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ABSTRACT

Much of what we know about the role of teachers in task-based classrooms comes from a body of research that has examined the various issues teachers face when attempting to implement TBLT for the first time (e.g. Carless, 2004; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007). Less empirical research has examined the connections between teacher education programs and subsequent successful TBLT implementation. Despite some previous studies on training teachers to implement TBLT (e.g. Ogilve & Dunn, 2010), few have adequately described the training teachers received and then connected training practices to successful TBLT implementation.

The present study utilized a mixed-methods design with a cohort of preservice teachers preparing to teach English at three different bilingual schools in Honduras. Pre- and post-training surveys and follow-up interviews measured changes in teachers’ beliefs about TBLT after training. Data were triangulated with daily teacher reflections on their experiences during training and follow-up surveys after two months of in-service teaching. Observations of teachers in their classrooms during training were used in stimulated-recall interviews and to assess implementation of task-based pedagogy. Implementation was also evaluated by interviewing family members of students enrolled in the bilingual school.

Results uncovered variations in the impact of the task-based teacher training program on novice language teachers’ TBLT beliefs and subsequent implementation patterns. Findings indicated that factors such as prior teaching experience, prior education and native language influenced teachers’ beliefs and implementation of TBLT. Teachers success levels were high for
aspects important to L2 learning such as elaborating input and encouraging inductive learning through repetition. However, less success was seen at providing negative feedback, respecting learner syllabi and developmental processes, and individualizing instruction. Stimulated recall findings uncovered that the majority of teachers focused on promoting a cooperative and collaborative learning environment. Implications of the study are discussed in terms of their impact for TBLT research, the methods used to investigate task-based teacher education programs, and the pedagogical implications for the participating bilingual schools and for other language programs in similar contexts worldwide.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

This study examines the outcomes of the implementation of a training program for novice bilingual school teachers to enact a pedagogical innovation in a network of Honduran bilingual schools. Task-based language teaching (TBLT, Long, 2016) is an approach to language pedagogy that utilizes authentic, communicative tasks rather than grammatical structures as the basis of instruction. This is in contrast to traditional models of language teaching, which assume that language learning occurs as part of a process of automatization that is linear and in the order presented by the instructor. Within bilingual programs, research-driven curricular innovations, such as TBLT, have met with widespread acclaim and practical success in many economically developed contexts (e.g., González-Lloret & Nielson, 2015), but have not yet reached most areas of the Global South. Latin American countries, in particular, have made considerable efforts to improve English language learning, yet students’ proficiency levels have remained stubbornly low along with the quality of teacher-training programs (Cronquist & Fiszbein, 2017). Little research in any world region has focused on the relationship between language teacher education programs and the outcomes of pedagogical innovations, or the ability of teacher-training programs to alter novice teachers’ beliefs about language learning and teaching. This is despite widespread, empirically supported understanding that teacher training is critical for new language teachers (Borg, 2003).

Early work (e.g. Beretta & Davies, 1985) investigating Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as a potential pedagogical innovation in language teaching and learning focused on examining language programs as they attempted to implement TBLT pedagogy. These studies, and a handful of others since (e.g., De Ridder, Vangehuchten & Gómez, 2007; González-Lloret & Nielson, 2015; Lai, Zhao & Wang, 2011) revealed promising findings in favor of
communication or task-based programs in comparison to syllabus-driven control programs. However, the majority of research published on TBLT since then has investigated specific TBLT variables, such as the effects of repeating tasks or providing students with time to plan before tasks, and how these factors inhibit or enhance performance and learning (e.g., Bygate, 2009; Foster & Skehan, 2009). Despite growing enthusiasm for task-based pedagogy, much less work has been done to investigate the program-level features of TBLT, such as task-based teacher training, in language classrooms.

Although a small amount of previous research has sought to describe and evaluate the implementation of task-based programs (e.g., Van den Branden, 2006), few have thoroughly described the role of the teacher and the role teacher education and training programs had in promoting successful TBLT implementation (see Erlam, 2016; Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010). More often, previous work has described the issues teachers face when attempting to implement TBLT in a particular context (e.g., McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007), particularly where educational and sociocultural values (such as an emphasis on teacher-centered instruction) have been deemed at odds with TBLT principles. Despite this previous work on training teachers to implement TBLT, there is little published work that adequately describes the training teachers receive and makes explicit connections between aspects of the training, teacher individual differences, and the success of subsequent TBLT implementation. Studies rarely, if ever, track teachers over time to determine if the effects of professional development are durable or if they fade after months of classroom teaching. Despite purporting to be a language pedagogy suitable for worldwide contexts, there have been no published studies of TBLT in Honduras and very little in the Latin American context as a whole.
The current study examines English-Spanish bilingual schools located in Honduras. English-Spanish bilingualism is perceived as a significant asset in Honduras, and a critically important factor in access to further education and employment. Sixty-five percent of Hondurans currently live below the poverty line (World Bank, 2017) and major cities routinely top the list of highest homicide rate in the world (U.S. Dept. of State, 2016) due to sweeping gang and drug-related violence. Current news coverage of “migrant caravans” mostly originating in Honduras, has highlighted the systematic inequalities facing many Hondurans in their pursuit of sustainable employment and personal safety and security (e.g. Kinosian, 2019). Despite the demand for English speakers in local industries in Honduras, the majority of bilingual schools are private and therefore only accessible to the elite and financially secure. The participating schools in the current project are battling the structural inequalities present in Honduras by providing English language teachers to local bilingual schools at very low or zero cost to the local community. Therefore, the implementation of pedagogical innovations in this context has direct and important educational implications for local community members.

Given these implications and gaps in existing research, the current study aimed to examine the impacts of a teacher-training program on language teachers' beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning. Additionally, the study examined the extent to which novice teachers were able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms immediately following training.

Utilizing a mixed-methods design, the study investigated a cohort of preservice teachers preparing to teach English at three different bilingual schools in Honduras. Pre- and post-training surveys and follow-up interviews measured changes in teacher beliefs about task-based language teaching after training. Data was triangulated with daily teacher reflections on their experiences.
during training and a follow-up survey after two months of in-service teaching. Observations of teachers in their classrooms during training were used for stimulated-recall interviews and to assess implementation of task-based pedagogy. Implementation was also evaluated by interviewing family members of students enrolled in the bilingual school during parent focus groups. Implications of the study are discussed in terms of its impact on TBLT theory, the methods used to investigate teachers and teacher education programs and the pedagogical implications for the schools were the study was conducted and for other language programs in similar contexts.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter presents an overview of the theoretical foundations and previous research that motivate the current study and is divided into three main sections. First, an overview of task-based language teaching – its theoretical underpinnings, design, and the role of the teacher in TBLT pedagogy is provided. The second section covers second language teacher education and operationalizes second language teacher beliefs. The third section provides a background and rationale for evaluating language programs and describes relevant previous language program evaluation research. The chapter concludes with the research questions and hypotheses for the current study.

2.1. Task Based Language Teaching

2.1.1. Overview

While traditional approaches to language teaching organize syllabi and curricula around grammar points, TBLT utilizes authentic tasks, as opposed to language, as the unit of instruction (Long, 1985, 2015). The aim of TBLT pedagogy is to provide students with the linguistic skills they need to engage in meaningful interactions outside the classroom. According to Long (2015), the theoretical foundation underpinning TBLT pedagogy is known as the Interaction Approach to SLA (Gass & Mackey, 2006) which is in turn based on the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981, 1983, 1996), components of Krashen’s (1980) Input Hypothesis, Swain’s Output Hypothesis (Swain, 2005), and the role of corrective feedback (Mackey & Goo, 2007; Mackey, 2012). TBLT pedagogy is also influenced by research on explicit and implicit learning processes (e.g. DeKeyser, 2007); attention (e.g. Doughty, 2001; Robinson, 1995) and noticing of new forms (Schmidt, 1990); and individual differences in second language (L2) attainment (e.g. Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003). The current study takes these ideas, the cognitive-interactionist tradition of
instructed SLA, as its theoretical basis and investigates novice language teachers’ understandings of second language acquisition processes that underpin TBLT pedagogy and how these understandings are affected by a task-based teacher training program. The following section begins with brief overviews of these key SLA theories that form the foundation of TBLT followed by an overview of TBLT design and implementation and some gaps in current research. The next subsection focuses in on the role of teachers in TBLT and the section concludes with an overview of current research on task-based teacher training and the future directions for this line of research.

2.1.1.1. Theoretical Underpinnings

2.1.1.1.1. The Interaction Hypothesis and Approach to SLA

The Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981, 1983, 1996) posits that second language learning is facilitated by conversational interaction, and in particular, the negotiation for meaning that occurs when interlocutors navigate a communication breakdown (Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Long later updated the hypothesis (1996) to include the provision of input, the opportunity to produce output, and negotiation for meaning including feedback, as essential elements for successful language learning. Since the inception of the hypothesis, hundreds of empirical investigations have robustly demonstrated the link between interactional processes and SLA (See meta-analyses by Keck, Iberri-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, & Wa-Mbaleka, 2006; Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russell & Spada, 2006; Ziegler, 2016). The interaction hypothesis has led to of a line of inquiry in second language acquisition research now known as the interactionist approach (see Mackey, Abbuhl, & Gass, 2012; Mackey & Goo, 2012 for overviews) that is now viewed as its own model or theory of SLA (Mackey & Gass, 2015).
subheadings below provide brief overviews of key elements of the Interaction Approach to SLA that underpin TBLT pedagogy.

2.1.1.1.2. Input and Output

Input, or the language that a learner is exposed to, is an essential feature in all approaches to second language acquisition. Input is characterized as the positive evidence learners receive about the target language (Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998). In 1977, Stephen Krashen proposed the Input Hypothesis suggesting that comprehensible input, or any input that learners are readily able to understand, was the driving force of language development (Krashen, 1997, 1980). Input can be modified during interaction to suit the needs of the learner at a given point in time (Mackey, 2012) and many researchers have examined the ways in which interlocutors modify the input to make it more comprehensible to language learners (Krashen, 1977, 1980; Long, 1983).

Simplifications and elaborations are ways in which interlocutors adjust the input to ease the burden of comprehension for the language learner as well as through the provision of corrective feedback. However, for Krashen, mere exposure to this comprehensible input under the right conditions was enough for language learning.

Swain’s Output Hypothesis (1985) suggested that in addition to input, the production of output is also crucial for language development. Output is the language that learners produce themselves during interaction. Swain (1995, 2005) argues that the opportunity to produce language and correct non-targetlike production after feedback from an interlocutor allows learners to focus on linguistic form and contributes to their noticing of the gap between their interlanguage knowledge and the target language. For example, after receiving feedback a learner might have the chance to modify their output to make it more targetlike. A modified output opportunity is the learner’s chance during interaction to correct the error indicated by
feedback from their interlocutor. When learners have the chance to listen to their own production of the target language they can more accurately compare their productions to their perceptions of the interlocutor’s model (Swain, 2005).

2.1.1.1.3. Negotiation for Meaning and Corrective Feedback

Negotiation for meaning, or adjustments made during conversation to achieve understanding between interlocutors, involves both the elements of input, output and corrective feedback. Long (1996) defined negotiation as:

“The process in which, in an effort to communicate, learners and competent speakers provide and interpret signals of their own and their interlocutor’s perceived comprehension, thus provoking adjustments to linguistic form, conversational structure, message content, or all three, until an acceptable level of understanding is achieved” (p. 418).

Negotiation during interactions has been shown to facilitate language learning by allowing the learners to receive comprehensible input and to modify their own output to be better understood. Repetitions, prompts, and segmentations of words or phrases are all strategies interlocutors might employ while negotiating for meaning (Mackey, 2007). Negotiation for meaning is a main feature of task-based interaction.

Negotiation for meaning also entails the provision of corrective feedback, or the corrections or negative evidence learners receive about their output (as defined in Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Feedback entails any indication that an error or misunderstanding has occurred during the process of negotiation for meaning. In this way corrective feedback can provide the negative evidence a learner needs to “notice the gap” between their own production and that of native or proficient speakers (Schmidt, 1990). Corrective feedback is generally divided into two
types: explicit and implicit ranging from a simple indication that an error has occurred and has caused a communication breakdown, such as a clarification request (‘Sorry what did you say?’), to a metalinguistic explanation of how the error should be corrected (‘In English you need to use the past tense ending –ed…’). SLA researchers have extensively investigated the effects of corrective feedback on various aspects of second language acquisition (see Mackey & Goo, 2007; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Li, 2010, for meta-analyses) both in classroom and laboratory settings. These studies have shown how corrective feedback promotes L2 developing by assisting learners in noticing the problematic areas of their production. One type of corrective feedback in particular, called a recast, have been the center of many studies (e.g. Ellis, 2007; Lyster, 2004; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Mackey et al., 2000; 2007). Recasts are a form of corrective feedback where the interlocutor rephrases all or part of the learners non-targetlike utterance while preserving the same meaning (Mackey & Gass, 2015; Richards & Schmidt, 2002) and is the form most commonly employed by instructors in second language classrooms (Brown, 2016). Implicit feedback is of particular importance in TBLT in that this form of feedback frees up both instructors and learners to focus on tasks the sites of negotiation for meaning and therefore, language development (Long, 2016).

2.1.1.4. Explicit and Implicit Learning

The effectiveness of implicit (unaware) versus explicit (consciously aware) learning is largely determined by age of onset of second language learning with very young learners being able to access and acquire implicit knowledge more readily than adult learners (summarized in Ellis & Shintani, 2013). The successfulness of implicit-only learning tapers off through adolescence (ages 4-6 for phonology) until adulthood where purely incidental exposure yields limited outcomes (Boers & Lindstromberg, 2012) at much slower rates. For young children sustained,
naturalistic exposure to the L2 can promote the attainment of native-like language abilities, although this is not guaranteed (Granena & Long, 2013). All others will require some form-focused instruction combined with incidental exposure – such as that which is learned from exposure and communicative use of the L2 – which forms the basis of TBLT pedagogy. According to Long (2015), implicit learning always remains the dominant, default process for L2 learning, however as learners age they must have their attention intentionally raised to focus on new forms. Previous research has shown a tendency for explicit learning to have a greater benefit for salient, simple rules and categories and implicit learning more beneficial for chunk learning, complex rules and non-salient patterns (Robinson, 1996) pointing to a need for a pedagogy that combines the two. Furthermore, a variety of studies have pointed out that learners do not learn what they are developmentally not ready to acquire (Mackey, 1999; Pienemann, 1984). All of these factors must be taken into consideration when designing pedagogy and syllabi for second language learning.

2.1.1.5. Attention and Noticing

Attention has been shown to be an additional critical factor for SLA (Robinson, 1995). The work of Schmidt (1993, 1990; Schmidt & Frota, 1986) pointed to the need for learners to consciously notice linguistic features in the input in order to acquire them, the basis of his Noticing Hypothesis. While conscious noticing of new forms is critical for “noticing the gap” (Schmidt, 1995), unconscious attention or detection (Tomlin & Villa, 1994) is also critical for implicit input processing. A variety of studies over the past decade have indicated that the more learners notice, the more they learn (e.g. Schmidt & Frota, 1986; Lai & Zhao, 2006; Mackey, 2006; Mackey, Philp, Fujii, Egi, & Tatsumi, 2002; Philp, 2003; Trofimovich, Ammar, & Gatbonton,
Noticing is critical for TBLT pedagogy due to its focus on incidental attention to relevant forms that are necessary for successful completion of target tasks.

2.1.1.6. Individual Differences

A variety of factors that vary at the level of individuals have been shown to affect the degree to which learners are successful at acquiring an L2. The effects of individual differences on SLA such as age of onset, working memory (e.g., Mackey, Philp, Fujii, Egi, & Tatsumi, 2002), aptitude (e.g. Trofimovich, Ammar, & Gatbonton, 2007), anxiety (e.g. Sheen, 2008), and motivation (e.g. You & Dörnyei, 2014) have all been investigated especially for adults. Age of onset has been identified as the single most robust predictor of ultimate L2 attainment (Long, 2015), followed by aptitude (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003) and short-term memory (Long, 1990). These factors can help explain variable success between and within learners in a classroom. TBLT pedagogy takes into account the various individual differences present in the learners in its design by including needs-analysis as a critical first step in designing a task-based syllabus (i.e. one that is focused on authentic learner needs for the L2) as well as part of the assessments which are task-driven and assess what the learner can accomplish with the L2 in contexts relevant to their own needs and abilities.

2.1.1.2. TBLT Overview

TBLT pedagogy arose from a desire to reconcile findings in SLA research, such as those briefly summarized above, with traditional and popular approaches to language teaching (as summarized in Long, 2016). For example, in the traditional PPP, or Presentation, Practice, Production, model of language teaching (Byrne, 1986), the instructor first presents a new linguistic form or grammar point, students drill the form, and are thereby asked to produce the form. The PPP model for language learning assumes that learning occurs as part of a process of automatization.
that is linear and in the order that is presented by the instructor; therefore, these approaches are incompatible with the natural developmental stages known to affect the order of acquisition of forms (Mackey, 1999, Pienemann, 1984). However, the PPP method along with other grammar-based pedagogies represent the majority of traditional language teaching styles. On the other extreme end, so-called “natural approaches” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) focus exclusively on meaning, which are inefficient for those with reduced capacity for incidental learning (i.e. older learners) or in contexts where learners do not have access to large amounts of input (e.g. foreign language classrooms, like the ones investigated in the current study).

TBLT, however, provides only incidental focus on form (rather than forms) congruent with a learners’ own internal syllabus. TBLT also takes learner relevance as one of its central tenets. TBLT programs begin with thorough needs analyses in which target tasks, or “what [learners] need to be able to do in the new language” (Long, 2015, p. 6), are identified and used to develop a task syllabus. Tasks range from linguistic survival skills such as, ordering food in a restaurant, or giving directions to a cab – to highly complex skills such as, asking a professor to review a manuscript or interviewing for a job. The selection of which tasks are relevant is a direct result of findings from a needs analysis (see Malicka, Gilabert Guerrero, & Norris, 2017 for a recent needs analysis implementation study). These tasks are then sequenced by complexity as “pedagogic tasks” or “the activities and the materials that teachers and/or students work on in the classroom or other instructional environment” (Long, 2015, p. 6). Finally, the syllabus is implemented, integrating focus on form as needed throughout task performances such that learners acquire language through meaningful communication and interaction with peers and their instructors. Evaluations, where data on student performance is gathered, occurs via task-based assessment in which learners are tested on whether or not they can successfully
accomplish the target tasks. The process is intended to be iterative, with cycles of needs analyses and evaluations working to improve the overall implementation of the task-based program.

Long (2015) summarizes these features as the “Methodological Principles (MPs)” for TBLT, or:

“The universally desirable instructional design features, motivated by theory and research findings in second language acquisition…, educational psychology, philosophy of education, general educational curriculum design, and elsewhere, which show them to be either necessary for SLA or facilitative of it.” (p.301)

Long’s ten MPs include:

- Use task, not text, as the unit of analysis (MP1),
- Promote learning by doing (MP2),
- Elaborate input (MP3),
- Provide rich input (MP4),
- Encourage inductive “chunk” learning (MP5),
- Focus on form (MP6),
- Provide negative feedback, (MP7)
- Respect learner syllabi and developmental processes (MP8),
- Promote cooperative collaborative learning (MP9) and,
- Individualize instruction (MP10)
  (Long, 2015, p. 300).

These represent the framework TBLT is based upon and do not suggest particular pedagogic procedures to enact in the classroom. Instead, pedagogic decisions are left up to teachers to decide at the local level.

TBLT has been implemented, evaluated and documented in contexts worldwide (e.g. Hermes & King (in press) with language revitalization; Shintani (2016) with young learners in Japan; Müller-Hartmann & Schocker-von Ditfurth (2011) in Germany, Van den Branden (2006) program-wide in Flanders, Belgium) and a variety of meta-analyses have been conducted that
examine the effects of features of TBLT on various linguistic outcomes. The kinds of interaction-driven learning that occurs during task-based interactions has been meta-analyzed several times (Cobb, 2010; Keck et al., 2006; Mackey & Goo, 2007) demonstrating positive effects for task-based learning outcomes. Other task-related features have also been meta-analyzed, such as: the effects of task complexity (Jackson & Suethanapornkul, 2013; Sasayama, Malicka, & Norris, 2018), the factors that affect implementation in specific regions or settings (Butler, 2011) or modalities such as in computer-mediated contexts (Ziegler, 2016), the effects of long-term full-scale implementations of TBLT in a wide range of contexts (Bryfonski & McKay, 2017), and reviews of the kinds of methods used in task-based research (Plonsky & Kim, 2016) all pointing to positive outcomes for TBLT pedagogy and advancements in task-related research.

2.1.1.3. Criticisms and Gaps in Previous TBLT Research

Despite the success reported in the variety of meta-analyses described above, others have criticized some key aspects of TBLT pedagogy (for a recent reviews of criticisms and responses, see Ellis, 2017, 2018; Long, 2016). Critiques have been leveraged at TBLT’s reliance on incidental focus on form and claim there is not enough focus on grammar or vocabulary development to be feasible or insufficient research deeming that the pedagogy is preferable (De Bot, 2015; Swan, 2005; Widdowson, 2003). Scholars have also questioned the sociocultural fit of TBLT within particular contexts, for example, regions where teacher-fronted teaching styles and rote memorization are culturally preferred (Carless, 2003) or with different ages of learners (Bruton, 2005). Even Long (2015) laments that:

“In light of the factors that have been identified as prone to favor or disfavor the diffusion of innovation, it is easy to see why TBLT is unlikely ever to displace
traditional approaches to [language teaching] in some parts of the world, and in many schools and classrooms in all parts.” (p. 371)

To better understand how and when TBLT can be productively applied in worldwide contexts and how to promote innovation despite deeply rooted traditional approaches, there is a need for more in situ evaluations of intact TBLT programs to better understand the factors that contribute to the adoption or rejection of TBLT methods. However, most previous research has focused on specific, short-term features of tasks, task-variables and task-based interactions (Plonsky & Kim, 2016) with far less investigating program-level features such as long-term implementations (but see Prabhu, 1987, one of the first studies of TBLT implementation), detailed classroom studies of the ways teachers and students engage in task-based lessons (but see East, 2012; Samuda, 2009) or the role of teachers in TBLT classrooms.

2.1.2. The Role of the Teacher in Task-Based Language Teaching

2.1.2.1. Overview

With student-centered interaction and learning highlighted as key elements of TBLT, the role of the teacher has previously been criticized as being downgraded or cast aside as the manager or overseer of activities. However, the importance of the role of the teacher in TBLT has been underscored in a variety of previous works as in fact requiring greater expertise and resourcefulness than teaching in a traditional focus on forms/PPP approach (e.g. Samulda, 2001; Van den Branden, 2016). As Long (2016) points out in his response to common criticisms of TBLT, teachers using a TBLT approach must employ more creativity and decision-making in order to tailor input and corrective feedback to individual learners. Teachers using a PPP approach, that often follows a one-size-fits-all commercial textbook, need only implement “lessons planned down to the last drill and exercise by an unseen textbook writer and assumed
appropriate for all students in a group on the same predetermined day” (Long, 2016, p. 25).
However, teachers in learner-centered, TBLT, classrooms are critical, in that they are the
pursuers of the learner needs analysis which dictates the tasks learners tackle and what success
means for those tasks. Furthermore, teachers must be reactive to learners’ individual syllabi in
the corrective feedback, input and forms they provide as well as attending to other individual
differences and differentiating instruction accordingly. All of this occurs in the harmonious, safe
classroom environment that the teacher alone creates and maintains for the students. Despite this,
the critical role of teachers in TBLT classrooms has received considerably less attention in
previous research when compared with other task-related variables (Kris Van den Branden, 2016).

2.1.2.2. Existing Research on the Role of the Teacher in TBLT

The role of the teacher in TBLT has generally been described as a guide, facilitator (Willis, 1996), or interactional partner (Kris Van den Branden, 2006) who provides access to
negotiations for meaning, communicative input, pushed output and focuses on form when
necessary. Samuda (2001; 2009) argues that the role of the teacher in TBLT is to “lead from
behind” defining the relationship between task and teacher as “complementary” in which the
teacher is a “bystander.” Pedagogically oriented research on the role of the teacher in TBLT
(Devlieger & Goossens, 2007; Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2017; Van Avermaet, Colpin, Van
Gorp, Bogaert, & Van den Branden, 2006; Van den Branden, 2006, 2016; Willis, 1996) has
argued that the primary role of TBLT teachers is to select content pre-task, act as a interactional
partner and supporter during tasks, and assess task performance post-task (Norris, 2015). Teachers in TBLT classrooms have also been called on to provide socioemotional support
(Devlieger & Goossens, 2007) and to differentiate between individual learners’ motivations,
language learning needs and interests (Van Avermaet et al., 2006). Willis and Willis (2007) go further and provide and outline of the six roles of the teacher in a TBLT classroom including: leader and organizer of discussion, manager of group work, facilitator of the task process, motivator of student participation, language advisor and (if that wasn’t enough!) language teacher. Han (2018) points out that as interest and research on TBLT pedagogy has grown and expanded over recent years, so have the expectations of task-based language teachers. Given these myriad responsibilities inherent in the role of the teacher in a TBLT classroom, there has been a clear, ongoing, need to better document how teachers implement their role in real classrooms.

Previous research that has investigated the role of the teacher in TBLT has typically examined the questions or difficulties teachers face when designing or preparing to teach task-based lessons or described the role of the teacher in TBLT classrooms (Van Avermaet et al., 2006; Van den Branden, 2016). Brandl (2016) summarizes the main questions that have dominated previous research on teachers in TBLT (as also cited in Han, 2018):

- How do teachers conceptualize TBLT?
- How do teachers go about implementing tasks or a task-based syllabus?
- What challenges and struggles do they experience?
- What are teachers’ attitudes toward TBLT?
- How compatible do they perceive TBLT with their current instructional practices?

