

Revista Lengua y Cultura

Biannual Publication, Vol. 5, No. 10 (2024) 69-77



Pre-Service English as a Foreign Language Teachers' Perceptions of Task Based Language Teaching for Higher Education Programs in Mexico: Methodology of a Case Study

La Percepción de Docentes en Formación de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera sobre la Enseñanza Basada en Tareas para Programas de Licenciatura en México:

Metodología de un Estudio de Casos

Andrés Sepúlveda-Rodríguez a

Abstract:

This quantitative case study research explored pre-service English as a foreign language, (EFL), teachers' perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) for facilitating written language competency for learners of English in public secondary schools, in northern Mexico. The participants in the study (n = 193) were from two locations: A public university in the state of Nuevo León, Mexico with 112 EFL Pre-service teachers (Location A) and a Normal Superior School (state teacher training college) with 81 (Location B). All participants took part in the study voluntarily and responded to a survey via email. The study included a survey with a five-point scale (1. *Strongly disagree*, 2. *Disagree*, 3. *Neutral*, 4. *Agree*, 5. *Strongly agree*). The survey contained a demographic section followed by three subscales with a total of 35 items: Subscale one, The Teaching Process (items 1-10); Subscale two, The Role of the Task (items 11-18), and Subscale 3, The Teaching of Language Competencies (items 19-35). The last five items (31-35) asked participants about the facilitation of written expression competency through TBLT. The items of the survey responded to the three research questions of the study, regarding perceptions about TBLT approach to the teaching of English; the role of task in English language learning; and the contribution of TBLT for teaching of the written expression competency in Mexico. The construction of the survey was informed by contributions of Prabhu (1987), Nunan (2004), Swan (2005), Ellis (2009), Long (2015), Jeon and Hahn (2006), and SEP (2018). The survey was administered using the SurveyMonkey platform. Since this is in-progress research, findings and conclusions will appear in further publications.

Keywords:

Perception, quantitative case study, Task-based language teaching, task, National English Program (NEP) 2011, written expression competency, Likert survey.

Resumen:

Este estudio de casos cuantitativo exploró la percepción de docentes en formación de Inglés como Lengua Extranjera (ILE) sobre la Enseñanza Basada en Tareas (EBT) para facilitar la competencia de expresión escrita de alumnos de secundarias públicas en el norte de México. Los participantes el estudio (n = 193) pertenecieron a dos locaciones: una universidad pública del estado de Nuevo León, México con 112 docentes en formación (Locación A) y una Escuela Normal Superior con 81 (Locación B). Todos los participantes fueron tomaron parte en el estudio de manera voluntaria y respondieron una encuesta por correo electrónico. El estudio incluyó una encuesta con una escala de cinco puntos (1. *Totalmente en desacuerdo*, 2. *En desacuerdo*, 3. *Neutral*, 4. *De acuerdo*, 5. *Totalmente de acuerdo*). La encuesta incluyó una sección demográfica y tres subescalas con un total de 35 reactivos: Subescala uno, El Proceso de Enseñanza (reactivos 1-10); Subescala dos, El Rol de la Tarea (reactivos 11-18); Enseñanza de las Competencias Lingüísticas (reactivos 19-35). Los últimos cinco reactivos 31-35) preguntaron a los participantes sobre la facilitación de la competencia de expresión escrita por medio del EBT. Los reactivos de la encuesta respondieron las tres preguntas de investigación del estudio con respecto a las percepciones del enfoque EBT para la enseñanza del inglés; el rol de la tarea en el aprendizaje del inglés; y la contribución del EBT en la enseñanza de la competencia de expresión escrita en México. La encuesta se diseñó de las contribuciones de Prabhu (1987), Nunan (2004), Swan (2005), Ellis (2009), Long (2015), Jeon y Hahn (2006) y SEP (2018) y se aplicó a través de la plataforma SurveyMonkey. Debido a que ésta es una investigación en proceso, hallazgos y conclusiones aparecerán en publicaciones futuras.

a Andrés Sepúlveda-Rodríguez, Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León | San Nicolás de los Garza | México, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0494-1268, Email: andres.sepulvedardr@uanl.edu.mx



Palabras Clave:

Percepción, estudio de casos cuantitativo, enseñanza de la lengua basada en tareas, Programa Nacional de Inglés (PRONI) 2011, competencia de expresión escrita, encuesta Likert.

