

## Exploring Iraqi EFL Intermediate School Teachers' Perception of Task-Based Language Teaching

Asst. Prof. Dr. Shaima' Abdul Baqi AL-Bakri

University of Baghdad \ College of Education- Ibn Rushd

استكشاف ادراك مدرسي المتوسطة العراقيين لطريقة التدريس القائمة على المهمات

أ.م.د. شيماء عبد الباقي البكري

كلية التربية - ابن رشد / جامعة بغداد

### الملخص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية الى تحديد المعرفة النظرية لمدرسي اللغة الانكليزية العراقيين في المدارس المتوسطة لطريقة التعليم القائمة على اداء المهمات والى البحث فيما اذا كان المدرسون يطبقون هذه الطريقة في صفوفهم الدراسية وكيفية تطبيقها . كما وتهدف الدراسة الى استكشاف المعوقات التي تعيق التطبيق الناجح في المدارس العراقية والى استكشاف فيما اذا كانت استجابات المدرسين تختلف باختلاف الجنس و مستوى الخبرة والكلية التي تخرج منها . وقد تألف مجتمع البحث من مدرسي اللغة الانكليزية في المرحلة المتوسطة في الصفوف (الاول - الثاني - الثالث). ولأجل تحقق اهداف الدراسة تم اختيار 265 مدرس من 78 مدرسة متوسطة في بغداد / الرصافة. وقد تم بناء استبانة مغلقة لتكون اداة الدراسة. وبعد التأكد من ثبات وصدق الاداة تم تطبيقها على عينة الدراسة. وقد دلت النتائج على ان عددا كبيرا من المدرسين على معرفة بالجانب النظري للطريقة ولكن عدد الذين يطبقونها اقل من ذلك وذلك لمعوقات يواجهونها بالتطبيق. اما بخصوص سنوات الخبرة فقد اظهرت النتائج وجود فوارق ذات دلالة احصائية.

### Abstract

Task Based Language Teaching is an approach to teaching a foreign language that seeks to engage learners in interactional authentic language use by having them perform a series of tasks. It implies providing learners with authentic sources of meaningful materials, ideal situations for communicative activity, and supportive feedback allowing for much greater opportunities for language use.

The present study puts forward the following questions:

- 1- How do Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers perceive TBLT?
- 2- What are the Iraqi EFL teachers' views on the implementation, procedures, and constraints of TBLT?
- 3- Do the variations in gender, teaching experience, and the grade teachers teach affect EFL teachers' perceptions of the TBLT?

On the basis of the above questions the following hypotheses have been hypothesized:

1. Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers do not well perceive TBLT.
2. There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to their gender.
3. There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to their teaching experience
4. There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to the grade they teach.

The population of the present study consists of Iraqi Intermediate School EFL Teachers (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> year classes) of the three General Directorates of Education in Baghdad / Al-Rusafa. The sample of the study consist of (265) Iraqi Intermediate Schools EFL Teachers from 78 Schools.

The Instrument of the study consists of a closed questionnaire which comprises four fields and 53 items. The validity of the closed questionnaire has been insured, and the

reliability has been secured for the four sections and for the over all 53 items of the questionnaire.

The findings show that:

- 1- The majority of teachers have satisfactory and a good level in the fields of theoretical knowledge, views of implementing, procedures of implementing, and the constraints.
- 2- There is no statistical significant difference between male and female intermediate school teachers' perception in the four fields as well as the overall 53 items.
- 3- There is no statistical significant difference between the perception of inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers with respect to the fields of theory level, views on implementing, and the constraints.
- 4- There is statistical significant differences in the perception of inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers with respect to the procedures teacher used in implementing TBLT; and
- 5- There is no statistical difference in the perceptions of Iraqi Intermediate School EFL Teachers according to the grade teachers teach and with respect to the four fields.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 The Problem and Its Significance

Language learning has eluded its lifeless role and emerged into the daylight when its communicative and living side was discovered since 1980s. To reach the creative and personal developmental dimension of language, there have been many attempts in education world via the efforts of strengthening "learner-centered teaching" which lifted the lid off a new world called as "Task Based Language Teaching" (Yaman and Gokce, 2012:1).

Task based language teaching (TBLT) has attracted the attention of second language acquisition researchers, curriculum developers, educationalists, teacher trainers and language teachers worldwide. To a great extent, the introduction of TBLT into the world of language education has been a "top-down" process. The term has been coined and developed by second language researchers and language educators, largely in reaction to teacher-dominated classroom practice.

Willis & Willis (2007:1) claim that the most effective way to teach a language is by engaging learners in real language use in the classroom. This is done by designing tasks- discussions, problems, games, and so on- which require learners to use the language for themselves. However, TBLT has become a dominant approach to language teaching worldwide.

For the last ten years, a new ELT curriculum has been approved for Iraqi schools and curriculum designers set new standards that match the modern attitudes in language teaching. The Ministry of Education in Iraq has strongly encouraged language teachers to use communicative and task based teaching since the new curriculum explicitly states that English classes are to be student-centered, activity-centered, and should be conducted in English.

Thus, the problem of the present study is expressed through these questions:

- 1- How do Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers perceive TBLT?
- 2- What are the Iraqi EFL teachers' views on the implementation, procedures, and constraints of TBLT?
- 3- Do the variations in gender, teaching experience, and the grade teachers teach affect EFL teachers' perceptions of the TBLT?

### 1.2 Aims

The study aims at:

1- Exploring and identifying Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers' perceptions of TBLT, according to: theoretical knowledge, views and procedures of implementation and the constraints that act against a successful application in Iraqi schools.

2- Finding out whether teachers' perceptions differ according to gender, teaching experience, and the grades they teach.

### 1.3 Hypotheses of the Study

It is hypothesized that:

1. Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers do not well perceive TBLT.
2. There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to their gender.
- 3- There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to their teaching experience
4. There is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers according to the grade they teach.

### 1.4 Limits of the Study

This study is limited to Iraqi Intermediate School EFL Teachers' of the first, second, and third grade classes in Baghdad, Al-Rusafa sector in the academic year 2010-2011.

### 1.5 Value of the Study

It is believed that this study will be beneficial for educational policy makers, curriculum developers, teacher trainers, and language teachers. The study sends a clear message to the EFL teachers in charge of graduating professional teachers about the real demands and requirements of EFL teaching in Iraq. It will also contribute in facilitating EFL teachers' practical use of TBLT techniques thereby improving the learners' communicative abilities.

The present study is also useful for textbook designers because it shows what kind of textbooks are really required for EFL teachers to work on. Moreover, the study is useful for supervisors in charge of ELT in Intermediate schools in regard to their observations and evaluations of EFL teachers and the kind of training they need.