(Brandl, 2016, p. 429)

These questions clearly point out that the majority of research focused on teachers has been concerned with teacher behaviors. For example, using transcripts of a beginning adult ESL class to investigate the interplay between task design and instructional strategies, Samuda (2009)
found the teacher of a TBLT classroom moved from a focus on meaning to a focus on form then back to a focus on meaning as she navigated tasks with her students. Pre-task design in this case was shown to assist the teacher to scaffold implicit language focus with positive evidence mined from task input data and to frame negative feedback by integrating form and meaning. A study by Carless (2004) examined three primary school English language classrooms in Hong Kong using a case study methodology. In this context, it was found that teachers interpreted the concept of TBLT in different ways in their classroom practice based on their own understandings of tasks and the challenges they faced implementing tasks. McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) also investigated the implementation of a task based program via a case study. In their examination of teachers’ and learners’ reactions to a task-based EFL course at a Thai university they found that while teachers and learners generally had positive reactions towards the innovation, they needed time to adjust to the task-based teaching approach. Although participants had concerns about the lack of grammar instruction and receiving enough support from the teacher during the tasks, revisions to the course improved their perceptions. These studies of teachers perceptions of TBLT implementation have contributed to understandings of how task-based learning interacts with a variety of cultures and language programs.

Newer research has gathered teachers’ perspectives on specific elements of task design such as task complexity or task sequencing (Gurzynski-Weiss, 2016). A study by Révész and Gurzynski-Weiss (2016) elicited ESL teachers’ perspectives on sources of task difficulty by tracking teachers’ eye movements as they judged a variety of pedagogic tasks. Studies such as this one provide valuable insight into the factors teachers consider when choosing and modifying tasks for various difficulty levels. Other studies have investigated instructors’ in-class decision making about the kinds of task-based interactions known to support L2 development such as
focus on form (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004) and corrective feedback (e.g. Polio, Gass, & Chapin, 2006). A study by Gurzynski-Weiss, (2016) for example, found that contextual factors (error type), learner proficiency level, and instructor beliefs all worked together to influence teachers’ decisions about when, how and what type of feedback to provide during meaning focused interactions. Overall, however, previous work has found that TBLT teachers do not “follow ‘official’ TBLT-related pedagogic recommendations in a slavish way” (Andon & Eckerth, 2009, p. 305). Instead, teachers in a variety of contexts modify their approach to suit the needs of their particular learners in the particular context in which they work (e.g. Carless, 2004; East, 2012; Ellis, 2015; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007; Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2017; Samuda, 2009; Van Gorp & Van den Branden, 2014).

Despite this previous work, in 2016 Long identified teacher education for TBLT as one of the remaining “real issues” for the pedagogy, noting the variety of factors that mitigate against teacher buy-in and adoption of TBLT methods in their classrooms. Van den Branden’s (2016) article in the same volume on the role of teachers in task-based language education highlighted the same issue, saying: “both in the research literature on tasks and second language learning and in the pedagogical literature on task-based language teaching, the role of the teacher has received scant attention” (p. 164). Ellis (2017) echoed these sentiments in a position paper, “Moving task-based teaching forward,” and listed teacher education programs and their ability to “overcome the problems [teachers] face in task-based teaching” (p. 508) on his own list of “real issues” in the design and implementation of TBLT courses. Developing a teacher’s ability to successfully implement TBLT in classrooms is challenging, as demonstrated by a variety of implementation studies (East, 2012; Van den Branden, 2016) and action research (Müller-Hartmann & Schocker, 2017). Clearly, the extent to which TBLT pedagogy can be deemed higher quality than
traditional grammatical approaches is critically dependent on the quality and training of the teachers executing tasks in their language classrooms.

2.1.3. Task-Based Teacher Training

2.1.3.1. Overview

Much of what we know about the role of training teachers in task-based classrooms comes from a body of research that has examined the various issues teachers face when attempting to implement TBLT for the first time (East, 2012; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007; Tinker Sachs, 2007). Studies of teachers implementing TBLT have identified a variety of challenges for implementation including cultural acceptance of the methodology, difficulties with classroom management and discipline, and issues controlling the use of the students’ L1 or promoting the use of the target language in the classroom. Much less research has focused specifically on the process of training teachers to implement task-based methods. According to Han (2018) the majority of these documented trainings have been procedural, such as exercise where teachers practice determining what is a task and what isn’t a task, rather than focused on the epistemological basis and rational for TBLT. Despite these shortcomings, a variety of previous studies have documented the training teachers receive to implement TBLT in their classrooms.

2.1.3.2. Existing Research on Training Task-Based Language Teachers

In his article, “Training teachers: Task-based as well?” Van den Branden (2006) raises the question:

Can “teachers or student teachers…actually be trained to teach ‘the task-based’ way? How…do experienced language teachers, who have been using a grammar-based, form-focused syllabus for years react to in-service training in task-based language education?” (p. 217).
These questions have been explored in a small body of past work aimed at understanding teacher reactions to TBLT training. Using case studies of in-service training programs around Belgium (e.g. D’hondt, 2004; Linsen, 1994; Luyten & Houben, 2002), Van den Branden (2006), advocates for TBLT to be implemented by combining theoretical training with the introduction of task-based syllabi along with ongoing professional development and support for teachers. He argues that it is not enough for teachers to simply have on and off professional development seminars and workshops on TBLT methods.

Despite the critical role of the teacher in implementing task-based pedagogy, much less empirical research has examined the connection between teacher education or training programs and subsequent successful TBLT implementation—however, some patterns have emerged. In a study by Ogilvie and Dunn (2010), student teachers participated in a constructivist-based curriculum course that targeted teachers’ “dispositions” towards TBLT and their ensuing utilization of TBLT pedagogy during a teaching practicum. Data from questionnaires, written reflections, and interviews revealed that preservice teachers’ dispositions towards TBLT did in fact increase after the course, however their positive disposition towards TBLT did not translate to successful implementation in the classroom. The authors suggest that teachers did not utilize the principles of TBLT in their practicum classroom because they did not perceive its epistemological value. Additionally, teachers reported the desire to adhere to their own cultural norms for teaching and learning and felt that challenging those norms during their practicum would result in negative reviews of their teaching by their mentor teachers. Finally, the authors indicated that a lack of training in TBLT methods on the part of the mentor teachers resulted in limited support for the new teachers as they were carrying out lessons in the practicum.
classrooms. This study highlights that teacher training on TBLT principles does not necessarily result in the ability to successfully implement TBLT in the L2 classroom.

The difficulty of translating knowledge and understanding of TBLT principles taught in teacher training programs to actual task design and implementation has been echoed in a few other contexts (e.g. Chan, 2012; Erlam, 2016). In one example, Chan (2012) found that elementary school teachers in a professional development course in Hong Kong had difficulty in grasping the concepts of TBLT as it applied to their own teaching. The author suggests teachers use self-reflection and peer-evaluation as strategies to evaluate themselves and their implementation of the pedagogy. Other work has found that teacher age may also play a role. In a case study by (Zheng & Borg, 2014) a group of Chinese secondary school teachers of English were observed implementing TBLT. Of the case study participants, the younger teachers were more likely to enact the principles of TBLT than the older teachers who used more formal grammar lessons in their teaching.

In a study in New Zealand by Erlam (2016), forty-three teachers of seven different languages participated in a year-long professional development course that highlighted TBLT pedagogy. At the end of the program the teachers designed tasks for their own classrooms based on what they had learned in the training. The tasks created by the teachers were evaluated based on four essential criteria for tasks established by Ellis (2003). Results indicated that about half of the tasks the teachers designed fulfilled all four of Ellis’s criteria, with 82% fulfilling three or more of the criteria. The criteria that was most difficult for the teachers to satisfy was to allow learners to utilize their own linguistic resources to complete the task, while the easiest criteria for the teachers to satisfy was for the task to have a clearly defined outcome. Erlam suggests that teacher training programs should stress the importance of ensuring language learners are able to
meet the language demands of the task by providing support via scaffolding and other resources. Additionally, teachers must understand the difference between having students function as language users versus language learners to ensure meaning-making occurs during the task.

In order to promote a deeper, more holistic understanding of TBLT, some advocates have called for teacher training programs to be, themselves, task-based (Brandl, 2016; Han, 2018) with learners experiencing training mediated by tasks. Brandl (2016) argues that teacher training programs should involve a large amount of modeling:

- A teacher trainer needs to walk the talk when training foreign language teachers.
- Teachers need many hands-on opportunities where they can try out and experiment with TBLT methodologies in a safe environment under the guidance of an expert trainer. This practice will allow them to experience TBLT in action and will prepare them for some of the challenges. One training element that is in particular noteworthy is the need for trainees to be involved in the development of the task materials. (Brandl, 2016, p. 435)

One such study by Han (2018), investigated a task-based learning in a Chinese language teacher-training program aimed at preparing teachers to implement TBLT. Using case studies of three Chinese-L1 novice teachers, the study examined both the teachers content learning (i.e. understanding of TBLT) and their own language learning in English as their L2. By analyzing weekly reading journals where teachers wrote their reactions to chapters from Willis and Willis' (2007), *Doing Task-Based Teaching*, Han described the teachers’ variable reactions to content on psychological and cognitive dimensions that were measured. Han argued that the results indicated that the task of journaling was conducive to learning about TBLT.
2.1.3.3. Limitations of Existing Research on the Task-Based Teacher Training

Despite this previous work on training teachers to implement TBLT, there is little published work that adequately describes the training teachers receive and makes explicit connections between aspects of the training and the success of subsequent TBLT implementation. Studies typically take a case study approach, following a small number of teachers (three teachers in Han, 2018; four teachers in Chan, 2012) and documenting their experiences at one school. Fewer studies have examined larger groups of teachers (43 teachers in Erlam, 2016; 12 in Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010), teachers from a variety of grade-levels or disciplines, or teachers from more than one school. Studies rarely, if ever, track teachers over time to determine if the effects of professional development are durable or if they fade after months of classroom teaching.

Furthermore, as is the case overall in published applied linguistics research, previous work has overwhelmingly examined education in privileged contexts, mostly in North America, Europe and Asia (but see recent work by Nero, 2018 on teacher training in The Dominican Republic) and less so in the Global South.

As described previously, TBLT teacher education has been recently called out as one of the top issues in TBLT research (Long, 2016; Ellis, 2017; Van den Branden, 2016). According to Ellis (1997, 2017), many of the key characteristics of a successful pedagogical innovation depend on teacher buy-in and commitment to the innovation. Successful innovation is therefore, dependent on the implementation of well-designed and carefully implemented second language teacher training programs that take into account teacher beliefs and experiences.
2.2. Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE)

2.2.1. Overview

The current study will examine novice teachers as they are trained prior to their first year teaching a TBLT curriculum. Teacher training is critical for new language teachers whose beliefs about teaching and learning are influenced by their own prior learning experiences and shaped by teacher induction programs (Borg, 2003). Recent developments in the field of STLE have focused on teacher cognition, reflection and professional cultures (Wright, 2010) recognizing that teachers are not merely passive purveyors of knowledge – or “a cog in the educational machine” (Elbaz, 1981, p.45) – but instead are “active, thinking decision-makers who play a central role in shaping classroom events” (Borg, 2015, p. 1). The interest in teacher cognitions stems from early work in the field of psychology (Clark & Yinger, 1977; Shulman & Elstein, 1975) that demonstrated a connection between understanding knowledge/beliefs and understanding human action (summarized in Borg, 2015). By extension, understanding teacher cognitions is critical to understanding the process of teaching. The following section summarizes previous research in SLTE and teacher cognitions and ends with a description of how the current study operationalizes second language teacher beliefs.

2.2.1.1. Existing Research in Teacher Education and Cognitions

Early research in educational psychology on teacher cognition, originally called “teacher thinking” (Clark & Yinger, 1977), was concerned with teacher planning, teacher judgement, teacher interactive decision-making, and teachers’ implicit perspectives (Borg, 2015) as well as how teaching develops as a result of experience. Early researchers in this domain (Clark & Yinger, 1977; Elbaz, 1981; Shavelson & Stern, 1981) highlighted the complex nature of teaching and the need to better understand cognitive dimensions at play in teachers’ interactions,
pedagogy and practice. Other previous research has sought to understand the effects of previous learning experiences and academic courses on new teachers’ cognitions, finding that teacher cognition is affected by a multitude of factors including, teachers’ own experience in schooling, their professional coursework, contextual factors, and classroom practice (Borg, 1997). Teachers’ own experiences in learning environments have shown to be especially pivotal, in that through many previous years of exposure through their own schooling, new teachers have already engaged in an “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) and then find it difficult to absorb alternative models of pedagogy that challenge their preexisting notions. Pajares (1992) claimed that beliefs about teaching and learning are already well established by the time a student gets to college. Mainstream educational research has shown that at the onset of teacher training programs, “students may have inappropriate, unrealistic or naïve understandings of teaching and learning” (Borg, 2015, p. 60). Prabhu (1987), one of the first documented studies of TBLT implementation, recognized this as one of the main barriers to innovation in education:

A new perception of pedagogy, implying a different pattern of classroom activity, is an intruder into teachers’ mental frames – an unsettling one, because there is a conflict of mismatch between the old and new perceptions and, more seriously a threat to prevailing routines and to the sense of security dependent on them. (p. 105)

This “sense of security” from previous teaching or learning experiences described by Prabhu may help explain why teachers’ beliefs are resistant to change, as variety of past work has demonstrated. A study by Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) reviewed over 300 studies of preservice teacher training and determined that pre-existing beliefs were relatively impervious to change and that the formal teacher preparation courses had little impact on changing those
beliefs. However, the authors attribute their finding to the traditional behaviorist models of preservice teacher training and advocate for programs that consider social and cultural conditions in schools and the values of and needs of preservice teachers and their trainers. A survey of preservice teacher education in developing countries by Lewin and Stuart (2003) came to similar conclusions and advocated for a focus on the learning experiences of preservice teachers as a method of reforming teacher training. In a study by Vélez-Rendón (2006), the learning-to-teach experience of a preservice German language teacher was examined through interviews, observations, lesson plans and stimulated recall interviews. The teacher was found to have preconceived beliefs about best teaching practices and those beliefs were difficult to alter even after her educator program.

This mismatch between old and new perceptions is echoed in research that has examined the contrasting experience of expert and novice teachers. A review by Carter (1990) summarized the findings from cognitive psychology that demonstrated how expert teachers “draw on richly elaborated knowledge structures derived from classroom experience to understand teaching tasks and interpret classroom events” (p. 299). In contrast to novice teachers, expert teachers are able to utilize their experiences and familiarity with classroom situations make more accurate predictions about behaviors and results in a classroom. However, in general it has been found that teachers are more amenable to innovation pre-service than later in their careers (Beijaard & Verloop, 1996). Pajares (1992) pointed this out in a summary of 16 “fundamental assumptions” of teacher beliefs stating, “the earlier a belief is incorporated into the belief structure, the more difficult it is to alter. Newly acquired beliefs are most vulnerable to change” (p. 324). Programs that take teachers’ prior experiences and beliefs in consideration in the design and execution of the training program have been shown to be more effective at influencing teacher cognitions (e.g.
Kettle & Sellars, 1996). Additionally, teacher training programs that foster reflection and development of epistemological beliefs have been shown to be more effective in promoting educational innovations (Brownlee, Purdie, & Boulton-Lewis, 2001). Programs have accomplished this in a variety of ways including: by supervising new teachers and encouraging reflection, by providing peer reflection groups where teachers can engage in collaborative professional development, and through providing teachers with opportunities to trial new teaching ideas (Kettle & Sellars, 1996).

2.2.1.2. Limitations of Existing Research on Teacher Cognitions

Our understanding of teacher cognitions and the ability of teacher education programs to influence teacher cognition is not yet complete. The research paints a complex picture: some programs seem to effect change, while others do not; some programs are successful with certain students but not others; experience in schooling and previous teaching experiences seem to play a role, but it is unclear what that role is; and some beliefs seem to be more difficult to change that others. Richardson (1996) paints a bleak picture, arguing that teacher education seems ill-suited to affect cognitions given the known effects of “two powerful forces – previous life history, particularly that related to being a student, and classroom experience as a student teacher and a teacher” (p. 113). However, some limitations prevent a complete understanding of the effects (or lacking effects) of previous experiences on the ability of teacher training programs to alter teacher cognitions. One issue as described by Clark (1986) is that research on teacher planning and decision-making has been done almost exclusively upper middle class suburban classrooms. Therefore, it is difficult to say that previous findings would hold true in other less privileged communities. Furthermore, previous research lacks connections between teacher
cognitions and student outcomes (Borg, 2015) – a critical piece to the puzzle of determining whether or not training programs are effective.

2.2.2. Second Language Teacher Cognitions

While there is a more robust history of research into teachers’ beliefs in the domain of mainstream education (Wright, 2010), the field of second language teacher education (SLTE) has lagged behind (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). There has been relatively little work investigating the development of language teachers’ cognitions – most of which have been conducted with experienced, not preservice, teachers (Borg, 2006). According to Wright (2010), “research on the interactions of [student teachers’] prior knowledge and beliefs about language teaching and learning, and programme goals, course content and teacher educators’ cognitions and pedagogy in ongoing SLTE programmes is almost non-existent” (p. 269). Only recently have SLTE programs begun to emphasize the importance of preservice teachers’ prior learning experiences and beliefs and “the influence of teacher educators in reshaping…[those] beliefs through their modelling of alternative pedagogies” (Wright, 2010, p. 267).

A variety of studies have investigated the relationship between language teachers’ beliefs and cognitions and their classroom practices (e.g. Asassfeh, 2015; Kang & Cheng, 2014) (Martínez Agudo, 2014) as we as the beliefs of language learners themselves (Loewen et al., 2009). The finding that teachers engage in an “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) has also been echoed among language teachers (Golombek, 1998; Johnson, 1994; Numrich, 1996). In a study of pre-service language teachers teaching in a practicum course, Johnson (1994) found that teachers drew from their own first-hand experiences as second language learners to judge the appropriateness of theories and methods as presented in their training. The willingness of the teachers to internalize the content of the preparation course was connected to the teachers’ prior
language learning experiences. This finding was echoed in Numrich (1996) which found that teachers avoided or promoted various teaching techniques based on their own negative or positive experiences with those techniques in their own language learning. For example, error correction was viewed negatively by teachers who remembered feeling “humiliated and uncomfortable” being corrected in class as language learners (p. 139). Additionally, native (NS) versus non-native speaker (NNS) teacher status seems to play a role in absorption of new teaching practices or teacher-training content (e.g. Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010; Warford & Reeves, 2003). A study by Warford and Reeves (2003) found that the “apprenticeship of observation” has a stronger effect on NNS teaching their L2 due to the fact that the NNSs are living the language learning experience as they teach, while NSs are not. Prior experiences teaching has also been shown to play a role in how language instructors approach various aspects of teaching (Polio et al., 2006; Richards, 1998; Tsui, 2003). For example, Tsui (2003) compared one expert, two experienced and one novice ESL teacher over the course of 18 months teaching in Hong Kong. Tsui found that the teachers differed in their in-class behaviors with the expert teacher exhibiting more reflection and problem-solving and the novice teacher acting more reactively and inconsistently in her lesson planning and routine.

A handful of previous studies have specifically investigated the impact of teacher education programs on second language teacher beliefs (Borg, 2005; Cabaroglu & Roberts, 2000; Da Silva, 2005; Gutierrez Almarza, 1996; MacDonald, Badger, & White, 2001; Peacock, 2001; Pennington & Urmston, 1998; Richards, Ho, & Giblin, 1996; Sendan & Roberts, 1998; Urmston, 2003) with some evidence suggesting that teacher education programs have limited effects on pre-service teacher cognitions (e.g. Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 1999, 2001; Pennington & Urmston, 1998; Urmston, 2003). A longitudinal questionnaire-based study of
Greek teachers’ beliefs about language teaching and learning by Mattheoudakis (2007) found that teachers’ individual beliefs about the importance of vocabulary and grammar learning in language learning remained strong even after a course on theories of language acquisition. Studies by Peacock (1999, 2001) found similar results: after track 146 ESL teachers over the course of a 3-year program in Hong Kong, the 2001 study found no significant changes in beliefs about language learning (the study utilized an inventory called the BALLI, Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory, by Horwitz, 1985 that measures agreement with statements about research-based language teaching practices). When the beliefs of the novice teachers collected by the BALLI survey were compared with responses from more experienced teachers, the researcher found the novice teachers were more likely than experienced teachers to agree with statements such as: “Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words” and “Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules.” A study by Mackey, Polio and McDonough (2004) additionally found that experienced ESL teachers used more incidental focus-on-form techniques (those typically associated with TBLT pedagogy) than inexperienced teachers. Some preliminary evidence has also demonstrated that teachers with previous experience learning languages via PPP or focus on forms based pedagogy tend to prefer teacher-centered lessons over communicative or task-based pedagogies, even after a course on task-based language teaching (Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010b).

However, a handful of studies have found the opposite result – that teacher education programs do have the potential to affect change on language teachers (Borg, 2011; Busch, 2010; Macdonald, Badger & White, 2001). A study by Busch (2010) found that 381 pre-service language teachers experienced changes in beliefs after enrolling in an introductory course on second language acquisition. Similarly, after measuring pre-service language teacher beliefs with
a questionnaire about L2 acquisition (questionnaire by Lightbown & Spada, 1993), MacDonald, Badger and White (2001) found that after a SLA course, teachers were more likely to reject behaviorist models of language learning demonstrating that the training did have an effect on participants’ cognitions. Previous researchers have advocated for more experiential learning and critical reflection for student teachers in order to promote change in cognitions post training (Borg, 2011; Farrell, 1999). This recommendation was born out in a study by Borg (2011) that examined the impact of in-service teacher education on language teacher’ beliefs finding that a course that emphasized critical reflection on teacher beliefs and experiential learning resulted in shifts in the beliefs teachers previously held about aspects of language teaching and learning.

Although many innovations in language learning and teaching are disseminated in academic journals, and discussed in training courses, previous research into language teachers’ perspectives have found tenuous connections between SLA research and language pedagogy in practice. In a study by Nassaji (2012), 201 ESL and EFL teachers completed a questionnaire to determine the extent to which they believed the findings of SLA research were useful and relevant for L2 pedagogy. While the data revealed that teachers did believe knowing about SLA research was useful, a high percentage of teachers stated they believed they gained more from teaching experience than from research. Few teachers indicated that they read research articles due to lack of time, difficulty of research articles and due to a lack of interest. The author suggests action research as one method of getting teachers involved in the process of scientifically investigating pedagogical questions. A study by Marsden and Kasprowicz (2017) shed further light on this issue by examining the flow of research to foreign language educators finding that many educators had barriers to direct exposure to relevant research due to issues with accessing articles, namely: a lack of time and lack of money to attend conferences and
engage with the research community. Furthermore, there was also a lack of indirect exposure to research. When the researchers reviewed professional publications aimed at teachers for references to relevant top-tier journals, they found a reference rate of only 12.43% per professional article. The authors offered some suggestions for improving communication between academic journals and teachers including open access distribution of “lay summaries,” or short summaries of articles that are more conceptually accessible to practitioners than the full research article. Without access or perceived utility of research in the fields of applied linguistics and SLA, it is unlikely that traditional methods of research dissemination are likely to impact on second language teacher cognitions.

2.2.2.1. Operationalizing Teacher Beliefs

The current dissertation study measured novice English teachers’ beliefs about second language teaching and task-based language teaching pedagogy. Teacher beliefs have been defined and described in a variety of ways in previous research including:

- “Teacher thinking” (Clark & Yinger, 1977),
- “Pedagogical thoughts, judgements, decisions and behaviors” (Shavelson & Stern, 1981),
- “Routines” – “habitualized patterns of thought and action which remove doubts about what to do next, reduce complexity and increase predictability” (Crookes & Arakaki, 1999, as cited in Borg, 2015 Table 2.2)
- “Teacher knowledge” (Verloop, Van Driel, & Meijer, 2001),
- “Teacher Cognition” – The unobservable dimensions of teaching including what teachers, know, believe and think (Borg, 2003, p. 81).
Beliefs—“Statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts, and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of what ‘should be done,’ ‘should be the case,’ and ‘is preferable’ (Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004, as cited in Borg, 2015, Table 2.2).

The current study defines second language teacher beliefs aligned with Borg (2003) and Basturkmen et al. (2004) in that beliefs include what they know “should be done” what they believe “should be the case” and what they think “is preferable.” These beliefs can be measured as evaluations or statements. However, as Pajares (1992) pointed out: “the construct of educational beliefs is itself broad and encompassing. For the purposes of research, it is diffuse and ungainly, too difficult to operationalize, too context-free. Therefore, as with more general beliefs, educational beliefs about are required…” (p. 316). For this reason, following Pajares (1992), the definition for the purpose of the current study will specifically examine: teacher beliefs about second language and task-based language teaching and will be measured by agreement or disagreement with statements about SLA and TBLT on surveys as well as by statements in open-ended survey questions and in semi-structured interviews.

2.2.2.2. Limitations of Existing Research on Second Language Teacher Beliefs

Despite the importance of the role of teachers on student learning, previous research has been limited by a variety of factors. The field of teacher cognitions as a whole is large and fragmented with little replication or systematic approaches to investigating topics in SLTE (Borg, 2015). Given the global nature of language teaching, overall the number of studies investigating the cognitions and role of beliefs in language teaching is small and past studies have largely been conducted in ESL, EFL, or English as an L1 contexts, mostly in the USA (Borg, 2015) and therefore may lack applicability to other languages or contexts. Ortega (2019) extends this disparity to research in SLA in general, pointing out that given the published research, the
“linguistic needs of students in higher education seem to be the highest priority for research in contemporary SLA” (p. 32) whose multilingualism typically represents a privileged choice rather than a necessity. Ortega also points out that SLA research typically is based in contexts located in the 36% of world countries classified as high income. Additionally, measuring real cognitive change in teachers is difficult. Any questionnaire-based studies run the risk of participants reporting changes in beliefs simply to appease course instructors or to match content (Borg, 2015). Finally, few studies have sought to connect cognitive change with behavioral change (i.e. actual teaching practices in classrooms).

While the complex role of teacher beliefs is still not completely understood, it is clear that teacher beliefs have a tremendous impact on learning in the classroom. Studies of the effects of instruction on learning have identified teachers as the “major players” in the educational process (Hattie, 2012) and are considered by some to be the most important factors in ensuring educational effectiveness (McKinsey & Company, 2010). However, the extent to which teacher education programs impact on preservice teacher beliefs, especially when preservice teachers engage in learning about pedagogical innovations such as task-based language teaching, remains unclear.

