil tests in a framework of grammar-directed instruction mainly originating from structure-focused curricula (Mann, 2006). The Canadian context described by Ogilvie and Dunn (2010) is no exception for pre-service

language teachers. Most of the novice language teachers opted for compliance with the cultural norms and expectations of experienced teachers, who were not positively disposed toward TBLT.

Such resistance was also addressed by some respondents in the studies of Joen and Hahn (2006) and Cheng and Moses (2011). TBLT seems to be more implementable by instructors and students who are more willing to take risks (Hyland, 2006). Introducing TBLT to language teachers and helping them to translate it into actions in classrooms is not an easy matter. To implement TBLT effectively and correctly in the classroom, teachers need early and in-depth training, including practical guidelines. To reach this goal, it is crucial to foster teacher education, create a supported approach to help teachers plan and implement tasks, and develop an assessment system that is compatible with each locality where TBLT may be employed (East, 2012). After evaluating a set of criticisms and clarifying misunderstandings of TBLT posited by several critics, Ellis (2009) proposed a number of principles to ameliorate potential problems with the implementation of TBLT and increase the likelihood of its successful implementation in widely varying types of classrooms:

1. Tasks should be catered to learners' proficiency levels.
2. Teachers should design and implement tasks in ways that maximize the use of the target language.
3. Teachers should have a clear understanding of what a task is.
4. Both teachers and students need to be aware of the purposes, rationales, and objectives of performing tasks.
5. Teachers should be encouraged to become involved in material development for a task-related course.

As indicated by a recent focus among teachers and researchers on flexibility, TBLT is an approach, not an omnipotent or monolithic protocol. As foreign language pedagogy moves into the post-methodological era, TBLT in whatever form may not always be the most suitable or effective way to fulfill a diversity of instructional goals. It would be too bold to claim that TBLT is universally valid.

However, as an approach it can be immensely valuable, and maintaining flexibility and versatility for different educational and cultural settings would make the adoption and adaption of TBLT more feasible and implementable, and therefore more effective.

## 2. Research questions

With the launch of AP Chinese in 2006, collaboration among secondary and post-secondary Chinese language educators in the US has become necessary and more frequent. Other factors that increase mutual professional exchanges include, for example, the development of K-16 articulation projects such as World-readiness Standards (5Cs used by 2015), the establishment of regional associations affiliated with the national Chinese Language Teachers Association, and STARTALK initiatives that aim to promote effective teaching and learning in Chinese language and culture in K-16 settings. Continued dialogues and anecdotal evidence indicate consistent differences and similarities among Chinese language professionals at different academic levels. Unlike studies that examine TBLT in one particular educational level, as summarized above, this study endeavors to compare and discuss secondary and post-secondary school teachers' perceptions and understandings of tasks and TBLT, as well as their views on and confidence in implementing TBLT in mainstream educational settings in the US. Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions.

1. Do post-secondary and secondary Chinese language teachers differ in their perceptions of tasks and TBLT? If yes, what and how?
2. Do post-secondary and secondary Chinese language teachers differ in their views of implementing TBLT? If yes, what and how?
3. Do post-secondary and secondary Chinese language teachers differ in their confidence levels in implementing tasks and TBLT? If yes, what and how?

In this empirical study, the term “TBLT” is used broadly, to replace task-supported language teaching (TSLT), for three reasons.

First, the questionnaire intentionally excluded ambiguously phrased question items. Secondly, TSLT is a term that appears only in scholarly works, and therefore the majority, if not all, of participants in this study had never been exposed to it. Using “task-supported language teaching” or “TSLT” in the questionnaire would have created great confusion and complicated the completion process. Thirdly, “TBLT” is widely circulated as pedagogical jargon for the use of tasks and different realizations of the TBLT framework in the field of teaching Chinese as a foreign language. Quite a number of recently published textbooks and instructional materials include published materials identified in their prefaces as created and organized in accordance with TBLT, though these materials, from a strict theoretical perspective, are for TSLT. Only an extremely small number of Chinese pedagogical experts whose research interests fall within TBLT are aware of its theoretical framework. Keeping all this in mind, it was logical and justifiable to use “TBLT” in a broad sense throughout the questionnaire to avoid lengthy explanatory notes defining TBLT and TSLT and aid the study’s smooth operation. To be clear, then, this study does not investigate differences between TBLT and TSLT; its aim instead is to explore attitudes toward this broad teaching method among teachers of secondary as compared to post-secondary levels.

## **2.1 Research methods**

An online questionnaire was used to collect quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire included two types of questions: the first 29 questions asked participants to scale their responses on a 5-point Likert scale, and the final question invited open-ended discussion. The resulting quantitative data was analyzed statistically using the Fisher’s exact test, and the qualitative responses to the open-ended questions were discussed through descriptive statistics.

## 2.1 Participants

A total of 280 full-time teachers participated in the study. Of these, 168 (60%) taught in post-secondary schools and 112 (40%) in secondary schools, including middle and high schools. Of those who taught in secondary schools, 65% taught in high schools, 12% taught in middle schools, and 23% had joint appointments in middle and high schools. In terms of professional qualifications, of the college group, 51.79% held a doctoral degree, 45.24% held a master's degree, and 2.98% held only a bachelor's degree. Of the secondary school group, 72.31% held a master's degree, 16.96% held a bachelor's degree, and 10.71% held a doctoral degree. As expected, then, the college group on average held higher educational degrees than did the secondary teacher group.