## II. Literature Review

### 2.1 Background of TBLT

Task-based language teaching is not a new concept. Prabhu (1987) used a task-based approach with secondary school classes in Bangalore, India, in his Communicational Teaching Project, beginning in 1979. American Government Language institutions switched to task-based instruction (TBI) for foreign language for adults in the early 1980s. Other teachers and institutions throughout the world are following the TBLT (Shehadeh, 2005:37). Why, then, are teachers making this change to TBLT? Shehadeh believed that the answer to this question is often because they realize that most language learners taught through methods that emphasize mastery of grammar do not achieve an acceptable level of competency in the target language. Language learning in the classroom is usually based upon the belief that language is a system of wordings governed by a grammar and a lexicon. However, it is more productive to see language primarily as a meaning system.

Most learners working within a structure-based approach fail to attain a useable level of fluency and proficiency in foreign language (FL) even after years of instruction (Skehan, 1996: 44). In India, Prabhu (1987: 11) notes that the structure-based courses required "a good deal of remedial re-teaching which, in turn, led to similarly unsatisfactory results". American government language institutions found that with task-based instruction and authentic material, learners made far more rapid progress and were able to use their new foreign language in real-world circumstances with a reasonable level of efficiency after quite short courses. They were able to operate an effective meaning system, i.e. to express what they wanted to say, even though their grammar and lexicon were often far from perfect (Lever and Willis, 2004:13).

In recent years a number of researchers, syllabus designers and educational innovators have called for a move in language teaching toward task-based approaches to instruction (Prabhu, 1987; Nunan, 1989, Long and Crooks, 1991; Ellis, 2003).

Since the advent of communicative language teaching and the belief that language is best learned when it is being used to communicate messages, the communicative task has ascended to a position of prominence as a unit of organization in syllabus design. Nunn (2006:70), for example, proposed a task-based unitary framework because it "leads to

student-led holistic outcomes in the form of written reports, spoken presentations and substantial small-group conversations that lead to decision-making outcomes”. This interest in the task has been motivated to a considerable extent by the fact that ‘task’ is seen as a construct of equal importance to second language acquisition (SLA) researchers and to language teachers (Pica, 1997:50).

### 2.2 Defining Language Learning Tasks

In the literature, various definitions have been offered to define language learning tasks that differ quite widely in scope and formulation ( Bygate et al., 2001; Ellis, 2003; Shehadeh, 2005), up to a point where almost anything related to educational activity can now be called a ‘task’. Some of the differences in the available definitions arise from the fact that, as a concept, the word ‘task’ can be used for different purposes (Bygate et al., 2001:65). The definitions of ‘task’ that are most informative are listed .They emphasize that tasks are activities (‘things people do’) and that these activities are goal-directed

| Author                  | Definition   |
|-------------------------|--|
| Long(1985)              | A piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus examples of tasks include painting a fence, dressing a child, filling out a form.... In other words, by ‘task’ is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between. ‘Tasks’ are the things people will tell you they do if you ask them and they are not applied linguists. |
| Crookes (1986)          | A piece of work or activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course, at work, or used to elicit data for research   |
| Carroll (1993)          | Any activity in which a person engages, given an appropriate setting, in order to achieve a specifiable class of objectives.   |
| Bachman & Palmer (1996) | An activity that involves individuals in using language for the purpose of achieving a particular goal or objective in a particular situation.   |
| Bygate et al. (2001)    | An activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective.   |

Thus, there has been a multiplicity of definitions of task from different point of views as a “concept”. However, Bygate, Skehan and Swain identifies task as “ an activity which requires learners to use language with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective.” emphasizing the process aspect of task (cited in Liang & Ying, 2007:53) while Willis (1996) suggests that task is an activity involving the use of language but in which the focus is on the outcome of the activity rather than on the language used to achieve that outcome (cited in Seedhouse, 1999:338).

Clark et al., (1994) get together all the facets of task and summarize 5 key elements of tasks:

- A purpose, or underlying real-life justification for doing the task,
- A real, stimulated or imaginary context in which the task takes place,
- A process, of thinking and doing required in carrying out the task,
- A product or the result of thinking and doing that can be tangible or intangible.

A framework of knowledge, strategy and skill used in carrying out the task (cited in Careless, 2001:88)

### 2.3 Key Features of Tasks

A number of the definitions are presented in Table 2 to emphasize or suggest that there should be a close link between the tasks performed by learners in the language classroom and in the outside world. The things learners do with the target language in the classroom (i.e. the classroom tasks) should be related to, or derived from, what the learners are supposed to be able to do with the target language in the real world (target tasks). In this respect, a preliminary needs analysis for establishing course content in terms of the real-world target tasks that learners need to be able to perform constitutes a necessary step in designing a TBLT curriculum or syllabus (Long & Crookes, 1991:38).

In order to specify the kind of language use that classroom tasks should give rise to, the following definitions of classroom tasks are presented that emphasize the primacy of meaning, and i.e. the learner's attention should primarily be directed towards meaning

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Breen (1987)         | Any structured language learning endeavour which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. 'Task' is therefore assumed to refer to a range of workplans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision-making.  |
| Prabhu (1987)        | An activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process was regarded as a task.  |
| Candlin (1987)       | One of a set of differentiated, sequencable, problem- posing activities involving learners' cognitive and communicative procedures applied to existing and new knowledge in the collective exploration and pursuance of foreseen or emergent goals within a social milieu.  |
| Nunan (1989)         | A piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is primarily focused on meaning rather than form.   |
| Willis (1996)        | Activities where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome.  |
| Skehan (1998)        | An activity in which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• meaning is primary</li> <li>• there is some communication problem to solve</li> <li>• there is some sort of relationship to comparable real- world activities</li> <li>• task completion has some priority</li> <li>• the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome.</li> </ul>  |
| Lee (2000)           | (1) A classroom activity or exercise that has: (a) an objective obtainable only by the interaction among participants, (b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and (c) a focus on meaning exchange; (2) a language learning endeavor that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and/or produce the target language as they perform some set of workplans.  |
| Bygate et al. (2001) | An activity, susceptible to brief or extended pedagogic intervention, which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective.  |
| Ellis (2003)         | workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate prepositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes. |

## 2.4 Basic Assumptions of TBLT

Feez (1998: 17) summarizes the following basic assumptions of TBLT:

- The focus of instruction is on process rather than product.
- Basic elements are purposeful activities and tasks that emphasize communication and meaning.
- Learners learn language by interacting communicatively and purposefully while engaged in meaningful activities and tasks.
- Activities and tasks can be either those that learners might need to achieve in real life, or those that have a pedagogical purpose specific to the classroom.
- Activities and tasks of a task-based syllabus can be sequenced according to difficulty.
- The difficulty of a task depends on a range of factors including the previous experience of the learner, the complexity of the tasks, and the degree of support available. (Richards and Rodgers, 2001: 224).

## 2.5 Types of Tasks

Ellis (2003) classified tasks into the following types:

### 1. Unfocused Tasks

An unfocused task is one that encourages learners to use English freely without concentrating on just one or two specific forms (i.e., a replication activity).

### 2. Pedagogic (rehearsal, activation)

Pedagogical tasks have a psycholinguistic basis in SLA theory and research but do not necessarily reflect real-world tasks. For example, four students are given pictures and must describe them to the rest of the class. The other students ask the four students questions about their pictures, and a student then tries to tell a story.