2.3. Language Program Evaluation

2.3.1. Overview

In order to adequately improve the practice of TBLT pedagogy in authentic learning environments, it is critical to include evaluation as part of the cyclical process of implementation. The current study aims to not only expand our understanding of language teacher training for the benefit of SLA researchers and consumers of applied linguistics research, but to also benefit and contribute to the program under investigation itself. Language program evaluation enables
evidence-based decisions and promotes connections between language research and practice (Norris, 2016). As Norris (2016) points out second language teaching and the implementation of pedagogical innovations are implemented:

“not within sanitized laboratories where theories are carefully tested, but rather under the realities of geopolitical and economic forces; governmental budgets and policies; institution affordances and constraints; and the everyday actions of administrators, teachers, learners, and others.” (p. 169)

Beretta (1992a; 1992b, as summarized in Norris & Watanabe, 2013) summarized these issues arguing that experimental studies often lack applicability to real language classrooms due to the difficulty of controlling the many factors and variables present in real language classrooms. Beretta also pointed out that evaluations conducted by external reviewers rather by program insiders are less frequently met with positive reactions, and that many studies lack the involvement of key stakeholders such as language teachers, parents and students reducing buy-in to new pedagogies or teaching methods. In this way, language program evaluations are better suited to assist curriculum developers, administrators and instructors better understand ‘what works’ in the multifaceted contexts in which they teach. Language program evaluation has the potential to more accurately reflect the realities of language teaching and learning in classrooms and therefore has the potential to benefit both the programs under study and applied linguistics research at large.

The current study will adopt a “utilization-focused” (Patton, 2008b) approach in that it will aim to address the needs of “specific intended primary users for specific, intended uses” (Patton, 2008, p. 37). One criterion for the research questions are the needs of the stakeholders of the study, namely, the school administration, teachers, students, and parents, with the
administration and teachers as the primary intended users of the evaluation. In utilization-focused evaluations, the investment of the Primary Intended Users (PIUs) is critical to the usefulness of the results of the evaluation. Previous research has demonstrated the importance of stakeholder buy-in for successful evaluation use (e.g. Llosa & Slayton, 2009) as well as the importance of involving teachers in the experience of evaluating tasks as a means of developing teachers’ understandings of pedagogical innovations such as task-based language teaching (Ellis, 2015). The value of the research and evaluative findings will be determined by the extent to which program administration, teachers and families are able to understand how the program is functioning and the degree to which they put findings into use (as suggested by Patton, 2008).

Language teacher evaluation including the evaluation of teacher training programs has received considerable attention in previous language program evaluation research (Norris, 2016). Although Norris points out that teachers alone do no constitute entire language programs (and therefore the methods for teacher evaluation are distinct from those used in full program evaluations), teachers are nevertheless critical elements in programs and therefore play a large role in understanding language program evaluations in general. Some previous work has examined how teachers are evaluated by students or administrators (Burden, 2008; Sundquist & Neary-Sundquist, 2008) pointing out how students do not always have accurate perspectives about the teaching they received. Other work has focused on certification programs (Carstens-Wickham, 2008; Peacock, 2009) or provided lists of recommended practices and case studies of language teacher evaluation (Coombe et al., 2007). One previous study by Martinez and Sanz (2008) investigated the role played by teacher beliefs in program implementation. This study focused specifically on teacher and administrator beliefs about the role of tracking in Spanish programs and the creation of Spanish for specific purposes courses as is done in many ESL/EFL
programs. The results of their evaluation indicated that the majority of language teachers believed courses directed at preparing students for specific purposes allowed for the most effective teaching. This finding was in contrast to the director of the program who believed that student motivations should not determine program characteristics. Studies like these clearly supported the institutions and programs that they evaluated by providing the means to make evidence based decisions, however they also offer contributions to the field of applied linguistics in that they uncover the realities of research-based practices when they are implemented “in the real world.” As Norris (2016) states, “the real contribution of program evaluation in applied linguistics… may be that it helps us to both understand our theories and ideas as they are applied in action, and to facilitate their application by real individuals and groups in ways that are meaningful, practical, and useful in the first place” (p. 184).

2.3.1.1. Rationale for Language Program Evaluation

In this case, the evaluation of the teacher training program will aim to influence the implementation of future teacher trainings at the school site. Therefore, the success of the task-based teacher training program cannot justifiably be measured by quantitative changes to teachers’ beliefs and practices alone. For these reasons, along with investigating the connection between teachers’ beliefs about SLA and TBLT and implementation in their classrooms, the study will also examine the usefulness of various aspects of the training for the preservice teachers and administrators. The school administration of the current study will be an integral part in the development and execution of the evaluation. Parents of current students will also be included in data collection and their input on the effectiveness of the teaching at the schools will be considered as an indicator of programmatic effectiveness.
2.4. Research Questions

Given the importance for the field of information about evaluations that are useful for authentic language programs, along with the gaps in current understanding about how to best train teachers to implement TBLT practices, the current study aims to answer the following research questions:

1) To what extent are language teachers’ beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher training program?

2) To what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms following the task-based training program?

3) How useful was the training for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first-year of teaching?

2.4.1. Hypotheses

The first research question asks, to what extent are language teachers’ beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher training program implemented in the current study? Previous research on teacher training and task-based teacher training as outlined above suggests that teachers’ beliefs may be affected by participation in a teacher training program and that any changes will be moderated by teachers’ prior learning and/or teaching experiences, teachers’ ages and their beliefs and expectations about second language learning and teaching. As in previous work (e.g. Johnson, 1994; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Numrich 1996; Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010), teachers who indicate they experienced language learning from didactic, grammar-based methods are predicted to be less amenable to changes in
cognitions post-training than teachers with experience in student-centered language learning environments.

The second research question asks, to what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms immediately following the training and during their first-year teaching? Previous research suggests that may be disconnect between teachers’ understanding of TBLT principles and successful implementation in the classroom. Change in cognitions from pre-, post-, and delayed-post training surveys are hypothesized to correlate with success of implementation of the pedagogy in the current study. Previous experiences learning languages and the first language of the teacher (as in Warford & Reeves, 2003) are expected to act as moderators to this effect.

The third research question asks: how useful was the training program for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first year of teaching. Previous findings suggest an association between a program’s focus on critical reflection and experiential learning and benefits to language teachers’ practice (Borg, 2011; Farrell, 1999).
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The current chapter begins with an overview of the context where the study took place and a description of the teacher training program and study participants. Next is a report of all aspects of the research design, procedure and the materials created for the project. Findings from pilot studies testing the research design and materials are also articulated in detail, as well as the changes that resulted from the various pilot studies. The chapter concludes with the coding and statistical procedures employed in the study.

3.1. Context

The research reported in this dissertation examines the implementation of a TBLT teacher training program at three bilingual schools located in the northwest region of Cortés and Santa Bárbara, Honduras (see Figure 3.1). The following section provides an overview of the

![Figure 3.1 Map of Honduras](Image adapted from OpenStreetMap.org and contributors, distributed under CC-BY-SA license.)
environmental context surrounding the school sites and an overview of the training institute for novice English teachers.

Historically, English-Spanish bilingualism has been perceived as a significant asset in Honduras due, in part, to the region’s proximity to the U.S. and its political and economic ties (Euraque, 1999). English language proficiency is recognized as a critically important factor in access to further education and employment due to the demand for English speakers in local call-centers, factories, and tourism industries (Soluri, 2005), positions that are often more lucrative and sustainable than typical local employment. In 2013, the director of the Honduran department of labor stated that there had been a 70% increase in the demand for professionals who can speak and write English in San Pedro Sula (Nolasco, 2013), the “industrial capital” of Honduras and the nearest major city to the school sites under investigation in the current study. San Pedro Sula is also home to many international call centers that provide customer service to English speaking countries. A few hours away to the west lies the city of Copán Ruinas, the site of the only Mayan ruins in Honduras, and therefore the hub of mainland Honduran tourism. Other neighboring towns to the bilingual schools are home to large internationally operated manufacturing plants that employ many locals. Despite growing demand for proficient English speakers, public education in Honduras lags behind other countries in Central America, with fewer than 50 percent of teachers trained to national standards of education and only 29 percent of students in Honduras continuing after sixth grade with high dropout rates across all grades (UNESCO, 2012). According to a study recently published by The Inter-American Dialogue, a Washington D.C.-based think-tank, the English proficiency level of the majority of public English language teachers in Honduras was rated as at or below the level expected of their students (Cronquist & Fiszbein, 2017). In addition, the quality of most language education available to the general
public is inadequate for achieving high levels of proficiency in English. A recent study (Pearson, 2013) found that Honduras ranked the lowest out of 14 Latin American countries in the level of English proficiency spoken in the work place, finding that workers were only able to communicate using simple sentences and could not actively participate in the workplace using English (see Figure 3.2).

![Figure 3.2 English Proficiency in the Workplace (Business English Index, 2013)](image-url)

**Figure 3.2 English Proficiency in the Workplace (Business English Index, 2013)**

*Note: The Business English Index is a 10-point scale that ranks international employees into four levels of proficiency with beginner represented by levels 1-3, basic by levels 4-6, intermediate by levels 7 and 8 and advanced by levels 9 and 10. See The 2013 Business English Index & Globalization of English Report. Figure based on data reported in Cronquist and Fiszbein (2017).*

With over 65 percent of Hondurans currently living below the poverty line (World Bank, 2017) and cities routinely topping the list of highest homicide rate in the world (U.S. Department of State, 2016) due to sweeping gang and drug-related violence, it is not surprising
that over 18,000 unaccompanied Honduran minors migrated to the United States in 2014 alone (U.S. Customs and Border Protection, 2016). While these figures have declined slightly in 2016 and 2017 due to increased border enforcement by the Mexican government (International Crisis Group, 2016) as well as reportedly due to current policies and rhetoric of the Trump Administration (Raderstorf, Wilson, Zechmeister, & Camilleri, 2017), the “AmericasBarometer” (2016) reported that “intentions to move abroad have risen significantly in every country in Central American since 2014, especially in Honduras” (as cited in Raderstorf et al., 2017, p. 3).

The same survey also reported that 35% of Honduras have considered migrating in the last 12 months because of insecurity. Bilingualism is often a means to escape the cyclical poverty present in Honduras that drives many young Latin Americans to consider migration. Due to the desire to learn English and access high-paying jobs in local industries, bilingual education is in high demand. However, the majority of bilingual schools are private and therefore only accessible to the elite and financially secure making opportunities for upward mobility rare.

The participating schools in the current project are battling these structural inequalities by providing English language teachers to local bilingual schools at very low or zero cost to the local community. Bilingual Education for Central America (BECA) is a US-based non-for-profit that recruits, trains and supports proficient English-speaking volunteer teachers to staff a network of community-run bilingual schools in Honduras. These partnerships allow members of the local communities to access quality, low or no-cost bilingual education. The partnerships began in 2004 and currently serve over 600 students from preschool through 9th grade (10th and 11th grade, or colegio, is not currently offered by BECA schools) in three different schools in Honduras. The schools are open to all local children regardless of gender, economic status, disability, ethnicity, race or religion. BECA purposefully does not own or operate any of the schools, but instead,
partners with pre-existing local organizations. As stated in BECA’s 2016-2017 annual report: “BECA’s schools do not belong to us – they belong to our Honduran partners. They are social hubs for their communities as they steward the ship towards the world they want for their children.” San Jeronimo Bilingual School (SJBS) is operated by a nonprofit of democratically-elected association of Honduran parents. Santa Monica Bilingual School (SMBS) is operated by La Hermandad de San Agustin, an order of Spanish and Honduran nuns. Amigos de Jesús (ADJ) operates out of a children’s home of the same name for children who have been victims of abuse or neglect. The schools employ 40 volunteer English-speaking volunteer teachers (20% of which are local, English-speaking Hondurans) as well as a staff of local Honduran teachers who teach in Spanish. According to the organizations vision statement, BECA aims to:

…graduate students who champion learning and literacy, challenge the status quo, and who embody a service-minded attitude to become persistent advocates for social change. Our goal is not to encourage students to pursue opportunities outside of Central America, but rather to empower and enable them to remain in the region by equipping them with the skills they need to access economic and social opportunity from within their native countries. (becaschools.org, 2018.).

After nearly 15 years of operation, growing grade-by-grade at each school, 96% of the first 47 student graduates matriculated high school, 35 of whom enrolled in bilingual programs in San Pedro Sula with help from BECA sponsored scholarships.

In preschool and kindergarten, 50% of the school day is taught in Spanish and 50% in English. In 1-through 9+ grades, English, math, science, and elective classes are taught in English via volunteer English teachers and Social Studies and Spanish classes in Spanish via local Honduran staff (see Table 3.1 for a sample school schedule).
Table 3.1 San Jeronimo Bilingual School Second Grade Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Period*</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morning Meeting</td>
<td>BECA Volunteer</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>BECA Volunteer</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>BECA Volunteer</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spanish Literacy</td>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Local Staff</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Read Aloud</td>
<td>BECA Volunteer</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silent Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>BECA Volunteer</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Class periods are roughly 40 minutes long each.

English content curriculums were developed in house through partnerships between local school staff, BECA administration and education consultants and represent a mix of local Honduran country-wide standards and relevant U.S. standards from the Common Core State Standards (2018) and other U.S. state curriculums. Volunteer English teachers are hired for one-year contracts and are trained as either classroom teachers for preschool through 6th grade (meaning they teach one grade level all subjects, math, science and English) or as a subject-specific teacher (math, English or science) for 7th through 9th grades (meaning, for example, one middle school math teacher teaches 7th, 8th and 9th grade math). These teachers are trained in grade level-content, classroom and behavior management, and social and emotional skill development prior to embarking on their first-year teaching. The following section provides an overview of the novice teacher training program which was adapted over the past two years to include a TBLT focused curriculum based on the results of needs analyses and programmatic evaluations previously conducted with the primary investigator (see section 3.3.3 on pilot data collection).
3.1.1. Description of 2018 Teacher Training Program

The current study investigates and then evaluates the implementation of a TBLT-focused training program for novice English teachers in the context described above. The summer institute for novice English teachers includes two weeks of content instruction and focused lesson planning and two weeks of hands-on teaching. See Figure 3.3 for an overview and timeline of the training that occurred in the current study.
Figure 3.3 Training Timeline

Rotating training sessions:
Foundations of educational and second language theories, task-based lesson planning, task-based assessments, differentiated instruction, ELA, science, procedures and routines

Week 1
Mornings
Grade level lesson planning with mentor
Cross grade-level planning time

Week 2
Mornings
Rotating training sessions:
Cultural understanding, mathematics teaching, social and emotional learning, providing quality feedback, student-teacher interaction, co-planning strategies to use on a bilingual team

Mornings
Grade level lesson planning with mentor
Cross grade-level planning time

Weeks 3 & 4
Mornings
Practicum teaching:
Teachers rotate every hour for 3 hours to teach
Mentor and peer teachers observe all lessons
Teachers debrief with mentor and peers each day

Afternoons
Grade level lesson planning with mentor
Cross grade-level planning time
The TBLT elements in the summer training institute are part of this intensive four-week long training for all first-year English-speaking teachers and administrators at BECA schools. Although intensive short-term SLTE courses such as CELTA (Certificate in English Language Teaching to Adults) courses have received criticism in the past (Ferguson & Donno, 2003; Horne, 2003; Macpherson, 2003) the course is designed to prepare teachers for the specific teaching contexts they will encounter at BECA schools and is the only practical length given the short-term commitment of the volunteer staff. Teachers receive on-going professional development throughout the academic year in addition to the summer training, however only the summer training and subsequent in-class teaching will be examined in the current study.

The structure of BECA’s teacher training was first developed by former BECA teacher Jenna Bell (née: Foster) and was the foundation for the training delivered in 2018 for this dissertation. The training is approximately 160 hours long and divided into two phases. In the first two weeks of training, teachers split their time between working with a mentor on lesson planning for their grade-level and attending training sessions on language teaching, pedagogy, and best practices in education (see Table 3.2 for a breakdown of the TBLT-focused elements of the training courses and the other courses teachers attend during the training).
Table 3.2 Summer Training Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Courses</th>
<th>General Pedagogy Courses</th>
<th>Content Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Foundations in second language education theory</td>
<td>• Foundations of educational theory</td>
<td>• English Language Arts (ELA) through the 4-Blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task-based lesson planning</td>
<td>• Social-Emotional learning and classroom management</td>
<td>• Foundations of math learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing quality feedback</td>
<td>• Co-planning strategies to use on a bilingual team</td>
<td>• Planning and teaching science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporating literacy through content driven-tasks</td>
<td>• Classroom procedures and routines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using formal and informal task-based assessments</td>
<td>• Cultural exchange and understanding in the classroom and beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designing and executing differentiated tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting output and classroom interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers cycle through these mini-courses in teams with other teachers who are teaching the same grade level – either PreK to 2nd grade, 3rd grade to 5th grade, or 6th to 9th grade. The courses are taught by a team of trainers who are BECA volunteer alumni and current experienced teachers.

The primary investigator of this dissertation teaches the foundational courses and courses related to task-based language teaching as well as mentors the special-education and lower-school teachers. Other trainers are brought in who have expertise in pre-school and middle school teaching and mentor the teachers of those grade-levels as well as teach courses in social-emotional learning, English language arts, science and math.

In the TBLT-focused training sessions, teachers learn the methodological principles of TBLT as they are described in Long (2015) including: promoting learning by doing, providing rich input, focus on form (not forms), providing corrective feedback, respecting learner syllabi and developmental processes, promoting cooperative collaborative learning and individualizing
instruction. In the introductory module on theories of language learning, teachers compare and contrast TBLT to other theories of language learning and teaching including Krashen’s Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983b) and PPP approaches. Teachers then receive a course on task-based lesson planning using a backwards design, a lesson planning strategy utilized by BECA schools in which teachers consider the objectives and goals of a lesson prior to planning individual tasks (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). In the course on incorporating literacy in content-driven tasks, teachers develop strategies for including literacy goals and objectives in content focused subjects such as math and science. Teachers also complete a module on informal and formal task-based assessments in which they evaluate and design assessments for grade-level example lessons and units as well as for their own lessons. Finally, teachers receive additional courses on providing quality corrective feedback (both oral and written) and how to promote learner autonomy and peer interaction through group work (centers for lower school grades, group work for upper school grades. See Appendix A for complete lesson plans from those training sessions).

The training sessions are designed to be student-centered throughout in that they model the execution of the session objectives. The training is therefore highly interactive, with teachers engaging and experiencing tasks designed for them first-hand. The novice teacher trainees are frequently treated as if they are the “students” by the trainer in order to model a given objective. The teacher trainees are also often asked to practice a given objective by modeling with a small group of other teachers. For example, in the foundations of second language education course, rather than simply telling the teachers about various teaching methods (TBLT vs PPP vs Grammar Translation for example), the teachers complete a “Gallery Walk” activity where they move in small groups around the room between posters that have some key points regarding each
teaching method. The teachers leave comments and rotate to see what comments other groups have left on the posters. After the activity, the teachers debrief in new groups and are assigned interactive roles to encourage the flow of discussion. In this way, a variety of teaching techniques, management strategies and content is quickly and clearly disseminated to the teaching team. During these two weeks of course work and individual lesson planning time, teachers recorded self-reflections on their learning experience and shared them with the training team. These self-reflections are part of the data collection that is described in detail in Section 3.3.1.2.

The second two weeks of the summer institute for novice English language teachers are a teaching practicum where teachers design and execute their own lessons in classrooms. Teachers divide into grade-level teams and individually teach hour-long lessons to small groups of students. Teachers design a lesson for each of the content areas they will be teaching (math, science, reading, etc.) to practice during the teaching practicum. Mentors and fellow teachers observe the practicum lessons and provide feedback after each session. Teachers reflect on what they felt they did well and what they felt they could improve from each of the lessons they taught that day. Following the self-reflection, the other teachers and mentors who observed the lesson share their feedback with the instructor. A selection of these practicum sessions will be video-recorded as part of data collection (see Section 3.3.1.1 for more details).

3.2. Participants

The following section describes the participants in the current study including the novice English language teachers and administrators who took part in the TBLT training, the students who attended class both during the teaching practicum and during the school year, and the parents and
family members who participated in a focus group to discuss their children’s language learning and schooling with the investigator.

3.2.1. *English Language Teachers and Administrators*

The 4-week teacher training program included the 2018-2019 cohort of preservice and novice English-speaking teachers (*n* = 19) embarking on their first or second year teaching at one of the three partner schools described in section 3.1. These teachers were hired to teach at a variety of grade-levels, from preschool through 9th grade, or as a special education teacher or school administrator. English teachers are recruited to teach content - English, Math and Science as well as electives such as art and physical education – in English. Therefore, teachers are both language and content instructors, not solely English class teachers. Because the English-speaking teachers are recruited as volunteers, the prototypical first-year volunteer is a recent university graduate from the United States, with limited previous formal teaching experiences (however, home country and previous teaching experiences of volunteers do vary, as illustrated in Table 3.3). For these reasons, the training these teachers receive during the 4-week summer institute is integral for their success in the coming school year.

More recently, some first-year teachers are local Honduran alumni from the bilingual schools or from other local bilingual schools, seeking teaching experience. In the previous two years of piloting the project, approximately 20% of the volunteer teachers were local English-speaking Hondurans. This recent change to the volunteer demographics means that there are now two distinct groups within the teaching team, each with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Previous research (Anderson, 2016) has compared and contrasted the experiences of non-native and native speaking language teachers in teacher training courses finding that these two groups prioritize different components of course content. The current study included 6
teachers who were formerly students at one of the bilingual schools. For these reasons, NNS/NS teacher status was considered as a factor in the analysis of the final results of this dissertation study.

**Table 3.3 Teacher Biodata**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n teachers</th>
<th>Previous Teaching Experience</th>
<th>n teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 or more years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Ages/grades previously taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>University/college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garifuna</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>Primary School (PreK-5+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Type of teaching credential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean = 22</td>
<td>No formal teaching credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range = (19, 28)</td>
<td>University degree in linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University degree in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESOL certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching certification/license</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Grade(s) Teaching 2018-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>1st – 3rd Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>4th – 6th Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>7th – 9th Grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.R.</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2. *Students*

Participants also included students from the participating bilingual schools (*n* = 114) who were anonymously video and audio recorded during classroom observations. Student participants were students from the children’s home at the Amigos de Jesus Bilingual School or from Santa
Monica Bilingual School. To ensure the safety and security of this population, no biographical
data on the children can be released other than the grade levels that participated. The table below shows which focal teacher’s video recorded observation is associated with which group of students:

### Table 3.4 Observed Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level observed</th>
<th>n students</th>
<th>S# (teacher pseudonyms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>S19 (Isabel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>S4 (Sara), S5 (Andrea), S8 (Paulina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>S18 (Abigail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>S1 (Claudia), S2 (Chris), S12 (Christina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>S6 (Rebecca), S11(María), S9 (Beth), S15 (Raquel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>S17 (Alejandro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>S10 (Orlando), S14 (Mariana), S16 (Madheline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.2.3. Parents and Family Members

Family members of students (n = 5) also participated in a focus group regarding their perceptions of their children’s success in the bilingual environment of the BECA schools. The table below includes the pseudonyms for the parents that participated and information regarding their children who attend one of the BECA supported bilingual schools.
Parents self-selected to participate in the focus group. The parents that attended the focus group were all familiar and friendly with the researcher from her prior time spent teaching and training in Honduras.

3.3. Research Design

Data collection occurred in two main phases: during the four-week summer training institute (July-August 2018) with follow-up surveys 2 months later during the first quarter of the academic year. Data was collected via pre-, post- and delayed post-training surveys, post-training interviews, daily teacher reflections throughout the training, and post-training observations of teachers and students, each of which are discussed in turn below. All aspects of the study that are outlined below were approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) from Georgetown University and BECA Schools.

3.3.1. Procedure

On the first day of the summer training, teacher participants were introduced to the current study and read the informed-consent documents. After obtaining consent, the teachers took the pre-training survey and began the two-week training sessions. Each day for two weeks teachers attended sessions on English language teaching with BECA schools and submitted daily reflections on their experiences. Parent focus-groups were conducted during this time as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Pseudonym</th>
<th>n children in bilingual school</th>
<th>Child’s grade level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1st, 4th, 9th, and one graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giselle</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1st, 4th, 6th, 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4th, 7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5th, 8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabiola</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3rd, and one graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After two weeks, participants began the teaching practicum portion of training. During this time, teachers were identified as participants for video recorded classroom observations. Selected teachers recorded one hour-long lesson at one point over the two-week teaching practicum. Once a teacher submitted a lesson video, they set-up a time with the researcher the same day to complete the simulated recall and post-training interview. Teachers began the school year in August 2018. Two months post-training, the teachers completed delayed post-training surveys online via Google Forms (see Figure 3.4).

Figure 3.4 Data Collection Overview
3.3.1.1. Video Recorded Classroom Observations

Video-recorded observations of language teachers were collected during the practicum portion of the training. During the practicum, teachers were able to choose which task-based lesson they wanted to video record and submit to the researcher. When a teacher indicated they were prepared to record a lesson, a digital camera was placed in the classroom and monitored by the researcher. For teacher-centered aspects of the lesson, a digital camera was used to record. For student-centered activities, a Samsung 360 digital camera was placed in the center of the room and captured all students working as well as the instructor. The researcher documented the lesson via field notes.

Following the video recording, the file was uploaded to the researcher’s secure hard drive and edited down to a 30-minute samples to be used in subsequent stimulated recall interviews (see Section 3.3.2.3.1 for a full description of the stimulated recall interview protocol including how video samples were generated).
Table 3.6 Video Recordings Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade level observed</th>
<th>S# (teacher pseudonym)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time recorded (mins : secs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>S19 (Isabel)</td>
<td>Morning Meeting</td>
<td>30:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S4 (Sara)</td>
<td>Math (teen numbers)</td>
<td>32:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S5 (Andrea)</td>
<td>Reading (vocabulary)</td>
<td>32:02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S8 (Paulina)</td>
<td>Science (animals)</td>
<td>50:55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S18 (Abigail)</td>
<td>Morning meeting</td>
<td>49:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S1 (Claudia)</td>
<td>Math (addition)</td>
<td>38:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S2 (Chris)</td>
<td>Read Aloud (behavior)</td>
<td>33:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S12 (Christina)</td>
<td>Writing (brainstorming)</td>
<td>46:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S6 (Rebecca)</td>
<td>Science (sounds)</td>
<td>38:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S11 (Maria)</td>
<td>Reading (predictions)</td>
<td>38:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S9 (Beth)</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>46:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S15 (Raquel)</td>
<td>Grammar (past tense)</td>
<td>41:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S17 (Alejandro)</td>
<td>Science (water cycle)</td>
<td>46:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;-&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>S10 (Orlando)</td>
<td>Reading (Greek mythology)</td>
<td>37:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S14 (Mariana)</td>
<td>Math (word problems)</td>
<td>39:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S16 (Madheline)</td>
<td>Reading (predictions)</td>
<td>47:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>646:07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Video data was later coded with a rubric to examine adherence to TBLT principles (see Section 3.4.1.3 for coding procedures). Both the observations of teachers and those of students engaging in tasks in the classroom were used to determine the success of implementation in accordance with TBLT principles outlined in training.