Introduction

The purpose of this quantitative case study was to explore a contemporary phenomenon (Yin, 2014), namely, the perception of EFL pre-service teachers regarding the TBLT approach and its pertinence in teaching English as a foreign language in a specific Mexican educational context. More specifically, to the usefulness of TBLT in developing the competence of written expression within the context of state-run secondary schools in northern Mexico.

The study would lead to a better understanding of EFL pre-service teachers' perceptions on how TBLT could contribute specifically to the process of developing EFL writing skills in these learners, in a context where TBL could be an appropriate teaching/learning approach. Participants took part of the study voluntarily and were pre-service EFL teachers who had completed their English language teaching practices or social service at public educational institutions that included products, projects and final papers in their programs of study.

The results of the study will show how far these graduates from the state teacher training colleges understand the TBLT approach in their English lessons. They could help teacher training colleges to assess the effectiveness of current training in this area, and, if appropriate, to amend current training courses and teaching practice activities. The current article includes a detailed report on the overall research design and procedures, and the results will be presented in a later article.

Methodology

The methodology for this study was that of a quantitative case study. Yin (2014) defined this type of research thus: "a case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-world context conditions, which are pertinent to your case" (p. 16). Creswell (2002) defined case study as "an indepth exploration of a bounded system (e.g., an activity, program, event, process, or individuals) in terms of time, place, or some physical boundaries" (p. 485).

The bounded system of the study was defined in terms of (i) individuals and (ii) place (Creswell, 2002) due to the fact that participants of the study were EFL pre-service *teachers* from *two specific* teacher training colleges in the north of Mexico, namely, from the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (UANL), henceforth Location A, and from the Normal Superior School, henceforth, Location B.

The data collection instrument was a survey, administered online through SurveyMonkey. The items have five possible responses on a Likert (1932) scale from: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree to (5) Strongly agree (see Table 1.1). Responses were analyzed utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software version 21.0.

A total of 200 participants from both locations completed the demographic form and 193 completed the entire survey (see Table 1.1). The other 7 participants were excluded from the analysis because they did not complete the entire survey. Responses of the 193 (100%) participants were used to answer the research questions for the study. There were 112 (58%) participants from Location A and 81 (42%) from Location B. Participants' responses were collected via the SurveyMonkey, then analyzed utilizing the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. Table 1.1 shows the number and percentage of participants who responded to the two sections of the data collection instrument.

Table 1.1 Survey Participants

Survey section	Location		Loca	Location		
	Α		В	В		
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Demographics (Q1-9)	115	57	85	43	200	100
Survey (Q1-35)	112	58	81	42	193	100

N.B. Q stands for questions, which are those included in the survey.

The survey contained two sections to collect two types of data: (a) the demographic data (nine items), and section (b) the Likert-scale survey with three subscales, giving a total of thirty-five items. The demographic section collected participant profile data such as age, gender, English language learning experiences, and English language teaching experiences to determine that they were pre-service teachers of EFL. The last five items of subscale three, 31-35, emphasized the teaching of the written expression competency of public secondary school learners in northern Mexico. The items of the survey intended to elicit data to address the three research questions (RQs):

RQ1: What are the pre-service teachers' perceptions about the TBLT approach to EFL teaching?

RQ2: What are the pre-service teachers' perceptions about the role of task in English language learning?

RQ3: How does the TBLT approach contribute to the teaching of the written expression competency of public secondary school learners of English in Mexico?

Context of the Study

Location A is part of a public autonomous university system in Mexico, which has a total of 25 autonomous universities in México (SEP, 2015). Location B is a Normal Superior School. According to Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP, 2017), a Normal Superior School is an educational institution that prepares English language teachers to serve in public secondary school in the 32 states of Mexico.

