

TRADITIONAL METHODS VS. TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING IN EFL CLASSROOMS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

Dr. Nazia Anwar

Lecturer, University of Gujrat,

nazia.anwar@uog.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: *

Dr. Nazia Anwar

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17720475>

Received
13 June 2025

Accepted
13 July 2025

Published
07 August 2025

ABSTRACT

The conventional teaching approach in teaching EFL has been in use since the classrooms and this has focused on the accuracy, grammar and a teacher-oriented teaching. In its turn, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is centered on communicative, meaning-driven tasks that ensure learner engagement and fluency (Ellis, 2003; Long, 2015). The purpose of this study is to compare the effectiveness of the conventional methods and TBLT in enhancing the language proficiency among EFL learners and how the teachers have encountered difficulties when using TBLT. A mixed-methods design was used. Sixty students were separated into two categories and were to be taught using traditional means or TBLT within eight weeks. The proficiency in reading, writing, speaking, and listening was tested by pre-tests and post-tests. Four teachers were interviewed semi-structured on the implementation issues. According to quantitative findings, TBLT group performed better than traditional group in all the skills but particularly speaking and listening. Results of the qualitative analysis revealed that design of the task, classroom management, resource constraints were significant barriers of the teachers. TBLT positively affects the communicative competence of EFL learners, but it needs teacher training, institutional support and contextual adaptation to be successfully implemented.

Keywords: Traditional methods, TBLT, EFL classrooms

INTRODUCTION

The instruction of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) has experienced a transformation in the last few decades, shifting on the traditional and teacher-centered instructional methods to the techniques that are more communicative and learner-oriented. The Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) are classic types of language teaching that have been popularly employed in the Asian, Middle Eastern and European EFL settings (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These methods are very focused on accuracy, mastery of grammar, and limited practice, which is the structuralist attitudes toward language and the behaviorist theories of learning (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Although traditional ways offer organization and

familiar routines, they have been blamed to offer limited chances of communication and use of language intuitively, which are believed to be key in the building of communicative competence (Harmer, 2015).

Conversely, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has become popular as a new form of communicative language teaching that puts emphasis on meaning-oriented interaction and application of language in real life. Ellis (2003) argues that tasks motivate learners to apply language to real-life applications that favor progress to fluency and communicative effectiveness. TBLT is based on interactionist theories of second language acquisition, stating that negotiating the meaning in the course of communicative tasks

facilitates the development of the language (Long, 2015). Many studies have established that TBLT has been found to be more effective in terms of engagement, motivation, and oral fluency improvement of learners than traditional methods (Nunan, 2004; Bygate, 2016). Consequently, TBLT has found its way to numerous educators and researchers as a better way of equipping the learner to apply English in their actual lives.

Although, TBLT has been theoretically and empirically supported, it is still difficult to apply it in a lot of EFL classrooms. Tasks design, classroom management and task performance assessment are some of the areas that teachers find difficult (Carless, 2007). The presence of large classes, examination-based education systems as well as the lack of institutional support make the implementation of TBLT in actual classrooms even more difficult (Littlewood, 2007). Task based lessons may also be quite unfamiliar or uncomfortable to the learners especially when they are used to teaching centered learning and learning based on grammar (Butler, 2011). Such difficulties show that there is a discrepancy between the theoretical benefits of TBLT and the practicalities of EFL teachers. Despite the fact that the advantages of TBLT and disadvantages of traditional means of teaching have been studied before, fewer studies have directly compared the two instructional techniques and also conducted research on how the educators feel about the challenges of TBLT. Knowledge on the difference between traditional and task-based approaches in fostering learner proficiency can guide educators to make an informed choice on the practice of instruction. Moreover, researching the issue of teacher challenges is an even more insightful experience that may help to understand the practical limitations that affect the implementation of TBLT in EFL settings.