3.3.1.2. Daily Instructor Reflections

During the two-week content portion of the training (i.e. prior to the practicum), instructors submitted daily reflections on their experience in the training. At the end of each day, participants received a note-card and were instructed to write one positive reflection (+) and one change (Δ, delta) for the day’s sessions. The positive note could represent one aspect of the
training they found meaningful, or a major take-away lesson from the day. The delta or change could represent one aspect of the training they did not understand, did not see the utility of, or any other logistical concerns they might be having. These reflections were very short, only a few sentences per instructor as illustrated in Figure 3.5:

![Figure 3.5 Plus/Delta Example](image)

Five minutes at the end of each day was allotted to writing the reflections. The reflections were collected daily by the researcher and converted into an electronic format (excel file with metadata see Section 3.4.1.2 for coding procedures). Reflections were anonymous and reviewed with the other trainers each day to make any immediate adjustments to the training or address any specific concerns the next day as needed. These reflections will be used to examine the key areas of training that stood out to teachers as well as measured the changes that occurred in teachers’ perceptions in real time.

3.3.1.3. Stimulated Recall Interviews and Post-Training Interviews

In order to better understand the online decision making of the novice English teachers as they taught in their classrooms and during the teaching practicum it was necessary to utilize introspective measures. There are a variety of options for measuring introspective thinking such
as through verbal think-alouds (Leow, 2000; Leow, Grey, Marijuan, & Moorman, 2014), self-observations (e.g. Cohen, 1998) and stimulated recall interviews (Gass & Mackey, 2017). Stimulated recall interviews require participants to recall what they were thinking as they performed a prior task or participated in some prior event. These thoughts are elicited by presenting participants with a stimulus, such as a video or audio recording, of the task the participant previously performed and asked about what they were thinking at that time, as they were doing the original task. Gass and Mackey (2017) highlight language teacher cognitions, in particular, as one topic that stimulated recall interviews can help in understanding, including shedding light on “what teachers are thinking and how that thinking changes according to specific classroom situations and/or over time” (p. 28).

The current dissertation utilized stimulated recall interviews to investigate teachers’ cognitions as they taught lessons in the classroom due to the fact that concurrent protocols such as think-alouds are clearly not possible while teachers are engaged in the act of teaching. During the practicum portion of training, all teachers participated in one two-part interview. Part one was a stimulated recall interview (following Gass & Mackey, 2017) and part two was a semi-structured interview about their general experiences in the training (See Appendix B). Each part of the interview took approximately 30 minutes to complete for a total of one hour per interview per participant. In the stimulated recall interview teachers were played clips of themselves from the teaching practicum portion of training implementing a task-based lesson in the classroom and asked to reflect on what they were thinking at various moments during the original execution of the lesson.

Retrospective measures do pose some limitations, however, as participants must be trained to orient their verbalizations to what they were thinking at the time the event in question
occurred, rather than at the time of the interview. For this reason, each participant heard
instructions about stimulated recall interviews and were told (following Gass & Mackey, 2017)
to only consider what they were thinking at the time of the video recording (see Section 3.3.2.3.1
for a full description of the protocol). In order to increase the reliability of teacher’s
recollections, the stimulated recall interviews were scheduled immediately following the
recorded lesson and were conducted as soon as possible post-teaching. All interviews occurred
within several hours of the recorded lesson. Videos collected for the stimuli were edited slightly
prior to the interviews for time, i.e. sections of the videos when the students and teacher were out
of view of the camera, or doing silent work were deleted to allow the interview to focus on the
live teaching moments and to ensure the interviews did not last longer that 30 minutes.
Participants had control over the pause button of the videos during the stimulated recall interview
in order to ensure the recall was participant rather than researcher driven.

In the second half of the interview, semi-structured questions asked participants to reflect
on their overall experience in training including the most useful and least useful aspects, how
prepared they feel to begin teaching post-training and suggestions for improvements to the
training for future summers. The researcher audio recorded and took notes during both parts of
the interviews.

3.3.1.4. Parent Focus Groups
While success in teaching is clearly closely tied to teacher and student performance, students’
families are also key stakeholders in the process of their children’s developing bilingualism. In
accordance with the features of quality language program evaluation (Norris, 2016; Patton,
2008a), parents/family members were included as key stakeholders and their beliefs about their
children’s success in language learning in the classroom was be operationalized as one form of
success of the training program. During the second week of the training, a random sampling of parents from one school were approached to participate in the focus group. Parents listened to an explanation of the current study and rationale for the focus groups and agreed to meet with the researcher at a specific timeslot. When parents arrived for the focus groups, they sat in a circle in a quiet room at their child’s school and read the consent form. After consent was obtained, the researcher explained the desired outcome of the focus group – namely, that the purpose was to share opinions and experiences, not to decide on a conclusion or single best practice. The researcher explained that parents could agree or disagree with each other and speak whenever they had something to say, not in any particular order. The researcher began audio recording and focus group began with some warm up questions (see Appendix C for a full list of focus group questions). Parents were asked to reflect on how they defined a quality English teacher, what skills they envisioned their children obtaining after graduation, and the opportunities afforded by English language proficiency in their community. The researcher moderated the focus group by keeping the parents focused on the key questions and by probing for more details (i.e. “Can you give an example of that?” “Could you say why you feel that way?” “Does anyone have a different perspective?”).

The focus group lasted for approximately one hour. Following the focus group, the parents were thanked for their participation and given the opportunity to ask any questions about the study. The focus group reflections of parents and family members on their children’s English learning in their current classrooms was considered along with the outcomes of teacher and student observations as part of the results of implementation of the training.
3.3.2. Materials

Several instruments were created for this dissertation study: task-based teacher training lesson plans, pre-, post-, and delayed-post training surveys, and several different interview protocols including a post-training semi-structured interview for teachers, stimulated recall protocols for teachers, and parent focus group protocols. Each of these instruments is discussed in detail below.

3.3.2.1. Training Materials and Lesson Plans

All lessons and training materials participants received during the two weeks of training sessions were developed in conjunction with BECA school’s administration and staff and adapted to include TBLT-focused lessons for key training sessions. Five sessions were specifically focused on key areas of task-based language teaching. Novice teachers attended these sessions in addition to sessions on general pedagogy and content (math, science etc.). The task-based sessions included: foundations in second language education theory, task-based lesson planning, providing quality feedback, using formal and informal task-based assessments, and designing and executing differentiated tasks. Each of these sessions is briefly described below. Full lesson plans are provided in Appendix A.

In the session on foundations in second language and bilingual education theory, teachers confront commonly held beliefs about second language learning and teaching and compare and contrast popular pedagogies in second language instruction including: grammar translation, PPP, the natural approach, and TBLT. Teachers discuss key SLA topics such as: first vs second language acquisition, the critical theory hypothesis, Krashen’s theories of second language learning and academic vs. basic language proficiency. Teachers also read and analyze BECA
school’s official language policy which emphasizes English-only instruction without disparaging or discouraging Spanish language use (See Appendix D for full policy).

The objectives for the session on task-based lesson planning included: an introduction to backwards design, writing quality task-driven objectives, and how to evaluate lessons based on their appropriateness for ELLs. Following Ogilvie and Dunn (2010), in this session teachers were asked to rate and reflect on a series of lesson plans that each describe different models of language instruction including TBLT, grammar-translation, and PPP. Teacher ratings and responses were utilized to determine pre-training beliefs about TBLT pedagogy and changes after the training has completed.

The session on providing quality feedback introduces teachers to the variety of types of oral corrective feedback, the pros and cons of each type, the rationale for varying feedback strategies in the classroom. In this session, teachers watch videos of an instructor providing various forms of oral corrective feedback and work to categorize them. Teachers end the sessions by creating a plan for corrective feedback use in their own classrooms and trying various strategies with each other in small groups and leave with a “tips and tricks” handout to save for future reference.

In the session on informal and formal task-based assessments, teachers review the material covered in the task-based lesson planning session and discuss why it is important to choose the task to assess at the end of a lesson or unit in advance of planning and sequencing task-types and specific aspects of lesson plans. Teachers brainstorm formative (i.e. informal, ongoing) ways of assessing as well as summative (i.e. target tasks) forms of assessment. Teachers end the session by designing a rubric to grade a target task for their own grade-level on a topic of their choice.
Finally, in the session on differentiating tasks teachers are posed the questions: In what ways will students in my class differ? What is differentiation and why is it useful? What are some routines and procedures that are necessary to ensure differentiation is possible in my classroom? In this session, teachers watch a series of videos of teachers implementing differentiation strategies with various tasks. Teachers then discuss and plan for a differentiated activity of their choice with other teachers teaching at the same grade level.

Materials for all of these sessions include videos and handouts provided by BECA schools and created for use in this school context. Some pre-existing plans have been adapted by the researcher of the current study to feature task-based skills and pedagogy while other lessons were newly designed by the researcher for the current project.

3.3.2.2. Surveys

In order to measure preservice teachers’ beliefs about the pedagogical principles key to TBLT before and after training, as well as how their beliefs about TBLT affected their implementation in the classroom, pre- and post-training surveys were developed. The final version of the survey was adapted from Ogilvie and Dunn’s (2010) pedagogical beliefs questionnaire which was in turn modeled after Karavas-Doukas (1996) language pedagogy instrument. There survey was adapted (rather than replicated exactly) from the questions in Ogilvie and Dunn’s (2010) original survey due to the presence of double-barreled questions. Initial pilots of Ogilvie and Dunn’s survey did not result in split-half reliability coefficients at the level the original authors reported for their pilot. Therefore, the survey was redesigned with Ogilvie and Dunn’s questions and TBLT themes as a base and re-piloted to obtained new reliability measurements (see Section 3.3.3 on pilots for more details).
In this 30-item questionnaire, each item represents a key characteristic of second language teaching and task-based language teaching and asks participants to indicate if they agree or disagree with those items via a 5-point Likert scale (see Appendix E for full survey, English and Spanish versions). There are 10 themes represented in the survey – all areas of language pedagogy critical to task-based language teaching. The themes include: the role of error correction, focus on process or product, explicit/implicit grammar instruction, group work, use of exercises and drills, syllabus design, authentic needs/negotiation of syllabus, focus on language study or use, the role of the teacher, and student vs teacher directed learning (see Table 3.7). Each question in the survey has a positively worded and negatively worded version; there are a total of 15 pairs of questions in the survey. Strong agreement with items that are positively worded such as “Errors are a natural part of language learning” were designed to indicate a positive disposition towards TBLT while strong agreement with negatively worded items such as “Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits” were interpreted to indicate a negative disposition towards TBLT.
### Table 3.7 Survey Themes and Final Survey Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Correction</strong></td>
<td>• All of students’ English errors must be immediately corrected.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large amounts of explicit correction of students’ English errors is counterproductive.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students’ language errors represent bad habits they have developed in the language.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Errors are a natural part of language learning.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explicit Grammar Instruction/Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>• Explicit grammar instruction should be the focus of a language program.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explicit grammar instruction should be limited in a language program.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a second language.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task/activity rather than studied in an explicit manner.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The primary focus of a language program should be students’ accuracy in the language.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The primary focus of a language program should be on students’ ability to use the language.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authentic Needs</strong></td>
<td>• Learners don’t know what’s best for their language learning in the classroom</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tasks/activities should be adapted to suit the students’ needs.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training language students to take responsibility for their own learning is not effective</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The language teacher should help students develop individual strategies for improving their learning.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Work</strong></td>
<td>• When students speak in their first language during group work, their learning is limited.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language students learn more by cooperating with each other in group activities</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students acquire each other’s language errors during group work.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group work activities are important for creating an environment in which students feel comfortable interacting in the target language.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syllabus</strong></td>
<td>• Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult grammar.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult tasks/activities.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of Exercises/Drills</strong></td>
<td>• Grammar exercises/drills are necessary for developing skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.7 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process vs Product</td>
<td>• Grammar exercises/drills don't develop skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom should look the same for every student.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom looks different for every student.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student vs Teacher Directed</td>
<td>• A good language class mainly follows the order presented in a textbook.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A good language class is mainly led by the needs of the students</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of the Teacher</td>
<td>• The primary role of the language teacher is to provide grammatical explanations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The primary role of a language teacher is to create an environment conducive to interaction in the target language.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Study vs Language Use</td>
<td>• Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate effectively.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results from the Likert-scale items provide a numerical result (1 through 5 for each item) with negatively worded items coded in reverse (i.e. an item rated 5, strongly agree, on a negatively worded item would receive 1 point in coding). Results from positively worded items (those that indicate strong disposition towards TBLT/SLA pedagogy) were added to results from reverse coded (negatively worded) items to generate a raw disposition score. The possible scores range from to 30 (very low disposition towards TBLT principles) to 150 (very high disposition towards TBLT principles). Raw scores on this 120-point scale were converted to percentages to represent individual disposition towards (or against) TBLT principles. An additional five Likert-scale items asked teachers to rate how prepared they felt to accomplish various aspects of TBLT in their classroom. Open-ended questions on the survey asked teachers to reflect in writing on their own experiences as language learners as well as what constitutes a high-quality
language instructor. Teachers’ responses to these questions were used as prompts in subsequent interviews and also to measure beliefs about TBLT.

In order to test the reliability of the survey, several rounds of think-aloud protocols, expert evaluations and an online pilot with a large sample size were conducted. First, a preliminary version of the survey was administered to four volunteers to complete a think-aloud protocol. Each volunteer was asked to take the survey while verbalizing what they were thinking as they chose a response to each item. The think-alouds lasted on average of one hour per participant. Participants were encouraged to think-aloud both about why they chose the response they did and to comment on the wording of the items and overall survey design. Three of the think-aloud participants were graduate students studying linguistics. Of the graduate students, two were studying second language acquisition and task-based language teaching specifically. One was a native Spanish speaker. The fourth think-aloud participant was a former BECA teacher and an L2 Spanish speaker. The think-aloud data resulted in several changes to the wording of some of the items for clarity. Some participants pointed out that some questions did not make explicit mention of language teaching but rather could be interpreted as teaching practices in general. After revising the survey, an online version was created using Google Forms. This version was administered to two experts in the field of language program evaluation and survey development resulting in further wording and formatting changes. The final version of the survey was posted online and shared through social networks and snowball sampling. The online survey collected data from 57 participants including some general biographical information (see Table 3.8). University students who were the researcher’s current students in a spring 2018 course on language, culture and study abroad were offered extra credit in their course for taking the survey.
Table 3.8 Survey Pilot Biodata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Previous Teaching Experience</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 or more years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>Ages/grades Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Multiple ages/grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian/Farsi</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>University/college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Type of teaching credential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean = 27</td>
<td>No formal teaching credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range = (19, 56)</td>
<td>University degree in linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University degree in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TESOL certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching certification/license</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The online pilot did not include the open-ended questions from the previous pilot but instead left open comment boxes if participants wished to comment on the survey or note any errors, however none did so. The data from the pilot allowed for the calculation of a split-half reliability coefficient and Cronbach’s Alpha to measure the internal reliability of the questionnaire. Primary analysis demonstrated that the survey was fairly reliable (alpha = .701). However, a post-hoc analysis revealed two participants with INFIT/OUTFIT scores greater than 2.00, meaning these participants ratings seemed unreliable. After eliminating those participants, the final alpha for the questionnaire was .732 (split-half coefficient \( r = .654 \)). These values are sufficient for the internal consistency levels normally achieved by Likert scales (Oppenheim, 1992). The scores on the pilot survey ranged from a minimum of 97 points to a maximum of 142 points with an average of 113 points (\( SD= 7.98 \)). An analysis of histograms and Q-Q plots found the data was
distributed normally. A linear regression model found one predictor, having prior teaching experiences, explained 13.4% of the variance in scores on the pilot TBLT beliefs survey ($R^2 = .134 (F (1, 55), = 8.50), p = .005$) with no interaction effects and a medium effect size ($d = .78$). In other words, those participants who had taught previously scored higher than those who had not in terms of TBLT beliefs ($B = 5.91, t = 2.91, p = .005$).

For the current study, the final version of the survey was translated into Spanish by the researcher and back-translated by a native speaker. The final version of the survey was given to teachers in paper form including the previously piloted open-ended questions. Teachers were able to choose to take the survey in English or in Spanish. Questions were randomized in order to create an equivalent post-training version. Two months into the academic year a delayed-post training survey was administered electronically (via Google Forms). This survey did not ask the same questions as the pre- and post-training survey but instead asked teachers to reflect on the utility of various trainings they received now that they are full-time teaching (see Appendix F for full delayed-post training survey).

3.3.2.3. Interview Protocols

A variety of interviews were conducted over the course of the training including: stimulated recall interviews, instructor end of training semi-structured interviews, and parent focus group interviews. The development and procedures for these protocols is described in detail below.

3.3.2.3.1. Stimulated Recall Interview Protocols

In the final week of training during the teaching practicum and once during the school year (6-months post-training), teachers met with the researcher following video-recording a lesson for the stimulated recall interview. Teachers who volunteered to video-record a one-hour lesson were instructed to schedule a time the same day to meet with the researcher for the interview.
Prior to the start of the interview, the researcher uploaded the video and audio recordings from that teacher’s lesson and manually trimmed the video clip to a 30-minute sample. Sections of the video that were deleted were times when the students and teacher were not in the room (i.e. bathroom/water breaks, exiting the classroom). The researcher uploaded the video to her laptop and marked the pause button so that the participant could easily press pause whenever they wished to stop the video. The teacher and researcher met for approximately one hour for both the stimulated recall and semi-structured interviews (see the following section for a description of the semi-structured interviews). Prior to beginning, each participant heard instructions about stimulated recall interviews and were told (following Gass & Mackey, 2017) the following:

“What we are going to do now is watch the video of the lesson you taught earlier today. I am interested in what you were thinking at the time you were teaching today. I can see what you were doing by looking at the video and I can hear what you and your students said, but I do not know what you were thinking at that time. So, what I’d like you to do is tell me what you were thinking, what was in your mind at the time while you were teaching the lesson. I have placed a sticker over the pause button here so you can pause the video at any time you want. So, if you want to tell me something about what you were thinking, you can push pause. If I have a question about what you were thinking then I will push pause and ask you to talk about that part of the video.”

Following these instructions, participants saw (and interpreted) the researcher model an example. The participants had the opportunity to ask any questions they had about the interview prior to beginning. Following answering the participant’s questions, the researcher began audio recording and started the video. During the recall, the researcher used the following phrases to probe for
participant recollections: “what were you thinking here/at this point/right then?”, “Can you tell me what you were thinking then?”, or, “I see you are [doing X], what were you thinking then?” At the end of the video, the participant proceeded to the semi-structured interview.

3.3.2.3.2. Semi-Structured Interview Protocols

In preparing the final version of the semi-structured, end of training interview protocol, the interviews were piloted two times. The protocol initial asked teachers to simply reflect on the extent to which the training prepared them for their teaching and any recommendations. The second protocol added additional questions specifically to probe for key elements of the training the teachers found useful and not useful, specific outcomes they achieved, and if they had any suggestions for improvement on logistical or practical aspects of the training. The researcher took notes in addition to the recording. Final interview questions were translated into Spanish to provide teachers the option of conducting the interview in their L1.

For the current study, in the final week of training during the teaching practicum, teachers met with the researcher following their video-recorded lesson for the end of training interview. Teachers met with the researcher in a quiet office space on the school site to conduct the interview. After completing the stimulated recall portion of the interview, the researcher told the participant that they would now ask them some questions about their overall experience in training and the extent to which they think the training prepared or did not prepare them for the classroom. The researcher reminded the participant that the interview would be recorded and asked if the participant preferred to have the interview in Spanish or English. The researcher reminded the teachers that their responses would be kept anonymous and the audio recording was just to ease the note taking process. The researcher assured participants that the audio recordings would not be played and their quotes would only be attributed to a pseudonym or
used in aggregate. This portion of the interview lasted an average of 30 minutes. See Appendix B for the full semi-structured survey protocol.

3.3.2.3.3. Parent Focus Group Interview Protocol

The protocol for the parent focus group interview was developed based on best practices in useful language program evaluation (e.g. Bryfonski, 2018). In keeping with these practices, the protocol began with opening, warm-up questions (“What is your name?” “What grade are your children in?”) followed by a transition question (“How long has your child been a student at SJBS?”). Next, parents were asked the key questions for the focus group: “How would you define a high-quality English teacher?”, “What skill set do you envision your child having when they graduate?”, “What opportunities might be afforded to your child once they graduate due to their English proficiency?” The focus group ended by asking parents if they had any final thoughts or if there were any topics we didn’t cover that they wanted to comment on. The parent focus group lasted approximately one hour. See Appendix C for the full parent focus group interview protocol.

3.3.3. Pilot Studies

3.3.3.1. Overview

Several pilot studies were conducted between 2014 and 2017 in preparation for the current study (see Table 3.9 for an overview). First, a needs analysis was conducted in 2014 to evaluate the English language needs of 9th grade graduates from SJBS who wanted to obtain jobs in English-speaking industries or pursue other professional opportunities upon graduating from BECA schools. This first research study partnering with the schools in Honduras opened important avenues of communication between the instructors, administrators and the researcher. The second study conducted at the school sites was a program evaluation that examined the needs of
alumni upon graduating from BECA schools. Primary Intended Users of the evaluation and key stakeholders were identified, and evaluation questions, indicators and data collection methods were determined. One outcome of the evaluation was the need to improve teacher training which became the impetus for the current dissertation project. Two pilots of the dissertation project were then conducted and are explained in detail below.

Table 3.9 Overview of Pilot Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs Analysis</td>
<td>8 SJBS student alumni</td>
<td>- Student questionnaire</td>
<td>- Developed a list of English target task types and target tasks for recent SJBS alumni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>1 instructor</td>
<td>- Instructor interview</td>
<td>- Target tasks included: computer literacy, getting a job, personal financial management, professional writing, professional speaking, and translation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 administrator</td>
<td>- Administrator interview</td>
<td>- Many students indicated a strong desire to become bilingual school teachers after graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Document analysis (School reports, syllabi, local employer webpages and employment advertisements)</td>
<td>- Uncovered mismatches in student perceived needs for English and school administration/instructor perceived needs for their students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation</td>
<td>BECA Executive Director</td>
<td>Stakeholder analysis conducted with the Executive Director and Administration</td>
<td>- Expanding upon the previously conducted needs analysis, a plan was generated to better meet the needs of graduating alumni from BECA schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td>SJBS Program Administrator</td>
<td>Creation of an Evaluation plan in conjunction with Primary Intended Users.</td>
<td>- Stakeholders decided on 7 evaluation questions including “to what extent is the current curriculum meeting the needs of the students, teachers and program?”, “what are some possible partnership opportunities with local industries and businesses?” and “what kinds of tasks do employees have to perform in English in local industries” among others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Stakeholders created a plan to collect the data needed to answer these questions via focus groups, student portfolios, surveys of local industries, data on enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the teacher training program was one goal determined by the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summer 2016 the first evaluation and implementation of TBLT training materials were introduced. An initial draft of the survey was piloted along with post-training interviews, a follow-up survey and delayed post-training interviews six months later. The evaluation in 2016 was conducted primarily to develop preliminary instruments and open the conversation between school teachers and administrators and the researcher/trainer about using evaluative findings.
from training in scientific research. Results from surveys and interviews from this preliminary pilot uncovered changes in teacher cognition concerning task-based teaching methods. Prior to the training, teachers’ reflections on open-ended survey questions focused primarily on teaching English grammar. When asked what elements of language teaching they anticipated being the easiest or hardest to implement in their language classroom teachers 83% (10 of 12) teachers wrote about discreet grammar points such as “verb conjugations”, “sentence structures/grammar,” and “describing a word that they don’t know in English.” Post-training, when asked the same question, teachers described the importance of motivating students to communicate and providing meaningful feedback. Reflections included: “motivating students to speak in English when they are discussing prompts with one another,” “peer-to-peer English interaction,” “Providing meaningful feedback about [students] learning” and “creating activities that encourage low-speakers to engage more in speaking English in class.”

In interviews, teachers highlighted the utility of modeling and role-playing teaching strategies and described an increase in their confidence to implement new teaching method. 50 % of the teachers discussed the need to focus more of their time and energy on task and lesson planning. These themes persisted into the teaching year according to interview data from a small sample of teachers. However, implementation data was not collected during this round of piloting; therefore, it was impossible to connect results from the training to classroom teaching practices. The research findings from the 2016 pilot were presented at the 7th International Conference on Task-Based Language teaching in Barcelona, Spain in April, 2017.

In the summer of 2017, 20 novice teachers and administrators participated in the summer training and practicum. These teachers completed pre- and post-training surveys and wrote daily reflections. A sample of teachers (n = 9) participated in immediate post-training interviews (of
the 9 interviewed, 3 were local Hondurans while 6 where Americans). Eight volunteers also video-recorded one, hour-long, lesson during the practicum portion of training and reflected on the lesson in an interview. Video-recordings from this year were used to pilot a rubric for analyzing successful implementation of TBLT (see Section 3.4.1.3 for more details on the analysis). Results from the pilot disposition survey indicated a significant, positive, change in teachers’ beliefs about TBLT principles immediately following the training ($t = -2.89$, $df = 19$, $p = .00$). However, this represented a weak effect ($d = .40$) with a mean change in disposition of 4.63 points on the 88-point scale of that version of the survey. Findings from daily teacher reflections echoed previous findings with teachers highlighting the utility of modeling tasks and differentiation of instruction. In interviews, teachers pointed to the need for more training on multicultural awareness and greater emphasis on diversity and bilingualism. Teachers also indicated they wanted the training to be more differentiated by grade-level and they had difficulty applying concepts to the age-level of the students they would be teaching. Finally, echoing the findings of the previous pilot, teachers noted in interviews and on open-ended follow-up surveys that they experienced difficulty with lesson planning and task-based assessment design (in terms of decision making and strategies for lesson and assessment planning) and that these difficulties persisted into the school year.

