

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING IN ENGLISH CLASSROOM

Erwin Pohan⁽¹⁾, Emilia Andhini⁽²⁾, Evi Nopitasari⁽³⁾, Yoke Levana⁽⁴⁾

English Education Department
Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji, Tanjungpinang – Riau Archipelago Province
E-mail: erwinphn@umrah.ac.id / epohan08@yahoo.com

Abstract

It is true that task-based language teaching (TBLT) is one of an effective language teaching approach to improve teachers and learners' communication competence. This is in line with the educational policy of Indonesia involved in the "Kurikulum 2013", that is, enhancing teachers' communication competence. But, the studies of TBLT in Indonesian context are very limited. The purpose of the study is to find out how the state junior, senior, and vocational high schools teachers in Tanjungpinang, Riau Archipelago Province know well about the TBLT in English classroom practice. In this case, the focuses are on their perceptions of (1) understandings of TBLT, (2) views of implementation TBLT, and (3) reasons to use or avoid implementing TBLT in their English classroom. This is conducted in descriptive qualitative approach. All the EFL teachers of those schools are as the research subjects (55 teachers of 23 schools). Survey method, four sections questionnaire – research instrument (adapted from Jeon and Hahn, 2006) is used to collect data. such as general and demograhic information, teachers' understandings of TBLT, teachers' views on implementing TBLT, and reasons of using or not using TBLT. All the teachers are asked to fill in the questionnaire. Data analysis conducted through interpretation of each items to see the quality of their perceptions and Likert-scale to see their perceptions' quantity. The results showed that most of the teachers had good understandings and positive attitudes/views of TBLT. Classroom observation and deepen interview of these are suggested for future research.

Keywords: *understandings of TBLT, implementing of TBLT, reasons for using TBLT*

1. INTRODUCTION

There is no claim found that a certain teaching approach or method is the best one. But, it has a closed relationship with another teaching approach; supports, and completes each other to carry out good learning and teaching goal, planning, procedure, and outcome. For example, Task-based language teaching (TBLT), as the teaching approach, works based on the constructivist learning theory and communicative language teaching (CLT) (Farrel and Jacob, 2010.p. 60; Ellis, 2003). In other words, the existence of TBLT is not alone but derived from another theory.

Based on the research findings, TBLT is one of a new and an effective language teaching approach. Over the last two decades, the advent of communicative language teaching (CLT) approach has produced the term task-based language teaching (TBLT) as a new teaching approach (Jeon and Hahn, 2006; Izadpanah, 2010, p. 47) and enable to improve teachers' and learners' motivation and communication competence on an actual language use (Le, 2014, p. 108; Ellis, 2004; Nunan, 2004). In relation to classroom practice, TBLT is compatible with a learner-centered educational philosophy (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2005; Richards & Rodgers, 2001); it consists of particular components such as goal, procedure, specific outcome (Murphy, 2003;

Nunan, 2004; Skehan, 1998); it advocates content-oriented meaningful activities rather than linguistic forms (Beglar & Hunt, 2002; Carless, 2002; Littlewood, 2004).

Teacher, as a main actor for a successful of implementing TBLT, needs to have a good perception of TBLT conceptually. Jeon and Hahn (2006) states that having a sufficient knowledge about the instructional framework in relation to its plan, procedure, and assessment are very important for teacher who wants to implement TBLT successfully. This is in line to Branden (2006) in Calvert and Sheen (2014,p. 2) state that:

“essential for the success of task-based instruction is the ability of teachers to design and implement language learning tasks at an appropriate level of difficulty so that students can engage with and learn effectively from the materials provided.”

In fact, the studies of TBLT have increased from various perspectives such as understandings, views and reasons to use or avoid implementing TBLT (Jeon and Hahn, 2006; Bernard and Viet, 2010; Hadi and Tabatabaei, 2011; Le, 2014; Douglas, S. R. & Kim, Marcia, 2014; Lin and Wu, 2012, p. 586). But, in EFL countries, an accessibility of students to use English as the target language in the daily life are very limited. So, it is necessary for them “to be provided with real opportunities to be exposed to language use in the classroom” (Jean and Hahn, 2006).