This research is dual-folded, that is, it aims at comparing the efficiency of the conventional teaching and TBLT in enhancing the language proficiency of EFL learners, and to define issues that instructors encounter when using TBLT in a classroom. This study adds to the current knowledge on the understanding of language pedagogy and provides effective suggestions on how to enhance instruction practices by analyzing the learner outcomes and teacher experiences.

This work is important as it can offer evidence-based information that can be used by teachers,

curriculum analysts, policymakers, etc. to choose and adopt the best teaching approaches. In the contexts where the communicative competence is paramount, the results of this study can be used to inform the incorporation of task-based strategies and respond to the practical limitations. The research is also added to the current scholarly debate about the need to strike the balance between the traditional structure and communicative engagement when teaching the EFL.

1.1 Research Objectives:

To know how the traditional methods are compared to task-based language teaching in improving the language proficiency in EFL learners.

To identify the challenges teachers, encounter in implementing TBLT in EFL classrooms.

1.2 Research Questions:

How are traditional methods compared to task-based language teaching in improving the language proficiency in EFL learners?

What challenges do teachers encounter in implementing TBLT in EFL classrooms?

Literature Review

Such a comparison between the conventional teaching approaches and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been in the focus of EFL pedagogy over the past thirty years. Some of the most used traditional methods are the Grammar Translation Method (GTM) and the Presentation Practice Production (PPP) model, which have dominated many EFL classrooms, especially in Asian and Middle Eastern classrooms (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). These strategies are based on precision, practice and control, and instructor-focused teaching. Although they offer structure and expectations, critics believe that they give minimal opportunities of communicative interaction, which is fundamental in the process of acquisition of a second language (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). TBLT, on the contrary, encourages communication, purposeful language use and learner independence. This literature review discusses the theoretical basis of the two approaches, achievements of prior empirical studies and the issues related to the implementation of TBLT in EFL classrooms.

2.1 Conventional Practices in EFL Classrooms

The traditional way of teaching language is based on the structural linguistics and behaviorism learning theories. The GTM, in particular, is based on translation, rote memorization, and direct teaching of grammar (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Even though it builds grammatical knowledge, it is unable to sufficiently support communicative competence (Harmer, 2015). In the same manner, the PPP method which was common in EFL textbooks also adheres to a linear pattern of presenting a form of a language, practicing it in controlled activities and finally producing it in freer activities. According to critics, PPP has a tendency of overemphasizing accuracy and constraints the flexibility that learners require when using languages in spontaneous use (Skehan, 1996). Studies have shown that traditional means might enhance discrete language mastery, but it cannot usually be used to achieve fluency or pragmatic competence (Ellis, 2012). However, these approaches are still widespread since they are consistent with the exam-based educational approach and give educators and students some order.

2.2 Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

TBLT is a result of the development of communicative language teaching and is based on the interactionist theories of the second language acquisition. Long (2015) speculates that negotiation of meaning is generated under the condition of tasks, which fosters language development. A task in TBLT refers to a meaning-oriented undertaking that has a communicative result (Ellis, 2003). TBLT also changes the classroom orientation whereby instead of the form of language, the emphasis is on meaningful communication and learners are encouraged to use language in order to attain some objectives in the real world. Another important advantage is learner engagement; according to research conducted by Nunan (2004) tasks result in a higher level of motivation and engagement especially when tasks are connected to the interest of the learners. Empirical research has continually demonstrated that TBLT improves oral fluency, listening comprehension and interactive competence. Indicatively, Bygate (2016) discovered that task repetition enhanced fluency and confidence of the

learners to speak. Equally, Shintani (2016) found that young EFL students in the task-based lesson were more engaged and produced more spontaneous language than their peers who were taught by the traditional method. These results prove the point that TBLT provokes a higher level of thinking and contributes to more lasting language acquisition benefits (Skehan & Foster, 2001).