## 2.3 Questionnaire

The online questionnaire (see Appendix) consisted of three categories of items that elicited participants' background information (Part I), judgments of 29 five-point Likert items (Part II), and an open-ended question (Part III). The second category of items centered upon perceptions and understanding of tasks and TBLT, and this constituted the core section of the study. These Part II questions were based on those first created by Nunan (2004) to assess communicative competence and later used in several studies of perceptions mentioned in the literature review above. They included statements about task implementation, including items selected from Nunan's (2004) checklist and several items created particularly for this study. The multi-part question in Part III concerned teachers' confidence in implementing tasks; this question has never appeared in any earlier studies about teachers' perceptions of TBLT. The following is a brief summary of the 40 items in the second part of the questionnaire.

Section 1 (9 items): Understanding of tasks and TBLT framework

Section 2 (10 items): Views on implementing tasks

Section 3 (10 items): Confidence in implementing tasks

The elicited information permitted quantitative and qualitative analyses that complemented each other. Invitations to potential subjects were sent through email and other communications to members of national and regional Chinese language associations and different interest groups in the Chinese language teaching community. Participants thus included members and friends in the Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA), the Chinese Language Association of Secondary-Elementary Schools (CLASS), CLTA regional associations, teachers who participated in STARTALK programs located in different geographical areas of the US, and any individual teachers who could be contacted through emails.

## **2.4 Statistical analysis**

This study combines descriptive and referential statistical analyses to yield a whole picture of the results. The Fisher's exact test was used to determine whether statistically significant differences existed between the two groups of data. The Chi-square test was proven to be inappropriate for this study as it can be used only when cells have an expected frequency of five or more, and in this study, some cells were less than 5 or equal to 0. Differences were determined to be significant with a level  $p = 0.05$ .

## **3. Results and Discussions**

The following discussion includes quantitative and qualitative analyses. Quantitative analysis tracks the answers to the 29 items categorized in 3 sections of Part II of the questionnaire. Qualitative analysis was applied to responses to Part III, the one open-ended question eliciting respondents' self-reflections and thoughts about task implementation in their local classrooms.

### **3.1 Quantitative analysis**

Quantitative analysis includes three categories of discussion: teachers' perceptions of tasks and TBLT, their views on

implementing tasks and TBLT, and their confidence in implementing tasks in class.

**Section 1: Understanding of the features of tasks and TBLT framework.** Items in Section 1 measured teachers' perceptions and understandings of tasks and task-based language teaching. Results can be seen in the three summative tables below, along with the p-value yielded by the Fisher's exact test. Each item in the questionnaire has a scale of 1 to 5 that indicates respondents' level of agreement: 1 on the left end of the scale stands for "least agree" while 5 on the right end of the scale stands for "strongly agree." Table 1 shows frequencies, percentages, and p-values for items 1-9 on perceptions and understanding of tasks and TBLT.

Table 1: *Frequencies, percentages, and p-values for items 1-9 on perceptions and understanding of tasks and TBLT*

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test p-value
1	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.89%)	2 (1.79%)	21 (18.75%)	88 (78.57%)	0.2063
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	0 (0.00%)	9 (5.36%)	33 (19.64%)	123 (73.21%)	
2	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	7 (6.25%)	9 (8.04%)	22 (19.64%)	73 (65.18%)	0.0658
	UNIV	4 (2.38%)	9 (5.36%)	27 (16.07%)	45 (26.79%)	83 (49.40%)	
3	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.79%)	6 (5.36%)	24 (21.43%)	80 (71.43%)	0.1064
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	4 (2.38%)	18 (10.71%)	47 (27.98%)	96 (57.14%)	
4	HS	0	3	2	24	83	*0.0046

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test p-value
	&MS	(0.00%)	(2.68%)	(1.79%)	(21.43%)	(74.11%)	
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	0 (0.00%)	16 (9.52%)	40 (23.81%)	109 (64.88%)	
5	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	2 (1.79%)	4 (3.57%)	22 (19.64%)	84 (75.00%)	0.5108
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	2 (1.19%)	11 (6.55%)	36 (21.43%)	116 (69.05%)	
6	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	4 (3.57%)	15 (13.39%)	20 (17.86%)	72 (64.29%)	*0.0392
	UNIV	4 (2.38%)	5 (2.98%)	23 (13.69%)	55 (32.74%)	81 (48.21%)	
7	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.89%)	9 (8.04%)	22 (19.64%)	80 (71.43%)	0.4117
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	1 (0.60%)	16 (9.52%)	43 (25.60%)	105 (62.50%)	
8	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.89%)	8 (7.14%)	27 (24.11%)	76 (67.86%)	0.2861
	UNIV	4 (2.38%)	0 (0.00%)	17 (10.12%)	42 (25.00%)	105 (62.50%)	
9	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	10 (8.93%)	27 (24.11%)	75 (66.96%)	0.6184
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	1 (0.60%)	17 (10.12%)	45 (26.79%)	102 (60.71%)	

Note. P = 0.05; HS & MS: secondary teachers, UNIV: post-secondary teachers.