Population of the Study

All participants accepted voluntarily to be part of the study. There were 173 possible participants from Location A (UANL) who were EFL pre-service teachers that would be eligible to participate in the study and 87 from Location B (Normal Superior School). Both sets of participants were eligible to be part of the study due to all of them were over 18 years old pre-service teachers with experience in EFL teaching either in a professional way or through practicum hours from social service. Table 1.2 provides number and percentage of possible from research sites.

Table 1.2 Number of Possible Participants from Locations A and B

Location	Participants	
	n	%
Location A	173	67
Location B	87	33
Total of possible	260	100
participants		

Sampling Technique

Etikan et al. (2016) defined purposive homogeneous sampling technique with a nonprobability sampling method to select participants as the sampling technique that "focuses on candidates who share similar traits or specific characteristics" (P.3). In the circumstance of this quantitative case study, all possible participants (N=260) from both locations met the following eligibility criteria: (a) pre-service EFL teachers, (b) over 18 years of age, who were (c) completing practicum hours as part of their program of the study. The academic dean at location B sent an email to the researcher, which included a potential participant list and contact information from Location B. Then, a teacher of French teaching, not associated with the programs of study, assisted the researcher in inviting participants via email to respond to the online survey. Three follow-up reminders, one per week were sent to participants. The total number of respondents was 193 (74%) of the 260 potential participants.

Participant Demographic Data Descriptive Data

The survey link was sent to 260 potential participants via email and administered through the SurveyMonkey. From the two locations, a total of 200 participants responded the demographic form. From the 200 surveys, 7 (3%) were removed due to only completing the Demographics section (see Table 1.3), therefore, the total number of participants was 193 (97%). Completed survey data was downloaded from SurveyMonkey, to Excel, and transferred into SPSS for analysis. Table 1.3 provides a summary of the survey population.

Table 1.3 Survey Population and Sample

Survey status	Locat	ion A	Loc	cation B	Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
E-mailed	173	67	87	33	260	100
surveys						
Completed	115	57	87	43	202	100
demographics						
Excluded	3	3	6	7	9	4
surveys						
Completed	112	58	81	42	193	100
surveys						

Participant Demographics

The participant demographic descriptive analysis, survey section one, includes data on: (1) age, (2) gender, (3) area of residence, (4) experience with learning English, (5) program of study, (6) area of formation, (7) semester of enrollment, (8) experience teaching English, and (9) total years teaching for the 112 participants from Location A and 81 participants from Location B (n = 193). This is the descriptive statistical analysis of participants' responses to the nine items of the demographic section of the survey.

Personal Characteristics

For items 1-3 (age, gender, and area of residence), results indicated that participants from both Locations A and B ranged in age from 18 to 58 years old. Participants varied in age by a range of 40 years, with the majority of participants within the 18 to 25 age range (n = 153, 79%). There were 27 (14%) participants within the 26 to 33 age range. The minority of participants (n = 13, 6%) were over 34 years old. The majority of the participants were women (n = 149, 77%) and the remainder of participants were men (n = 44, 23%). The majority of participants (n = 190, 98%) indicated they lived in an urban area, and only 3 (2%) indicated they lived in a rural area.

Experience as English Learners

Item 4 collected information about participants' experience with learning English. This item included 11 options, and results showed that the majority of participants learned English at public preparatory school (n = 119, 61%), followed by public secondary school (n = 92, 47%), language centers (n = 83, 42%), UANL College (n = 77, 39%), on their own (n = 73, 38%), public primary school (n = 70, 38%), private primary school (n = 51, 27%), Normal Superior School (n = 54, 23%), private secondary school (n = 35, 19%), in the USA (n = 15, 8%), private preparatory school (n = 12, 6%), or other (n = 8, 9%)

4%). Responses to the "other" option indicated that that future EFL educators come to their training programs with a variety of experiences from a variety of settings.