2.2 Comparison of Findings of Traditional approach and TBLT

A number of studies directly contrast the effect of traditional and task-based approach. Carless (2007) discovered that communicative competence of students in TBLT-oriented classrooms was higher as opposed to learners taught in teacher centered approaches. On the same note, Van den Branden (2016) indicated that TBLT had been found to be effective in the development of functional language proficiency. Nonetheless, other researchers observe that traditional methods can still be useful in the first instruction in grammar or when the learners are inclined towards a structured learning (Butler, 2011). Therefore, although TBLT is better in terms of facilitating communication, the traditional approaches can be used as a supplement.

2.3 The Problems in the Implementation of TBLT

Although, TBLT has several benefits, there exist several challenges in its real classroom usage. Teacher preparedness is one of the problems. Research indicates that most teachers are not trained on how to design activities or deliver classes through a communicative classroom (Carless, 2009). The teachers frequently complain of being confused in terms of evaluating task-based performance, choosing the right tasks, and prioritizing the form and meaning (East, 2017). Another difficulty is classroom management particularly in big classes where it will not be easy to monitor student groups. Littlewood (2007) has discovered that in East Asian settings, the teachers considered TBLT to be challenging and laborious to implement because of the institutional limitations and big classes. There are also problems associated with learners and these are especially observed in exam-based systems. According to Butler (2011), most learners like the traditional methods as they correspond to the grammar-centered tests. The cultural requirements might

also create a barrier to TBLT adoption; in certain situations the teacher-centered teaching is perceived as more credible and efficient.

Research Methodology

The present research design was mixed-methods one, as the researcher aimed to compare the conventional teaching instructional approaches and the concept of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in EFL classrooms and to understand what difficulties teachers face when using TBLT. The mixed-method design was chosen due to the possibility to gather quantitative and qualitative data and achieve a deeper insight into the effectiveness of teaching and experiences in the classroom (Creswell & Clark, 2018). The interwoven numerical performance data with accounts by the teachers and learners were more persuasive and served to confirm the results by methodological triangulation (Dornyei, 2007).

3.1 Research Design

The quantitative component was completed through a quasi-experimental design. There were two intact EFL classes one taught using traditional methods and the other one taught using TBLT. The quasi-experiment can be used in an academic context where the randomization can hardly be organized, but groups must be compared (Gall et al., 2015). To assess language proficiency changes, pre-tests and post-tests were performed on both groups. The qualitative aspect was comprised of semi-structured interviews and classroom observations that enabled getting deeper insights into the experiences of teachers, teaching issues, and student reactions. The complexity of the classroom realities and teacher decision-making can be captured using qualitative methods (Richards, 2015).

3.2 Population and Sample

Two EFL classes in a private secondary school were used to carry out the study. The sample size was 60 learners, half of which were in group one and the other half in group two. The sampling was purposeful since samples of the chosen classes were close in their size, age range, and proficiency level, which is why they could be compared (Palinkas et al., 2015). Further, four EFL teachers were interviewed to obtain the information on their experiences of using TBLT and traditional approaches in teaching.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

Proficiency tests, observation in the classroom and teacher interviews were three tools of data collection. The language proficiency tests were the tests that evaluated reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills through the use of standardized criteria. The multiple language skill measures are in line with other recommendations made by Fulcher (2010) where he considers that assessment should be done comprehensively to ensure the ability of a language is well measured. Classroom observations were aimed at the engagement of learners, patterns of their interaction, and practices of their teaching. One of the tools that can be useful in studying classroom behavior and instructional processes is observation (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). In the semi-structured interviews, teachers were interviewed to understand their issues in implementing TBLT. The semi-structured interviews are open and give detailed answers (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

The experiment was conducted throughout eight weeks. The pre-test was done in Week 1, with the results of both groups being the same. Weeks 2-7 involved teaching the experimental group using the TBLT and the comparison group using the traditional methods. The curriculum topics of the two groups were matched so that there was fairness in the lessons. The observations in the classroom were made twice a week in the classroom. During Week 8, post-test was undertaken by learners, and teachers were interviewed.