### 3. Real-world tasks

Tasks are everywhere in everyday life. Washing our face is a task, as is preparing breakfast, going to work by car, etc. Tasks are a part of our lives to such an extent that there is hardly any activity that cannot be called a task.

### 4. Focused Tasks

A focused task (Ellis, 2003) is either a consciousness-raising activity that focuses on examining samples of language to explore particular features. These are sometimes called "meta-cognitive" activities.

Willis (1996: 149) listed the following types of tasks of TBLT:

1. Listing: Including a brainstorming and fact-finding, the outcome is a completed list or draft mind map. This type of task can help train students' comprehension and induction ability.
2. Ordering, sorting: Including sequencing, ranking and classifying, the outcome is a set of information ordered and sorted according to specific criteria. These types might foster comprehension, logic and reasoning ability.
3. Comparing: This type of task includes matching, finding similarities, or differences. The outcome can be appropriately matched or assembled items. This type of task enhances students' ability of differentiation.
4. Problem solving: This type of task includes analyzing real situations, reasoning, and decision-making. The outcome involves solutions to the problem, which can then be evaluated. These tasks help promote students' reasoning and decision-making abilities.
5. Sharing experience: These types of tasks include narrating, describing, exploring and explaining attitudes, opinions, and reactions. The outcome is usually social. These tasks help students to share and exchange their knowledge and experience.
6. Creative tasks: These include brainstorming, fact finding, ordering and sorting, comparing and many other activities. The outcome is an end product that can be appreciated by a wider audience. Students cultivate their comprehensive problem-solving abilities as well as their reasoning and analyzing abilities.

These tasks are listed from easy to difficult, and all of them reveal the recognition process of students. The tasks in TBLT should be applicable to real life to help students accomplish the tasks and show their communicative competence in classroom teaching and real life situations (Willis, 1996: 149).

Ellis (2003) asserts that the design of a task-based lesson involves consideration of the stages or components of a lesson that has a task as its principal component. Various designs have been proposed (for example, Prabhu, 1987; Skehan 1996). However, they all have in common three principal phases, these phases reflected the chronology of a task-based lesson. Thus the first phase is 'pre-task' and concerns the various activities that teachers and students can undertake before they start the task; such as whether students are given time to plan the performance of the task. The second phase, the 'during task' phase, centers on the task itself and affords various instructional options, including whether students are required to operate under time pressure. The final 'post-task' phase involves procedures for following up on the task performance.

### III. Methodology and Procedures

#### 3.1 Population and Sample Selection Procedures

The population of the present study consists of Iraqi Intermediate Schools EFL teachers (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> year classes) of the three General Directorates of Education in Baghdad Al-Rusafa. The First General Directorate in Al-Rusafa consists of (90) Intermediate Schools and (230) English Teachers, the Second General Directorates in Al-Rusafa consists of (100) Intermediate Schools and (380) English Teachers while the third General Directorate in Al-Rusafa comprises (70) Intermediate Schools and (280) English Teachers .See Table 1

**Table 1**  
**Population of the Study**

| General Directorate of Education | Number of Schools | Numbers of Teachers |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Al –Rusafa. 1                    | 90                | 230                 |
| Al –Rusafa.2                     | 100               | 380                 |
| Al –Rusafa.3                     | 70                | 280                 |
| Total                            | 260               | 890                 |

In order to achieve the aims of the study, 265 intermediate school Teachers of the ("1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>") year classes have been randomly chosen from the three mentioned directorates. This represents %30 of the whole population and (78) intermediate schools have been chosen randomly from the total number of those three directorates. See Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**Sample of the Study**

| General Directorate of Education | Number of Schools | Numbers of Teachers |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Al –Rusafa. 1                    | 27                | 69                  |
| Al –Rusafa.2                     | 30                | 112                 |
| Al –Rusafa.3                     | 21                | 84                  |
| Total                            | 78                | 265                 |

The sample includes variation in teaching experience (Inexperienced teachers : short period teaching experience which is less than 5 years) and (Experienced teachers: long period teaching experience which is more than 10 years); in gender; and in grades teachers teach:1<sup>st</sup>,2<sup>nd</sup>,3<sup>rd</sup> intermediate grades (See Table 3).

**Table 3**  
**Sample's Teaching Experience, Gender, and Grade they Teach**

| Sample | Experience    |             | Gender |        | Grade teachers teach |                 |     |
|--------|---------------|-------------|--------|--------|----------------------|-----------------|-----|
|        | Inexperienced | Experienced | Male   | Female | 1 <sup>st</sup>      | 2 <sup>nd</sup> | 3rd |

|       |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |
|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|
|       | 162 | 103 | 114 | 151 | 97  | 87 | 81 |
| Total | 265 |     | 265 |     | 265 |    |    |

### 3.2 Instrument of the study

The Instrument of the study consists of a closed questionnaire. A questionnaire is a means of gathering information for specific purposes and an attempt to elicit feelings, beliefs, experiences or activities of respondents. It may be structured or unstructured as the situation demands (Sax, 1979:244-246).

Wiersma (1969: 274) defines the questionnaire as a list of questions or statements to which the subject is asked to respond by a written response. A response may range from a check mark to an extensive written statement.

In order to construct the closed questionnaire, an open questionnaire which consists of five questions has been constructed first to check teachers' theoretical knowledge of TBLT. It also investigates their views on implementing the way they implement it and the constraints that hinder its application. This open questionnaire has been administered to (70) teachers who are asked to respond freely without mentioning their names.

Then a closed questionnaire has been constructed. This closed questionnaire has been developed relying on the following sources:

1. Related literature: they are sources, books, journals.
2. Consulting specialists in the field.
3. Reviewing the ready made checklists in the field .
4. Results of the open questionnaire.

However, the closed questionnaire in its initial form consists of (31) items distributed under (4) fields:

1. Theory level ---7 items;
2. Views on implementing TBLT----- 8 items;
3. Procedures for Implementing TBLT----10 items;
4. Constraints ---- 6 items.

### 3.3 Face Validity of the Questionnaire

In order to check the face validity of the closed questionnaire, its initial form is exposed to a number of jurors and experts specialist in ELT Methodology and Linguistics. The jurors are requested to check whether the items are clear and appropriate, and to notice the content of each item and whether the items fulfill or cover what they are intended to.

After collecting the responses and in the light of those experts' views some modifications have been made by using the percentage of their agreement, some items have been added.

Therefore, the final form of the questionnaire has been developed( see Appendix A) which consists of (53) items as the following:

- 1-Theory level ---16 items
- 2-Views on implementing TBLT----- 10 items
- 3-Procedures for Implementing TBLT----19 items
- 4- Constraints ---- 8 items.

### 3.4 Pilot Administration of the Questionnaire

Thirty teachers have randomly been selected from the three directorates in Al-Rusafa for the sake of conducting a pilot administration of the questionnaire. This sample of teachers is excluded later when choosing the main sample of the study. The pilot administration has been done in order to;

1. Check the clarity of the items.
2. Compute the reliability of the questionnaire.

Consequently, no serious ambiguity is found concerning the questionnaire items.