3.3.3.2. Conclusions/Changes Resulting from Pilot Studies

Both the 2016 and 2017 pilots resulted in changes to the instruments and procedures that were ultimately utilized in the final dissertation project. In 2016, the first version of a pre/posttest survey to measure attitudes and understanding of TBLT principles was used (adapted from Jackson, 2012). In 2017, the newly designed survey (adapted from Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010) was piloted again; however, the split-half reliability for the overall survey was determined to be too
low for internal consistency \( (r = .30) \). Upon reviewing the instrument, some of the questions were deemed to be double-barreled (Ogilvie & Dunn actually point out that their survey contained double-barreled questions but retained those questions in their study due to high split-half reliability coefficients. The current study was unable to obtain similarly high split-half reliability coefficients with new pilot data), therefore, a new instrument was created and piloted (as described in Section 3.3.2.2). After several of the new teachers hired in 2017 were local, English-speaking Hondurans, it was also decided to translate the survey into Spanish and provide both English and Spanish version as options to all participants. Some additional logistical changes were also made based on lessons learned from previous pilots\(^1\) including back-up cameras and batteries, positions of cameras in the classroom. After the various pilot studies were completed, it was clear that the final data collection procedures would be effective and efficient for completing the full dissertation study.

Based on the results of previous pilots, the final version of the instruments and procedures outlined above were implemented in Honduras in the summer of 2018. Upon conclusion of the training and practicum, data was organized and prepared for coding and analyses as described in the next section.

3.4. Analysis

The following section describes how the collected data were coded and analyzed including statistical procedures. Next, there is a discussion of the steps taken to ensure reliability of the

\(^1\) In the 2017 pilot, high heat and the availability of only one camera with a dying battery resulted in some lost data. Additionally, upon watching the pilot videos of classrooms it became clear that the cameras needed to be positioned so that they did not distract any students and so that students did not block the cameras when they moved around for various activities. Interview questions were also translated into Spanish and participants were offered the opportunity to speak in either Spanish or English during interviews.
coded data. Finally, a summary is provided that outlines the analyses that contributed to each research question.

3.4.1. Coding Procedures

3.4.1.1. Surveys

Data obtained from the instructor pre-, post- and delayed-post training surveys was analyzed both quantitatively for Likert-scale items (see statistical procedures below) and qualitatively for open-ended response items. First, all paper surveys responses were manually transferred to Excel. Metadata was attributed to each participant’s responses including: age, gender, L1, English language proficiency, years previous teaching experience (including teaching credentials), if they were an alumnus of a BECA school, and current grade taught. For the purposes of further analysis some of these codes were collapsed. To problematize English NS/NNS status, L1 was coded as English (0), Spanish (1) (the L1 Garifuno speaker was categorized as L1 Spanish for statistically analyses since she was Spanish-Garifuno bilingual and due to the fact that she was the only participant in this category, all other participants self-identified as either a native Spanish or English speaker). Given the limited sample size and limited teach experiences of these novice teachers, to examine previous teaching experience, time spent previously teaching was examined as a categorical variable (‘0’ = no previous teaching experience, ‘1’= some teaching experience). Similarly, teaching credential (having a degree in related field) was also considered as a categorical variable with ‘0’ meaning no teaching credentials and ‘1’ for some teaching credential (university degree in a language/linguistics, state/regional certification, TESOL certificate etc.) Given previous research (as summarized in the literature review), on NS/NNS teaching e.g. (Warford & Reeves, 2003) prior teaching experiences (e.g. Tsui, 2003), and experience with related fields such as SLA
(Gurzynski-Weiss, 2010), these three factors were investigated as independent variables to the effects of TBLT belief scores and implementation scores from video recordings.

Likert scale responses were assigned a numeric value (Strongly disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Neutral = 3, Agree = 4, Strongly agree = 5). Items expressing a negative disposition towards TBLT (see Table X from Section X) were reverse coded (Strongly agree = 1, Agree = 2, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 4, Strongly Disagree = 5). Open-ended items were transcribed and translated into English where necessary. Open-ended items were then transferred to Nvivo (QSR International) and coded by both the researcher and two trained coders for emergent themes using a grounded approach (using suggestions in Mackey & Gass, 2015) rather than proposing a pre-made coding scheme. After one round of open-coding of the qualitative survey data into main emerging themes, the data was coded a second time for sub-themes and variation within the emergent categories and also connections between the main themes. Individual responses with themes were compared with independent participant variables such as NS/NSS status, teaching experience, grade taught and age. Delayed-post training survey items were also analyzed qualitatively using a grounded approach.

3.4.1.2. Daily Instructor Reflections

Instructor reflections were collected daily from instructors during the first two-weeks of training. Instructors wrote one positive (+) comment and suggested one change (delta) for each day of training. The researcher collected the reflections each day and iteratively transferred from hard copies to Excel. Reflections were then tagged for the following metadata: date of writing, content of day’s training session, plus (+) content, or delta (change) content. This resulted in a mini-corpus of teacher reflections representing both positive comments and suggestions for improvement.
As with the open-ended survey items, the reflections were imported into Nvivo and coded by the researcher and a trained coder for emergent themes using a grounded approach with one round of open-coding and a second round to code for sub-themes and variation within the emergent categories and connections between the main themes.

3.4.1.3. Observation Rubrics

Teacher observation data was analyzed for adherence to the principles of task-based lesson design and implementation as taught during the training. A rubric (adapted from Erlam, 2016; Devlieger & Goossens, 2007; Long, 2015) was created to code for how well the teachers lesson adhered to the basic principles in TBLT as outlined by Long's (2015) Methodological Principles (MPs), Pedagogic Procedures (PPs) and Evaluation Criteria (EC) for task-based language teaching (see Table 3.10).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Principles</th>
<th>TBLT Theme (Long, 2015)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Uses task, not text as unit of analysis</td>
<td>The teacher creates roles for tasks/activities such that each student participates according to their assigned (or chosen) role. The teacher targets different skills in task performance (linguistic, social-emotional, physical-spatial etc.). Teacher has clear content objectives for the lesson. Teacher posts student-friendly objectives for the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promotes learning by doing (Promotes student talk)</td>
<td>The teacher provides opportunities for student output and modified output. The teacher uses open-ended questioning techniques, elicitations etc. The teacher pushes output from students in the context of meaningful interactions and tasks. The teacher provides positive feedback, encouragement, allows students to make mistakes etc. Teacher has a system for promoting student sharing/talk (talking stick, turn and talks, think-pair-share etc.) Teacher uses encouragement strategies to promote English use. Teacher responds to Spanish use in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborates input</td>
<td>The teacher uses natural language to interact with students. The teacher supports input comprehension in various ways: visually by means of pictures, drawings, objects; by referring to past situations that occurred in the classroom; by means of activating prior-knowledge etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provides rich input</td>
<td>The teacher provides varied and rich language input. The teacher always models an activity prior to asking the students to begin. The teacher performs regular comprehension checks (5-finger check, thumbs-up/down, student rephrases, teacher rephrases etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourages inductive “chunk” learning</td>
<td>The teacher provides repeated exposure to the same input. The teacher utilizes formulaic speech. The teacher introduces and repeats critical vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Focus on form</td>
<td>The teacher responds to children who signal problems with the task (reactively). The teacher attempts to detect students’ problems related to task performance (pro-actively). The teacher uses think-aloud strategies to help students work through problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provides negative feedback</td>
<td>The teacher supports student output through reformulations, recasts, negotiation for meaning, comprehension checks, clarification requests etc. The teacher provides corrective feedback in a variety of ways (both implicit and explicit) depending on the context of the error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respects learner syllabi and developmental processes</td>
<td>The teacher provides feedback on students’ learning process and on the goals of the task. The teacher provides feedback on the way in which the students work together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Principles</th>
<th>TBLT Theme (Long, 2015)</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Promotes cooperative collaborative learning</td>
<td>The teacher forms heterogeneous groups for group work and promotes peer interaction. The teacher organizes different stations for tasks e.g. class library, floor space, math supplies, art supplies, word wall etc. The teacher arranges tables/desks in such a manner so that they can look at one another, have eye contact, see actions, work in teams etc. (classroom management) The teacher gives clear instructions on task expectations including: How much time students have for planning and the task/What spaces/materials to use for the task/How to clean up after the task is over. Teacher time management: The teacher manages stages of task efficiently. Teacher circulates to monitor if students are on task. Teacher provides supplemental activities to early finishers if necessary. Counts down (or other strategy) to restrict clean up/transition time. The teacher promotes student autonomy through the use of routines and procedures including: Expectations for taking out and cleaning up tasks and activities. Expectations for noise level for certain activities. Expectations for certain transitions throughout the day (moving from math to science, science to recess etc.). Teacher has a system for behavior management to encourage respectful behavior in the classroom towards the teacher, materials other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Individualizes instruction</td>
<td>The teacher uses both heterogeneous and homogeneous grouping (by content-level, proficiency level, personality etc.) thoughtfully depending on the needs of the students and task-type. The teacher uses scaffolding to support student learning (provides extra pictures, visual aids, re-formatted or adapted tasks, extra explanations/feedback etc.) The teacher uses teacher-led centers to allow for all students to gain individual/small-group attention from the teacher. Additional tasks and activates are available for students who finish and extend learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each sub-section in the rubric (TBLT themes), the teacher received one point for accomplishing that principle, zero points if the principle was absent, a point was deducted for performing counter to the principle (following Devlieger & Goossens, 2007; see Table 3.11 below for detailed examples).
Table 3.11 Coding Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodological Principle</th>
<th>Teacher Behavior(s)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotes student talk</td>
<td>✓ Teacher uses encouragement strategies to promote English use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Teacher responds to Spanish use in English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Teacher makes no attempt to encourage English language use</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher disparages Spanish language use</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teacher responds to students in Spanish</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This generated a score per observation of 38 within a possible range of 76 points (range -38 to 38). The higher the score, the greater adherence to TBLT principles. To score the video recordings, the researcher and two trained coders played back clips and entered scores iteratively into a coding scheme document along with illustrative quotes and notes from the video for each line in the rubric. Raw scores from observation rubrics were descriptively and statistically analyzed (see section 3.4.2 Statistical Procedures for more details). This resulted in a “TBLT” implementation score for each individual participant as well as an average score across participants for each category (MP) coded within the rubric.

3.4.1.4. Stimulated Recall Interviews

Participant recalls from recorded stimulated recall interviews were first transcribed using ELAN (transcription software) and translated to English where necessary using the coding scheme presented in Table 3.12. In the coding scheme, teacher behaviors that were remarked upon during the stimulated recall interview were briefly summarized. Then, the associated recalls from the participant were transcribed in the next column. Finally, the relevant TBLT methodological principle (MP) was identified and entered into the last column. If the recall was not related to a particular MP, the rater coded it as n/a and left a comment in the comments column.
To take an example, in sample 34, the video of the classroom observation was paused at time 24 minutes and 55 seconds. At this point in the observation the teacher was giving students direction to sit in particular groups at their tables to begin an activity. During the stimulated recall interview the teacher paused the tape to say that at that time, she was thinking about making sure groups were homogeneously organized by reading level so that she could place the appropriate level books on the tables for silent reading. The rater coded this sample as MP 10 individualizes instruction. The final column was left available to the rater for additional comments on the rating as needed, although here it was not used.

**Table 3.12 Stimulated Recall Coding Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Time stamp</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Stimulated recall</th>
<th>MP?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24:55</td>
<td>Teacher gives directions to students to sit at certain tables</td>
<td><em>I wanted them to sit by reading level so that I could pass out bins with the correct books for each group. That way I can circulate to the high-need tables</em></td>
<td>Individualized Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coded data was analyzed by first calculating the relative frequency of each MP theme in the recalls and associated those themes with illustrated quotes from the interviews.

3.4.1.5. Semi-structured Interviews and Parent Focus Group Interviews

As with the open-ended survey questions and reflection data, instructor semi-structured interviews and parent focus group interview data was coded using a grounded approach. The data was first translated to English (where applicable) and transcribed by the researcher and research assistants in ELAN. Metadata associated with each interview included: participant ID
(to connect with biodata for instructors as listed above), and for parents, bio data (age of children in school, grades of children, years with BECA, number of children).

Interview data was thematically coded by the researcher and a trained research assistant again using a two-step, open-coding process. For instructor interview data, themes were triangulated and associated with qualitative and quantitative data from other data sources (surveys, stimulated recall and observations). Themes that emerged from parent focus group data contributed to perceptions of second language learning success in classrooms.

3.4.2. Statistical Procedures
Statistical procedures were utilized in the current dissertation study to examine changes in scores on pre- and post-training surveys and to investigate factors that influenced implementation according to scores from video rubrics. For the survey analysis, participant scores from Likert-Scale items were summed to generate a possible score range of 30 (very low disposition towards TBLT principles) to 150 (very high disposition towards TBLT principles). Raw scores on this 120-point scale were then converted to percentages to represent individual disposition towards (or against) TBLT principles. A paired samples t-test was used to determine if there was a significant change to teachers’ beliefs over time (pre- or post- training). The between subjects factor of prior experience teaching (no experience vs. some experience) was examined descriptively as a potential factor as it was found to be a significant predictor of score in pilot testing. Descriptive statistics examined changes in each thematic category (MP) of TBLT examined in the surveys. A paired-samples t-test was also used to investigate to what extent teachers felt more prepared to teach TBLT on a variety of dimensions.

Video scores calculated from rubrics ranged from -38 to 38 were converted to a positive 76-point scale resulting in a raw score for each participant. Descriptive statistics examined
average scores across participants in each coded (MP) category. A correlation investigated whether or not changes in survey responses were connected to success of implementation. A series of regressions were again used to identify factors (L1, experience teaching or degree in a related field) that predicted TBLT implementation as operationalized by video scores. Resulting linear models were compared with ANOVA. For stimulated recall data, descriptive statistics examined coded TBLT categories to determine which MPs were highlighted most and least by their recalls.

Effect sizes (Cohen’s $d$, Pearson’s $r$) for all statistical tests were calculated to measure strength of observed effects and interpreted with respect to field specific benchmarks (Plonsky & Oswald, 2014).

3.4.3. Reliability Analyses

Due to the high-inference coding procedures required to analyze the observation and stimulated recall data it was necessary to conduct a thorough reliability analysis. This is particularly necessary for the stimulated recall data where the researcher was also a participant in the recall interview. In order to ensure reliability of the developed coding schemes, several independent (third-party) raters were trained to rate stimulated recall interview data and observation data with established categories. Additional coders coded the qualitative data from open-ended survey items, reflections, interviews and field notes. In order to train the raters to code stimulated recall and video observation data, three previously rated video samples from classroom observation data and three transcribed samples from stimulated recall interviews were shown to the raters. The researcher and the raters reviewed the coding scheme and rated two samples from each type of data together. Then, the rater coded a third sample on their own and asked any questions of the researcher. For the observation data, the raters watched clips from classroom recordings and
coded with the coding scheme described in Section 3.4.1.3 above. For the stimulated recall interview data, the rater saw transcribed samples of participant recalls and coded them with the coding scheme presented in Section 3.4.1.4. Following training, the raters were left to code and random sample of 36% (six out of 16 videos) of the classroom observation data as well as a random sample of 42% (5 out of 12) of the stimulated recall interview data. A simple percent-agreement was calculated between the researcher’s ratings and the rater’s coded samples. Any disagreements were reanalyzed and discussed until 100% agreement was achieved.

For qualitative coding of open-ended survey items, teacher reflections, focus groups, and interview questions, 85% of the data was coded by two or three coders. Themes determined by each coder were compared. Themes that were identified similarly by all raters were combined and themes that were identified by only one rater were added for additional depth to pre-existing categories.
### Table 3.13 Summary of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) To what extent are language teachers’ beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher-training program?</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong> Pre- and post-training surveys closed items</td>
<td>Disposition score calculated</td>
<td>Tracked individual teachers’ changes, in terms of their cognitions and beliefs about TBLT immediately post training. Examined changes in perceptions of preparedness to teach TBLT curricula pre- and post-training. Examined factors that moderated changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Open-ended survey responses</td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End of training interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) To what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms following the task-based training?</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong> Recorded classroom observations during and post-training</td>
<td>Coded with a rubric and generated a TBLT disposition score and scores for each of the ten MPs. Correlation evaluated connection between surveys and video scores. Factors predicting implementation scores statistically analyzed with linear models. Effect sizes calculated.</td>
<td>Examined factors that predicted success of TBLT implementation immediately following training. Examined adherence to ten methodological principles. Observations were further triangulated with parent perceptions of success elicited from focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Methods Used</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Stimulated-recall interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coded with a coding sheet and associated TBLT methodological principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Parent Focus Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) How useful was the training for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first year of teaching?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative Data:</strong> Daily teacher reflections</td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td>Generated themes around the most and least useful training elements. Themes presented to the training team and school organization to inform future summer institutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-ended survey responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

The results are organized first by research question, then by method used to address that research question. Each sub-section ends with a summary table that includes the research question examined, methods used, analyses used and a summary of the findings.

4.1. Research Question 1

To what extent are language teachers’ beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher training program?

Based on the previous literature reviewed in Chapter 2, it was hypothesized that changes to teachers’ dispositions toward TBLT would increase from pre- to post-testing and be moderated by prior learning/teaching experiences and language (L1) background. The following methods were used to answer this research question: pre- and post- TBLT training surveys (open and closed-ended items), and post-training semi-structured interviews.

4.1.1. Pre- and Post- Training Survey Results

4.1.1.1. TBLT Beliefs

Fifteen novice teachers responded to both the pre- and post-training surveys and their data were included for subsequent analyses. As described in Chapter 3, the possible scores on the TBLT beliefs portion of the surveys ranged from 30 (very low disposition towards TBLT principles) to 150 (very high disposition towards TBLT principles). Descriptively, pre-training teachers exhibited a high disposition towards TBLT principles that remained high with a slight increase after four-weeks of training (see Table 4.1). However, the mean scores at both pre- and post-testing were lower than the average score of the pilot sample (mean = 113.00, SD = 7.98). The range of the teachers’ scores in the current study was also lower than the pilot sample (97, 142).
Table 4.1 Pre- and Post-Training TBLT Beliefs Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>105.13</td>
<td>8.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers’ beliefs about TBLT showed variation, with 8 teachers showing positive changes towards a higher TBLT score at post-testing, 4 teachers showing a negative change towards a lower TBLT score at post-testing, and 3 showing no change in belief score from pre- to post-testing. See Figure 4.1 below (note, names are pseudonyms. Pseudonyms without bars represent no change from pre- to post-test).

Looking into specific questions on the survey, for the majority of items teachers on average agreed with items with positive TBLT disposition and disagreed on items with a negative TBLT disposition and did not change those ratings from pre- to post-testing. As outlined in Chapter 3, the responses were on a 5-point Likert-scale (1-strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3-neutral, 4-agree, 5-strongly agree), therefore if answers align with TBLT principles they should have higher
ratings (4.00-5.00) for items marked ‘+’ and lower ratings (1.00-2.00) for items marked ‘-’ as shown in the column “Disposition towards TBLT principles” in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Alignment with TBLT before and after Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
<th>Average rating pre-training (SD)</th>
<th>Average rating post-training (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error Correction</td>
<td>• Students’ language errors represent bad habits they have developed in the language.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.50 (.94)</td>
<td>2.57 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Errors are a natural part of language learning.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.80 (.41)</td>
<td>4.93 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Grammar Instruction/Knowledge</td>
<td>• Explicit grammar instruction should be the focus of a language program.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.93 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.40 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Needs</td>
<td>• Learners don’t know what’s best for their language learning in the classroom</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00 (.75)</td>
<td>2.67 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tasks/activities should be adapted to suit the students’ needs.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.40 (.63)</td>
<td>4.23 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training language students to take responsibility for their own learning is not effective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.20 (.77)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The language teacher should help students develop individual strategies for improving their learning.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.33 (.61)</td>
<td>4.20 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>• Language students learn more by cooperating with each other in group activities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.13 (.83)</td>
<td>4.27 (.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Students acquire each other’s language errors during group work.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.42 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.40 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Group work activities are important for creating an environment in which students feel comfortable interacting in the target language.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.47 (.51)</td>
<td>4.67 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Exercises/Drills</td>
<td>• Grammar exercises/drills don't develop skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.27 (.96)</td>
<td>2.60 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process vs Product</td>
<td>• Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom looks different for every student.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.00 (1.00)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student vs Teacher Directed</td>
<td>• A good language class mainly follows the order presented in a textbook.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.40 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.20 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A good language class is mainly led by the needs of the students</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.13 (.63)</td>
<td>4.33 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of the Teacher</td>
<td>• The primary role of the language teacher is to provide grammatical explanations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.87 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.87 (.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
<th>Average rating pre-training (SD)</th>
<th>Average rating post-training (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Study vs Language Use</td>
<td>• The primary role of a language teacher is to create an environment conducive to interaction in the target language.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.40 (.73)</td>
<td>4.33 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.47 (.83)</td>
<td>2.47 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate effectively.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.27 (.96)</td>
<td>4.27 (.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For most other questions, teachers were, on average, neutral at the beginning of training and remained neutral at the end of training:

Table 4.3 Neutral Responses before and after Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
<th>Average rating pre-training (SD)</th>
<th>Average rating post-training (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Grammar Instruction/Knowledge</td>
<td>• The primary focus of a language program should be on students’ ability to use the language.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.87 (.91)</td>
<td>3.53 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task/activity rather than studied in an explicit manner.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.80 (1.08)</td>
<td>3.87 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Correction</td>
<td>• Large amounts of explicit correction of students’ English errors is counterproductive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.40 (.91)</td>
<td>3.33 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Work</td>
<td>• When students speak in their first language during group work, their learning is limited.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.07 (1.09)</td>
<td>3.33 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>• Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult grammar.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.20 (.86)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult tasks/activities.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.33 (1.17)</td>
<td>3.27 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Exercises/Drills</td>
<td>• Grammar exercises/drills are necessary for developing skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.93 (1.07)</td>
<td>3.47 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In four cases, teachers’ average post-training ratings changed to align more with TBLT principles:

**Table 4.4 Change towards TBLT alignment Post-Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
<th>Average rating pre-training (SD)</th>
<th>Average rating post-training (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Error Correction</td>
<td>• All of students’ English errors must be immediately corrected.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.00 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.40 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a second language.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.13 (.74)</td>
<td>3.07 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explicit grammar instruction should be limited in a language program</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2.27 (.96)</td>
<td>3.27 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The primary focus of a language program should be students’ accuracy in the language.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.13 (.91)</td>
<td>2.80 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In one case, teachers’ average post-training ratings changed to align less with TBLT principles (although, note the larger standard deviation at post-testing):

**Table 4.5 Change away from TBLT alignment Post-Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TBLT Theme Addressed</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disposition towards TBLT principles</th>
<th>Average rating pre-training (SD)</th>
<th>Average rating post-training (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process vs Product</td>
<td>• Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom should look the same for every student.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.80 (.94)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the results of the pilot survey with a larger data set that found prior teaching experience to be a significant predictor of TBLT score in a random sample of the general population, prior teaching experiences were explored as a potential factor for results with the novice bilingual school teachers before and after training. A paired-samples t-test investigated the effects of the within-subjects effect of time on beliefs scores. The between-subjects factor of prior experience
teaching (no experience vs. some experience) was examined descriptively due to small sample size. The table below shows descriptive statistics comparing these groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.6 Descriptives for Prior Teaching Experience Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prior teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ prior teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the paired samples t-test was not statistically significant and had a weak effect and a confidence interval that intersected with zero (95% CI: -6.16, .42)– meaning that the TBLT training did not significantly change the novice teachers’ scores on the beliefs survey (see Table 4.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.7 Paired Samples t-test Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Post testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A descriptive examination of the scores of the experienced versus inexperienced teachers found a potential interaction between time and prior teaching experiences, with teachers with some prior teaching experience scoring higher than those without prior teaching experience at pre, but not post-testing (see Figure 4.2).
However, the overall scores between two groups did not appear to be different overall. This is clear when examining the boxplots of these two groups as seen in Figure 4.3 below.

Figure 4.2 Descriptive Interaction between Time and Prior Teaching Experiences

Figure 4.3 Prior Teaching Experience Group Differences
4.1.1.2. Preparation

The survey additionally asked teachers to rate how prepared they felt to implement TBLT in their classrooms before and after training. They responded on a 5-point Likert scale (1- not prepared, 2-somewhat prepared, 3-neutral, 4-prepared, 5-well prepared). Teachers indicated how prepared they felt for the following activities pre- and post-training: write objective-driven lesson plans using BECA curricula, execute lesson plans in the classroom, create routines and procedures to organize your classroom, use classroom management techniques in the classroom to manage student behavior, and assess student learning. See Table 4.8 below for descriptive results and Figure 4.4 for a graphical representation of those results.