Experience as English Teachers

Item 8 focused on participants' experience with teaching English. Results show that 71 participants (35%) had no prior experience with teaching English, while 59 participants (30%) had completed English teaching practicum hours, having taught in private English schools (57 participants, 29%), at UANL preparatory schools (30 participants, 15%), at NEPBE (19 participants, 10%), at NEP (13 participants, 6%), or in a bachelor's degree program (7 participants, 4%). There were 23 participants (12%) who selected the "other," meaning that they taught English at locations such as private basic education schools in elementary and secondary levels or private preparatory schools.

In regard to English teaching years of experience, there were two categories: 0-4 and 5-15 years of teaching experience. The majority of participants (n = 171, 89%), indicated having 0-4 years of English teaching experience. The remainder of participants (n = 22, 11%) had 5-15 years of experience with teaching English. These were the ten variables of the demographic form with responses from participants and percentages per location.

Data Collection Procedures

First, the researcher contacted the Academic Deans at the two locations to explain the purpose of the study and to obtain their approval to move forward with institutional participation. Then, through letters of permission from each site, the researcher requested participants' e-mails from each site to begin the survey data collection process. After that, the researcher gathered the email addresses of the EFL pre-service teachers at those locations. Then, a research assistant began sending emails with the survey invitation link to the possible participants (n = 260) obtained from Location A and Location B. After that, the survey was administered on the SurveyMonkey platform. The cover page of SurveyMonkey included a consent form, which explained to participants that the study was voluntary, and that all data collected was to be kept private and confidential.

After reading the consent form, participants were asked to click on the survey link to participate. Next, the research assistant sent participants five follow-up e-mail reminders to respond to the survey within 3 weeks of launching the survey. After that, the survey closed gathering a total of 202 surveys completed, from which two were discarded due to participants being under 18 years old. An additional

number of 7 surveys was not usable as they only completed the demographics section; therefore, the total participants or viable surveys were 193. After the survey was closed, utilizing the SurveyMonkey platform, the researcher proceeded to analyze the survey results of the EFL pre-service teachers' responses.

Instrumentation

As mentioned above, in this quantitative case study, aiming to measure the perceptions of pre-service teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) about Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach, a Likert scale survey was used. Trochim (2006) stated that the data collection measure of 1-to-5 refers to a rating scale which contains five points from: (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) Agree to (5) Strongly agree. This type of data collection ascribes to a quantitative measure of participants' beliefs or opinions (Borgelt et al., 2013).

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions Survey Sections

The Likert-type scale included three subscales: Subscale one contained 10 items (1-10) about the teaching process, Subscale two included 8 items (11-18) about the role of the task, and Subscale three contained 17 items (19-35) about the teaching of language competencies, from which items 31-35 addressed written skills. The three subscales are related to the three research questions of this case study which were aimed to identify EFL preservice teachers' perceptions concerning TBLT. Table 1.4 shows the relation of subscales, items, and the total number of items.

Table 1.4 Survey Subscales and Number of Items

Subscale	Item	Total number
	range	of items
1) The teaching process	1-10	10
2) The role of the task	11-18	8
3) The teaching of	19-35	17
language competencies		
4) Written expression	31-35	
competency		
Total		35

Reliability and Validity Instrument Reliability

To assess internal consistency reliability, this study utilized Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficient (α), which demonstrates the consistency of results provided by the instrument (Trochim, 2006). In this respect, Trochim (2006) stated that tests of internal consistency show how consistent results are for different items in a survey. In the case of this study, there were 193 EFL pre-service teachers who completed the survey (Subscales 1-3). For the analysis of the consistency reliability of results, the study utilized the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 for data analysis on the Cronbach's alpha score of the survey items of the three subscales. Table 1.5 provides the thirty-five items divided into the three subscales summarizing the data analysis of the Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD), and Alpha coefficient for each item of the survey for the study.