### 3.5 Reliability of the questionnaire

Reliability is determined when the same questionnaire is administered to the same pilot study after a period of time. The same pilot sample is asked to respond to the questionnaire after 10 days. The statistical manipulation of the data has been obtained from the two administrations. Reliability has been checked by using Person's Correlation Formula which is then corrected by applying Spearman-Brown Formula. It is found that the reliability of;

1. The first field (Theory Level) is (0.852);
2. The second field (Views on TBLT Implementation) is (0.777);
3. The third field (Procedures used on TBLT Implementation) is (0.860);
4. The fourth field, (Constraints that act against the application of TBLT) is (0.743); and,
5. The reliability coefficient of the total items of the questionnaire is (0.883).

Then Alpha Cronbach Formula 1 (Space saver) for the four fields and of the total of (53) items of the questionnaire is used to find out the external reliability coefficient. It is found that the external reliability of;

1. The first field (Theory Level) which consists of 16 items is (0.8378);
2. The second field (Views on TBLT Implementation) consists of 10 items is (0.7601);
3. The third field (Procedures used on TBLT Implementation) which consists of 19 items is (0.8531);
4. The fourth field (Constraints that act against the application of TBLT) Which consists of 8 items is (0.7501);

5. The reliability coefficient of the total items of the questionnaire which consists of 53 items is (0.8554) (See Table 4).

**Table 4**  
**Reliability Coefficient**

| No. | Fields of the Questionnaire            | Reliability Coefficient |                  |
|-----|--|-------------------------|------------------|
|     |  | Person's                | Alpha Cronbach1. |
| 1.  | Theory Level                           | 0.852                   | 78               |
| 2.  | Views on TBLT Implementation           | 0.777                   | 01               |
| 3.  | Procedures used on TBLT Implementation | 0.860                   | 31               |
|     | straints                               | 3                       | 01               |
|     | total Items of the Questionnaire       | 3                       | 54               |

### 3.6 Final Administration of the Questionnaire

After ensuring the reliability and validity, the closed questionnaire has been administered to the sample of teachers in the first of December to the end of January of 2010-2011. The aims of the questionnaire are explained to teachers.

### 3.7 Scoring Scheme

The scoring scheme comprises of five points likert scale, which was used to measure Iraqi EFL Intermediate school teachers' perceptions of TBLT. The scale consists of five points and each option is assigned marks as follows: strongly agree =5, agree =4, rarely agree =3, disagree=2, and strongly disagree=1.

## IV. Results

### 4.1 Results Related to the First Aim

Mean, standard deviation, and t- Test value are found for all of the four fields; Theory Level, Views on Implementing of TBLT in classroom, Procedures teachers employ in implementing TBLT, Constraints, as well as for the total (53) items that are included in the questionnaire (See Table 5).

**Table 5**  
**Mean, Standard Deviation, and t-test Values of the Four Fields and the Whole Items of the Questionnaire**

| Field  | Sample | Mean     | Standard Deviation | Theoretical Mean | T –test value |       | Level of Significance 0.05 | df  |
|--|--------|----------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|-------|----------------------------|-----|
|  |        |          |                    |                  | Calculated    | Table |                            |     |
| Theory level                                   | 265    | 54.8189  | 10.89539           | 48               | 10.188        | 1.96  | Not Sig                    | 264 |
| Views on Implementing of TBLT in Classroom     |        | 34.6113  | 6.92355            | 30               | 10.842        |       | Not Sig                    | 264 |
| Procedure Teacher Used in Implementing of TBLT |        | 71.5057  | 6.82249            | 57               | 34.611        |       | Not Sig                    | 264 |
| Constraints                                    |        | 31.8340  | 4.05301            | 24               | 31.465        |       | Not Sig                    | 264 |
| All Items of the Questionnaire                 |        | 192.7698 | 19.54239           | 159              | 28.130        |       | Not Sig                    | 264 |

The results shown in Table (9) indicate that Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers possess a satisfactory and a good level of perception of the TBLT at the four indicated fields as well as in general since all the mean scores are higher than the theoretical means. The calculated t-test values are higher than the table t-values at 0. 05 level of significance and under 264 degree of freedom. Thus, the first null hypothesis which states that Iraqi Intermediate school EFL teachers do not well perceive TBLT according to theory level, views and procedures of implementation, and the constraints that act against its successful application in Iraqi schools is rejected.

For the sake of a detailed description of the results, the items in each field are arranged according to their ranks. The results indicate the following:

#### 4.1.1 Theory Level.

The results shown in Table 6 reveal the teachers' responses that indicate their perception of the theory level of TBLT.

**Table 6**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation for the Theory Level**

| Rank | Theory Level Items  | N.  | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Theoretical Mean | No. of Item |
|------|---|-----|--------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1    | In TBLT, the priority is not the bits and pieces of language, but rather the functional purposes for which language must be used. | 265 | 3.9698 | 1.18347            | 3                | 11          |
| 2    | In TBLT, learners' abilities, needs and interests are important.  |     | 3.8226 | 1.19447            | 3                | 15          |
| 3    | Activities and tasks of a task-based syllabus are sequenced according to difficulty.  |     | 3.7887 | 1.27054            | 3                | 13          |
| 4    | A task should motivate learners to be engaged in language use.  |     | 3.7811 | 1.25122            | 3                | 16          |
| 5    | TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.  |     | 3.7434 | 1.16214            | 3                | 1           |
| 6    | A Task involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing and interacting in the target language.                        |     | 3.6528 | 1. 2969            | 3                | 8           |
| 7    | A Task involves a non-linguistic product as outcome.  |     | 3.6453 | 1.2772             | 3                | 12          |
| 8    | A task is any activity in which   |     | 3.5660 | 1.28872            | 3                | 4           |

|    |  |        |          |   |  |    |
|----|--|--------|----------|---|--|----|
|    | the target language is used by the learner.  |        |          |   |  |    |
| 9  | TBLT offers the opportunity for natural learning inside classroom.   | 3.5170 | 1.28533  | 3 |  | 14 |
| 10 | A Task includes a particular objective, an appropriate content, a specified working procedures and a range of outcomes.  | 3.4340 | 1.34713  | 3 |  | 9  |
| 11 | TBLT focuses on whole set of real-world tasks.   | 3.2981 | 1.35882  | 3 |  | 10 |
| 12 | TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.  | 3.2302 | 1.349765 | 3 |  | 6  |
| 13 | A Task is an activity which requires learners to arrive at an out come from given information through some process of thought, and which allows learners to control and regulate that process. | 2.9472 | 1.41590  | 3 |  | 7  |
| 14 | A task has a clearly defined outcome.  | 2.8820 | 1.39991  | 3 |  | 3  |
| 15 | TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post task.  | 2.8226 | 1.32096  | 3 |  | 5  |
| 16 | A task involves a primary focus on meaning.  | 2.7170 | 1.29359  | 3 |  | 2  |

Table 6, shows that the items no. (11, 15, 13, 16, 1, 8, 12, 4, 14, 9, 10, 6) that occupy the ranks (1- 12) respectively are found to be well perceived since their mean scores are higher than the theoretical mean (3).