Across items 1-9, the distribution of the five levels of agreement in the Likert scale shows a clear decrease from 5, "strongly agree," to 1, "least agree," with a sharp decline from 5 to 4, "agree." As expected, the majority of responses to almost all 9 items are "strongly agree." The only two exceptions are both near 50% and both from the post-secondary group: 49.40% of post-secondary teachers chose "5" for item 2, "A task involves a primary focus on meaning," and 48.21% chose "5" for item 6, "A task is intrinsically motivating." Of all 9 items, the percentages of "strongly agree" in the secondary group are consistently higher than those in the post-secondary group, and more than 80% of the items show a difference in levels of agreement between the two groups. The majority of the respondents agreed with the statements on two different levels, 5, "strongly agree," or 4, "agree." The percentage of participants choosing 2, "least agree," and 1, "disagree," for any item is quite small, with an average close to 3%. The item to which the most participants chose a response of 1 or 2 is again item 2, "A task involves a primary focus on meaning."

According to the result of the Fisher's exact test, the only items that show a significant difference between the two groups of respondents are items 4, "A task bears a relationship to real-world activities," and 6, "A task is intrinsically motivating." Although item 2 does not show significant difference, its p-value is very close to 0.05. Following is a detailed analysis of these three items.

The p-value for item 4 is 0.0046, well below the 0.05 significance threshold. The majority of respondents from both groups agreed with the statement: summing responses of 5, "strongly agree," and 4, "agree," 95.54% of the secondary respondents and 88.69% of the post-secondary group agreed. However, strength of agreement differs between the two groups. Although the percentages of respondents who agreed with the statement are similar (21.43% secondary and 23.81% post-secondary), 74.11% of the secondary respondents strongly agreed with the statement, while 64.88% of the post-secondary respondents did, showing a difference of slightly less than 10%. Overall, although the majority of the two groups agreed

with the statement, the secondary group tends to show a higher level of agreement than the post-secondary group.

The p-value for item 6 is 0.0392, also indicating significant difference between the two groups. As for item 4, the majority of both groups, 83.14% of the secondary group and 80.95% of the post-secondary group, agreed with the statement, but they differ in the level of agreement. The percentage of respondents who strongly agreed (5) with the statement is much higher in the secondary group (64.29%) than in the post-secondary group (48.21%), showing a difference of 16.08% between the two groups. Conversely, the percentage of respondents who agreed (4) with the statement is lower in the secondary group (17.86%) than in the post-secondary group (32.74%), showing a difference of 14.88%. Item 6 resembles item 4 in that secondary teachers show a higher level of agreement than the post-secondary group does.

It is worth noting that although the p-value for item 2 ( $p = 0.0658$ ) does not reach the significance threshold, it is noticeably lower than those for the rest of the items (excluding 4 and 6), which are all above 0.10. This difference follows the pattern discussed above. Summing ratings of 4 and 5, more secondary level respondents (84.82%) agreed with the statement than did post-secondary respondents (76.19%). In addition, less than half (49.40%) of the post-secondary respondents strongly agreed with the statement, which is significantly lower than the percentage of “strongly agree” in the secondary group (65.18%) and one of the lowest percentages among all 9 items. A significant number of post-secondary respondents (16.07%) showed a neutral attitude toward the statement, which is significantly higher than the neutral responses of the secondary group (8.04%) and the highest neutral of all 9 items.

Overall, secondary and post-secondary instructors agreed with the perceptions stated in all of the above items. However, it is worth noting that, as compared to post-secondary school instructors, secondary school Chinese language instructors tend to more strongly support the notions that tasks have a focus on meaning, that tasks

connect to real-world experiences, and that tasks are intrinsically motivating.

The following table shows frequencies, percentages, and the statistical analysis of the Fisher's exact test of Section 2 of the questionnaire, which explores teachers' views of task implementation.

**Section 2: Views on implementing TBLT.** Items in Section 2 of the questionnaire focused on views on implementing task-based language teaching. Table 2 shows the results of responses to items in Section 2, which were designed to elucidate respondents' views on curricular and pedagogical values, namely, their reactions to and degree of support for incorporating and implementing tasks in a Chinese language class.

Table 2: *Frequencies, percentages, and p-values for items 10-19 on teachers' views of task implementation*

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
10	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	4 (3.57%)	11 (9.82%)	29 (25.89%)	67 (59.82%)	0.4006
	UNIV	1 (0.60%)	4 (2.38%)	27 (16.07%)	50 (29.76%)	86 (51.19%)	
11	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	3 (2.68%)	24 (21.43%)	37 (33.04%)	48 (42.86%)	0.2938
	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	9 (5.36%)	46 (27.38%)	56 (33.33%)	55 (32.74%)	
12	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.89%)	14 (12.50%)	32 (28.57%)	65 (58.04%)	0.1633
	UNIV	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.38%)	27 (16.07%)	62 (36.90%)	75 (44.64%)	