Table 1.5 Items of the Survey, Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD), Alpha Scores

M	SD	Alpha
		score
rocess		.895
3.96	.786	
3.91	.771	
3.91	.774	
4.27	.808	
4.13	.931	
4.19	.864	
3.75	.825	
4.14	.854	
3.78	.931	
4.15	1.031	
	3.96 3.91 3.91 4.27 4.13 4.19 3.75 4.14 3.78	3.96 .786 3.91 .771 3.91 .774 4.27 .808 4.13 .931 4.19 .864 3.75 .825 4.14 .854 3.78 .931

.918

.952

Subscale two: The role of the t	ask		
11. Privileges the design of real-world activities	3.97	.853	
12. Promotes progressively more complex p edagogic tasks	3.94	.845	
13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the	4.14	.901	
14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks	4.16	.835	
15. Develops learner's collaborative skills	4.10	.901	
16. Motivates the language learner	4.10	.995	
17. Develops the learner's language identity	3.98	1.003	
18. Includes pre-task, task implementation, and post-task cycle	4.03	.850	

Subscale three: The teaching competencies	of langu	age
19. Offers opportunities to teach linguistic components	4.02	.845
20. Promotes the internalization of linguistic elements	4.03	.777
21. Offers authentic input of target language	4.04	.783
22. Facilitates the communicative function of language	4.10	.869
23. Contributes to the improvement of communicative fluency	4.04	.951
24. Attains language accuracy	3.99	.842
25. Provides semantic meaning	4.06	.879
26. Promotes the learning of English language integrated competencies	4.02	.878
Promotes writing and speaking skills	4.16	.827
28. Develops English language listening comprehension competency	3.98	.944
29. Develops English language reading comprehension competency	4.20	.788
30. Facilitates English language speaking expression competency	3.95	.964

31. Facilitates English language written expression	4.09	.848	
competency			
32. Facilitates the writing of	4.21	.785	
short texts on learners'			
interests and experiences			
33. Allows successful written	4.07	.807	
communication in context			
34. Encourages students to	4.09	.900	
write thoughts and opinions			
35. Enhances student active	4.07	.838	
participation through writing			
tasks			

Table 1.6 provides the reliability coefficient results for each subscale of the survey, number of responses (*n*), mean (M), and standard deviation (SD). Subscale one, the teaching process (items 1-10), provided a Cronbach's alpha of .895 and a range of mean scores from 3.75-4.27. Subscale two, the role of the task (items 11-18), presented a Cronbach's alpha of .918 and a range of mean scores from 3.94-4.16. Subscale three, the teaching of language competencies (items 19-35), provided a Cronbach's alpha result of .952 and a range of mean scores from 3.95-4.21, which are at the neutral level to strongly agree on the Likert scale.

Table 1.6 Survey Subscale Mean, Standard Deviation and Cronbach's Alpha

Subscale	# of	n	М	SD	CA
	ite				
	ms				
1. The teaching	10	193	4.01	.858	.895
process (1-10)					
2. The role of the	8	193	4.05	.898	.918
task (11-18)					
3. Teaching of	17	193	4.06	.854	.952
language (19-35)					

After the statistical analysis of the Cronbach's alpha scores of the 35 items using SPSS version 21.0, an alpha coefficient score of .972 was obtained for the entire survey. The alpha coefficient of the overall survey indicated a high internal reliability due to scores that were consistently close to each other where there was not a large variance between participants' responses (Cho, 2016). This means that participants did not vary in their perceptions on items in the three subscales of the survey.

Instrument Validity

To ensure content validity of the instrument, three experts in English language teaching reviewed the survey and made suggestions on each questions relevance and clarity. One of the experts was a language professor and lecturer from a university in Malmö, Sweden. Another was the academic coordinator of the language department in a top private educational institution in Nuevo León, Mexico. The third expert was a language education professor from a university in Texas, U.S.A. After the three professors reviewed the survey, the researcher made necessary corrections and the experts again reviewed the instrument. Following the content validity, the survey was then deployed for use on SurveyMonkey platform.