While items (7, 3, 5, 2) yield ranks (13-16) respectively since their mean scores are below the theoretical mean (3). This indicates that Iraqi EFL teachers do not grasp well that a task is an activity which requires learners to arrive at an out come from given information through some process of thought, and which allows learners to control and regulate that process. They do not perceive well that a task has a clearly defined outcome and a task involves a primary focus on meaning. They also do not recognize well that the TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post task

#### 4.1.2 Views on TBLT Implementation

The results illustrated in Table 7 show the teachers' responses that indicate their perception concerning their views on TBLT implementation.

**Table 7**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Views on TBLT Implementation**

| Rank | Views on TBLT Implementation  | Sample | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Theoretical Mean | No. of Item |
|------|---|--------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1    | TBLT offers an innovative way to language learning and completely changes teachers' roles in language teaching. | 265    | 3.7698 | 1.25674            | 3                | 22          |
| 2    | TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.  |        | 3.6868 | 1.22630            | 3                | 18          |
| 3    | It is widely applicable as it is suitable for learners of all ages and backgrounds.                             |        | 3.6491 | 1.32053            | 3                | 25          |
| 4    | TBLT can promote the learners creativity and ability of doing   |        |        |                    |                  |             |

|    |   |  |        |         |   |    |
|----|---|--|--------|---------|---|----|
|    | things.   |  | 3.6377 | 1.22972 | 3 | 21 |
| 5  | I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.  |  | 3.5472 | 1.29343 | 3 | 17 |
| 6  | TBLT improves learners' interaction skills.   |  | 3.5170 | 1.22501 | 3 | 23 |
| 7  | TBLT emphasizes the cultivations of the students' integrated ability of using the language  |  | 3.5094 | 1.28250 | 3 | 20 |
| 8  | The Pre-task activities are important because they give a chance to introduce new language and push learners to interpret tasks in more demanding ways. |  | 3.4302 | 1.24462 | 3 | 19 |
| 9  | TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment.  |  | 2.9660 | 1.43111 | 3 | 24 |
| 10 | TBLT requires resources beyond the textbooks.   |  | 2.8981 | 1.46195 | 3 | 26 |

As shown in Table 7, the items no. (22, 18, 25, 21, 17, 23, 20, 19) that occupy the ranks (1- 8) respectively are found to be well perceived since their mean scores are higher than the theoretical mean (3).

While items (24 and 26) yield ranks (9 and 10) respectively since their mean scores are below the theoretical mean (3). This indicates that Iraqi EFL Teachers do not grasp well that TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment as well as it requires resources beyond the textbooks.

#### 4.1.3 Procedures Used for TBLT Implementation

The results indicated in Table 8 show the teachers' perception regarding the procedures used for implementing TBLT.

**Table 8**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of the Procedures Used on TBLT Implementation**

| Rank | Procedures Used on TBLT Implementation  | Sample | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Theoretical Mean | No. of Item |
|------|---|--------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1    | In task cycle phase, learners work in pairs or groups and use whatever linguistic resources they possess to achieve the task.   | 265    | 4.1962 | 1.20886            | 3                | 38          |
| 2    | In pre-task phase, the teacher, helps the learners to recall some language that may be useful for the task.   |        | 4.0981 | 1.13058            | 3                | 33          |
| 3    | In pre-task phase, the teacher instructs the learners to do the task and be sure that all the learners understand the task instruction.   |        | 3.9811 | 1.23231            | 3                | 34          |
| 4    | Post task phase contains also practice stage in which the teacher conducts practice of the new words, phrases, or patterns which occurred in the analysis activity, the task text or, the report phase. |        | 3.9585 | 1.15231            | 3                | 44          |
| 5    | In task phase cycle, learners work with the teacher to improve their language while planning the reports of the task  |        | 3.9509 | 1.29446            | 3                | 40          |
| 6    | In pre-task phase, the teacher introduces the topic and gives the learners clear instruction on what they will have to do.  |        | 3.9472 | 1.17625            | 3                | 32          |
| 7    | In post phase task, some of the specific  |        | 3.9420 | 1.20488            |                  | 43          |

|    |  |  |        |         |   |    |
|----|--|--|--------|---------|---|----|
|    | features of the language, which occurred naturally during the task, are identified and analyzed.   |  |        |         | 3 |    |
| 8  | In task cycle phase, the learners present spoken or written reports of the work done in the task.  |  | 3.9245 | 1.32071 | 3 | 39 |
| 9  | In reporting stage, the learners have to conclude and make inferences  |  | 3.8113 | 1.25615 | 3 | 37 |
| 10 | Teacher's role in post task phase is a language guide.   |  | 3.8000 | 1.30616 | 3 | 45 |
| 11 | In planning stage, the learners have to make decision, agreeing, suggesting.   |  | 3.7811 | 1.33045 | 3 | 36 |
| 12 | In pre-task phase, the teacher's role is an instructor   |  | 3.7434 | 1.20377 | 3 | 31 |
| 13 | The teacher's role in planning stage is that of language adviser, helping learners shape their meaning and express more exactly what they want to say.   |  | 3.7245 | 1.30106 | 3 | 42 |
| 14 | In pre-task phase ,the teacher activates topic- related words, phrases and target sentences that will be useful in carrying out the task and in the real world.                                  |  | 3.5811 | 1.32931 | 3 | 28 |
| 15 | In pre-task phase, the teacher introduces and creates interest in doing a task on the chosen topic.  |  | 3.1623 | 1.30271 | 3 | 27 |
| 16 | In pre-task phase ,,the teacher devises enabling tasks to help students communicate as smoothly as possible.   |  | 3.1660 | 1.37716 | 3 | 29 |
| 17 | In pre-task phase, the teacher exposes learners to language in use by having them listen to a recording of other people doing the task, or by having them read a text related to the task topic. |  | 3.0113 | 1.38849 | 3 | 30 |
| 18 | Task cycle includes three stages: task, planning and reporting.  |  | 2.8717 | 1.15411 | 3 | 35 |
| 19 | The teachers, in task cycle, just monitor the learners' activities and encourage them.   |  | 2.8491 | 1.26426 | 3 | 41 |

Table 8, shows that the items no. (38, 33, 34, 44, 40, 32, 43, 39, 37, 45, 36, 31, 42, 28, 27, 29, 30) that occupy the ranks from (1-17) respectively are found to be well perceived because their mean scores are higher than the theoretical mean (3).

While the items no. (35, 41) yield ranks (18-19) respectively since their mean scores are found to be below the theoretical mean (3). This indicates that Iraqi EFL teachers do not know very well that a Task cycle includes three stages: task, planning and reporting and the teachers in task cycle just monitor the learners' activities and encourage them.