Table 4.8 Perceptions of Preparedness Pre- and Post- Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Write lesson plans</th>
<th>Execute lesson plans</th>
<th>Create routines</th>
<th>Use classroom management</th>
<th>Assess student learning</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-training</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-training</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note responses are averages on a 5-point Likert scale

A t-test examined if teachers changed their average perceptions of preparedness on all 5 metrics after training and found that after-training teachers rated their preparedness levels significantly higher ($t(17) = -3.19, p = .005$) with a medium effect size of $d = 1.06$. 
4.1.1.3. Open-ended Survey Items

On pre- and post-training surveys teachers were also asked to answer open-ended questions on what aspects of language teaching they expected to be easiest and most difficult to implement in the coming year. Responses to survey items were coded in to themes by two trained coders resulting in the following patterns. First, the themes that emerged from the survey pre-training²:

---
² For all qualitative data, responses are presented in the language the teacher chose to use at the time of filling out the survey or answering an interview question.
### Table 4.9 Pre-Training Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easiest to Implement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Memorization of nouns, greetings, everyday words”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Straightforward rules that don’t have exceptions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking/Conversation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Conversación en inglés [conversations in English]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Comprensión oral; comprender y seguir instrucciones [oral comprehension, understanding and following instructions]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“I think encouraging students to utilize the language will be easiest”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“La fonetica [pronunciation]”, “sounds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most difficult to Implement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Proper grammar”, “exceptions”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking/Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Conversations”, “actually speaking the language”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Aprender a leer en inglés [learning to read in English] (decoding, coding)”, “writing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a NNS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Not being a native English speaker. There are a few things I might need extra time to get to know some words”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Planning lessons”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Oraciones completes de otros ámbitos o contornos [complete sentences of other areas or regions]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Teoria [theory]”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note # refers to the number of participants whose response included that theme in the data

Post-training teachers were asked to respond to the same two questions. The following patterns were found in the post-training survey data:
Table 4.10 Post-Training Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Easiest to Implement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Classroom management and behavior systems”, ’following an agenda”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer interaction/Group work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“task-based activities, group work activities” ”En actividades para que ellos aprendan practicando [activities where they learn by practicing]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborating input</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Gestures w/ words/repetition/procedures”, “gestures have been important, repetition, visuals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Guided reading and writing workshop”, “spelling”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Introducing new vocab for new subjects”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Interaction in the classroom”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most difficult to Implement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Grammar is hard to teach when the students have a very low understanding of their language”, “modismos [idioms]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Appropriate activities”, “Assessment of language levels. I've been able to grasp large group levels but some individuals are more difficult as I can't tell if they are just quiet or don't understand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Yo pienso que también sería la disciplina porque sería la más fácil y al mismo difícil de mantener [I think that it would also be discipline because it will be the easiest and most difficult to maintain]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaborating input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Knowing the way on how to teach concepts or breaking down them so that it easy and understandable to give or be more instructional”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“independent reading”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note # refers to the number of participants whose response included that theme in the data

Notable changes in the above reflections pre- and post-training include:

- Grammar emerged as a prominent theme for both easy and difficult aspects of language teaching pre-training, but only as a difficult aspect of language teaching post training.
Aspects of TBLT that were not present in pre-training themes including: peer interaction, classroom management, elaborating input, differentiation and scaffolding emerged in post-training surveys.

4.1.2. Semi-structured Interviews

During the final days of training, fifteen teachers took part in semi-structured interviews where they were asked to reflect on their experience in the training and teaching practicum. Teachers were asked what their main takeaways were from the training and how these takeaways impacted on their beliefs as new teachers. Several themes emerged from this data. First, teachers discussed how they had changed their theoretical and pedagogical approach to language teaching after participating in the training. One teacher cited her prior experiences in a local public school and contrasted them with the style of teaching she experienced at the training:

*I learned so many things [that] maybe changed my perspective as a teacher. I grew up with a different method that I don't like but when you work in a public school you are forced to work with those methods. I was 3 or 5 years out of SJBS when all I was working all those methods and then coming back and being part of this training and resetting. The teacher here is actually the facilitator and in contact with the student and cares about the social emotional part of each student and doesn't just prepare a lesson just to go through the content and thinks of every child.* (Isabel, kindergarten teacher)

The concepts of “teacher as a facilitator” and the ability to individualize instruction are aspects of TBLT teaching that this teacher found different to her prior teaching experiences but gained from the TBLT training. This teacher also cited “proper grammar” as a difficult aspect of

---

3 Interviews primarily asked teachers about what aspects of the training were most and least useful. These themes will be covered in the results for research question three.
language teaching on her survey (as described above) but included “gestures”, “repetition”, “visuals”, “learning styles” and “behavior procedures” on her post-training survey. Another teacher described the transition from focus on theory and grammar for language teaching to being able to visualize teaching in a TBLT classroom:

*I have been able to clearly walk though my classes. Before when I had to do a lesson plan I was so fixated on the words and theories, but now if I want to start my day I would start a do now and walk around and visualize what a day would look like a lot more clearly. Even when I'm not in classroom even when I think about what I'm going to do tomorrow I can envision a lot more clearly.* (Beth, middle school teacher)

This teacher described the process of transforming from a novice teacher that could see beyond “words and theories” to a more experienced teacher that can visualize and anticipate. She also described how the process of visualization allowed her to adjust for comprehension issues by elaborating input. She said, “I know that I need to make things as detailed and visual as possible and anything that can make my teaching … go smoother.” This teacher also cited grammar, and vocabulary as difficulties she anticipated for language teaching before training but listed “interaction in the classroom” and “differentiation” post-training on her surveys.

The theme of differentiation was echoed among several other teachers who described how recognition of individual differences in the classroom has influenced their teaching. A 2nd-grade teacher, Claudia, described how she recognized after training the variety of levels and types of students she will have in her classroom. She said: “…todos aprenden diferente no todos los sistemas funcionan para todos igual, los estudiantes estan a diferentes niveles [everyone learns differently, the systems do not function in the same way for everyone, the students are at
different levels].” As a result of this realization she went on to say: “I’ve definitely changed the way I express myself” adding that she tends to elaborate input more, use more gestures and visuals to ensure she reaches every student. A similar theme emerged from kindergarten teacher Natalia’s response. She reflected after training that she had learned:

*Cado niño aprende de forma diferente. Cado niño tiene capacidades diferentes.*

*Aprenden [mejor] de hacer una actividad del tema a dar que sólo leer el contexto*  
[Each child learns differently. Each child has different abilities. They learn better doing an activity on the given topic than only reading the context].

Natalia reflected specifically on the transition from envisioning teaching a topic to students didactically and designing her classroom around tasks and activities, a hallmark of TBLT.

4.1.3. Summary

Results from the survey that investigated whether TBLT training impacted on teacher’s beliefs found no statistically significant changes in scores after training ($t = -1.86$, $df = 14$, $p = .083$) with a weak effect ($d = .30$). However, results clearly supported the effects of TBLT training on teacher’s perceptions of preparedness to teach a TBLT curriculum ($t = -3.19$, $df = 17$, $p = .005$) with a medium effect size of $d = 1.06$. Quantitative and qualitative results show variability in teachers changing dispositions pre- and post-training with some teachers demonstrating larger changes towards a TBLT disposition while others showed negative changes and some no change at all. Qualitative results indicated some teachers were still concerned with teaching grammar points post-training while other reflected on TBLT themes like differentiation, classroom management and peer interaction. Descriptive results suggested a connection between previous teaching experiences and TBLT disposition after training with inexperienced teachers showing greater gains than teachers with prior teaching experiences. Overall, results show the variability
between teachers in the impact a training program can have on their perceptions and dispositions towards TBLT and uncovered factors that may predispose teachers to accept the pedagogy.

Table 4.11 Research Question 1 Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions and Hypotheses</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) To what extent are language teachers' beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher-training program? H1: Changes to beliefs will be moderated by prior learning/teaching experiences and language background.</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong> Pre- and post-training surveys closed items</td>
<td>Disposition score calculated. Statistically analyzed with t-tests and effect sizes.</td>
<td>No significant change from pre- to post-survey ($t = -1.86$, $df = 14$, $p = .083$) with a weak effect ($d = .30$). Descriptively, teachers with no prior teaching experiences changed their beliefs more than those without experience over time. Teachers indicated that they did feel significantly more prepared to teach a TBLT course ($t = -3.19$, $df = 17$, $p = .005$) with a medium to large effect size of $d = 1.06$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Open-ended survey responses on pre- and post-training surveys. End of training interviews</td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td>Before training, teachers reflected on the grammatical forms and difficulties of language teaching. After training, some teachers reflected on aspects of TBLT themes such as classroom management, differentiation, interaction, scaffolding and less on discrete aspects of language such as pragmatics, phonetics and grammar. However, several teachers continued to reflect on grammar after TBLT training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Research Question 2

To what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms following a task-based training program?

Based on previous literature as summarized in Chapter 2, it was hypothesized that there would be a connection between teachers’ beliefs on surveys and their success of implementing TBLT as operationalized by their score on a TBLT rubric coded from videos of recorded lessons. It was further hypothesized that implementation scores would be moderated by previous language learning/teaching experiences and first language. The following methods were used to answer this research question: recorded classroom observations scored with a TBLT rubric, stimulated-recall interviews, and parent focus groups.

4.2.1. Video-recorded Classroom Observations

A total of sixteen teachers participated in video recordings of teaching during the two-week teaching practicum. Each video was between 30 and 45 minutes long and was coded with a rubric aligned with the 10 methodological principles (MPs) of TBLT resulting in scores with a possible range of zero to 74 points. Higher scores reflected more compatibility with TBLT principles. Results from the 16 teachers’ video scores showed wide variability with scores ranging from a low of 20 points to a high of 63 points ($M = 49.8$, $SD = 10.97$) see Figure 4.5.
Within the categories of the 10 MPs, scores were highest for the MP “3) Elaborate input” (average 94% of possible points earned) and lowest in the category of “10) Individualize instruction” (40% of possible points earned).

Table 4.12 Video Coding Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Methodological Principle (MP)</th>
<th>Average Points Earned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use task, not text as the unit of analysis</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote learning by doing</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborate input</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide rich input</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourage inductive “chunk” learning</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Focus on form</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide negative feedback</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect learner syllabi and developmental processes</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Promote cooperative collaborative learning environment</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Individualize instruction</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Pearson correlation investigated whether or not there was a connection between changes on beliefs survey pre- and post- training (operationalized as gain scores) and scores on implementation (operationalized as score on observation rubric). The results showed there was not a significant correlation between the two variables ($r (12) = .094, p = .783$).
In order to investigate factors that predicted outcomes in terms of success of implementation in video recorded classroom observations, two linear regression models were compared. There were three main factors of interest: prior experience teaching (some vs none), prior related degrees such as in a language, linguistics, education or a teaching credential such as TESOL or teaching certification (some vs none) and teacher’s L1 (NS of English vs NNS of English).

Table 4.13 Descriptives for Predictors of Video Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relate Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first linear model examined all three factors and their interactions for video score finding a collective significant effect between prior experience, related degrees and L1 for video score \( F(7,8) = 5.22, p = .002, R^2 = .89 \) with the following results for individual predictors:
Table 4.14 Linear Model with 3 Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td>7.94 32.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some related degree</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>25.94 60.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some prior experience</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>19.94 54.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>6.01 32.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some related degree*</td>
<td>-44.50</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>-4.54</td>
<td>.001*</td>
<td>-67.05 -21.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some prior experience</td>
<td>-33.50</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>-3.55</td>
<td>.007*</td>
<td>-55.23 -11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Spanish</td>
<td>-23.50</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>-42.99 -3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some related degree *</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.015*</td>
<td>9.47 66.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This model shows that each predictor and interaction significantly contributed to the model.

However, given the small sample size and smaller contribution of the variable L1 in the above model in terms of \( t \)-values (also see descriptives and Figure 4.6 for a visual noting the outlier),

![Figure 4.6 Video Scores by L1](image-url)
this model was compared with another linear model only examining the predictors prior teaching experience and related degrees.

This second linear model also found a collective significant effect for video score \( (F(3, 12) = 8.78, p = .002, R^2 = .68) \) with the following results for individual predictors:

**Table 4.15 Linear Model with 2 Predictors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intercept)</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>&lt;.000*</td>
<td>28.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some related degree</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.005*</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some prior experience</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.003*</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some related degree * some prior experience</td>
<td>-19.06</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>.033*</td>
<td>-36.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ANOVA comparing these two models did not find a statistical difference \( (F = 3.74, p = .052) \) indicating that the addition of the L1 predictor did not lead to a significantly better fit.

This model indicates that those with some prior teaching experience out performed those without with a medium effect of \( d = .96 \) (see Figure 4.7). Similarly, the model indicated that those with a prior degree in a related field significantly outperformed those without with a medium effect of \( d = .82 \) (see Figure 4.8). Notably, the standard deviations for the scores of experienced teachers and teachers with prior related degrees was smaller than their less experienced counterparts. This indicates the experienced teachers and teachers with prior degrees performed more consistently than those that did not have prior experience or degrees. The interaction between prior related degrees and prior teaching experience was also significant with a medium effect of \( d = .84 \). An analysis of simple main effects uncovered that when teachers had no prior related degrees, those with teaching experience outperformed those without teaching experience \( (F(1,12) = 12.98, p \)
=.004). However, when teachers had prior related degrees there was no significant difference between those with or without teaching experience ($F(1,12) = .00, p = 1.00$) (see Figure 4.9).
Given the variation in implementation scores between experienced and inexperienced teachers and teachers with and without prior related degrees, individual correlations were run to investigate if there was a connection to change in TBLT beliefs (as documented by the questionnaire) and implementation scores within each of these subgroups of teachers. No statistically significant correlations were found (experienced teachers: $r(8) = .05, p = .89$, inexperienced teachers: $r(5)= .42, p = .47$, teachers with prior degrees: $r(7)= .21, p = .64$, teachers without prior degrees: $r(6)= .32, p = .52$); however, these results have limited validity due to the small sample of teachers who contributed data to both surveys and video recordings in each subgroup.

To further illustrate these results, the teacher (Christina, 3rd grade) that scored the highest (63 out of 74 points) designed and implemented a task-based lesson that had the objective of brainstorming ideas for writing projects using web-diagrams. She began the lesson by modeling a web-diagram brainstorm whole-class on the white board and then randomly chose students to
supply their own examples. She then had students working in table groups create their own web-
diagrams while she circulated providing feedback and extra support to struggling students. She
received full points for MP1: use task, not text as the unit of analysis for her orientation towards
brainstorming and writing rather than grammar or mechanics. She also received full points for
MP3 elaborate input for her use of visuals and gestures. Christina had a prior degree in Spanish
linguistics but no prior teaching experience.

By contrast the teacher with one of the lowest scores, Raquel a 4th grade teacher, scored
32 out of 74 points. Her lesson had a forms focus rather than a task-focus: the objective was to
recognize regular vs irregular past tense verbs. Her activities included underlining verbs in
example sentences and distinguishing between regular and irregular and creating past tense
sentences with pre-determined words in small groups. This resulted in a score of zero for MP6:
focus on form and a low score in MP1: use task not text as the unit of analysis. Raquel had no
prior related degrees nor prior teaching experience.

4.2.2. Stimulated Recall Interviews
A total of twelve teachers participated in stimulated recall interviews following their recorded
classroom observation providing 410 individual recalls (mean = 34.17 per participant, range: 16
– 50). All recalls were coded with a rubric aligned with the 10 MPs of TBLT. As shown below in
Table 4.16, the majority of recalls across participants were coded as MP 9: promote cooperative
and collaborative learning environment. The least number of recalls were coded as MP 8:
respect learner syllabi and developmental processes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Methodological Principle (MP)</th>
<th>Average recalls per participant</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use task, not text as the unit of analysis</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>“I was hoping [they would] look for the information in the page not just copying down.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote learning by doing</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>“I was like internally struggling with how much do I say and how much do I let them show.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elaborate input</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>“I mean they were answering my question, but not where I wanted to go. So that's why I was like &quot;whyy&quot; (gestures) &quot;do YOU&quot; (gestures) &quot;THINK&quot; (gestures) &quot;I have a chair?&quot; Like every word for me for me is this.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide rich input</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>“I thought my directions were clear, I was like alright we're doing it. But I obviously didn't repeat it back to them I didn't rephrase it.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encourage inductive “chunk” learning</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>“I had that moment …where I thought, oh a really good way to have started the lesson would have been let's talk about each material and its name. I say it first you repeat it as written on the board. This is a rubber band. Rubber band. Rubber bands.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Focus on form</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>“When that happened first thing that came to my mind was like I'm going to …point to one number to see if they can like tell me. That idea came to my mind at that time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Provide negative feedback</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>“They have problems with the number 13. Like they say thir-ty, thir-ty or fourty so like I do that to be like what number was that?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Respect learner syllabi and developmental processes</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>“So I've been concentrating on.. like stepping back for two seconds analyzing is this worth fighting for? no it's not let's move on”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Promote cooperative collaborative learning environment</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>“There were still kids talking so I wanted students to pay attention to me and be quiet.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of the MP with the majority of recalls, *promote cooperative and collaborative learning environment*, most teachers focused their recalls on maintaining control over the behaviors of the students in the class so that they felt comfortable continuing on in their lesson. For example, after watching a clip of herself telling the class they would earn points if they were silent and that she would wait, Claudia a 2nd grade teacher said:

*I think they were mostly quiet but there was a couple of people that were still just totally not paying attention. But since they were all being really good I'm like "oh okay I think we are like getting really up there like we're building up to it" sort of thing so then I was hoping then if I gave them time then those kids that were already doing really good would influence their friends."

Here the teacher is describing thinking about how she can better promote student autonomy in her classroom through her classroom procedures and routines. Claudia demonstrated her persistence in enforcing her classroom management systems by waiting until she had the students’ attention leading to more points in her video score. By contrast, Rebecca a 4th and 5th grade teacher described how she felt like giving up after she lost her classes’ attention during a science lesson. She said:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Methodological Principle (MP)</th>
<th>Average recalls per participant</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Illustrative Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Individualize instruction</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>“I was thinking to who because I know some of them by faces that they don’t behave well. So, I was like hmm who is little kid going to work well with?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>“It was so hot the whole class.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this moment, I realized that no one was interested or paying attention to anything I was saying. And I was like what am I going to do to get them on track right now? And I didn’t really have a plan because I was trying to reflect on like shoot when they are in [Beth]’s class they are so engaged and they are all hanging on every word that she says. And in that moment, I was like I’m doing something wrong because they are not in that state.

Similarly, Chris a 2nd grade teacher, recalled that during a moment when students did not follow his directions as expected that he decided to just move on with his lesson rather than trying to adjust his students’ behavior. He said he was thinking at the time:

This is not even a little bit what I wanted. This is NOT going to look good. can I press a rewind? I really don't think I'm going to get them to bring their chairs back to where they are. We're just going to roll with it and see what happens.

Chris also reflected on how his lack of elaborated input may have resulted in the lack of followed expectations that led to a break down in attention and control in the classroom. He recalled:

I thought my directions were clear, I was like alright we're doing it. But I obviously didn't repeat it back to them I didn't rephrase it.

Despite Chris’s recognition of his management issues in the stimulated recall interview, he was not able to regain control of the class or his lesson during his observation which lowered his implementation score.

Paulina, a 1st grade teacher, however reflected on a time where elaborating input did work after students misunderstood a direction. In her science class, she asked students to look under their desks where she had hidden pictures of animals. When the students looked inside their
desks instead of under, she began gesturing and repeating the instruction, modeling with students around the room. She recalled:

… I started to notice that many of them were confused because it was not actually "under" the table exactly like inside the desk it was really under the table so some of them were like "I don't have!" and they were like sad and stuff and I was like "everybody has!" … I continued to say "it's UNDER your table!"

Paulina also adapted her instruction when she saw peer-to-peer interaction and engagement. After failing to get the classes attention with a silent signal (clapping a rhythm), she instead let them talk at their tables:

Like I heard conversations going on I just saw them they were right in front of me like matching their pictures and … I kept on thinking like I had to give them the time to talk about their cards.

Paulina demonstrated recognition of the benefits to letting students interact feely, allowing them to produce output and engage with the science materials. This adaptability to student needs in real time was reflected in her TBLT video score and overall performance.

4.2.3. Parent Focus Group

A total of five parents participated in a focus group about their perceptions of success of the teachers in bilingual school program where their children are enrolled. When asked how they defined a strong English teacher, their conversation resulted in the following themes—first they discussed the personality features of a good English teacher:
### Table 4.17 Parent Focus Group Themes- Personality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Illustrative quote</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Unos niños no tienen amor y confianza en casa y buscan estos valores en los maestros.</td>
<td>Some children do not get much love and trust at home from their family and look for these values in their teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>los niños aprenden muchas cosas jugando con ellos...</td>
<td>The children learn a lot simply playing with them [the teachers].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>El maestro tiene que estar seguro que cuando un alumno comete un error, llama a este alumno y no otro... el maestro tiene que estar muy atento.</td>
<td>The teacher needs to make sure that when one student does something wrong, he does not punish another student. The teacher must be very attentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>Tienen que ser flexibles y sensibles con la tarea en la internet... poner la tarea para uno o dos días después, porque no todos tenemos internet en casa.</td>
<td>They should be flexible and sensible with online assignments... have the homework due a day or two after because not every family has Internet at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good communicator</td>
<td>Que haya mucha comunicación entre el maestro y los niños...</td>
<td>There should be a lot of communication between the kids and the teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>El maestro tiene que saber diferenciar porque entre los alumnos hay todos tipos...</td>
<td>The teacher needs to know how to cater for different types of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature</td>
<td>Los maestros que vayan a dar clases a séptimo, octavo, y noveno tienen que ser personas bien maduras.</td>
<td>The teachers in seventh, eighth, and ninth grades need to be very mature themselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents spoke to the importance of teachers’ knowledge about aspects of teaching such as individual differences, classroom management practices and an understanding of the resources available or unavailable to some families.

Parents also discussed the linguistic background of the teachers and how they perceived the changing demographics of the English teachers. In prior years, almost all of the English teachers were native speakers from North America or Europe. Recently, bilinguals from around Latin America and their own community (alumni) have joined the English teaching team. The
parents discussed the tension between the benefits of bilingual teachers and the desire for their children to be taught by native speakers. On parent said that is was “Una gran ventaja de este año es que hablan bien el español [a great advantage this year is that [the teachers] speak Spanish well].” Another parent echoed this sentiment and pointed out that teachers who speak Spanish and English have better control of their classroom, especially when there are behavioral disputes between students. She said: “Que sepan las dos lenguas por que así ellos saben a quién creer y a quién no... [They need to know both languages to be able to know whom to believe].” However, parents also raised concerns about the transfer of nonnative accents from Spanish speaking teachers: “no es el mismo acento que un americano, eso es el problema [the accent is not the same as an American, that's the problem].” Another parent agreed saying: “es bueno que sea americano, que sea nativo en inglés, que no sea su segunda lengua, por el acento [it would be good to have American teachers that are native in English, not as a second language, for their accent].” One parent offered that perhaps a native speaker is only necessary during the critical first years of English exposure for a good accent. They said: “Que por lo menos hasta el cuarto o quinto año sea americano...[At least until 4th or 5th grade the teacher should be American].”

4.2.4. Summary

Results from video observations showed a connection between previous training and teaching experiences and success of implementation. First language was determined to not be a significant predictor of successful implementation. Teachers were most successful at elaborating input to make it comprehensible and scored on average highest in this category. Teachers struggled with individualizing instruction and monitoring learning in respect to learner internal syllabi and processes which may be explained by their unfamiliarity with the students they were teaching. When asked to reflect during stimulated recall interviews, teachers’ recalls were most commonly
associated with promoting a collaborative learning environment through classroom management and promoting learning by doing by encouraging participation and less on providing feedback or monitoring student learning. A parent focus group indicated that a successful English language teacher, from parents’ perspectives, was one who was a highly skilled bilingual, a good communicator, flexible and mature and raised concerns about the effects of nonnative English-speaking teachers on the accents of their children.
### Table 4.18 Research Question 2 Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions and Hypotheses</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) To what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms following a task-based training program?</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative:</strong> Recorded classroom observations during training</td>
<td>Coded with a rubric and generated a TBLT disposition score</td>
<td>Teachers ranged from high rating for TBLT (63 out of 74 possible points) in video-recorded lessons to a low rating for TBLT (20 out of 74 points) with an average of 49 points out of 74. As a group, they were rated the highest on average in the category of MP3 (elaborate input) and lowest in the categories of MP10 (individualize instruction). There was no correlation between gain scores on the beliefs questionnaire and video scores ($r (12) = .094, p = .783$). However, a linear regression model found teaching credentials, prior teaching experiences and the interaction between those factors to predict video score.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Stimulated-recall interviews</td>
<td>Coded with a coding sheet and associated TBLT methodological principles</td>
<td>Teachers focused their recalls on MP9- promote a cooperative collaborative learning and classroom management and MP2- promote learning by doing and less on MP7- provide negative feedback, MP8- respect learner syllabi and developmental processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Parent Focus Groups</td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td>Parents identified bilingualism, communication skills, flexibility and maturity as important skills in an English teacher. Raised concerns about nonnative English-speaking teachers and transmission of nonnative accents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H2: There will be a connection between teachers’ beliefs on surveys and success of implementation and moderated by previous teaching experiences and first language.*
4.3. Research Question 3

How useful was the training for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first year of teaching?

The following methods were used to answer this research question: written teacher reflections, end-of-training semi-structured interviews, and closed and open-ended responses to post-training and delayed-post training survey questions.

4.3.1. Written Reflections

During the first two-weeks of training (prior to the teaching practicum), teachers were asked to write a short reflection each day at the end of the training sessions. Teachers were asked to write one positive reflection or takeaway and one negative reflection or change they would make. This resulted in 200 positive and negative reflections from the teachers over the course of ten training days. Taken together, teachers’ reflections fell into two main categories: comments on the training organization and teaching strategies they were learning. The following tables present the themes that emerged over the entire 2 weeks of training. Table 4.19 below shows the positive takeaways teachers reflected on as they proceeded through training:
Table 4.19 Themes from Daily Reflections (Positives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session specific</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ELL [English Language Learners]: really interesting training, with many activities that help us to be engaged and have less distraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>I like the one on one time with mentor, good space to ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Group/individual work, got to know better my peers, Shar[ing] strategies with my fellow 1st grade teacher, I loved working in small groups and getting more individualized attention from the trainers, I like how our small groups have become, so we can have more info on our teaching levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unit planning and getting more familiar with the curriculum!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I really liked the lesson plan reflection activity with [trainer] this afternoon, it was super helpful to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Using classroom management techniques… (modeling 'em), I liked the way different methods and strategies were modeled. I like that we started with a bit of theory and immediately did activities that were modelled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building confidence</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I can imagine my life here as a teacher, feel more confident about my classroom management procedures and routines, Although initially apprehensive, I am now starting to get excited about my classroom responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools and resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Having tangible resources, I loved that today we got a few more tools to take away from the seminars. I have more concrete ideas of what to do and what not to do, I like specific, actionable, explicit ideas for what to do in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Making us reflect in our practice and personal life, I'm making more connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note # refers to the number of times the theme emerged in the data

From the above table, top reflections focused on the topics of specific activities and sessions that teachers found useful. Modeling of teaching strategies, mentorship and collaboration with other
teachers were also prominent themes throughout the reflections. Teachers also left comments on changes they would make to the training throughout which resulted in the following themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>I would also like a bit more lecturing on how to actively transfer this information to using it in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I think that the planning lesson should be a factor #1, how to do planning lessons how to understand the curriculum better. I think that will be wonderful to understand all classes and daily lessons will be wonderful to understand better what we are doing, More structure on yearlong planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session specific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Would like to have a session focused on the building of curriculums and lesson plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I'm struggling to connect with my mentor. I feel like there isn't a lot of direction in my meetings and I'm not getting what I'm craving, which is a more concrete plan of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I'd love to get more done on lesson planning in my small group/ 1 on 1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>While I like that you're modeling everything we can use in class, I honestly do feel like I'm in 1st grade, which can get slightly frustrating. I'll get over it though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I would like a bit more concreteness. Right now, we are given information that is a bit general and are able to draw our own conclusions from it., Concrete ideas and tools, helpful handouts, etc., I would like to have something concrete in the trainings, not just theory, it makes harder for me to keep all the theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>More strategies/ examples, the &quot;watch me teach and take away ideas&quot; method isn't going to so well for me. I wanted more tactics on how to teach ELL students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would like to know more about science activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note # refers to the number of times the theme emerged in the data*
Many of the reflections on changes teachers would make to the training centered around the theme of desiring more concrete examples and takeaways that can be readily applied in the classroom. The desire for more examples and support with lesson planning emerges as a theme during the training as well. However, these reflections only represent the teachers experiences in the first two weeks of training and not their experience during the teaching practicum.