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
13	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (7.14%)	33 (29.46%)	70 (62.50%)	*0.0400
	UNIV	0 (0.00%)	4 (2.38%)	19 (11.31%)	64 (38.10%)	81 (48.21%)	
14	HS &MS	10 (8.93%)	23 (20.54%)	29 (25.89%)	33 (29.46%)	17 (15.18%)	0.7511
	UNIV	14 (8.33%)	30 (17.86%)	56 (33.33%)	43 (25.60%)	25 (14.88%)	
15	HS &MS	2 (1.79%)	2 (1.79%)	19 (16.96%)	44 (39.29%)	45 (40.18%)	0.1607
	UNIV	4 (2.38%)	11 (6.55%)	40 (23.81%)	52 (30.95%)	61 (36.31%)	
16	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	10 (8.93%)	52 (46.43%)	31 (27.68%)	18 (16.07%)	0.3183
	UNIV	9 (5.36%)	16 (9.52%)	72 (42.86%)	50 (29.76%)	21 (12.50%)	
17	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	8 (7.14%)	19 (16.96%)	85 (75.89%)	0.5175
	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	1 (0.60%)	15 (8.93%)	37 (22.02%)	113 (67.26%)	
18	HS &MS	0 (0.00%)	1 (0.89%)	9 (8.04%)	24 (21.43%)	78 (69.64%)	*0.0052
	UNIV	1 (0.60%)	2 (1.19%)	31 (18.45%)	51 (30.36%)	83 (49.40%)	

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
19	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	0 (0.00%)	19 (16.96%)	33 (29.46%)	59 (52.68%)	*0.0174
	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	12 (7.14%)	24 (14.29%)	56 (33.33%)	74 (44.05%)	

Table 2 shows frequencies, percentages, and p-values found by Fisher's exact test on teachers' views of task implementation. Similar to the results in Table 1 on perceptions of tasks, the percentages of "strongly agree" for the secondary group are higher than those of the post-secondary group. Overall, the highest percentages for both groups again fall on "agree" or "strongly agree." Exceptions are responses to item 14, "TBLT places much psychological burden on the teacher as a facilitator," and item 16, "TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements." For item 14, the highest percentage of secondary respondents to that item chose 4, "agree" (29.46%); however, the highest percentage of post-secondary respondents to that item chose 3, "neutral" (33.33%). Combining agree (4 and 5) and disagree (1 and 2) responses to item 14, 44.64% and 29.46% of the secondary respondents agreed and disagreed, respectively, while 40.48% and 26.19% of post-secondary respondents agreed and disagreed, respectively. This indicates that views of TBLT do not follow the response patterns discovered above for items 1-9. For item 16, the highest percentage of responses by both groups are neutral, 46.43% (secondary) and 42.86% (post-secondary). Again combining agree and disagree responses, more respondents in both groups agreed that task-based language teaching is proper for controlling classroom arrangement (43.75% of secondary and 42.26% of post-secondary) than disagreed (9.82% of secondary and 14.88% of post-secondary).

All items show insignificant differences between the two groups of respondents, except for items 13, “TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills,” 18, “TBLT encourages the use of authentic materials,” and 19, “TBLT can be flexibly incorporated into any adopted approach or curriculum.”

The significant difference found in responses to item 13 ( $p=0.0400$ ) lies in the number of respondents who strongly agreed with the statement. More than half (62.50%) of the secondary teachers and less than half (48.21%) of the post-secondary teachers strongly agreed, a more than 10% difference. In addition, when both agree responses (4 and 5) are summed, 91.96% of the secondary school teachers agreed with the statement, as compared to 86.31% of the post-secondary group, suggesting that the statistical results for item 13 exhibit a similar pattern to those that show significant difference in Section 1. Namely, the percentages of agree responses in the secondary group show a steep incline across the scale of 1-5, while post-secondary response percentages are more spread out with a more gradual incline. In other words, the post-secondary respondents had more varied attitudes and were more reserved toward the statement than the secondary group respondents, who were more tightly grouped together.

The same pattern holds for responses to item 18 ( $p = 0.0052$ ). The number of respondents who strongly agreed with the statement significantly varies between the groups. While the majority of the secondary level respondents completely agreed with the statement (69.64%), less than half of the post-secondary level respondents did (49.49%), showing a significant difference of over 20%. Responses in general to this item are more evenly distributed among post-secondary teachers than among secondary, indicating more varied and reserved attitudes toward the statement in the post-secondary group.

For item 19, the significant difference ( $p = 0.0174$ ) lies in the number of respondents who disagreed with the statement: combining “disagree” (2) and “strongly disagree” (1), 0.89% of secondary level

respondents and 8.33% of post-secondary level respondents disagreed. Again, this shows the same pattern discussed above.

Overall, items 10-19 in Section 2 exhibit a common pattern: a lower percentage of post-secondary respondents strongly agreed with the statements, and generally more post-secondary respondents disagreed with the statements. It is fair to say that post-secondary respondents are less unified than secondary respondents in their views of task implementation. This leads to the suggestion that teachers in secondary school settings more strongly support the pedagogical and curricular values of tasks than do teachers in post-secondary settings.

**Section 3: Confidence in implementing tasks.** The following table shows frequencies, percentages, and p-values for items 20-29, which investigate teachers' confidence in implementing tasks.