#### 4.1.4 Constraints

The results shown in Table 9 indicate teachers' perceptions about the Constraints that act against the application of TBLT

**Table 9**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of the Constraints**

| Rank | Constraints  | Sample | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Theoretical Mean | No. of Item |
|------|--|--------|--------|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 1    | Materials in textbooks are not proper for using TBLT.                              | 265    | 4.4189 | 0.90140            | 3                | 46          |
| 2    | I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance                    |        | 4.1019 | 1.00047            | 3                | 48          |
| 3    | I don't have enough time to implement TBLT   |        | 4.0566 | 1.22807            | 3                | 52          |
| 4    | Large class size is an obstacle to use TBLT  |        | 3.9811 | 1.10252            | 3                | 47          |
| 5    | I don't have enough resources to implement TBLT.                                   |        | 3.9472 | 1.24812            | 3                | 53          |
| 6    | I have difficulty in designing tasks that correspond with the classroom materials. |        | 3.8604 | 1.30534            | 3                | 50          |
| 7    | It is difficult to ensure the systematization and sequence of tasks.               |        | 3.7962 | 1.27772            | 3                | 51          |
| 8    | I have limited target language proficiency.  |        | 3.6717 | 1.25293            | 3                | 49          |

Table 9, shows that the items no. (46, 48, 52, 47, 53, 50, 51, 49) that occupy the ranks from (1-8) respectively are found to be well perceived because all of the teachers seem to be agree on the main constraints that act against their application of TBLT in their classrooms.

#### 4.2 Results Related to the Second Aim

##### 4.2.1 Verifying the Second Null Hypothesis

Mean, standard deviation and T- values for two independent samples are found for all the four fields: Theory Level, Views of Implementing, Procedure for Implementing, Constraints as well as all the 53 Items of the Questionnaire (See Table 10).

**Table 10**  
**T-test Values of Two Samples**

| Field                                      | Gender | Number | Mean     | Standard Deviation | T –test value |         | Level of Significance <b>0.005</b> | df  |
|--|--------|--------|----------|--------------------|---------------|---------|------------------------------------|-----|
|  |        |        |          |                    | Calculated    | Table   |                                    |     |
| Theory Level                               | Male   | 114    | 54.122   | 10.88957           | 0.903         | 1.96    | Not Sig                            | 263 |
|  | Female | 151    | 55.3444  | 10.90630           |               |         |                                    |     |
| Views on Implementing TBLT in Classroom    | Male   | 114    | 34.4474  | 7.38462            | 0.334         |         | Not Sig                            | 263 |
|  | Female | 151    | 34.7351  | 6.57642            |               |         |                                    |     |
| Procedure Teacher Use in Implementing TBLT | Male   | 114    | 71.5157  | 6.90034            | 0.025         |         | Not Sig                            | 263 |
|  | Female | 151    | 71.4967  | 6.78614            |               |         |                                    |     |
| Constraints                                | Male   | 114    | 32.0439  | 3.56579            | 0.732         | Not Sig | 263                                |     |
|  | Female | 151    | 31.6755  | 4.39022            |               |         |                                    |     |
| All items of the questionnaire             | Male   | 114    | 192.1316 | 19.27560           | 0.461         | Not Sig | 263                                |     |
|  | Female | 151    | 193.2517 | 19.79165           |               |         |                                    |     |

As shown in Table 10, it is found that the calculated t-values for each field and for the whole items are below the table t-value 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and under 263 degree of freedom. This reveals that there is no statistical significant difference between male and female intermediate school teachers' perception of the TBLT with respect to the four fields as well as their whole perception of the overall items. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that there is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi intermediate school teachers according to their gender is accepted.

**5. 2.2 Verifying the Third Hypothesis**

In order to identify the statistical difference among Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers' perception of TBLT according to their teaching experience. Mean, standard deviation and t-test value of two independent samples are found for all the four fields: Theory Level, Views of Implementing, Procedure of Implementing, Constraints as well as all the 53 Items of the Questionnaire (See Table 11).

Table 11

Mean, Standard Deviation, and t –test Value of Two Samples According to Teaching Experience

| Field  | Year of Teaching Experience | No. | Mean     | Standard Deviation | T –test Values |       | Level of Significance 0.05 | df      |                                |
|--|-----------------------------|-----|----------|--------------------|----------------|-------|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
|  |                             |     |          |                    | Calculated     | Table |                            |         |                                |
| Theory Level                                   | Inexperience                | 162 | 55.6049  | 11.17026           | 1.476          | 1.96  | Not Sig                    | 263     |                                |
|  | d Experienced               | 103 | 53.5825  | 10.38147           |                |       |                            |         |                                |
| Views on Implementing of TBLT in Classroom     | Inexperience                | 162 | 35.1852  | 7.46106            | 1.698          |       | 1.96                       | Sig Not | 263                            |
|  | Experienced                 | 103 | 33.7087  | 5.90386            |                |       |                            |         |                                |
| Procedure Teacher Used in Implementing of TBLT | Inexperience                | 162 | 72.3148  | 7.1681             | 2.444          |       |                            | 1.96    | Sign in favor of Inexperienced |
|  | Experience                  | 103 | 70.2330  | 6.33107            |                |       |                            |         |                                |
| Constraints                                    | Inexperience                | 162 | 31.8580  | 3.94507            | 0.121          | 1.96  |                            |         | Not Sig                        |
|  | Experience                  | 103 | 31.7961  | 4.23653            |                |       |                            |         |                                |
| All items of the questionnaire                 | Inexperience                | 162 | 194.9630 | 20.64425           | 2.310          |       | 1.96                       |         | Sign in favor of Inexperienced |
|  | Experience                  | 103 | 189.3204 | 17.20762           |                |       |                            |         |                                |

The results shown in Table 11 indicate that there is no statistical significant difference between the perceptions of Inexperienced Teachers and experienced Teachers with respect to the fields of Theory Level, Views on Implementing of TBLT in classroom, and the Constraints. The calculated t-test values of the above fields are found to be less than the table t- value at 0. 05 level of significance and under 263 degree of freedom.

While it has be found that there is statistical significant differences in the perception of Inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers with respect to the procedures teachers use in implementing TBLT and their over all perception of the whole 53 Items. That is because the calculated t-values of the Procedure field and the over all perceptions are found to be higher than the table t- value and in favor of the inexperienced teachers. Thus, the third null hypothesis is rejected.

**4.2.3 Verifying the Fourth Hypothesis**

In order to find out the statistical difference among Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers' perception of TBLT according to the grade they teach and with respect to the four fields: theory level, views of implementing, procedure of implementing and constraints. Mean and standard deviation have been found to determine the significance difference and one-way analysis of variance is used to trace the differences for each field.

#### 4.2.3.1 Theory Level

In order to find out the statistical difference among teachers' perceptions of the theory level according to the grade they teach. Mean and standard deviation are found (See Table 12).

**Table 12**

#### Mean and Standard Deviation of the Theory Level for the Grade Teachers Teach

| No. | Grade of Teaching | Number | Mean    | Standard Deviation |
|-----|-------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| 1   | 1 <sup>st</sup>   | 97     | 55.0619 | 10.81936           |
| 2   | 2 <sup>nd</sup>   | 87     | 54.8161 | 11.32247           |
| 3   | 3 <sup>rd</sup>   | 81     | 54.5309 | 10.64435           |

In order to compare the teachers' perception of the theory level according to different grade they teach, one way-analysis is used (See Table 13).