3.5 Data Analysis

The pre-tests and the post-tests quantitative data were analyzed through the descriptive statistics and the paired samples of comparison to identify the degree of improvement. The difference between groups was measured with the help of statistical analysis and the effectiveness of each teaching approach was identified. The thematic analysis was used to analyze qualitative data obtained through observation and interviews due to the steps of coding, categorization, and identification of recurring patterns. It is advisable that the thematic analysis be used to analyze the complex qualitative data in educational research (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3.6 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted within the culture of ethics. Both learners and teachers were informed about the intention of the research, and both gave their consent. Anonymity and confidentiality were also guaranteed, as it is related to ethical standards stated by Cohen et al. (2018).

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

The pre-test equivalence of groups in the study was 1.1. It was necessary to identify whether the control group (Traditional Method Group) and experimental group (TBLT Group) first were similar in terms of language proficiency to explore the effects of the instructional treatment. The same standardized pre-test in terms of reading, writing, listening and speaking was given to both groups. Descriptive statistics showed that the means of the two groups were very similar with the Traditional Group having a mean pre-test of 42.8 (SD = 8.6), and the TBLT Group had a mean of 43.5 (SD = 8.9). The independent-samples t-test was used to test the hypothesis of whether this difference was significant. The findings did not show a significant difference between the groups at the start of the study ($t(58) = -0.31, p = .76$) which means that the learners began with the same level of proficiency. This pre-test similarity enabled the research to assign any following dissimilarities in the final products to the instructional modalities instead of original disparity amongst the groups.

The comparison of the post-test performance is conducted as shown below:

After the 8 weeks of teaching time, the groups had the same post-test to assess the improvement of proficiency. The Traditional Group improved their mean score by gaining 7.4, thus making it 51.1 (SD = 7.4). The TBLT Group showed greater improvement, and it increased to 61.3 with SD = 6.8. The extent of the improvement implied different effects of the two methods of teaching. Each group had a paired-samples t-test to test learning gains in the groups. In the case of the Traditional Group, the difference between the pre-test and post-test was statistically significant ($t(29) = 7.59, p < .001$), which means that the traditional methods played a role in the quantifiable improvement of proficiency. The results were even stronger ($t(29) = 12.41, p < .001$) in the case of the TBLT Group indicating that there was enormous

improvement. An independent-samples t-test that compared improvement between the two groups based on gain scores (post-test, which is posttest-pretest) was used. The average gain of TBLT Group was 17.8 points and Traditional Group was 8.3 points. The t-test supported the hypothesis that the difference in gains is statistically significant ($t(58) = 4.39, p < .001$). This finding suggests that TBLT significantly influenced general language development than the conventional methods.

4.1.1 Skill-Based Analysis

In order to gain a better understanding of the particular features of the language proficiency as it was determined by the instructional strategies, the study compared the performance of the learners on the individual elements of the skills.

4.1.2 Speaking Skills

The biggest difference between the two groups was noted in the speaking component. The TBLT Group scored at 6.5 and Traditional Group scored at 2.4. The focus on authentic communication, the meaningful negotiation, and the task-based engagement of TBLT seems to have helped to achieve a higher level of oral fluency and confidence. The difference between speaking gains was statistically significant as proved by the independent-samples t-test ($p < .001$).

4.1.3 Writing Skills

The TBLT Group improved its score by an average of 5.1 points in writing, as opposed to the Traditional Group, which improved its score by 3.0 points. Activities that involve written productions like report writing and emailing would have offered more meaningful contexts whereas the traditional method focuses on controlled grammar practice that led to moderate but less significant improvement.

4.1.4 Listening Skills

The TBLT group (mean increase = 4.2 points) also recorded higher gains on listening as compared to the Traditional Group (2.1 points). These differences were probably due to the use of real audio materials and task based comprehension activities in TBLT classrooms.

4.1.5 Reading Skills

Both groups also developed better in terms of reading, but it was less than other skills. The TBLT

Group had an increment of 2.0 points and the Traditional Group had an increment of 1.3 points. Because explicit and communicative methods can be equally effective in teaching reading, the influence of the difference in the methodologies was not as significant.