Table 3: *Frequencies, percentages, and p-values for items 20-29 on teachers' confidence in implementing tasks*

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
20	HS &MS	2 (1.79%)	10 (8.93%)	29 (25.89%)	52 (46.43%)	19 (16.96%)	0.9810
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	13 (7.74%)	45 (26.79%)	75 (44.64%)	32 (19.05%)	
21	HS &MS	1 (0.89%)	3 (2.68%)	26 (23.21%)	47 (41.96%)	35 (31.25%)	0.1716
	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	5 (2.98%)	23 (13.69%)	66 (39.29%)	72 (42.86%)	
	HS&MS	0 (0.00%)	6 (5.36%)	32 (28.57%)	48 (42.86%)	26 (23.21%)	*0.0034

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
22	UNIV	1 (0.60%)	7 (4.17%)	22 (13.10%)	72 (42.86%)	66 (39.29%)	
23	HS&MS	0 (0.00%)	8 (7.14%)	30 (26.79%)	43 (38.39%)	31 (27.68%)	*0.0426
	UNIV	1 (0.60%)	6 (3.57%)	25 (14.88%)	81 (48.21%)	55 (32.74%)	
24	HS&MS	1 (0.89%)	12 (10.71%)	30 (26.79%)	42 (37.50%)	27 (24.11%)	0.3756
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	9 (5.36%)	39 (23.21%)	76 (45.24%)	41 (24.40%)	
25	HS&MS	1 (0.89%)	10 (8.93%)	18 (16.07%)	51 (45.54%)	32 (28.57%)	0.5305
	UNIV	4 (2.38%)	7 (4.17%)	29 (17.26%)	79 (47.02%)	49 (29.17%)	
26	HS&MS	3 (2.68%)	17 (15.18%)	22 (19.64%)	44 (39.29%)	26 (23.21%)	0.2121
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	14 (8.33%)	25 (14.88%)	75 (44.64%)	51 (30.36%)	
27	HS&MS	2 (1.79%)	7 (6.25%)	29 (25.89%)	42 (37.50%)	32 (28.57%)	0.0569
	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	4 (2.38%)	27 (16.07%)	67 (39.88%)	68 (40.48%)	
	HS&MS	1 (0.89%)	6 (5.36%)	22 (19.64%)	45 (40.18%)	38 (33.93%)	0.9684

Item	Groups	1	2	3	4	5	Fisher Exact Test P-Value
28	UNIV	2 (1.19%)	8 (4.76%)	30 (17.86%)	65 (38.69%)	63 (37.50%)	
29	HS&MS	4 (3.57%)	11 (9.82%)	28 (25.00%)	39 (34.82%)	30 (26.79%)	0.4248
	UNIV	3 (1.79%)	12 (7.14%)	37 (22.02%)	76 (45.24%)	40 (23.81%)	

As indicated in the above table, the majority of teachers in both groups chose “agree” or “strongly agree” across the board, and since the statements all start with “I am confident in...,” the positive results indicate that the majority of respondents in both groups were confident in their own abilities to implement tasks. Interestingly, the percentages of post-secondary respondents who chose “strongly agree” are higher than those of the secondary respondents, with the single exception of item 29, “I am confident that I can create rubrics to assess required language skills objectively and successfully.” In addition, the percentages of post-secondary respondents who chose “agree” are all higher than those of the secondary respondents, with the single exception of item 28, “I am confident that I can enhance students’ proficiency through tasks.” When responses 4 and 5 (“agree” and “strongly agree”) are summed for items 28 and 29, the percentages of the post-secondary respondents who agreed with the statements (76.19% for item 28 and 69.05% for item 29) are both higher than those of the secondary respondents (74.11% for item 28 and 61.61% for item 29), indicating that post-secondary respondents are overall more confident in their ability to create rubrics for assessment, to enhance students’ proficiency through tasks, and to implement tasks in class.

The p-values of the Fisher exact test show insignificant differences between the two groups of respondents (including for

responses to items 28 and 29), except for items 22, “I am confident that I can create appropriate tasks,” and 23, “I am confident that I can appropriately implement tasks in class.” The p-value for item 22 is 0.0034, well below the 0.05 significance threshold. While 28.57% of the secondary teachers gave a neutral response to the statement, only 13.10% of the post-secondary level respondents did, showing a more than 15% difference. This difference indicates that fewer secondary respondents are confident in their own abilities to create appropriate tasks. In addition, the number of respondents who strongly agreed with the statement, 23.21% of the secondary level respondents and 39.29% of the post-secondary group, contributes greatly to the significant difference (more than 16%) between the two groups and further supports the conclusion that post-secondary respondents are generally more confident in their ability to create appropriate tasks. This conforms to the general pattern for items 20-39 discussed above. Overall, although the majority of the two groups agreed with the statement, the means of the secondary level responses lean toward neutral, while those of the post-secondary level responses lean toward agree.

The p-value for item 23 is 0.0426, also indicating significant difference between the two groups. Summing both “agree” options (4 and 5), 66.07% of the secondary level respondents agreed with the statement, compared to 80.95% of the secondary level respondents, which again suggests that the post-secondary respondents are, in general, more confident in their abilities to implement tasks. In addition, the percentage of secondary respondents (26.79%) who were neutral to the statement is higher than that of the post-secondary respondents (14.88%), which again indicates a more reserved attitude toward the statement from the secondary group.

It is worth noting that although the p-value ( $p = 0.0569$ ) for item 27, “I am confident that I can do pre-class preparation well before implementing tasks,” does not reach the significance threshold (0.05), it is noticeably lower than the other Section 3 p-values, which are all above 0.1. Summing both “agree” options (4 and 5), 66.07% of secondary level respondents agreed with the statement, compared to

80.38% of post-secondary level respondents, which indicates that post-secondary respondents lean toward agreeing with the statement. Again, the post-secondary group shows a generally higher confidence level in pre-class preparation and task implementation, which complies with the overall pattern of the entire set.