Specifically, In Indonesia generally and Tanjungpinang city, Riau Archipelago Province particularly, the TBLT has not yet been researched sufficiently or proven empirically (Hutagalung and Purwati, 2014; Lukman and Kurniasih, 2014). In other words, they had investigated the TBLT in EFL context but not in EFL teachers’ perceptions. Meanwhile, teachers’ perception of language teaching process has a great impact on what they actually do in practice. Therefore, this study’s aim is to explore Bintan EFL teachers’ perspectives of task-based instruction based on investigating their understandings of TBLT concepts, positions on TBLT implementation, and reasons they choose, or avoid, implementing TBLT in the classroom.

The most research question is how do the state junior, senior, and vocational high schools teachers in Tanjungpinang, Riau Archipelago Province know well about the task-based language teaching (TBLT) in their English classroom? In relation to the recent research question, there are three research questions to be examined:

1. According to the state junior, senior, and vocational schools teachers in Tanjungpinang, how are their understandings of TBLT in English classroom?
2. How are the teachers’ views of implementation TBLT in English classroom at the state junior, senior, and vocational schools in Tanjungpinang?
3. What are the teachers’ reasons to use or avoid implementing TBLT in their English classroom at the state junior, senior, and vocational schools in Tanjungpinang?

To find out how the state junior, senior, and vocational high schools teachers in Tanjungpinang, Riau Archipelago Province know well about the task-based language teaching (TBLT) in their English classroom is the objective of the study. Then, seeing the teachers’ understandings of TBLT, views of implementation TBLT, reasons to use or avoid implementing TBLT in their English classroom at the state junior, senior, and vocational high schools in Tanjungpinang, Riau Archipelago Province. And, Significances of the study are (1) to strengthen the spreading out of applying the TBLT theory in different participants, settings, and activities or context; (2) to enhance the EFL teachers’ insights of TBLT in Tanjungpinang particularly; (3) to provide the use of TBLT mapping which is done by the EFL teachers in Tanjungpinang; (4) to be the fundamental data for the policy makers of education to consider the TBLT to be employed as the teaching approach in the whole senior high schools in Tanjungpinang.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED THEORIES

Based on the research questions, there are three main theories dealing with those questions such as EFL teachers’ perceptions of concepts, position, and reasonings of TBLT.

Understandings of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

Since 1970s, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Prabhu as the first proponent, has been being discussed, investigated, and implemented by many teachers around the world as one the most popular language teaching method, approach. It is also the realization of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and constructivist learning theory in English teaching (Nunan, 2001; Ellis, 2006; Lin and Wu, 2012:586). The teaching processes are based on communicative task or meaningful activities. In other words, TBLT can be defined as providing leaning activities and engaging learners to practice in the authentic and functional use of language for meaningful purposes (Nunan, 2004).

So, the task as the core activities of implementing TBLT can be defined as the communicative act: beginning, middle, and end; a piece of classroom work (Nunan, 2001); a work plan (Ellis, 2006); central component of TBLT (Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010:162); closely related to real-world activities (Beglár and Alan, 2002:100) with focus on meaning (Espinar and Baxter, 2012); a clear goal or outcome, the use of language in authentic non-pedagogical context; not a single grammatical structure but a non-linguistic outcome (Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010:162; Nunan, 2001). And It also requires “learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interpreting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form” (Nunan, 2006).

After knowing the task as the core of TBLT, it can help teacher to create the its appropriate activity. One of the teachers’ creation of TBLT can be seen from their ability to design syllabus: selection (lists of linguistic features such as grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary, experiential content – content and theme), sequencing and justifications of the content of the curriculum with three essential elements of TBLT such as language data, information, and opportunities for practice (Nunan, 2001).

Implementing of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

There are some components for implementing TBLT successfully. Candlin and Murphy (1987) suggest six components.

1. **Goal** refers to the general aim for the task
2. **Input** represents verbal or non-verbal materials that learners can manipulate.
3. **Setting** refers to the environment in which the task is performed.
4. **Activities** involve the things participants will doing in a given setting.
5. **Roles for teacher and learners** are closely related to the successful implementation of the task.
6. **Feedback** concerns the task evaluation.

Those are in line with the implementation of Kurikulum 2013 of Indonesia which theme “producing Indonesian people who are productive, inovative, affective through strengthening their attitudes, skills, and knowledge integratedly”. Mulyasa (2015, p.99-131) states that based on the theme, teachers should be able to design an effective and meaningful instruction; organize the instruction; choose the instructional approaches; and execute the instruction, build character and competence; and make the successful criteria of instruction.