**Table 13**

#### F-Ratio for the Difference among Teachers of the Grade Teachers Teach in the Field of the Theory Level

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F*Ratio | Level of Significance 0.05 |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Between groups     | 12.446         | 2   | 6.223       | 0.052   | Not Sig                    |
| Within groups      | 31326.859      | 262 | 119.568     |         | Not Sig                    |
| Total              | 31339.306      | 264 |             |         |                            |

As indicated in Table 13, the result has revealed that there is no statistical significant difference in teachers' perception of this field according to the grade they teach as the calculated f-ratio (0.052) is less than the table f-ratio (3.04) at 0.05 level of significance and under 2, 262 degree of freedom.

#### 4.2.3.2 Views of Implementing

In order to find out the statistical difference among teachers' perception of the views of implementing TBLT according to the grade they teach. Mean and standard deviation are found (See Table 14).

**Table 14**

#### Mean and Standard Deviation of Views of Implementing

| No. | Classes of teaching | Number | Mean    | Standard deviation |
|-----|---------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| 1   | 1 <sup>st</sup>     | 97     | 34.9588 | 6.77298            |
| 2   | 2 <sup>nd</sup>     | 87     | 34.2184 | 6.79676            |
| 3   | 3 <sup>rd</sup>     | 81     | 34.6173 | 7.29138            |

In order to compare the teachers' perception of the views of implementing according to different grades they teach, one way-analysis is used (See Table 15).

**Table 15**

#### F-Ratio for the Difference among Teachers of the Grade Teachers Teach in the Field of the Views of Implementing

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df  | Square Mean | F *   | Level of Significance 0.05 |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|----------------------------|
| Between groups     | 25.145         | 2   | 12.572      | 0.261 | Not Sig                    |
| Within groups      | 12629.821      | 262 | 48.205      |       | Not Sig                    |
| Total              | 12654.966      | 264 |             |       |                            |

As indicated in Table 15, the result has revealed that there is no statistical significant difference in teachers' perception of this field according to the grade they teach as the calculated f-ratio (0.261) is less than the table f-ratio (3.04) at 0.05 level of significance and under 2, 262 degree of freedom.

#### 4.2.3.3 Procedures of Implementing

The results indicated in Tables 16 and 17 have revealed that there is no statistical significant difference in teachers' perception of this field according to the grade they teach as the

calculated f-ratio (0.906) is less than the table f-ratio (3.04) at 0.05 level of significance and under 2, 262 degree of freedom.

**Table 16**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Procedures of Implementing**

| No. | Classes of teaching | Number | Mean    | Standard deviation |
|-----|---------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| 1   | 1 <sup>st</sup>     | 97     | 72.0206 | 6.98209            |
| 2   | 2 <sup>nd</sup>     | 87     | 71.7011 | 6.80990            |
| 3   | 3 <sup>rd</sup>     | 81     | 70.6790 | 6.64798            |

**Table 17**  
**F-Ratio for the Difference among Teachers of the Grade Teachers' Teach in the Field Procedures of Implementing**

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df  | Square Mean | F *   | Level of Significance 0.05 |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|----------------------------|
| Between groups     | 84.399         | 2   | 42.199      | 0.906 | Not Sig                    |
| Within groups      | 12203.843      | 262 | 46.580      | 0.906 | Not Sig                    |
| Total              | 12288.242      | 264 |             |       |                            |

#### 4.2.3.4 The Constraints

The results indicated in Tables 18 and 19 have revealed that there is no statistical significant difference in teachers' perception of this field according to the grade they teach as the calculated f-ratio (1.392) is less than the table f-ratio (3.04) at 0.05 level of significance and under 2, 262 degree of freedom.

**Table 18**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Constraints**

| No. | Classes of teaching | Number | Mean    | Standard deviation |
|-----|---------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|
| 1   | 1 <sup>st</sup>     | 97     | 31.4021 | 4.19737            |
| 2   | 2 <sup>nd</sup>     | 87     | 32.3908 | 3.74587            |
| 3   | 3 <sup>rd</sup>     | 81     | 31.7531 | 4.17292            |

**Table 19**  
**F-Ratio for the Difference among Teachers of the Grade Teachers' Teach in the Field of the constraints**

| Source of Variance | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F*Ratio | Level of Significance 0.05 |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Between groups     | 45.600         | 2   | 22.800      | 1.392   | Not Sig                    |
| Within groups      | 4291.094       | 262 | 16.378      |         | Not Sig                    |
| Total              | 4336.694       | 264 |             |         |                            |

However, all the above results related to the fourth hypothesis have indicated that there is no statistical significant difference in the perception of Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers according to the grade they teach. Thus, the fourth null hypothesis is accepted.

## V. Findings and Conclusions

### 5.1 Findings

The findings show that:

- 1-The majority of teachers have satisfactory and a good level in the fields of theoretical knowledge, views of implementing, procedures of implementing, and the constraints.
- 2- There is no statistical significant difference between male and female intermediate school teachers' perception in the four fields as well as the overall 53 items.

3- There is no statistical significant difference between the perception of inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers with respect to the fields of theory level, views on implementing, and the constraints.

4- There is statistical significant differences in the perception of inexperienced teachers and experienced teachers with respect to the procedures teacher used in implementing TBLT; and

5- There is no statistical difference in the perceptions of Iraqi Intermediate School EFL Teachers according to the grade teachers teach and with respect to the four fields.

## 5.2 Conclusions

The current study aims to paint a general picture of EFL teachers' TBLT perception within the sample of 265 intermediate school teachers under the dimension of some variables as; gender, experience and school grade. The overall findings of this study reveal that EFL teachers have well perceived of TBLT due to a higher level of understanding of tasks and TBLT concepts

The gender variable resulted with no difference in perception between females and males. The school grade variable also resulted with no difference in understanding between those who teach the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> grades. While teaching experience variable resulted in significant differences between the perception of experienced and inexperienced teachers and in favour of inexperienced teachers. This can be due to the fact that newly graduated teachers are well versed in the latest and modern activities and methods of teaching. They possess up-to-date knowledge that could be brought to the task of teaching.

However, Iraqi intermediate school EFL teachers believe that task-based learning benefits learners' communication skills and interaction. Accordingly, language tasks can be used in communicative approach to arouse learners' motivation for learning a foreign language. These tasks don't just give variety to the language teaching methodology but also make the classroom much more fun and interesting; besides, they can produce a lively atmosphere in the classroom which gives language instruction more creativity.

Concerning the findings of this study, using flexible and interactive teaching tasks in English classes have many positive results, such as TBLT encourages learners' academic progress; improves learners' interaction skills; encourages learners' inherent motivation; creates a collaborative learning environment; and is suitable for small group work.

Language tasks are tools of communicative approach in language teaching which can increase students' use of target language by providing collaborative as well as competitive problem solving tasks as mentioned by teachers who took part in this study.