Overall, post-secondary school teachers show a higher degree of confidence in task implementation than secondary school teachers. While the pattern that emerges from statistical analyses of Sections 1 and 2 suggests that post-secondary respondents tend to be more reserved toward statements related to their understanding of tasks and TBLT and in their views on implementing TBLT, analysis of responses in Section 3 suggests the opposite, that post-secondary respondents are generally more confident in their understanding and abilities to implement tasks. Why post-secondary school teachers are more confident than secondary school teachers in this area deserves further exploration. Possible explanations may take into account differences in education level, professional background, classroom management, class size, learners' independence and behavioral maturity, and homework load, to name a few. Both teachers and learners are accountable in a foreign language class, and the roles of both populations come into play in determining the outcomes of instructional implementation. Needless to say, implementing tasks in a foreign language class involves a variety of factors, both controllable and uncontrollable by the teacher, and it would be worthwhile to analyze which factors are most conducive to an effective task-based class.

### 3.2 Qualitative analysis

In addition to quantitative analyses, the study also invited respondents to answer one open-ended question about whether and why they use TBLT.

Table 4: *Frequencies and percentages of using TBLT among secondary and post-secondary Chinese language teachers*

	MS/HS	College	Total	MS/HS %	College %
Yes	89	137	226	79.46%	81.55%
No	23	31	54	20.54%	18.45%

Of the 280 respondents, 226 responded that they used TBLT and 54 that they did not. Of secondary school teachers, 89 chose to adopt TBLT, whereas 23 chose not to. Of post-secondary teachers, 137 adopted TBLT, and 31 did not. Both groups thus roughly fall into a ratio of 4:1, TBLT adoption to rejection. In other words, in both secondary and post-secondary settings, approximately four out of five teachers were in favor of TBLT.

Of the 226 respondents who indicated that they had adopted of TBLT in teaching Mandarin Chinese, 85% provided explanations for their choices. The following table is a summary of all the reasons given for favoring TBLT, based on the responses coded from complete sentences or key phrases in all responses.

Table 5: *Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for using TBLT among secondary and post-secondary Chinese language teachers*

Reason	Frequency = 192	Percentage
Meaningful/natural language use	39	20.31%
Interesting & motivating	32	16.67%
Real life-situation	28	14.58%
Student-centered & active engagement	23	11.98%
Communication skills and competence	16	8.33%
Useful and effective	16	8.33%
Best practice	7	3.65%
Assessment & outcome	6	3.13%
Goal	6	3.13%
Improve efficiency	5	2.60%
Use along with other methods	4	2.08%
Advanced-level course	3	1.56%
Required	2	1.04%
Various Classroom Activities	2	1.04%
Analytical & high order thinking skills	2	1.04%
Context	1	0.05%

The above table includes 16 categories of reasons for using TBLT, with a wide variety of frequency in responses. The reasons

cited most frequently include TBLT's effectiveness in teaching meaning and natural language use (cited by 20.31% of respondents), learners finding it interesting and motivating (cited by 16.67% of respondents), and its similarity to real-life situations (cited by 14.58% of respondents). TBLT's ability to encourage student-centered active engagement, TBLT's effectiveness in teaching communication skills, and TBLT's usefulness each received near 10%. Though their exact reasons for using TBLT vary, the majority of teachers reported implementing it for these reasons. The rest of the responses were given by less than 5% of respondents and range from TBLT being considered a best practice to, at the bottom of the list, TBLT offering learners contextual consideration. All these reasons align with characteristics of tasks that are well created and successfully implemented, and they mirror the advantages recognized by TBLT advocates. Altogether, the favorable responses collected from Chinese language teachers are very similar to the advantages that Ellis (2003) discusses from a theoretical perspective. As he puts it, incorporating tasks into whatever curriculum is adopted allows learners to focus on meaning; accurate linguistic structures are learned through meaningful communication that promotes natural and spontaneous use of language. Tasks are intrinsically motivating and student-centered, and participation in well-prepared and appropriate tasks can encourage a learner to achieve desirable outcomes in language acquisition. One of the biggest and perhaps most exciting advantages of TBLT is the flexibility and feasibility it offers to teachers to develop and adopt tasks that fit a wide array of curricular needs. Especially in its weak form, TBLT can mesh with whatever teaching approach teachers have already been using. This encourages teachers to keep whatever is workable and add tasks to complement and enhance their existing approaches.

Although the majority of the respondents tended to choose to implement TBLT in some form in their teaching, approximately 20% did not. Of the 54 respondents who reported that they did not use TBLT in their teaching, only 24 provided reasons. The following table summarizes the reasons why they chose not to incorporate tasks in their teaching.