4.3.2. *Semi-structured Interviews*

During the final days of training (immediately following stimulated recall interviews), fifteen teachers took part in semi-structured interviews. During the semi-structured interview teachers were asked to provide additional reflections on their experience after participating in the teaching practicum. They were asked to describe the extent to which they believe the training prepared them for their teaching, what elements they found to be the most useful and what elements they found to be the least useful.

In terms of elements of the training teachers found to be the most useful, all of teachers at some point described specific sessions and strategies that they found helpful including: classroom management strategies, assessment strategies, lesson planning techniques, and specific ideas for math, science and ELA activities that they planned to use. In terms of aspects of the training structure, 11 teachers commented on how they appreciated the use of modeling. One teacher said:

*I liked how you modeled how to get our attention… I think that stayed more in my brain than a list would. You modeling the mini lessons and what those looked like instead of just talking through them.*
An additional nine teachers described the utility of learning the pedagogy and teaching techniques actively rather than passively. One teacher connected active learning from training to her experience in the practicum:

*I learn the best when I see someone do something and then I do it myself. Giving us a lot of examples of how we can do things. I took a lot of notes down on things I can do with my students, I think getting to try things out seeing and knowing that everything is step by step, but when you actually try to do it you're like "why would I think about that, I didn't think about that!" It's been great to see this and play around with it. [The practicum] is great because we get to explore and experience the real thing because when you have an idea it's just what's in your mind but you don't know how things will turn out.*

Another teacher who had participated in an education program at a local university said:

*I am at college and I am learning how to be a teacher for preschool and if someone [asked] me where [did] I learn more it is people from here who have taught more from their experience not from those who have just studied to be teachers and know books. It's not like that here. I learned more to how to be in a classroom how to create a safe environment in a classroom more than any other place.*

This teacher highlighted the utility of experiential learning and hands-on practice for language teaching. Seven teachers also described how they appreciated that the training was differentiated for different grade levels and how teachers were given strategies to adapt techniques from one grade level to work in their own class.
The utility of mentorship was also a prominent theme in the interviews. Teachers stated they found individualized attention, time for reflection, observation by more experienced teachers and being provided feedback essential to their development as teachers. One teacher reflected:

_The most useful thing was being re-taught how to teach and then immediately putting it into practice and getting feedback whenever is fresh in my mind, that's the most important thing._

Teachers also discussed how the training had built their confidence through the process of observation and reflection. One teacher stated:

_At first, I felt like I was being observed and everyone else was doing great but then I realized it was ok to make mistakes._

These teachers described how the training prepared them to learn from their mistakes and the increased their awareness of the utility of observing others.

Teachers also were asked which aspects of the training were the least useful or what areas they would change. The main theme to emerge from this portion of the training was its intensity. One teacher reflected on her experience having never taught before. She said: _“it’s actually really intense for people who have never been in the classroom.”_ This teacher also wondered how she would be able to make use of the large amount of information presented: _“At the beginning it was too much information and I said "how is going to help me if it is a lot of information [and] I cannot get all this in my mind?"_

The next most prominent theme was on the need to dedicate more training time to lesson planning. This theme was also uncovered in the written reflections described in the previous
section. Teachers described their struggle in breaking down target tasks from the curriculum into individual unit and lesson plans. One teacher said:

*I wish we had done more on how to lesson plan how to plan out the parcial [quarter], I would say something wish we had more of was a class or workshop on how to look through the curriculum and lesson plans and taking time to pick those apart and how to take a unit and spread it out to make a week or two weeks.*

The teachers suggested it would be beneficial to have more time for group planning and sharing ideas. An additional five teachers said they also wanted more ideas on how to build in differentiation into their lesson plans including: planning for students with varied English proficiency levels and working with students with learning disabilities.

An additional theme in the post-training interviews came from those teachers who considered themselves NNSs of English. These teachers reflected on their experience in the training (which was conducted entirely in English) as well as their experience teaching in English. One teacher offered practical advice: “*some words are difficult and some of them speak so fast. So fast. Trainers and students. Slow down and use words that are not so difficult.*” Another teacher described her experience teaching alongside native English speakers as well as those who from her perspective were more proficient bilinguals. She said:

*I think most of the people who are Americans or from other countries they have more confidence speaking English because many years ago they learned the second language. For me, I sometimes felt shy because I only learned [English] two years [ago] and sometimes I can't find the words I need to express myself. So sometimes it has been a little difficult but I'm trying my best and trying to practice my English every day and express myself. Sometimes I felt intimidated because I*
can't express myself and what I think because of my limited English but I'm trying to be open to new experiences and not be silent.

Other teachers voiced their concerns about how parents and community members would feel about having a bilingual as opposed to monolingual English speaker as their teacher. One teacher explained that she was worried the parents would be disappointed and say “oh we don’t have a gringo for our class.” Another teacher said he recognized parents’ concerns but disagreed. He said:

“Some of us didn’t get the ‘real’ accent from Americans and that’s why they [parents] think ‘if no American teachers are here my kids can’t learn English.’

We need to change [that] orientation…we can do it the same as you guys do it.”

Several teachers mentioned that specific training sessions reflecting the linguistic diversity represented in the teaching team may help open the conversation surrounding teaching when English is the teacher’s second language.

4.3.3. Post- and Delayed-post Training Surveys

The final day of training, eighteen teachers submitted open-ended questions on a post-training survey. On the immediate post-training survey, teachers were asked to list three specific takeaways and two changes they would make to the training. The following themes emerged for teacher takeaways:
Table 4.21 Post-training Teacher Takeaways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Classroom environment and management       | 16  | Classroom procedures and the best ways to model, practice and implement them.  
Procedures are the foundation for teaching.  
All the different strategies modeled for us for teaching and building classroom culture.  
We are developing a community of learners. |
| Lesson planning                            | 13  | The ability to plan good [lessons], well thought out classes with smart objectives  
Pacing is important and experienced teachers are able to fit a lot into a 50-minute period  
The ability to reflect on and change my lessons |
| Utility of teaching practicum               | 12  | Tener observaciones diarias para saber que hice mal y como puedo mejorarla [having daily observation to know what we are doing badly and how to improve]  
Having amazing and "learnable" teaching moments from my mentors.  
La oportunidad de practicar en la academia [the opportunity to practice in [the teaching] academy]. |
| Differentiation                            | 7   | Fitting lessons and procedures to my grade level  
Los estudiantes están a diferentes niveles [the students are at different levels] |
| Self-confidence                            | 6   | Crecí mucho en cómo ser maestra, me siento más seguro de lo que voy hacer [I grew a lot in how to be a teacher, I feel more confident about what I’m going to do].  
Confidence in my ability to be a good teacher  
I felt like a teacher and learned more about the teaching role in the classroom. |
| Social-emotional learning                  | 3   | Social and emotional learning and recognizing the different realities that our students live in. |

*Note # refers to the number of participants whose response included that theme in the data
In response to the question: what are two specific changes you would make to training? The teachers responded both with specific comments on how the training was delivered as well as lingering questions and concerns they continued to have at the end of their training.

Table 4.22 Post-training Teacher Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Illustrative Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Enfoque en lesson plan para maestros que no tienen experiencia enseñando [focus on lesson planning for teachers who don’t have teaching experience].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More instruction on planning a full class period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ver ejemplos de planeaciones [see examples of lesson plans].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparamos mejor con el curriculum [prepare us better with the curriculum]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacing (time management) in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation by grade level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Maneras de adoptar las actividades al grado otoragdo [ways to adapt activities to the assigned grade]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specified to the teacher's grade or how specifically to apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More info about how to assess where students are at the beginning of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations and goal setting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Goals we should be aiming for each week or day, not just 1 goal for end of training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Give clear instruction on what you as trainers want us to give you buy the end of the term so that way we don't stress about meaningless things that could wait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Connect the sessions more to the manual. I felt it was a super helpful resource that wasn't well-utilized during most of the sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note # refers to the number of participants whose response included that theme in the data.

Approximately two weeks following the post-training survey, teachers began the academic year at their assigned school with their students. Approximately two months into the academic year teachers were asked to complete a Google Forms online survey reflecting on the experience of

---

4 The teachers also listed logistical aspects of the training and the teaching practicum which are not listed here.
training now that they are teaching. A total of eight teachers responded (44% response rate).

Teachers were first asked to rate sessions they attended on a five-point Likert scale from to 1-not at all useful to 5-extremely useful. The results for the relevant TBLT sessions are summarized here:

**Table 4.23 Teachers’ Average Ratings of the Utility of Training Sessions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Average rating</th>
<th>Mode rating</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLA theories and bilingualism</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting output and classroom interaction</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning TBLT lessons</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing quality feedback</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using formal and informal task-based assessments</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating a collaborative and cooperative learning environment</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching practicum</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentorship</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings from these questions revealed that teachers found the most utility in hands on practice such as being mentored and teaching in the practicum and less with sessions on theories of language teaching.
Teachers were then asked what sessions they wish had been provided during training that were not. Teachers responded that they wished they had been giving more training on designing task-based assessments, reading and understanding the curriculum, concrete examples of task-based lesson plans, and more information about early literacy development. Teachers were then asked to rate the extent to which they received enough training on a variety of topics on a 7-point Likert scale from 1-way too little to 7-way too much.

Figure 4.10 Teachers’ Average Ratings of the Utility of Training Sessions
Table 4.24 Teachers' Average Rating of Amount of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Average rating</th>
<th>Mode rating</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning TBLT lessons</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3- Slightly too little</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using formal and informal task-based assessments</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3- Slightly too little</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with bilingual learners</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4- Just the right amount</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivating a collaborative and cooperative learning environment</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4- Just the right amount</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average ratings on TBLT elements did not reach below an average of ‘3-Slightly too little’ meaning they were generally satisfied with the amount of training they received on these topics (teachers also rated general teaching topics that are not reported here). In open-ended final comments, many teachers reflected on their need for more professional development in lesson planning saying that they still struggled to translate tasks from the curriculum into units and daily plans. One teacher mentioned that despite practicing writing lessons during training an attending sessions, they did not feel they were appropriate once they got to know their students and their proficiency levels. One teacher said:

*I would really love a strong break down of exactly how all the elements of the curriculum fit together in a hypothetical week. It's starting to come together, but I'd love more guidance and ideas.*

Another teacher described how they struggled when they had to design the first big assessment saying “I didn’t quite feel ready… I didn’t know in what ways to arrange it, what was too hard or too easy.” Findings from both open-, and closed-ended responses indicated that teachers felt comfortable creating routines and procedures and setting a cooperative classroom community, but did not connect enough with lesson planning during the training and were struggling to implement task-based lesson plans and assessments.
4.3.4. Summary

Qualitative results from daily teacher reflections, semi-structured interviews conducted post-TBLT training, and responses to open and closed-ended survey items post-training and during the academic year indicated that teachers most valued the utility of mentorship, modeling and observation in their reflections and responses to interviews and surveys. The teachers indicated the appreciated the active-learning style of the training with a focus on hands-on teaching and collaboration. Teachers said they felt prepared to implement procedures and routines to cultivate a collaborative learning environment after participating in the training. They highlighted the need for more specific training in lesson planning, specific tools/resources and more training on working with curricula and designing assessments. Teachers who considered themselves nonnative speakers of English described their varied experiences in the training and teaching English and their desire to upend stereotypes about nonnative language teachers.

Table 4.25 Research Question 3 Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Methods Used</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) How useful was the training for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first year of teaching?</td>
<td><strong>Quantitative Data:</strong> Likert-scale responses to delayed-post training survey</td>
<td>Grounded approach. Coded for emergent themes and connections between themes</td>
<td>Teachers highlighted the utility of mentorship, modeling and observation in their reflections and responses to interviews and surveys. They highlighted the need for more specific training in lesson planning, specific tools/resources and more training on working with curricula and assessment design. Experiences between NNS and NS varied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative Data:</strong> Open-ended responses on post-training and delayed-post training surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daily teacher reflections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

5.1. Research Question 1

To what extent are language teachers’ beliefs about task-based language teaching and second language learning impacted by the teacher training program?

5.1.1. Second Language Teacher Beliefs

Results from pre- and post-training surveys and semi-structured interviews revealed variability in teachers’ changing dispositions pre- and post-training; Results from quantitative survey data found no statistically significant changes in TBLT disposition scores after training with a weak effect ($d = .30$), but results from qualitative items demonstrated changes to perceptions and preparedness following training. Previous research has shown mixed findings for teacher education programs’ effects on pre-service teacher cognitions with some studies finding no effect (e.g. Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 1999, 2001; Pennington & Urmston, 1998; Urmston, 2003) and others documenting positive changes (Borg, 2011; Busch, 2010; MacDonald, Badger & White, 2001). The quantitative findings from the current study are counter to the results reported in Ogilvie and Dunn (2010) which found positive changes in teachers’ dispositions (using a survey from which the survey in the current study was based) after participating in a task-based training program. While the beliefs survey in the current study did not show a significant change from pre- to post-testing, an analysis of individual responses revealed that teachers’ beliefs were on average already aligned to TBLT and SLA principles pre-training. An examination of average responses to individual questions revealed that teachers were in agreement with statements about TBLT and SLA and remained in agreement after training, especially in the categories of: authentic needs (e.g. Tasks/activities should be adapted to suit the students' needs), group work (e.g. Language students learn more by cooperating with each other in group activities), and the
role of the language teacher (e.g. *The primary role of a language teacher is to create an environment conducive to interaction in the target language*).

It is possible that some of these topics aligned with these teachers’ folklinguistic beliefs (Preston, 1991) about language learning and teaching or prior experiences in language learning and therefore the training served to reaffirm those beliefs. On the other hand, teachers remained neutral or demonstrate positive changes in topics such as error correction and explicit grammar instruction/knowledge. For example, teachers on average responded neutrally to “All of students’ English errors must be immediately corrected” pre-training but on average disagreed post-training demonstrating they were aligning more with a TBLT perspective on error correction. It could be that some aspects of TBLT such as error correction and the role of explicit learning are more susceptible to change when addressed in a training program due to conflicting pre-existing beliefs about language teaching and learning or prior experiences. For example, teachers have been shown to be more likely to implement strategies based on their own experiences with those techniques in their own language learning (Numrich, 1996) and judge the appropriateness of theories and methods based on their own language learning experiences (Johnson, 1994). There is also some evidence that teachers with previous experience learning languages via PPP or focus on forms-based pedagogy tend to prefer teacher-centered lessons over communicative or task-based pedagogies, even after a course on task-based language teaching (Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010). For one item, “Success in tasks/activities should look the same for every student,” teachers’ alignment was less TBLT-like after training than before training, with teachers overwhelmingly disagreeing (average of 1.80 on 5-point Likert Scale) before training, but less so after (average of 2.67 on 5-point Likert Scale). This result demonstrates that the experience of training and teaching in the practicum might have unintended effects. For example, the experience of
teaching and assessing students in the practicum might have cause some teachers to change their prior beliefs about what success in activities looks like for individual students. Further evidence is needed to uncover the specific characteristics that could have contributed to the changing (or unchanging) beliefs for particular topics uncovered in the current study.

In addition, variation in changing disposition was found at the level of individual teachers with some teachers demonstrating larger changes towards a TBLT disposition while others showed negative changes and some no change at all. These results indicate that generalizations about whether teachers’ cognitions can or cannot be affected by a teacher training program may be overly simplistic and more investigations of individual teachers’ changing beliefs could provide better evidence on how teachers experience training programs. Quantitative surveys that investigate teachers’ beliefs, while popular in previous work (MacDonald et al., 2001; Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 1999, 2001) may not paint a complete picture of teachers changing cognitions – teachers may feel pressure to agree with the program and trainers that instructed them, for example (Borg, 2015). For this reason, qualitative data was also collected in the current study and revealed additional details about teachers’ beliefs before and after training. Results from open-ended survey questions and interviews indicated that pre-training, teachers reflected on the relative ease versus difficulty of teaching specific linguistic features such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, pragmatics, reading and writing. After training when answering the same question, teachers’ responses reflected more aspects of instruction important to successful TBLT implementation such as: classroom management, peer-to-peer interaction, elaborating input, scaffolding, and differentiation. However, post-training, six teachers wrote that they were still concerned about grammar instruction, reflecting a viewpoint that they continued to associate language teaching with the instruction of specific grammatical forms. This finding
was also found in McDonough and Chaikitmongkol’s (2007) case study in a Thai university finding that teachers had lingering concerns about the lack of grammar instruction after being introduced to TBLT. This result also echoes findings elsewhere that indicate language teachers in general have strong beliefs about grammar instruction that are difficult to alter (as summarized in Borg, 2015).

Themes reflecting changing perceptions also emerged in semi-structured interview data. Teachers cited a change in their theoretical and pedagogical approach to language teaching, stating that they were better able to visualize implementing TBLT and language teaching beyond “words and theories” after training. They also described how they better recognized the importance of differentiation, visuals, interaction and tasks as vehicles for learning after training. These teachers tied these changes to their experiences teaching during the practicum which enabled them to anticipate learning difficulties. These findings are also found in previous work that has emphasized the importance of experiential learning for impacting on teacher’s beliefs about language learning and teaching (Borg, 2011) and that teachers gain more from experience teaching rather than reading about SLA concepts in research (Nassaji, 2012).

These mixed results indicate that while teachers’ beliefs about language teaching can be altered following a training program, especially one that includes experiential learning (e.g. Borg, 2011), training may not be uniformly successful at altering beliefs for all teachers. This finding has also been reported in a variety of previous studies (e.g. Pennington & Urmston, 1998; Richards et al., 1996) and points to the need to investigate individual teacher experiences and backgrounds and how these factors might inhibit or promote changing beliefs.
5.1.2. *The Role of Experience*

Descriptive results suggested a connection between previous teaching experiences and TBLT disposition after training with inexperienced teachers showing greater gains after training than teachers with prior teaching experiences. Previous work has found similar patterns: for example, Peacock (1999, 2001) tracked the changing beliefs of 146 ESL teachers and found that at the start of a training program inexperienced teachers were more likely than experienced teachers to agree with statements such as: “Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of new vocabulary words” and “Learning a foreign language is mostly a matter of learning a lot of grammar rules”, which are analogous to the low TBLT disposition items in the current study’s survey. The current study extends this finding to demonstrate the varied changes in inexperienced versus experienced teachers over the course of a TBLT training program. Similarly, in a study by Richards, Tung, and Ng (1992), inexperienced teachers were more likely than experienced teachers to think that grammatical theories of language are useful to language teaching. Inexperienced teachers also indicated that they thought personal teaching philosophies were the most important aspect of teaching while experienced teachers cited training and support.

Prior classroom experiences have been shown to have a powerful influence on teachers’ understanding of pedagogical concepts and therefore impact their actions in the classroom (Borg, 2015). Experienced and inexperienced teachers have demonstrated differing cognitions about teaching with experienced teachers demonstrating the ability to apply concepts and knowledge to new situations more readily than novice teachers (Borg, 2015). The result found in the current study are also consistent with research that has indicated that novice teachers’ beliefs are more susceptible to changes than more experienced teachers (Pajares, 1992) and that in general novice
teachers are more amenable to change (Beijaard & Verloop, 1996) given the results that the inexperienced teachers increased their scores from pre- to post-testing while those with more experience did not. While all of the teachers in the current study were relatively inexperienced (maximum of 2 years), these findings point to the impact of even small amounts of prior teaching experience on language teachers’ beliefs.

5.1.3. Task-based Language Teaching and Teacher Preparedness

Results from pre- and post-training surveys clearly supported the effects of TBLT training on teacher’s perceptions of preparedness to teach a TBLT curriculum (medium effect $d = 1.06$). On average, these teachers rated their preparedness to write task-based lesson plans, perform those lesson plans in the classroom, create routines and procedures conducive to learning, and use task-based assessments higher post-training. Given that TBLT has been described as requiring more expertise and creativity than a typical PPP approach (Long, 2016) and the well-documented challenges of cultural acceptance of TBLT and difficulties with classroom management and discipline (e.g. Carless, 2004; East, 2012; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007), these results point out the ability of a short-term training to impact on teachers’ self-perceptions of preparedness.

5.1.4. Summary

Overall, results showed variability between teachers in terms of their changing beliefs about TBLT and SLA principles before and after training. Quantitative changes to teacher beliefs were not statistically different post-training, a similar finding to a variety of previous work (e.g. Mattheoudakis, 2007; Peacock, 1999, 2001; Pennington & Urmston, 1998; Urmston, 2003); however, teachers’ responses indicated their beliefs were already highly aligned with TBLT at pre-testing. Quantitative items also uncovered gains in perceptions of preparedness to implement
TBLT after training. Qualitative findings from open-ended survey items and interviews shed more light on teachers’ changing perceptions in relation to grammar teaching and TBLT concepts post-training indicating that quantitative survey results alone may not be indicative of the ability of a teacher education program to impact on teacher beliefs, as has been suggested in prior work (Borg, 2015). Teachers with no prior experience seemed to improve their scores from pre-training to post-training more than teachers who had some prior teaching experiences, supporting prior research in this area (Beijaard & Verloop, 1996; Peacock, 2001). These results point to the continued need to investigate teachers’ changing beliefs from a mixed methods perspective.

5.2. Research Question 2

To what extent are teachers able to successfully implement TBLT in their classrooms following a task-based training program?

5.2.1. Task-based Language Teaching Implementation

Results from video observations showed varied success in TBLT implementation after training with no connection to survey scores. For example, the teacher with the lowest TBLT implementation score demonstrated positive gains on the belief survey post-training. This finding is in line with previous studies of TBLT teacher training such as Ogilvie and Dunn (2010) which found that increased dispositions towards TBLT did not necessarily translate to successful classroom implementation. Instead, some teachers’ lessons were aligned with TBLT principles while others were not regardless of the alignment of their beliefs towards or away from TBLT.

After receiving TBLT training some teachers designed and implemented lessons that were not aligned with TBLT principles. As described in Chapter 4, one of the lowest scoring teachers designed and implemented a lesson that was forms focused: regular and irregular past
tense forms. In that teacher’s stimulated recall interview, she reflected primarily on her considerations in providing feedback on the forms she presented. She said: “I was thinking, how can I explain that we just need the verb we don’t need the subject?” and “how am I going to do my activity if I don’t remind them about the verbs?” She also recalled how she felt frustrated by one student who demonstrated misunderstanding at the grammatical rules she was teaching:

“When he went to the board I was like “Do you understand why people said this one is regular?” and he said “No.” So, I was “ok, do you remember that we have the regular that ends in the –ed?” and I was trying to help him recognize at least with regular verbs that way he can see one word that ends in –ed is not all the time but mostly the majority of the time that means it is a verb in the past.”

In the study by Ogilvie and Dunn (2010), some teachers were also observed implementing lessons that lacked key principles of TBLT after attending training. The authors suggested that teachers did so because they did not perceive the epistemological value of the task-based method. Additionally, teachers in that study reported the desire to adhere to their own cultural norms for teaching and learning. Similarly, Erlam (2016) found that after a year-long professional development course that highlighted TBLT pedagogy only half of the tasks teachers designed for their own classrooms based on what they had learned in the training reflected four essential criteria for tasks established by Ellis (2003). The low-scoring teacher from the current study described above did not suggest she misunderstood the concepts of TBLT, rather that she felt that a grammatical lesson on verbs were necessary for the remainder of her lesson. She also indicated in her post-training interview that she struggled with lesson planning and that she felt overwhelmed by the amount of information packed into the training. This result provides further evidence that a lack of implementation of TBLT principles may not be related to teacher beliefs.
but to issues understanding key concepts of the pedagogy or issues with the way in which the training was delivered.

Despite some mismatch between TBLT concepts as presented in training and the implementation documented through classroom observations, the average score for implementation was 49.8 out of 74 or 66% aligned with TBLT methodological principles. These teachers implementing TBLT for the first time on average scored highest for MP 3 ‘elaborating input’. Those teachers, for example, used a variety of strategies to support input comprehension such as including visuals, gestures, music, and by activating prior knowledge or reference prior learning. In stimulated recall interviews, teachers reflected on their thinking when elaborating input, for example one teacher recalled after pointing to her eyes when giving directions that she “used gestures to see if they could understand me better.” Teachers also scored high in the category of encouraging inductive “chunk” learning by providing repeated exposure to the same input and introducing and repeating critical vocabulary. For example, when one teacher gave the direction for students to look under their tables and students responded instead by looking inside the desk shelves, the teacher demonstrated and repeated the prepositions “inside” versus “under” until students had all found the cards hidden under the desks. She recalled in her interview that she continued to repeat the vocabulary until she had 100% comprehension.

Teachers scored lowest in the categories of providing negative feedback, respecting learner syllabi/developmental processes and individualizing instruction. Negative feedback, when observed, was typically in the form of recasts of student utterances. For example, after asking the students where they would like to go on a trip, one student said: “Por Estado Unidos for Miss Megan!” to which the teacher replied “Are we going to see Miss Megan in the United States?” recasting the Spanish to English and then moving on in her activity. For MP 8
‘respecting learner syllabi and developmental process,’ teachers were rarely observed providing feedback on students’ learning process or the goals of the task and rarely were seen adjusting course when tasks did not go according to plan. One teacher was observed doing so; during a science lesson, she asked the students to walk around the room observing and discussing posters they had made previously about the sounds different objects make. Students however only stood at the posters near the posted reflection but did not talk to each other or reflect on what they had learned. Instead of continuing on in the activity, the teacher stopped the students and had them sit back at their tables. In her interview, she recalled:

I feel like it was really good for me to see that's what I did with the first lesson plan I was really attached to when I got nervous and I was like I have to go through everything that I planned and even when it wasn't going correctly or correctly the way I wanted it to I just separate myself from it. So, I've been concentrating on it ever since with like stepping back for two seconds analyzing is this worth fighting for? No, it's not let's move on.