The survey was constructed considering prior research studies conducted (see Table 1.7) by Nunan (2004), Swan (2005), Ellis (2009), Long (2015), and Jeon and Hahn (2006) related to TBLT principles and SEP (2011) regarding the National English Program in Basic Education (NEPBE) 2011. The survey contained three subscales: Subscale one: The teaching process (Items 1-10), Subscale two: The role of the task (Items 11-18), Subscale three: The teaching of language competencies (Items 19-35), of which items 31-35 addressed the written expression competency.

Table 1.7 Survey Item Analysis

Item 1. Promotes the scaffolding teaching process 2. Fosters use of prior language knowledge 3. Supports learner-centeredness 4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language identity Author Jeon and Hahn (2004) Long (2015) Jeon and Hahn (2006) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		
teaching process 2. Fosters use of prior language knowledge 3. Supports learner-centeredness 4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Wanan (2004) Long (2015) Long (2015) Vunan (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Jeon and Hahn (2006) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	Item	Author
2. Fosters use of prior language knowledge 3. Supports learner-centeredness 4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Swan (2004) Nunan (2004) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	Promotes the scaffolding	Jeon and Hahn
knowledge 3. Supports learner-centeredness 4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Swan (2005) Nunan (20015) Ellis (2009) World (2015) Fellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	teaching process	(2006)
3. Supports learner-centeredness 4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Swan (2005) Nunan (2015) Ellis (2009) Nunan (2004) Ellis (2009) Jeon and Hahn (2006) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	Fosters use of prior language	Nunan (2004)
4. Integrates language in context 5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Activates language in context Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	knowledge	
5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	3. Supports learner-centeredness	Swan (2005)
5. Provides teaching materials for diverse learners 6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	Integrates language in context	Nunan (2004)
6. Fosters the principle of educating by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		Long (2015)
by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	for diverse learners	. ,
by "learning by doing" 7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009)	6. Fosters the principle of educating	Long (2015)
7. Can be implemented together with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 8. Activates language learning (2009) 18. Can be implemented together 19. Ellis (2009) 19. Vunan (2004) 19. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Long (2015) 10. Long (2015) 10. Long (2015) 11. Privileges the design of real-complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Activates language learning (2006) 19. Long (2015) 20. Long (2015) 20. Long (2015)		. ,
with a more traditional approach 8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Nunan (2004) Ellis (2009) Jeon and Hahn (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		Ellis (2009)
8. Activates language learning 9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Nunan (2004) Ellis (2009) Jeon and Hahn (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		, ,
9. Supports teacher-centeredness 10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Ellis (2009) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		Nunan (2004)
10. Is appropriate to English teaching in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Jeon and Hahn (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		
in Basic Education public schools 11. Privileges the design of realworld activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language (2006) Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	10. Is appropriate to English teaching	Jeon and Hahn
11. Privileges the design of real- world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		(2006)
world activities 12. Promotes progressively more complex pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		
pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Develops the learner's language 19. Long (2015)		3 ()
pedagogic tasks 13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Designs language tasks that can be Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	12. Promotes progressively more complex	Long (2015)
13. Designs language tasks that can be practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015) Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)	pedagogic tasks	3 ()
practiced outside the 14. Allows teacher guidance in the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Ellis (2009) Ellis (2009) Long (2015)		Long (2015)
the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Jeon and Hahn (2006) 19. Ellis (2009) 19. Long (2015)		3 ()
the language learning tasks 15. Develops learner's collaborative skills 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language 17. Develops the learner's language 18. Jeon and Hahn (2006) 19. Ellis (2009) 19. Long (2015)	14. Allows teacher guidance in	Ellis (2009)
15. Develops learner's collaborative skills (2006) 16. Motivates the language learner 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015)		, ,
skills (2006) 16. Motivates the language learner Ellis (2009) 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015)		Jeon and Hahn
16. Motivates the language learner Ellis (2009) 17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015)		(2006)
17. Develops the learner's language Long (2015)	16. Motivates the language learner	
		J ()