Table 6: *Frequencies and percentages of the reasons for not using TBLT among secondary and post-secondary Chinese language teachers*

Reason	Frequency = 24	Percentage
Time & curricular constraints	9	37.50%
Unfamiliar with TBLT	3	12.50%
Improper or ineffective at elem./interm. levels	3	12.50%
Teaching grammar & culture	3	12.50%
Already adopted many different methods	2	8.33%
Technology/facility	2	8.33%
Don't use it at the advanced level	1	4.17%
Inappropriate	1	4.17%

Because of the low number of responses, there is large variation in frequency between the eight categories of responses. The reason given not to use TBLT by the highest percentage of participants (37.50%) was lack of time and curricular restraints, rather than a problem with TBLT itself. The second most frequently cited reason, at 12.50%, was unfamiliarity with TBLT practices. The rest of the responses include the belief that TBLT is improper for elementary levels and for teaching grammar and culture, and previous adoption of other methods. Most teachers are faced with the problems of limited time and curricular constraints, and it is not surprising that it is the top reason teachers chose not to consider TBLT. Unfamiliarity with the approach and use of technology are also legitimate concerns, but professional development training and participation in professional exchanges are viable solutions. Other

concerns cited more rarely seem to result from inappropriate assumptions or incomplete understanding. Some reasons contradict each other. For example, three respondents wrote that the approach is not appropriate for elementary and intermediate levels, whereas one found no use or value at the advanced level. In fact, research suggests that tasks are suited for all levels of proficiency, as long as they are well designed and effectively implemented. Three respondents had doubts about teaching grammar and culture using this approach, and this clearly should not be an obstacle, as TBLT tasks offer a refreshing approach to grammar and prioritize the development of cultural competence.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Based on this study, both secondary and post-secondary teachers had appropriate perceptions of TBLT. These results are exciting and rewarding for the development of the field of teaching Chinese as a foreign language. However, views on TBLT's curricular and pedagogical values varied between the two groups of educators. Interestingly, secondary teachers tended to favor the approach more than post-secondary teachers, although they were not as confident in their abilities to put conceptual understanding into practice as were post-secondary teachers.

Because of some limitations in this study, further examination is called for. First, although efforts were made to reach out to different interest groups and individuals, and 280 teachers of varying backgrounds participated, analysis of results did not take into account all factors contributing to differences in professional background, including for example years of teaching, educational backgrounds, experiences in professional development, and type and number of courses taught. To deepen our understanding of Chinese language teachers' perceptions of and views on tasks and TBLT, further studies geared toward factor analysis with different homogeneous groups will help answer research questions in more depth. Second, how far the results of the study can be extended to other less commonly taught languages is unknown. The field in less commonly

taught languages continues to grow and flourish, and we await further research into the perceptions of and confidence in 'TBLT' among educators in other languages, in both secondary and post-secondary educational settings. Third, this study confirms teachers' conceptual understanding of tasks, but theoretical knowledge alone does not ensure effective implementation in classrooms. It is frequently observed that understanding pedagogical principles is one thing, and demonstrating understanding through actual teaching is another: understanding does not automatically transform into right actions. It is hoped that further studies will investigate what is really happening in CFL classrooms and find any disconnects or mismatches between what teachers know and what they do in classrooms. If discrepancies exist, then professional training can address them in order to advance teaching.

As Van den Branden (2009) points out, it is not enough to simply inform teachers of pedagogical innovations; they need continued support across the developmental phases of their pedagogical decision-making processes. One study might explore why secondary school teachers who favored 'TBLT' tended to lack confidence in classrooms, whereas college faculty who supported it less strongly felt more confident in their implementation. Factors that may account for the observed differences between the two groups of teachers include teachers' professional background, dynamics in different classroom settings, curriculum design and assessment, and learners' variables. The challenges and difficulties that Chinese language teachers face are worth further exploration in future studies. After classroom observation and analysis of classroom episodes collected in primary schools in Hong Kong, Carless (2004) concluded that overall, teachers did not have an appropriate understanding of tasks and 'TBLT', and that these misconceptions led teachers to inappropriately replace tasks with exercises. Therefore, it is important that the current study be enriched and complemented by classroom observation. The correlations and interconnections between teacher self-reports, as documented in this study, and actual teacher practice, as observed by a third-party researcher, merit future studies. 'TBLT' provides a pedagogical framework with a set of proposed principles, indicating that while doing 'TBLT' in classrooms, instructors have the

discretion to decide what best fits into their curricula, teaching contexts, and language programs.

Another research direction suggested by this study is related to the need to clearly define the strong and weak versions of TBLT and to seek teachers' perspectives on and preferences for one over the other. In the field of teaching Chinese as a foreign language, there have been no comparison studies of this type. Finally, it would be worthwhile to investigate how TBLT and different types of tasks are implemented in different courses across levels, programs, and institutions, and what learners' associated performance outcomes are.

All these recommendations for further studies would address classroom practicalities and realities. It is crucial to put theory into practice and to value practitioners' work upfront if we wish to support and sustain TBLT, both theoretically and practically. These potential large-scale studies can offer immeasurable value to the field of foreign language teaching.

## References

- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 639-662.
- Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of task-based approaches for secondary schools: Perspectives from Hong Kong. *System*, 35, 595-608.
- Cheng, X., & Moses, S. (2011). Perceptions and implementation of task-based language teaching among secondary school EFL teachers in China. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 292-302
- Douglas, S., & Kim, M. (2014). *Task-based language teaching and English for academic purposes: an investigation into instructor perceptions and practice in the Canadian context*. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 31(8).
- East, M. (2012). *Task-based Language Teaching from the Teachers' Perspective: Insights from New Zealand*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fotos, S. & Nassaji, H. (Eds.) (2007). *Form Focused Instruction and Teacher Education: Studies in Honour of Rod Ellis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. New York: NY: Routledge.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40, 243-249.
- Jeon I., & Hahn, J. (2006). Exploring EFL Teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: a case study of Korean classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(1), 1-27.