4.1.6 Effect Size Analysis

The *d* of Cohen of both groups was used in order to find the practical meaning of the instruction methods. The Traditional Group achieved a medium effect size of 0.71, which is significant improvement. The effect size of 1.51, produced by the TBLT Group, is a very strong effect of the instructional intervention. This confirms the finding that TBLT is significantly better at improving the overall learning of EFL learners.

4.1.7 Quantitative Interpretation of Findings

In general, quantitative findings distinctly proved that:

Both teaching techniques resulted in a significant positive change based on language proficiency among the learners.

The TBLT Group had the highest overall performance in all skill areas as compared to the Traditional Group.

TBLT was also found to impact specifically speaking as a skill that is commonly said to be hard to master under conventional teaching.

Statistical tests were used to suggest that the means of gains were significant and meaningful.

These results give a first-hand evidence in response to the first research question: TBLT is more efficient than conventional approaches in enhancing the language proficiency of EFL students.

4.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

In order to answer the second research question, qualitative data collection is conducted using semi-structured interviews with those teachers who practiced TBLT during the research. Patterns, challenges, and insights that were recurrent were identified through thematic analysis. There were 5 key themes: the lack of training, the problem of task design, problems of classroom organization, the lack of resources, and ambivalent attitudes of learners. The most recurrent challenge that was cited was the insufficiency of proper training in task design and implementation. Some of the teachers noted that they were conversant with the

principles of communicative language teaching, but lacked practical exposure with TBLT. The teachers were faced with difficulties on linking activities to the levels of proficiency, developing authentic learning situations, and scaffolding series of tasks. One of the teachers told something more, she stated that the task-based lessons need a more profound pedagogical preparation in opposition to the traditional one which is based on textbooks and on the pre-programmed exercises. Teachers did not receive institutional support or professional development workshops, and thus did not know whether they were using TBLT in the correct way.

Another significant issue was the design of tasks that are meaningful, level-appropriate and in line with the learning objectives. Teachers claimed that they had a hard time creating tasks that can combine several skills and still be pedagogically sound. They also observed that it is time-consuming and involves creativity in making tasks out of nothing hence increasing workload on a weekly basis. There were teachers who stated that they were not sure of how to assess task performance in an equitable manner, more so in the open-ended communicative tasks. Conversely, conventional teaching tools offered easy instructions on grading, which minimized uncertainty. TBLT involves high interaction of students, working in groups and taking part, hence classroom management problem. The teachers complained of the problems in maintaining discipline in big classes and the equal participation of students. There was an increase in the level of noise during communicative tasks and some students were out-of-task. This was especially acute in the classes containing over 30 people. Classroom control was facilitated by the traditional approaches with their systematic lectures and personal written work. Thus, even those teachers, who advocated TBLT, admitted that the classroom processes should be controlled well in order to allow successful execution of the tasks.

The barriers identified by teachers were the shortage of technological facilities, access to authentic materials, and a strict institution-level schedule. There are classrooms that did not have projectors or audio systems required to carry out task based listening and speaking exercises. Furthermore, schools that are curriculum based usually have little space to engage in activities that are not outlined in the official curriculum.

Educators commented that TBLT necessitates a more adaptable structure of the syllabus, and in many cases, clients needed to follow the textbook-based units and progress testing models that are aimed at teaching under the traditional conditions. There were a variety of attitudes among learners. TBLT was welcome by some students since it made the learning more interactive, practical, and engaging. These students appreciated speaking time, face-to-face communication and getting tasks done. Nevertheless, TBLT was new to other students, and it was a challenge, in particular, to students used to grammar-based teaching. They anticipated the teacher to explain and not facilitate tasks. There are students that felt that they were not well equipped in terms of tasks to take traditional exams that focus on the rules of grammar and written precision. This discrepancy between the teaching methods and the demands of the assessment developed anxiety in the learners, which influenced their desire to engage fully.