There are five conditions to be considered in implementing tasks in school settings, particularly where the conditions may be less than ideal: large class size, cramped classroom, lack of appropriate resources, teachers not trained in task-based methodologies, teachers with limited language proficiency, and traditional examination-based syllabi (Carless, 2003:389). There are six factors of implementation of TBLT: attitude, understandings, time, textbook, preparation, pupils' language proficiency (Carless, 2003:496). And, Ellis (2006:19) stated two basic kinds of methodological procedures for teaching tasks: procedures relating to how the tasks specified in a task-based syllabus can be converted into actual lessons and how the teacher and learners are to participate in the lessons.

Ellis (1997, 2003) in Calvert and Sheen (2014: 3 & 5) “provides a framework for evaluating a task with the following three options: (1) student-based, which measures the degree to

which students found the task useful and/or enjoyable; (2) response-based, which compares predicted task outcomes to the actual ones: is conducted by analyzing the oral and written products of a task rather than student perceptions; and (3) learning-based evaluations, which attempt to measure the degree to which learning took place as a result of the task, (4) Retrospective evaluation can help teachers determine whether the materials can be used again, which activities work or not, and how the materials can be modified so as to increase task effectiveness in future lessons.”

Reasons for Using Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

Based on the conditions and factors above, the teacher will use TBLT in English classroom when they are positive to them. For example, Most of teachers’ reasons to use TBLT in their classroom were because of appropriateness to small group (70,1%), improving learners’ interaction skills (67,5%), encouraging learners’ intrinsic motivation (45,7%). But, few of them agreed with creating a collaborative learning environment (39,3%), promoting learners’ academic progress (27,4%), and other category (11,1%) for classroom management, promotion of TL use, and controlling large class, etc. (Jeon and Hahn, 2006).

Reasons to Avoid Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

However, they do not want to use TBLT if they are negative to him/her. For example, Jeon and Hahn, (2006) describe that most of teachers’ reason avoided implementing TBLT were 75,7% for lack of knowledge of TBLT, 73,0% for limited TL proficiency, 64,0% for difficulty in assessing learners’ task-based performance, 45,9% for learners were not used to TBL, 30,6% & 21,6% respectively for materials in textbooks were not proper for using TBLT & large class size is an obstacle to use task-based methods, and 10,8% for other reasons.

3. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Data Analysis

The study was conducted from February to March 2016. The researcher visited all the teachers (*SMP, SMA, and SMK* in Tanjungpinang), explained the goal of the research, and asked them fill in the questionnaire. Most of them could fill it at school and few of them asked him to answer it at home and took it back in the two next days. Then the collected data was tabulated to be analyzed.

And, the data was analyzed through the Likert-type items of the questionnaires, which were constructed to check teachers’ awareness of TBLT principles and their views on TBLT implementation, were given a numerical score (e.g., *strongly disagree =1, disagree =2, undecided =3, agree=4, and strongly agree=5*). In the open-ended items, the participants were asked to choose their own reasons for being in favor of or against implementing TBLT. So, the selected items were given the numerical score of “1” and the unselected ones were given “0”.

SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 11.0 for Windows was used to analyze the data. Measures of frequency (descriptive statistics) were used. In other words, a percentage analysis of teachers’ responses to each of the questionnaire items was done in order to indicate how well they understand each of the concepts of TBLT, what kind of views they hold when it comes to the TBLT implementation in foreign language classrooms, and for what main reasons teachers choose or avoid implementing TBLT

General and Demographic Information

Table 1 – 4 show the results of general and demographic information of the participants. In the table 1, participants were 41 of 55 (74.55%) female and 14 or 25.45% male from 23 junior, senior, and vocational schools. Only one senior high school did not participate in the study. It is in line with Lin and Wu (2012), their dominant’s participants were also 112 of 136 (82.4%) female and 24 of 136 (17.6%) male from 30 junior high schools of Taiwan.