- Leaver, B., & Willis, J. (Eds.) (2004). *Task-based Instruction in Foreign Language Education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Long, (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, 377-393. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56.
- Mann, G. (2006). A task-based approach to the development of the oral skills of international law students. *Research in Post-compulsory Education*, 11(2), 217-234.
- McDonough, K., & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Teachers' and learners' reactions to a task-based EFL course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(1), 107-132.
- Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating Form-Focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Ogilvie, G., & Dunn, W. (2010). Taking teacher education to task: exploring the role of teacher education in promoting the utilization of task-based language teaching. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161-181.
- Revesz, A., Sachs, R., & Hama, M. (2012). Task complexity, type-token frequency, and individual differences on the acquisition of past counterfactuals. Unpublished paper presented at American Association for Applied Linguistics 2012 conference, Boston, MA.
- Robinson, P. (2011). *Second Language Task Complexity: Researching the Cognition Hypothesis of Language Learning and Performance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in Second Language Learning*. Basingstoke, Palgrave, MacMillan.
- Sasayama, S. (2013). Book review on *Task-based Language Teaching from the Teachers' Perspective: Insights from New Zealand* by Martin East. *Language Teaching Research* 17(4), 506-509.

- Seedhouse, P. (1999). Task-based interaction. *ELT Journal*, 53, 149-56.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.
- Swan, M. (2005). Legislating by hypothesis: the case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26, 376-401.
- Sheen, R. (2003). Focus-on-form: a myth in the making. *ELT Journal*, 57, 225-33.
- Thomas, M. (2015). *Contemporary Task-based Language Teaching in Asia*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Van den Branden, K. (Ed.) (2006). *Task-based Language Teaching: from Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van den Branden, K., Bygate, M., & Norris, J. (2009). *Task-based Language Teaching: A Reader*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Widdowson, H. (2003). Innovation in teacher development. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 260-75.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2008). *Doing Task-based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Xhaferi, B., & Xhaferi G. (2013). Teachers attitudes and understanding of task-based language teaching – a study conducted at the faculty of languages, cultures and communications at SEEU. *SEEU Review*, 9(2), 43-60.
- Zheng, X., & Borg, S. (2014). Task-based learning and teaching in China: secondary school teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(2), 205-221.

## Appendix: Questionnaire

**Instructions:** We are conducting a study aimed at secondary school teachers and college faculty about their views on Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT), and would appreciate if you would take the time to fill out the following survey. It should take at most 10 minutes. This survey cannot be saved and restarted, so if you exit the page and return to the survey, your previous answers will be erased. Thank you for your participation. All responses will be kept confidential.

### PART I: Background Information

1. What school setting do you currently teach in?
  - Middle school
  - High school
  - College or university
  - Others
2. What is the highest educational degree that you have received?
  - Bachelor's
  - Master's
  - Doctorate

### PART II: Perceptions of Task-based Language Teaching

**Instructions:** Each of the following items consistently has a 5-point scale, 1 corresponding to "Strongly disagree" and 5 corresponding to "Strongly agree." Please choose the one that best fits your perceptions of task-based language teaching (TBLT).

### Section 1: Understanding of the features of tasks and TBLT framework

1. A task aims to achieve a communication goal.
2. A task involves a primary focus on meaning.
3. A task has a clearly defined outcome.
4. A task bears a relationship to real-world activities.
5. A task is an activity in which the target language is used by the learner.
6. A task is intrinsically motivating.
7. TBLT is a communicative approach to language teaching.
8. TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.
9. TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post-task.

### Section 2: Views on implementing TBLT

10. I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.
11. TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.
12. TBLT activates learners' needs and interests.
13. TBLT pursues the development of integrated skills in the classroom.
14. TBLT places much psychological burden on the teacher as a facilitator.
15. TBLT requires a lot of preparation time compared to other approaches.
16. TBLT is proper for controlling classroom arrangements.
17. TBLT materials should be meaningful and purposeful based on the real-world context.
18. TBLT encourages the use of authentic materials.
19. TBLT can be flexibly incorporated into any adopted approach or curriculum.

### Section 3: Confidence in implementing tasks

20. I am confident that I have a full and accurate understanding of tasks and TBLT.
21. I am confident that I can judge between appropriate and inappropriate tasks.
22. I am confident that I can create appropriate tasks.
23. I am confident that I can appropriately implement tasks in class.
24. I am confident that I can manage class time well while implementing tasks.
25. I am confident that while implementing tasks I can do a good job in terms of classroom management.
26. I am confident that I can encourage students to speak Chinese and avoid English during tasks.
27. I am confident that I can do pre-class preparation well before implementing tasks.
28. I am confident that I can enhance students' proficiency through tasks.
29. I am confident that I can create rubrics to assess required language skills objectively and successfully.

### PART III: Reasons teachers choose to or avoid implementing TBLT

30. Do you use TBLT in your teaching? YES      NO
  - 1) If you answered YES in the previous question, please list any reasons that made you decide to implement TBLT.
  - 2) If you answered NO in the previous questions, please list any reasons that made you decide NOT to implement TBLT.