4.3 Quantitative and Qualitative Findings Synthesis

Combined the results of the two data sets would help to get a complete picture of the effectiveness and implications of TBLT on pedagogy in an EFL setting.

The quantitative findings proved the significance of TBLT in terms of language proficiency in all the fields of skills, the most impressive ones being speaking and listening.

Qualitative results showed that though TBLT has been proved to be effective, there are significant obstacles that teachers encounter that are likely to affect successful implementation.

These obstacles do not disregard the importance of TBLT but outline structural and institutional constraints which should be tackled in order to maximize its benefits.

Briefly, TBLT is more pedagogically sound but more challenging in relation to teacher training, institutional adaptability and classroom materials.

The analysis of the data shows clearly that use of tasks in instructional process results in the best language learning outcomes than the traditional approaches. Nevertheless, TBLT implementation should be systemically supported, teachers trained, and provided with the necessary resources in a classroom. These issues are paramount to the optimization of the potential of TBLT within EFL learning settings.

Findings and Discussion

The results of this research indicate that TBLT results in increased enhancement in language proficiency when compared to traditional instructional approaches. The outcomes of the pre-test of both groups were close, and it means that the learners started their studying with the similar levels of proficiency. However, the post-test results reveal that the TBLT group made more improvement in all skills. The highest disparity was in speaking and listening. This trend is in line with previous studies. According to Ellis (2003), tasks encourage natural use of language and allow more room of meaningful interaction. Another argument presented by Long (2015) is that the interaction based on tasks enhances actual communication and promotes the growth of fluency. Such concepts elaborate on the reason why the TBLT group in this study recorded bigger increment in oral communication skills.

There was also improvement in the reading and writing. Though the improvement in the same was not as high as in speaking and listening, TBLT group had still done better than the traditional one. This observation is in line with the position that tasks combine skills and generate meaningful contexts of reading and writing (Skehan, 1998). Conversely, the conventional approaches are more based on exercises controlled and are more grammar-based. Due to this, the learning process is enhanced, yet the process is less integrated with actual communication and slower. Willis and Willis (2007) are also of the view that the tasks enable the learners to have a holistic language processing, hence enabling learners to create links among form, meaning, and use. This could be the reason why the TBLT group has a general better performance.

Important findings are also presented in the qualitative data. TBLT lessons have led to teacher reported higher levels of engagement among learners. According to them students were more active and assertive when they were assigned tasks in pairs or groups. Carless (2007) also reported the same results with the finding that task based lessons facilitated participation and helped in motivating learners within Asian EFL classrooms. The educators in the current research have found out that students liked collaborative learning and they were more ready to use English when performing tasks. This leads to the fact that

communicative environments promote more natural language production (Nunan, 2004). Nevertheless, educators had reported a number of difficulties in using TBLT. The time that was taken to design tasks was one of the biggest challenges. The teachers noted that preparing meaningful activities required a lot of time compared to the preparation of standard lessons. This problem is in line with the prior research. According to Carless (2009), a number of teachers find it difficult to meet the practical requirements of TBLT such as preparation of tasks and managing the classroom. The current study also reported challenges in dealing with large classes by teachers. It was difficult to keep track of all groups and to make sure that all participated equally. This is a significant concern that is widely reported in the case of the EFL environment where classes are large and resources are scarce (Littlewood, 2007). It was also mentioned that some of the teachers said that the learners were not certain about task-based lessons initially, particularly those who were accustomed to teacher-centered teaching method. This is similar to what Butler (2011) observes where it is indicated that learners in certain situations see the benefits of structured and form-based instruction due to exam pressure. On the whole, the results suggest that TBLT is more competent compared to conventional ways of enhancing language proficiency. The strategy helps facilitate the communication process and enhance engagement and meaningful learning. Nevertheless, to be successfully implemented, it needs proper training, reduced classes, and institutional support. These conditions can assist teachers to implement TBLT in a more efficient way and solve challenges that have appeared in the present study.