Table 1. Distribution of Gender (n = 55) and Teaching Level (n = 23)

Gender	Frequency	%	Teaching Level	Frequency	%
Male	14	25.45	SMPN	14	100.0
			SMAN	5	83.33
			SMKN	4	100.0
Female	41	74.55	SMPN	14	100.0
			SMAN	5	83.33
			SMKN	4	100.0
Total	55	100.0		23	

In the table 2, most of the JTs' experience of teaching were 19 of 31 (61.3%) 10-20 years. Then, more than 20 years (6 or 19.4%), and 5 of 31 for 5-9 years or 16.1% and 1 or 0.32% for less than 5 years. Next, STs' experience of teaching were 9 of 13 (69.2%) for 10-20 years. 3 of 13 teachers (23.1%) were about 5-9 years, and 1 or 0.77% for more more than 20 years. And, VTs' experience of teaching were dominant on 10-20 years or 7 of 11 teachers, and 2 or 18.2% for 5-9 & more than 20 years respectively. So, most of the teachers' teaching experiences from three schools were 35 of 55 (11.67%) for 20-29 years.

Table 2. Teaching Time experience among English Language Teachers (n = 55)

ELT	Experience (years)								F	%
	<5	%	5-9	%	10-20	%	>20	%		
JT	1	0.32	5	16.1	19	61.3	6	19.4	31	100
ST	0	0	3	23.1	9	69.2	1	0.77	13	100
VT	0	0	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2	11	100
Total	1		10		35		9		55	100
%	0.33		3.33		11.67		3.00			

JT = Junior High School Teacher; ST = Senior High School Teacher; VT = Vocational High School Teacher

In the table 3, most of the teachers' age from the three schools were 28 of 55 (9.33%) for 40-49 years old, then 6% or 18 of 55 teachers were 30-39 years old, and the oldest teachers were 9 of 55 (3.00%) for more than 50 years old. In addition, most the teachers from the three schools used *KTSP* (31 of 55 or 10.33%), *Kurikulum 2013* (20 of 55 or 6.67%), and 4 of 55 teachers (1.33%) used both curriculum in their teaching.

Table 3. Distribution of Age and Used Curriculum (n = 55)

ELT	Teachers' age								Used Curriculum					
	20-29	%	30-39	%	40-49	%	50+	%	KTSP	%	K-13	%	Both	%
JT	0	0	8	25.8	18	58.1	5	16.1	19	61.3	10	32.3	2	0.65
ST	0	0	7	53.8	5	38.5	1	0.77	10	76.9	3	23.1	0	0
VT	0	0	3	27.3	5	45.5	3	27.3	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2
Total	0	0	18		28		9		31		20		4	
%	0		6.00		9.33		3.00		10.33		6.67		1.33	

In the table 4, most of the teachers educational level from the three schools were on Bachelor degree (44 of 55 or 14.67%), Diploma degree was 7 of 55 or 2.33% and Master degree was 4 of 55 or 1.33%, and no Doctoral one. Beside that, there were 46 of 55 teachers (15.33%) from the three schools have got teacher certifications, and 9 of 55 or 3.00% have not got yet the certificates.

Table 4. Distribution of Educational level and Teacher certification

ELT	Educational Level								Teacher certification				F	%
	Dipl	%	Bd	%	Md	%	Dd	%	Yes	%	No	%		
JT	6	19.0	23	74.0	2	0.6	0	0	25	81.0	6	19.0	31	100
ST	0	0	12	92.0	1	0.8	0	0	12	92.0	1	0.8	13	100
VT	1	0.9	9	82.0	1	0.9	0	0	9	82.0	2	18.0	11	100
Total	7		44		4				46		9		55	100
%	2.33		14.67		1.33		0		15.33		3			

Dipl = Diploma; Bd = Bachelor degree; Md = Master degree; D = Doctoral degree

Tecahers' understanding of task and task-based language teaching (tblt)

On the item 1-4, most of JT (96,8%), ST (85%), VT (90%) had good understanding of conceptual task. They knew that the task refers to goal oriented, focus on meaning, and defining outcome clearly. Task can be defined as the communicative act: beginning, middle, and end; a piece of classroom work (Nunan, 2001); a work plan (Ellis, 2006); central component of TBLT (Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010:162); closely related to real-world activities (Beglar and Alan, 2002:100) with focus on meaning (Espinara and Baxter, 2012); a clear goal or outcome, the use of language in authentic non-pedagogical context; not a single grammatical structure but a non-linguistic outcome (Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010:162; Nunan, 2001).

And, the definition of TBLT is on the item 5-7. Most of the JT (90%), ST (85%), and VT (90%) knew about the TBLT such as. It can be called as TL activity is used by the learner, consistent with the principle of CLT, student-centered instructional approach, and three stages: pre, whilst, and post task phase. They are relevant with TBLT is compatible with a learner-centered educational philosophy (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 2005; Richards & Rodgers, 2001); it consists of particular components such as goal, procedure, specific outcome (Murphy, 2003; Nunan, 2004; Skehan, 1998); it advocates content-oriented meaningful activities rather than linguistic forms (Beglar & Hunt, 2002; Carless, 2002; Littlewood, 2004).