15. Develops learner's collaborative skills	Jeon and Hahn (2006)
16. Motivates the language learner	Ellis (2009)
17. Develops the learner's language	Long (2015)
identity	Long (2010)
18. Includes pre-task, task	Jeon and Hahn
implementation, and post-task cycle	(2006)
19. Offers opportunities to teach	(2000) Swan (2005)
linguistic components	Swaii (2005)
20. Promotes the internalization	Swon (2005)
of linguistic elements	Swan (2005)
21. Offers authentic input of target	Filio (2000)
language	Ellis (2009)
22. Facilitates the communicative	Nunan (2004)
function of language	Nullall (2004)
23. Contributes to the improvement	Nunan (2004)
	Nunan (2004)
of communicative fluency	Filia (2000)
24. Attains language accuracy	Ellis (2009)
25. Provides semantic meaning	Nunan (2004) Jeon and Hahn
26. Promotes the learning of English	•
language integrated competencies	(2006)
27. Promotes writing and speaking skills	SEP (2011)
	OED (0044)
28. Develops English language	SEP (2011)
listening comprehension competency	CED (2011)
29. Develops English language	SEP (2011)
reading comprehension competency	OED (0044)
30. Facilitates English language	SEP (2011)
speaking expression competency	CED (2011)
31. Facilitates English language written	SEP (2011)
expression competency	OED (0044)
32. Facilitates the writing of short texts	SEP (2011)
on learners' interests and experiences	OED (0044)
33. Allows successful written	SEP (2011)
communication in context	OED (0044)
34. Encourages students to write	SEP (2011)
thoughts and opinions	OED (0044)
35. Enhances student active	SEP (2011)
participation through writing tasks	

In conclusion, the survey instrument showed internal consistency reliability for the subscales and the survey as whole .972 with high reliability coefficients of .895 for Subscale one: the teaching process, .918 for Subscale two: the role of the task, and .952. for Subscale three: the teaching of language competencies. Content validity was established by grounding survey items in previous research measuring similar constructs in EFL teachers' perceptions on TBLT and through peer review of the instrument by experts in the field. Regarding external validity, the study may be generalizable to other populations of EFL pre-service teachers in northern Mexico.

Data Analysis

This quantitative case study research contains an embedded unit of analysis (Yin, 2014), which collected data from two locations (A and B). The study utilized a Likert survey with thirty-five items, asking participants to respond (1 Strongly disagree, 2 Disagree, 3 Neutral, 4 Agree, to 5 Strongly disagree) to statements about TBLT. After the survey was administered via Survey Monkey, the

researcher undertook the following data analysis procedures to address the three research questions.

This study provided a step-by-step descriptive statistics analysis using the SPSS version 21.0. First, survey data was exported from the SurveyMonkey tool to Excel. Then, the descriptive data was analyzed through the SPSS version 21.0, setting each survey item in the option variable view. Later, incomplete surveys were identified and deleted from the SPSS. Then, descriptive analysis was performed by clicking on Analyze/ Descriptive statistics/ Descriptives. Survey items data collected was shown in Table 1.5. Regarding demographic data, SurveyMonkey descriptive analysis was used to determine frequency and percentages of each of the descriptive variables. Then, the researcher proceeded to analyze the reliability and validity of the study.

Limitations

The limitations of any study are those methodological or contextual factors that might influence the outcomes of the study (Price & Murnan, 2004). This quantitative case study research contains limitations in the areas of research instrument, sample of participants, implementation of data collection, time constraints, completion by participants, and subjectivity of the individual.

Quantitative designs are limited when excluding open-end questions to gather data from participants (Berg, 2012). The quantitative design of this case study is limited since it utilized a Likert scale survey as the only data collection instrument. This case study did not include any other instrument such as questionnaires, observation, or narratives for participants to express their opinion on the issue of research. Results were gathered from the five-point survey where participants expressed their perceptions about TBLT.