Conclusion

This study aimed at comparing conventional teaching techniques and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in EFL classrooms and defining the difficulties that teachers are faced with when applying TBLT. The results indicate that TBLT can result in a better increase in overall language proficiency as compared to traditional methods. Students in TBLT group showed greater improvements in speaking, listening, reading and writing. These outcomes prove the idea that assignments promote a real communication that promotes the growth of fluency and self-confidence

in language use (Ellis, 2003; Long, 2015). However, conventionally the emphasis of the traditional methods is on accuracy and manipulation. Even though they caused some advancement in this study, the advancement was not as quick and communicative. The results are in line with the argument by Skehan (1998) that task-based learning gives rise to balanced attention to both meaning and form that enable learners to process language in more natural ways.

The research also contributes to the perception of the reaction of the learners to the TBLT. Observations and interviews with teachers indicated that learners became more active, motivated, and confident in TBLT lessons. A lot of students were willing to engage in pair and group activities, thus providing greater chances of interaction. These findings confirm the results of Carless (2007) who also reported that TBLT promotes participation and improves engagement in EFL situations. It seems that the focus on the actual communication gives the lessons a deeper meaning to learners, which can be helpful to maintain the learners interest and enhance its performance. This is also in line with the explanation given by Nunan (2004), who states that tasks are a reflection of language use in real life and thus they promote better learning.

Concurrently, the research study points to the challenges encountered by teachers during the implementation of TBLT. Most of the teachers indicated that they took more time and preparations to design tasks as opposed to planning traditional lessons. They struggled to develop tasks that are meaningful, level-based, and instructional goals. The issue is indicative of the general issues expressed by Carless (2009), who notes that the practical aspects of TBLT can be quite challenging to teachers. Another issue that arose was classroom management. The number of students in the classes was so large that it was almost impossible to keep groups track of the teachers and guarantee the equal participation. This justifies the issues raised by Littlewood (2007) who states that, TBLT is more challenging on situations where there are large classes in which there are limited resources. Certain learners were confused by unfamiliar task-based activities, particularly when they were accustomed to the teacher-centered teaching. Similar findings are noted by Butler (2011) who states that in certain Asian settings, students are more inclined to form-oriented, structured,

instruction due to examination stress and customs of education.

On the whole, the article demonstrates that TBLT is a very productive method of enhancing the proficiency of EFL learners. It has strengths in that it encourages communication, better engagement of learners, and meaningful use of language. Nonetheless, the difficulties identified in this research report show that the implementation should be successful only with the help of teacher training, institutional assistance, reasonable classes, and adequate resources. Under such circumstances, TBLT can be implemented more efficiently and regularly. To sum up, this study supports the importance of TBLT as a communicative and learner-centered model, but also it is necessary to pay attention to practical assistance and pedagogical training. The future research can focus on hybrid techniques that make the best use of the two TBLT and traditional methods, particularly in the situations where resources or classes are smaller and thus do not allow the maximum implementation. TBLT can play a great role in making the teaching of EFL more effective and communicable with proper adjustments.

REFERENCES

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Bygate, M. (2016). Sources, developments and directions of task-based language teaching. *Language Learning*, 66(S1), 1-24.
- Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 36-57.
- Carless, D. (2007). The suitability of TBLT in Asian contexts. *System*, 35(4), 595-608.
- Carless, D. (2009). Revisiting TBLT vs. PPP debate. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 19, 49-66.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- East, M. (2017). Challenges in implementing TBLT. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 113-125.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fulcher, G. (2010). *Practical language testing*. Routledge.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2015). *Applying educational research*. Pearson.
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based teaching in East Asia. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243-249.
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Shintani, N. (2016). Task-based language teaching in foreign language contexts. *Language Teaching for Young Learners*, 2, 3-30.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for task-based learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (2001). Cognition and tasks. *Language Learning*, 51(1), 1-36.
- Van den Branden, K. (2016). The role of task-based approaches. *Language Teaching*, 49(1), 1-15.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.