So, in relation to the first research question:

According to the state junior, senior, and vocational schools teachers in Tanjungpinang, how are their understandings of TBLT in English classroom?

Almost all of the teachers may have good understandings of task and TBLT concepts with 15% for undecided and disagree. Classroom observation and interview are needed to know more about their understandings comprehensively because the data was taken from the questionnaire. The results can be seen on the table 5 below.

Table 5. The Results of the Teachers' Understandings of Task and TBLT ($n = 55$)

Question	SA			A			U			D			SD		
	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT
1	12	2	2	18	10	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	13	0	1	17	9	7	1	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0
3	11	2	1	19	11	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	9	0	1	22	10	7	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	4	1	0	25	4	10	2	4	1	0	4	0	0	0	0
6	7	2	1	23	9	10	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
7	14	4	3	15	9	6	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA = strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree;

SD = strongly disagree

And, these findings are almost the same with previous findings that have shown that the teachers at SMP, SMA, and SMK have known about the practical understandings of the key concept of TBLT (Jeon and Hahn, 2006). This finding also supports the findings of the study conducted by Jeon and Hahn (2006) who examined EFL teachers' perceptions of TBLT at Korean secondary school classroom. Tabatabaei and Hadi (2011) with studied "Iranian EFL teachers'

perceptions of task-based language pedagogy. The results showed that the teachers had a positive attitude towards TBLT.

Teachers' views of task-based language teaching (tblt)

Next, in relation to the second research question:

How are the teachers' views of implementation TBLT in English classroom at the state junior, senior, and vocational schools in Tanjungpinang?

After knowing about the concept of task and TBLT, the teachers' position on the implementing TBLT can be seen on the table 6. On the item 8, JT (87%), ST (77,8%), and VT (91%) are interested to implement it in their classroom. It is 0,3% only who is disagree. Then, 65 % agrees, it provides a relaxed atmosphere to promote the target language (TL), 85% agrees that it activates learners' needs and interests, 90% agrees that the development of integrated skills in the classroom can be done through TBLT (item 11), 34,23 % agrees that it gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator, for the item 12, most of JT (71%) and VT (64%) had positive responses that TBLT gives much psychological burden to teacher as a facilitator, but negative response for ST (62%). Item 13 – 15, most of teachers (JT 87%), ST (69,3%), (VT, 75%) had positive responses toward requiring preparation time compared to other approaches, collecting classroom management properly, and the meaningful and purposeful materials based on the real world context.

Table 6. The Results to the Teachers' Views of Implementing TBLT (n = 55)

Question	SA			A			U			D			SD		
	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT	JT	ST	VT
8	9	1	0	18	10	10	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
9	5	1	0	21	7	7	1	1	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
10	9	1	0	21	10	9	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
11	7	0	1	22	9	8	2	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
12	6	0	0	16	5	7	6	4	2	2	4	2	1	0	0
13	3	1	1	22	9	6	4	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	0
14	2	0	1	27	9	7	2	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
15	8	3	5	22	10	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

SA = strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = strongly disagree

Focussing on the second research question which investigated the teachers' views of implementing TBLT. The results (item 8-15) showed that most of teachers had a positive views on implementing TBLT as an instructional approach in the classroom practice. The finding consistent with the previous study (Jeon and Hahn, 2006), most of them like to implement with rather hesitated to adopt it in the actual use task in the classroom. It might be true that they still used teacher-centered approach and tried to apply TBLT in the classroom.

Teachers' reasons to use task-based language teaching (tblt)

In response to the third research question: What are the teachers' reasons to use or avoid implementing TBLT in their English classroom at the state junior, senior, and vocational schools in Tanjungpinang?

Section four of the questionnaire contained one yes/no question which was related to this research question. If the respondents answered 'Yes', they had to tick any or all of the five reasons that followed, but if they answered 'No', they had six reasons to choose from.