The sample of participants is limited since it consisted of 193 EFL pre-service teachers from two institutions in northern Mexico. Therefore, the data is not generalizable to all EFL pre-service teachers in Mexico. The bounded case of this study was to explore EFL pre-service teachers' perceptions about TBLT, being limited to that particular unit of analysis and not able to generalize results (May, 2011) to other cases from different contexts.

A further limitation relates to time limits for the administration of the survey. The survey was administered in three weeks. Time is a limitation since the study had covered a higher percentage of participants (*n* = 193, 77% out of 260) if the survey administration would have taken longer. This way, results would provide responses from a wider number of participants and enable a more complete data collection analysis.

Another limitation was survey completion (Mathers, 2007). The total number of respondents who completed the demographic form of the survey was 200, from which 193 completed the survey. Thus, there was a lack of response from 7 intended participants because survey was voluntary, and participants could withdraw from the study at any time. Bell (1996) stated that biases could occur due to the accuracy of responses. In this respect, a survey assumes participants are answering honestly and reading the questions. This type of bias could happen in the study when participants had to select an option from the five-point Likert scale survey.

Another limitation focused on subjectivity of the individual respondent in answering the survey questions (Fowler, 2009). Upon obtaining consent, the researcher assumed that participants knew about the research issue, understood the purpose of the study, and consciously completed the survey. Given the fact that participants for the study were pre-service teacher and their rating responses fell upon the positive pole (4 Agree and 5 Strongly agree) of the five-point Likert scale, there might be a bias tendency to select these two options. For participants to provide a more objective response, the researcher would have provided them with video sessions on the TBLT approach for them to relate their real teaching practices with the principles of the approach.

Since this is an in-progress research, further publications will present a detailed explanation of the data analysis of the survey responses of participants to the three research questions and conclusions of the study.

References

- [1] Ansari, K., & Shahrokhi, M. (2014). Iranian teachers' conceptions of task-based language teaching: a case study of 40 English teachers in Gachsaran, *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(3),122-137.
- [2] Bell, S. (1996). Learning with information systems: Learning cycles in information systems development. Routledge.
- [3] Berg, B. L. (2012). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, (8th ed.). Allyn and Bacon.
- [4] Borgelt, C., Gil, M., Sousa, J., & Verleysen, M. (2013). Towards advanced data analysis by combining soft computing and statistics. Springer.
- [5] Cho, E. (2016). Making reliability reliable: A systematic approach to reliability coefficients. Organizational Research Methods, 19(4), 651-658
- [6] Creswell, J. (2002). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. Merrill Prentice Hall.
- [7] Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
- [8] Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.

- [9] Etikan, I., Musa, s., & Alkassim, R. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical* and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1-4.
- [10] Fowler, F. (2009). Survey research methods, (4th ed.). SAGE.
- [11] Jeon, J., & Hahn, J. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: a case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 1-27.
- [12] Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychology, 22(140), 55.
- [13] Mathers, N., Fox, N., & Hunn, A. (2007). Surveys and questionnaires. The NIHR RDS for the East Midlands. Yorkshire & the Humber.
- [14] May, T. (2011) Social research: Issues, methods, and process. Open University Press.
- [15] Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching. Cambidge University Press.
- [16] Price, J. H. & Murnan, J. (2004). Research limitations and the necessity of reporting them. *American Journal of Health Education* 35, 66-67.
- [17] SEP. (2011). Programa nacional de inglés en educación básica. Segunda lengua: Inglés. Programas de estudio 2011. Ciclo 4. 10, 20 y 30 de secundaria. Prueba en aula. SEP.
- [18] SEP. (2015). Programa nacional de inglés en educación básica. Segunda lengua: Inglés. Programas de estudio 2011. Ciclo 4. 10, 20 y 30 de secundaria. Prueba en aula. SEP.
- [19] SEP. (2017). Estrategia nacional de inglés. Estrategia nacional para el fortalecimiento del inglés. SEP.
- [20] Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 376-401.
- [21] Trochim, W. (2006). The Research methods knowledge base, (2nd ed). Atomic Dog Publishing.
- [22] Yin, R. K. (2014). Case study research design and methods, (5th ed.).