## References

1. Breen, M. P. (1987). "Learner contributions to task design". In C. N. Candlin and D. Murphy (Eds.). *Language Learning Tasks*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
2. Bygate, M. (1996). Effects of task repetition: appraising the developing language of learners.
3. In J. Williams and D. Willis (Eds), *Challenge and Change in language teaching*. London: Heinemann,
4. -----; Skehan, P.; and Swain. M. (Ed.). (2001). *Researching pedagogical tasks in second language learning, teaching, and testing*. New York: Newbury House.
5. Candlin, C. (1987). *Language Learning Tasks*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall International.
6. Carless, D. V., (2001). *Factors in the Implementation of Task-Based Teaching in Primary School*. Hong Kong: English department, Hong Kong Institute for Education.
7. Clark, J., Scarino, A., Brownell, J., 1994. *Improving the Quality of Learning: A Framework for Target-Oriented Curriculum Renewal*. Institute of Language in Education, Hong Kong.
8. Crookes, G. (1986). *Task classification: a cross-disciplinary review*. Honolulu: university of Hawaii at Manoa, social Science Research Institute, Center for second Language Classroom Research.
9. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

11. Feez, S. (1998). *Text-Based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Center for English Teaching and Research.
12. Halliday, M. K. (1975). *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
13. Liang, L., & Ying, G. (2007). "Managing tasks and task sequences for balanced or improved language production in language classrooms". *US-China Foreign Language*, 5(5), 56-61.
14. Leaver, B. L. and Willis, J. (2004). *Task-Based Instructions in Foreign Language Education: Practices and Programs*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
15. Long, M.H. (1985). "A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching". In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language development*. England: Multilingual Matters.
16. ----- and Crooks, G. (1991). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56.
17. Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
18. Nunn, R. (2006). Designing holistic units for task-based teaching. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(3), 69-93.
19. Pica, T. (1997). Second language teaching and research relationships: A North American view. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 48-72.
20. Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
21. Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
22. Sax, Gilbert. (1979). *Foundation of Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
23. Seedhouse, P. (1999). Combining meaning and form. *ELT Journal* 51, 336-344.
24. Shehadeh, A. (2005). Task-based language learning and teaching: Theories and applications. In Edwards, C and J. Willis (Eds). *Macmillan*.
25. Skehan, P., (1996). 'A framework for the implementation of Task-based instruction \ *Applied Linguistics*, 1996, 17/1:38-62.
26. ----- (1998). *A cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: O.U.P.
27. Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.
28. Willis, D. and Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford: O.U.P.
29. -Wiersma, William. (1969). *Research Methods in Education*. USA: Cornell University.

## Appendix A

### The Final Form of the Questionnaire

| 2. Views on Implementation |   |                |       |              |           |                   |
|----------------------------|---|----------------|-------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 17.                        | I have interest in implementing TBLT in the classroom.  | Strongly agree | agree | Rarely agree | Dis agree | Strongly disagree |
| 18.                        | TBLT provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language use.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 19.                        | The Pre-task activities are important because they give a chance to introduce new language and push learners to interpret tasks in more demanding ways. |                |       |              |           |                   |

| No. | Questionnaire Items  | Strongly agree | agree | Rarely agree | Dis agree | Strongly disagree |
|-----|--|----------------|-------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1.  | <b>Theory level</b>  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 1.  | TBLT is consistent with the principles of communicative language teaching.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 2.  | A task involves a primary focus on meaning.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 3.  | A task has a clearly defined outcome.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 4.  | A task is any activity in which the target language is used by the learner.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 5.  | TBLT includes three stages: pre-task, task implementation, and post task.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 6.  | TBLT is based on the student-centered instructional approach.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 7.  | A Task is an activity which requires learners to arrive at an out come from given information through some process of thought, and which allows learners to control and regulate that process. |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 8.  | A Task involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing and interacting in the target language.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 9.  | A Task includes a particular objective, an appropriate content, a specified working procedures and a range of outcomes.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 10. | TBLT focuses on whole set of real-world tasks.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 11. | In TBLT, the priority is not the bits and pieces of language, but rather the functional purposes for which language must be used.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 12. | A Task involves a non-linguistic product as outcome.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 13. | Activities and tasks of a task-based syllabus a-e sequenced according to difficulty.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 14. | TBLT offers the opportunity for natural learning inside classroom.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 15. | In TBLT, learners' abilities, needs and interests are important.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 16. | A task should motivate learners to be engaged in language use.   |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 20. | TBLT emphasizes the cultivations of the students' integrated ability of using the language.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 21. | TBLT can promote the learners creativity and ability of doing things.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 22. | TBLT offers an innovative way to language learning and completely changes teachers' roles in language teaching.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 23. | TBLT improves learners' interaction skills.  |                |       |              |           |                   |
| 24. | TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment.   |                |       |              |           |                   |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 25   | It is widely applicable as it is suitable for learners of all ages and backgrounds.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 26   | TBLT requires resources beyond the text books.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>3. Procedures for implementation</b>              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>3.1 pre- task: in pre-task phase the teacher,</b> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27   | Introduces and creates interest in doing a task on the chosen topic.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28   | Activates topic- related words, phrases and target sentences that will be useful in carrying out the task and in the real world.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29   | Devises enabling tasks to help students communicate as smoothly as possible.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30   | Exposes learners to language in use by having them listen to a recording of other people doing the task, or by having them read a text related to the task topic.                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 31   | Role is an instructor  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32   | Introduces the topic and gives the learners clear instruction on what they will have to do.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33   | Helps the learners to recall some language that may be useful for the task.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34   | Instructs the learners to do the task and be sure that all the learners understand the task instruction.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>3.2 task cycle (task implementation)</b>          |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35   | Task cycle includes three stages: task, planning and reporting.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36   | In planning stage, the learners have to decision-maker, agreeing, suggesting.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37   | In reporting stage, the learners have to conclude and make inferences.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38   | In task cycle phase, learners work in pairs or groups and use whatever linguistic resources they possess to achieve the task.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39   | In task cycle phase, the learners present spoken or written reports of the work done in the task.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40   | Learners work with the teacher to improve their language while planning the reports of the task.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41   | The teachers ,in task cycle,just monitor the learners' activities and encourage them.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 42   | The teacher's role in planning stage is that of language adviser, helping learners shape their meaning and express more exactly what they want to say.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>3.3 post-task</b>                                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 43   | In this phase, some of the specific features of the language, which occurred naturally during the task, are identified and analyzed.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 44   | This phase contains also practice stage in which the teacher conducts practice of the new words, phrases, or patterns which occurred in the analysis activity, the task text or, the report phase. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 45   | Teacher's role in this phase is a language guide.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>4. Constraints</b>                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 46   | Materials in textbooks are not proper for using TBLT.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 47   | Large class size is an obstacle to use TBLT.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48   | I have difficulty in assessing learners' task-based performance.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 49   | I have limited target language proficiency.  |  |  |  |  |  |

|    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 50 | I have difficulty in designing tasks that correspond with the classroom materials. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | It is difficult to ensure the systematization and sequence of tasks.               |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 | I don't have enough time to implement TBLT.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53 | I don't have enough resources to implement TBLT.                                   |  |  |  |  |  |