According to table 7, reason one "TBLT promotes learners' academic progress" was chosen by JT 21 of 31 (67,74%); ST 8 of 13 (10,26%); VT 7 of 11 (10,61%). Reason two "TBLT improves learners' interaction skills" voted by JT 26 of 31 (83,87%); ST 6 of 13 (0,77%); VT 9 of 11 (13,64). Reason three "TBLT encourages learners' intrinsic motivation" JT 23 of 31 (74,19%); ST 6 of 13 (0,77%); VT 6 of 11 (0,91%). Reason four "TBLT creates a collaborative learning environment" JT 20 of 31 (64,54%); ST 2 of 13 (0,26%); VT 8 of 11 (12,12%). Reason five "TBLT is appropriate for small group work" JT 18 of 31 (58,06%); ST 1 of 13 (0,13%), VT 8 of 11 (12,12%).

Most of the JTs' reasons to use TBLT were because of improving learners' interaction skills (83,87%), encouraging learners' intrinsic motivation (74,19%), creating a collaborative

learning environment (64,54%), and appropriateness to small group (58,06%). But some of them (VTs) agreed with improving learners' interaction skills (9 of 11 or 13,64%), and few of them (STs) agreed with encouraging learners' intrinsic motivation and improving learners' interaction skills (6 of 3 or 0,77%) respectively, creating a collaborative learning environment (2 of 13 or 0,26%), and appropriateness to small group (0,13%).

These findings were accordance with other findings such as Jeon and Hahn (2006), most of the teachers were in favor of task-based methods and "appreciate the fact that TBLT increases learners' motivation and small-group interaction."

Table 7. Teachers' Reasons to use TBLT in the classroom ($n = 55$)

Reason No.	Teachers					
	JT (n=31)	%	ST (n=13)	%	VT (n=11)	%
1	21	67,74	8	10,26	7	10,61
2	26	83,87	6	0,77	9	13,64
3	23	74,19	6	0,77	6	0,91
4	20	64,52	2	0,26	8	12,12
5	18	58,06	1	0,13	8	12,12
6	2	0,64	1	0,13	0	0

Teachers' reasons to not use task-based language teaching (tblt)

It can be seen in table 8 that only one teacher who answered "No" or did not use TBLT in the classroom. Reason nine "large class size is an obstacle to use task-based method" voted by JT 1 of 31 (0,32%). It means the teacher thought that the large class size was a logical reason to avoid implementing TBLT in the classroom. It is relevant to ... five conditions that should be considered in implementing TBLT in the school setting, particularly where the condition may be less than ideal: one of them is large class size.

Table 8. Teachers' Reasons to not use TBLT in the classroom ($n = 55$)

Reason No.	Teachers					
	JT (n=31)	%	ST (n=13)	%	VT (n=11)	%
7	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	1	0,32	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0

The findings were contradicted with Tabatabaei and Hadi (2011, p. 4) where 13 of 51 teachers (25,5%) voted all reasons. However, here was only 1 of 31 teachers (Junior high school teacher) avoided implementing TBLT. It can be predicted that they might or not know more about TBLT.

4. CONCLUSION

In Indonesian context, studies of TBLT concepts and implementation are still limited. The teachers do not have a direct contact with native speakers of English to have a reference of how to practice target language inside and outside the classroom. As a result, they are hesitate to use TBLT even though they believe that it has some advantages in developing the teachers and learners' communication skills. It can be seen from senior school teachers (ST) who had lower number of reasons to use TBLT in the classroom (see on page 8).

The findings of the study revealed that most of the teachers of junior, senior, and vocational schools in Tanjungpinang, Riau Archipelago Province have a good understandings of task and TBLT concepts and a positive attitudes towards using the items in the classroom. Only

one teacher avoid TBLT as an instructional method with reason “large class size is an obstacle to use task-based method.” Ideally, according to their responses, they can create and conduct various communicative tasks in the classroom as the realization of TBLT concepts (goal, procedure, meaningful activity, and assessment)

Then, their answers of the questionnaire were so ideal towards classroom practice because most of their responses were agree and strongly agree. To make sure the truthfulness of their understandings, positive attitudes/views, and choose or avoid implementing TBLT in the classroom comprehensively, conducting classroom observation and deepen interview are needed.

REFERENCES

- Beglar, David, and A. Hunt. Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching. In Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya, *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2002: 96-105
- Barnard, Roger and Viet, Nguyen Gia. Task-based language teaching (TBLT): a vietnamese case study using narrative frames to elicit teachers' beliefs. *Language Education in Asia*, 2010, 1(1), 77-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.5746/LEiA/10/V1/A07/Barnard_Nguyen Barnard and Nguyen - Page 77.
- Candlin, C. and Murphy, D. *Language learning task (eds.)* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall International, 1987.
- Calvert, M., & Sheen, Y. Task-Based Language Learning And Teaching: An Action-Research Study. *Language Teaching Research*, 2014: 1362168814547037.
- Carless, D. R. Factors In The Implementation of Task-Based Teaching In Primary Schools. *System*, 2003: 31(4), 485-500.
- Carless, D. R. Implementing Task-Based Learning With Young Learners. *ELT Journal*, 2002: 56(4), 389-396.
- Ellis, R. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ellis, Rod. The Methodology of Task-Based Teaching. 2006. Retrieved at 23rd Feb 2015 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Ellis, R.. Taking the critics to task: the case for task-based teaching. *Proceedings of CLASIC 2014*. 2007: Retrieved from www.fas.nus.edu.sg/.../clasic2014/Proceedings/ellis_rod.pdf at 25th
- Espinar, K. K., & Baxter, P. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Retrieved from umb.edu on, 9(16), 2014, 2012.
- Farrel, T. S. C., & Jacob, G. M. *Essential for successful English language teaching*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2010.
- Gay, L., and Airasian, Peter. *Educational Research: Competences for Analysis and Application*. New Jersey: MERRILL an imprint of Prentice, 2000.
- Hall Hadi, Atefeh. Perceptions of Task-based Language Teaching: A Study of Iranian EFL Learners. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n1p103>. 2013. Retrieved from ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/download/23048/... at 14th February 2015
- Hutagalung, Evi Y. and Purwati, O. The implementation of task-based language teaching to teach Speaking descriptive to the first graders of junior high school *E-Jurnal Unesa. Volume 01 Nomor 01 Tahun 2014*, 2014:1 – 10 Retrieved from
- Izadinia, Mahsa. Teacher Educators as Role Models: A Qualitative Examination of Student Teachers' and Teacher Educators' Views towards Their Roles. *The Qualitative Report* 2012 Volume 17, Article 2102: 47, 1-15 <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR17/izadinia.pdf>

- Jeon, In-Jae and Hahn, Jung-won. Exploring EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching: A Case Study of Korean Secondary School Classroom Practice, 2006: Retrieved at 23rd Feb 2015 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Le, Tuyen Van. Factors Affecting Task-Based Language Teaching from Teachers' Perspectives. *Study in English Language Teaching ISSN 2329-311X Vol. 2, No. 1, 2014* www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt Retrieved from www.scholink.org/ojs/index.php/selt/article/download/162/163 at 14th February 2015
- Lin, T. B., & Wu, C. W. Teachers' Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching in English Classrooms in Taiwanese Junior High Schools. *TESOL Journal*, 3(4), 2012:586-609.
- Liton, Hussain Ahmed. EFL Teachers' Perceptions, Evaluations and Expectations about English Language Courses as EFL in Saudi Universities, 2013.
- Lukman, Lufi Wirmarini and Kurniasih, Esti. Using task-based language teaching to teach tenth graders of SMA negeri 9 Surabaya to analyze simple past and past continuous tense in recount text, 2014: Retrieved from <http://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/tag/6834/task-based-language-teaching-tblt> at 14th Feb 2015
- Mulyasa, E. *Pengembangan dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung: Rosda, 2015
- Nunan, David. Task-Based Language Teaching in the Asia Context: Defining 'Task', 2006: Retrieved on September, 2006 from http://www.asia_efl_journal.com
- Nunan, David.. Aspects Of Task-Based Syllabus Design. *Karen's Linguistics Issues* 2001: Retrieved from <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/syllabusdesign.html> www.seasite.niu.edu/~aspects_of_taskbased_syllabus.htm at 1st Feb 2015
- Ogilvie, G.; Dunn, W. Taking Teacher Education to Task: Exploring the Role of Teacher Education in Promoting the Utilization of Task-Based Language Teaching, 2014: Retrieved at 6th Dec 2014 From *Language Teaching Research*, <http://ltr.sagepub.com/>
- Zheng, X.; Borg, S.. Task-Based Learning and Teaching in China: Secondary School Teachers' Beliefs and Practices. Retrieved at 6th Dec 2014 From *Language Teaching Research*, 2014: 18,2, <http://ltr.sagepub.com/>