Her reflection also demonstrates how she had learned from prior experiences teaching the students that it was not always worthwhile to continue with a lesson plan that was not working even if she was too nervous to improvise.

Teachers scored the lowest in individualizing instruction which may be explained by their relative unfamiliarity with the students they were teaching. The teachers had only been in the practicum with those students for one and a half weeks when they were recorded. When teachers did demonstrate individualizing instruction, it was typically at the level of recognizing behavioral issues in particular students and cold calling them or moving them to sit elsewhere and not individualized attention to English proficiency levels or other learner characteristics. One
teacher was observed individualizing her instruction taking proficiency into account. The teacher asked one student who she knew was new to the school and had a lower level of comprehension, to pass out papers. She recalled “I called on [student name] to make him feel part of the class because he still looks at me there like “what am I supposed to do?” but then, I gave him the papers.”

The variation in scores on classroom implementation reflected prior work that has documented teachers mixed success with implementing TBLT for the first time (Chan, 2012; Erlam, 2016; Ogilvie and Dunn, 2010). Chan (2012), for example, found that elementary school teachers in a professional development course in Hong Kong had difficulty in grasping the concepts of TBLT as it applied to their own teaching. Erlam (2016) found in her study that the TBLT criteria that was most difficult for the teachers to satisfy in lesson plans after a training session was to allow learners to utilize their own linguistic resources to complete the task, similar to the teachers in the current study’s difficulty with respecting learner internal syllabi and developmental processes. Erlam suggested that teacher training programs stress the importance of ensuring language learners are able to meet the language demands of the task by providing support via scaffolding and other resources. This is similar to the need to focus more on individualized instruction found in the current study.

The pattern of stimulated recalls reflected the trend of scores for classroom observations. Teachers rarely recalled cognitions on the topics of providing negative feedback or respecting learner syllabi and developmental processes. Instead, teachers’ recalls were most associated with promoting a collaborative learning environment through classroom management and promoting learning by doing by encouraging participation. Managing a classroom in which learners engage in interactive tasks was at the forefront of teachers’ minds as they taught, according to the results
from the stimulated recall data. Long (2016) has noted that teaching a TBLT curriculum requires more expertise and is overall more demanding than a typical PPP-style curriculum due to the need to implement “quick-thinking reaction, triggered by unforeseen learner errors or by the surprising direction in which learners sometime take a task” (p. 24). Difficulties with classroom management has been documented criticism of TBLT implementation in other contexts (Carless, 2003). However, it may be the case that novice TBLT teachers simply prioritize the principles of collaboration and learning by doing in order to maintain control of the classroom, which is especially important when working with small children as was the case in the current study. Other more reactive aspects of TBLT, such as providing negative feedback and tailoring the tasks in real time to learner development maybe require more mental resources than teachers have at their disposal when they are teaching for the first time. As Long (2016) points out, TBLT is “harder (but also more intellectually stimulating and rewarding) than working through tedious drills and exercises one item at a time, knowing what the learners are supposed to say or write before they say or write it” (p. 25).

5.2.2. Teacher Individual Differences in Implementation
Results from video recorded classroom observations uncovered a link between previous training and teaching experiences and success of TBLT implementation that explained 68% of the variance in TBLT implementation scores. First language (L1 Spanish versus L1 English) was determined to not be a significant predictor of successful implementation.

Findings from prior studies have also found that prior teaching experiences plays a role in the implementation of language teaching pedagogies (Polio et al., 2006; Richards, 1998; Tsui, 2003). These studies have demonstrated how more experienced language teachers exhibit more reflective practices and are better at problem solving in-class issues as they arise whereas novices
exhibit inconsistency (Tsui, 2003). Richards (1998), for example, found that inexperienced teachers were less likely to improvise when things went wrong in the classroom than experienced teachers. Mackey et al. (2004) also found that more experienced ESL teachers used more incidental focus-on-form techniques (those typically associated with TBLT pedagogy) than inexperienced teachers. These results were born out in the current study which found that teachers with some prior teaching experiences (as opposed to absolutely no prior experiences) performed better when their implementation was rated against the 10 methodological principles of TBLT which translated to an average of 19.06 points higher than those without teaching experience. Similarly, teachers who had a prior degree in a language, linguistics, education or TESOL outperformed those who did not have a related degree translating to an advantage of on average 20.40 points on the TBLT rubric scale. When these two factors were examined as an interaction, it was found that prior teaching experience differentiated scores when teachers also had no prior related degrees. However, the teachers that did have a related degree performed equally as well as experienced teachers without prior degrees. This finding suggests that both teaching experience and experience in disciplines associated with language learning can have a positive influence on novice teachers’ abilities or willingness to implement TBLT practices. This result further suggests that for a group of all inexperienced teachers, it may be useful to leverage the experiences of those who have prior experience studying a related field, as this factor seems to be just as useful to adoption of the pedagogy. Programs that implement TBLT might also consider requiring novice teachers to observe or volunteer in classroom contexts or complete relevant coursework, such as a course on SLA or TESOL, prior to engaging in training to maximize the impact of the TBLT training.
In previous work, the status of the language teacher as NS or a NNS of the language of instruction was shown to be a factor in how the teachers implement a language pedagogy. Warford and Reeves (2003), for example, found that the “apprenticeship of observation” has a stronger effect on NNS teaching their L2 due to the fact that the NNSs are living the language learning experience as they teach, while NSs are not. Additionally, Anderson (2016) found that NS and NNS teachers prioritize different components of course content during implementation. However, in the current study, the native language of the participants was not deemed to be a significant factor in predicting scores on TBLT implementation. However, this does not mean that the experiences of native and non-native English-speaking teachers were equivalent. In post-training interviews, teachers who considered themselves NNS (of English) reflected on their experience teaching in their second language, language use in the training, and the experience of being a bilingual in the community while native English speakers did not. They spoke about confidence, and lacking confidence, speaking English, feeling intimidating or unable to express themselves, and the need for some aspects of the training to be adapted or adjusted for Spanish speakers. Spanish speakers also spoke about the community’s perception of “non-gringo” teachers and their desire to demonstrate that they “can do it the same as you guys do it,” meaning, upending the stereotype that students can only learn a second language from native speakers.

This stereotype was also discussed among the parents interviewed. The parent focus group was conducted in an effort to include the perspectives of key community stakeholders as recommended by language program evaluators such as Beretta (1992a; 1992b) and Norris and Watanabe (2013). This prior work (Beretta 1992ab) has pointed out that the involvement of key stakeholders such as family members may support buy-in to new pedagogies or teaching
methods. Therefore, the perspectives of parents of students in the bilingual schools were included as an additional result of TBLT implementation. The results from a parent focus group indicated that they considered a successful English language teacher as one who was a highly skilled bilingual, a good communicator, flexible and mature. However, parents also raised concerns about the effects of nonnative English-speaking teachers on the accents of their children. While prior research has demonstrated no connection between L2 pronunciation development and whether the teacher was a native or nonnative speaker of the target language (Levis, Sonsaat, Link, & Barriuso, 2016), the perception that nonnative teachers are less adequate than native teachers has been persistently documented in worldwide contexts (Braine, 2005). Braine (2012) described this as the “ironic phenomenon” where NNS English teachers who return home after receiving specialized training (in some contexts earning advanced degrees abroad) come home to find they are unable to obtain employment teaching English. Braine specifically notes cases in Japan, Korea, and Hong Kong where language program administrators preferred hiring unqualified NSs of English rather than qualified local teachers. A similar pattern occurred in the context of the current study: Spanish-English bilingual teachers, many of whom are alumni from the very school they are about to teach in, perceived the preferences of parents to have a NS English teacher for their children, despite indicating that bilingualism was an advantage for both students and teachers.

These results speak to the need for teacher training programs to recognize the perspectives of teachers from other language backgrounds and work to support them by offering trainings on topics such as how to best collaborate in a bilingual teaching team. In order to hear the concerns of parents, but at the same time work to upend stereotypes about nonnative language teachers, teachers, trainers and administrators must work to promote and uphold a
standard that bilingualism is an advantage not a disadvantage for language teachers. Overall, these results can be summarized in a conceptual model for TBLT teacher education. Prior work has devised conceptual models for understanding the effects of teacher education on teacher beliefs (e.g. Borg, 2003, 2015; Nishino, 2012). Based on results of the current study, the proposed model (presented in Figure 5.1) accounts for the factors that influence novice teachers’ beliefs about TBLT, experience in TBLT training and implementation of TBLT in their classrooms. The model also indicates the hypothesized relationships between these factors (direction of the arrows) based on the results of the current study.

![Figure 5.1 A Conceptual Model for TBLT Teacher Education](image)

5.2.3. *Summary*

Overall, there was variability in teachers’ ability to implement TBLT immediately following their participation in a task-based training program. There was no connection between beliefs about TBLT and implementation, a result found in prior research (Chan, 2012; Erlam, 2016; Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010). Instead, teachers were overall successful at elaborating input and
encouraging inductive learning through repetition and less successful at providing negative feedback, respecting learner syllabi and developmental processes and individualizing instruction. Stimulated recall findings uncovered that the majority of teacher recalls focused on promoting a cooperative and collaborative learning environment, reflecting documented criticism that TBLT classrooms are more difficult to manage than traditional language classrooms (e.g. Carless, 2004), however also providing preliminary evidence on which of Long’s (2015) methodological principles novice language teachers tend to prioritize when teaching for the first time.

Implementation scores were linked with prior education and teaching experiences with higher scores from teachers with prior related degrees or teaching experiences—a similar finding to prior work (Polio, Gass, & Chapin, 2006; Richards, 1998; Tsui, 2003) extended in the current study to TBLT contexts. This finding also suggests that teacher training programs could encourage novice teachers to seek out teaching experiences or related coursework prior to training to enhance subsequent implementation. The first language of the teachers was not found to be significantly linked to performance, however teachers who considered themselves nonnative speakers of English raised concerns about parents’ perceptions of nonnative speaking teachers. Parents, in a focus group interview, did raise the topic of NNS teachers specifically in relation to the desire for their children to have a native-like accent in English. This phenomenon of preferring outsiders who are native speakers, rather than qualified locals, has been documented previously, primarily in Asian contexts (Braine, 2012), and seems to also extend to the context where the current study took place. Teachers called for more training on supporting bilingualism within the teaching team and within in the school community.
5.3. Research Question 3

**How useful was the training for the teachers immediately following the training and during their first year of teaching?**

5.3.1. *Supportive Elements in Task-based Teacher Training*

When asked what aspects of the teacher training program were the most useful, the main themes to emerge were on the topics of: modeling teaching strategies, the utility of mentorship, and promoting collaboration with other teachers. The training that was implemented for teachers in the current study was itself task-based and included frequent modeling on the part of the trainers and the novice teachers as well as participation in hands-on tasks and activities. Prior work has also encouraged this strategy, describing it as a way to promote a more holistic understanding of TBLT (Brandl, 2016; Han, 2018). Brandl (2016) argued that task-based teacher trainings should involve a large amount of modeling to encourage teachers to connect strategies and theory to practice. Teachers also commented on the hands-on nature of the training indicating the active, rather than passive, learning was critical to implementation in the practicum. While modeling in the current study was viewed positively in the majority of survey and interview response (“I liked the way different methods and strategies were modeled”. And “I like that we started with a bit of theory and immediately did activities that were modelled.”), some teachers indicated they were at times frustrated being treated like they were “in the 1st grade” indicating there was not uniformity in teachers’ perceived utility in the task-based nature of the training. Regardless, modeling consistently was a prominent theme in the qualitative data on utility of training features.

Similarly, teachers identified the mentorship of more experienced teachers and peer collaboration as useful aspects of the training. One teacher specifically pointed out how feedback
and observation led them to be less critical of themselves, inspiring confidence and increasing their sense of preparedness. This theme is reflected in prior work such as Chan (2012) who suggested TBLT teachers use self-reflection and peer-evaluation as strategies to evaluate themselves and their implementation of the pedagogy. The positive impact of reflection was noted in the written teacher reflections with one teacher indicating that it helped her “make more connections” between the training and her experience as a teacher. The practicum portion of the training was highlighted on post-training surveys as one of the teachers’ top takeaways from the training. Twelve teachers highlighted how the opportunity to practice what they saw modeled in training enabled them to see improvement in their own teaching. Teachers also highlighted classroom management strategies as top takeaways from the training, reflective of the results from stimulated recall interviews that indicated teachers primarily focused on managing the classroom environment, promoting safety and limiting chaos, as they taught for the first time rather than other aspects of TBLT such as addressing individual differences. However, teachers also listed differentiation techniques as a top takeaway on post-training surveys indicating that they did perceive the benefits of differentiation in task-based classrooms. Perhaps, as indicated previously, their focus on classroom management overshadowed their ability to differentiate during the teaching practicum. These findings were durable into the school year as teachers indicated they found mentorship, the teaching practicum and classroom management techniques to be the most useful aspects of training when they were asked after teaching in their classrooms for several months. They also indicated on delayed post-training surveys that they received “just the right amount” of training on cultivating a collaborative and cooperative learning environment.
Other themes from qualitative findings on post-training surveys and interviews indicated that teachers overall felt more prepared to teach a task-based curriculum after training. They listed self-confidence, “feeling like a teacher” and “growing as a teacher” as key takeaways from the training. This corroborates the previously described quantitative finding that teachers felt more prepared to enact TBLT pedagogy post-training.

5.3.2. Improving the Utility of Task-based Teacher Training

Results also uncovered a variety of changes that teachers indicated would improve the quality of the task-based training they received. The most prominent theme to emerge from this data was the desire for more and more specific instruction on day-to-day lesson planning. This finding was echoed across written reflections, interviews, and surveys after training and several months into the school year. This finding echoes previous work (e.g. Erlam, 2016) which has found that teachers struggle to plan task-based lessons at the end of a year-long professional development program on TBLT (as evidenced by the title of Erlam’s article: “‘I’m still not sure what a task is:’ Teachers designing language tasks”). It is important to note that unlike other documented training programs in prior literature, such as Erlam’s year-long program, the teachers in the current study only received two weeks of intensive training followed by two weeks in a teaching practicum. Teachers in the current study indicated post-training that they continued to find it difficult to break down target tasks from the curriculum into individual lesson plans. On delayed post-training surveys completed several months into the school year teachers on average rated the utility of the lesson planning training as “average” and indicated the training they received on lesson planning was “slightly too little” for their current needs. Their difficulties with lesson planning also persisted into the school year. Teachers also indicated on post-training surveys that they found it difficult to integrate ideas for differentiation for high and low proficiency students.
into their lesson plans and worried about the implications of certain tasks for students with comprehension issues or learning disabilities. Differentiation emerged as the second most prominent theme on post-training surveys in terms of aspects of the training the teachers indicated they would change citing the need for more information on how to assess students or adapt techniques they learned to their own grade-level. They also indicated, when asked during the school year, that they received “slightly too little” training on using formal and informal task-based assessments.

Another theme that emerged was the need for more concreteness in terms of examples and resources throughout the training. Teachers indicated that they wanted more specific strategies, examples and techniques, preferably in easy-to-use handouts or other resources. This reflects a documented difficulty in preparing teachers to enact TBLT (as overviewed in Long, 2016) which is that, unlike in traditional language programs where one textbook provides day-by-day activities and structure, TBLT requires more creativity and moment-to-moment decision making on the part of the teacher. This may also be reflected in teachers’ overall dissatisfaction in their preparation to write and enact task-based lesson plans. Teachers’ desire for ‘how-to’ style resources was documented during the first two weeks of training as reflected in the teachers’ written reflections, as well as after training as reflected in post- and delayed-post training surveys and interviews. In the delayed post-training survey, one teacher specifically recommended the training provide the lesson plans they would need for the first month of school.

In order to meet the needs of the teachers in the current study, and also perhaps in teachers in similar contexts worldwide, teacher trainers and school administration must find a way to marry the desire of teachers to be given pre-made lesson plans and lists of go-to activities with the components of TBLT, namely: a focus on authentic student needs, reactivity,
differentiation and individualization. While it will not be possible to develop a textbook that these teachers can draw pre-made lesson plans from, programs should develop resources tailored to students in their specific context (according to the results of a needs analysis) and find ways to compile that information into resources that are accessible and useable by novice language teachers.

5.3.3. **Summary**

Qualitative results from daily teacher reflections, semi-structured interviews conducted post-TBLT training, and responses to open and closed-ended survey items post-training and during the academic year indicated that teachers most valued the utility of mentorship, modeling and observation in their reflections and responses to interviews and surveys which reflected the suggestions of prior researchers (Brandl, 2016; Chan, 2012; Han, 2018). The teachers indicated the appreciated the active-learning style of the training with a focus on hands-on teaching and collaboration. Teachers said they felt prepared to implement procedures and routines to cultivate a collaborative learning environment after participating in the training which was also reflected in the stimulated recall data. In terms of utility, teachers highlighted the need for more specific training in lesson planning, specific tools/resources and more training on working with curricula and designing assessments. It was suggested that teacher trainers and administrators work to find solutions that provide the ease of implementation found in traditional teaching programs with effectiveness of task-based curricula for SLA.
CHAPTER VI: LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

6.1. Limitations

There are a variety of limitations of the current study that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. Limitations will be discussed in terms of the following themes: generalizability, instrumentation and procedures used to investigate the research questions.

6.1.1. Generalizability

This study took place during a single iteration of a yearly training program for novice bilingual teachers preparing to teach in a single network of schools in Honduras. The unique context where the study took place adds to the body of SLA and TBLT research that has often excluded regions such as Latin America; however, results should be viewed through the lens of this particular context. Teachers recruited to teach at the partner schools involved in this study are atypical in the sense that they have limited prior teaching or training experience and may or may not have the desire to embark on a career in teaching. Many teachers in this program, specifically those from countries outside of Honduras, join for the cultural exchange and to experience with international development and nonprofit work, meaning they may have qualitatively different motivations than other novice teachers, for example those enrolled in a teaching certification program in a university or TESOL certificate type program.

The sample of novice teachers who participated in the study was relatively small. While the sample represented the average number of novice teachers who typically attend the training program each year in this context, the small sample size precluded deeper investigations of quantitative findings. For example, participant features such as age, gender, or self-rated English proficiency level, could not be examined as a possible predictor of implementation scores in addition to experience due to the low number of teachers in teach category of interest. For these
reasons, depth rather than breadth was prioritized in terms of data collection and the findings may not be generalizable to a larger sample of teachers or to other contexts. In order to promote generalizability to the context where the study took place and to other contexts, the study should be replicated (see future directions below).

While data collection examined a single group of teachers participating in TBLT training, there was no control group of teachers that did not receive TBLT training included for analysis. This was due to the authentic nature of the study which took place in collaboration with bilingual schools and their administration. Therefore, there was no ethical or feasible way to include a control group of teachers. While studies that take place in authentic language programs add ecological validity to results, it is difficult to attribute the type of implementation exhibited by teachers in the current study exclusively to the training they received. Future studies with more experimental conditions could mitigate this limitation.

It should also be noted that the lead trainer in the implementation of the training program was also the investigator of this study. She was also familiar with the organization and schools as a former teacher at one of the schools. This was her sixth year participating in the summer training program. The role of a researcher/evaluator as being an insider versus an outsider to the research community under investigation has been previously discussed in the evaluation literature (e.g. Patton, 2008) as having both benefits and limitations. Benefits include access and rapport with the participants (such as the parent participants), potentially leading to richer data. Limitations include the threat of confirmation bias or halo effects on the part of the researcher from pre-existing knowledge of the community and phenomenon under investigation. Threats to these validity concerns were addressed by including interrater reliability on a larger sample of the data set including data types where interrater reliability is typically not calculated such as
thematic qualitative coding (as was the case for reflections, open-ended survey questions and semi-structured interview data).

6.1.2. Instrumentation

The beliefs survey that was administered pre- and post-training was redesigned based on previous work (Ogilvie & Dunn, 2010c) and piloted with a larger sample of teachers. However, belief questionnaires of all varieties have inherent limitations that should be considered when interpreting results. It has been previously documented that these questionnaires are limited by the fact that participants may simply be responding in the way that best matches course content or the perceptions of the trainers, not because the teachers’ actual beliefs had been altered (Borg, 2015). This bias of social desirability could have been especially strong in this case because the surveys were not completely anonymous (their biodata was included in the first survey and they were assigned a subject number for subsequent data collection). While teachers were later assigned a pseudonym and subject number, it was necessary to associate their biodata such as prior teaching experiences, L1 etc. with their scores to track changes in beliefs over time and the impact of various background factors in order to analyze the data. Additionally, the teachers average scores pre-training were high in terms of disposition towards TBLT pedagogy meaning there was a possible ceiling effect in the quantitative data that may limit changes observed pre- and post- training. The delayed-post training survey did not include the same questions as the pre- and post- surveys (due to requests from the organization that the survey obtain particular information and be kept to a shorter length). This precluded a quantitative analysis of post-delayed changes to TBLT/SLA beliefs during the academic year which could have shed further light on this topic.
The other instrument that was developed for the current study was the TBLT rubric that was used to score classroom video recordings. This rubric was adapted from rubrics used in previous studies (Erlam, 2016; Devlieger & Goossens, 2007) and aligned with the 10 methodological principles of TBLT as defined by Long (2015). However, the rubric was a high inference coding scheme that relied on observation of only 30 minutes samples of the video recordings (due to unequal samples across participants). To mitigate the high inference nature of the coding scheme, interrater reliability was used on a high percentage of the videos. However, researcher bias remains possible for the videos that were coded by only one researcher. The rubric should be replicated with additional data from different contexts to determine its reliability for defining and describing TBLT implementation in classroom video recordings. Furthermore, only one observation per teacher was included for analysis in the current study. Therefore, it remains possible that the features of TBLT that were or were not present in the sample obtained were context-dependent, meaning a teacher could have demonstrated a key missing principle of TBLT later in the lesson or in a lesson on a different topic. The absence of a component of TBLT in a teacher’s recorded lesson cannot therefore indicate the teacher did not know how to implement that component, only that they did not in the sample obtained for analysis.

6.1.3. Procedures

Several procedures for collecting the data in the current study involved context-dependent decisions that could have impacted the results. Due to scheduling restrictions, the stimulated recall interviews could not be conducted immediately upon completion of the teacher’s video recorded class. Instead they were held immediately after lunch each day (the first time teachers had a break after teaching in the mornings). It has been suggested that stimulated recall interviews should be conducted as soon as possible following the initial recording to avoid
memory decay and the possibility that the participant will reflect on the experience of watching themselves back rather than reporting on what they were thinking at the time the video was made (Gass & Mackey, 2017b). Due to the training schedule, teachers had a delay of several hours between their recorded lesson and their interview and the amount of time varied between teachers depending on what time they taught their lesson in the morning. This variability was unavoidable in the unique context where the study took place but could have had varying impacts on the memories the teachers later recalled when interviewed. Furthermore, despite a brief training on how to orient towards what they were thinking rather than what they were thinking as they watched the video, a small amount of recalls were clearly not oriented towards the time the video was recorded and could not be included for analysis. For example, in one video clip the teacher is seen standing in front of the class outside asking them to line up and quiet down before heading into the classroom. A late arriving student stands behind his teacher making faces at the other students. During the stimulated recall interview the teacher said: “I did not know he was behind me. Oh my gosh he does that so well.” Given that she did not know he was behind her at the time the video was recorded, her comment here is not a reflection of what she was thinking at the time but rather her reaction to watching the video at the time of the interview. Cases such as these were not coded and raises the possibility that teachers were not consistently oriented to recalling prior thinking during their interviews.

When organizing classroom observations, it was necessary to alert teachers prior to the day they would be recorded that the video recording would be happening. For this reason, the possibility that teachers prepared their lessons differently because they knew they were going to be observed should be considered. Teachers were accustomed to having multiple observers (trainers and fellow teachers) in the room during all of their practicum lessons, however only one
lesson, the one used for subsequent analysis, was video recorded. The 360-degree camera was also relatively obtrusive because it had to be set-up on a tripod in the middle of the classroom. This may have acted as additional pressure on the teacher to conform their teaching to particular expectations and led to social desirability bias in the findings.

An additional procedural element that should be noted was that the written reflections, which the teachers recorded daily the first two weeks of training and turned into the researcher, were anonymous and therefore could not be linked back to individual teachers’ experiences in the training. This was due to decisions at the school-level and so that teachers would feel comfortable sharing feedback in real time as the training progressed. However, it precluded connecting individual reflections to other sources of data.

6.2. Directions for Future Research

6.2.1. Future Research with Current Data

The current dataset offers a variety of opportunities for further research into the topics of teacher perceptions, teacher training, and the implementation of tasks in classroom contexts. There were several additional pieces of data that were collected during data collection for the current study that have yet to be analyzed and could shed further light on the current findings. Additionally, data presented in this study could also be analyzed in other ways to shed further light on current findings.

At the end of each day of the teaching practicum, teachers met in small groups with instructors teaching at the same grade-level to discuss their teaching that day and offer suggestions. Once per group this meeting was audio-recorded with the researcher resulting in four, hour-long focus groups with the teachers. In these groups, the teachers take turns highlighting what they found positive in each other’s teaching that day and areas for
improvement. Data from these focus groups can be analyzed in conjunction with classroom observation recordings and stimulated recall data to provide more evidence on teachers’ perceptions of their own task-based teaching as well as their perspectives observing others’ teaching. Results would provide additional data on what novice task-based teachers notice in their own teaching and others and what areas of TBLT they highlight as requiring improvement.

In addition to these focus group interviews, the researcher also kept detailed field notes on the teachers as they taught during the practicum. The researcher kept notes on what teachers did well and suggestions for improvements from the perspective of a teaching mentor on each participating teacher. The researcher gave her field notes to each teacher at the end of the training. Currently, the video observations only offer one snapshot of each teacher’s implementation of the pedagogy. These field notes could be use as additional data on the teaching practices of these novice teachers and provide more details on the day-to-day progress of the teachers’ implementation throughout the teaching practicum.

Further analysis can also be done with the results of the stimulated recall interviews. The teachers’ recalls could be aligned with points gained or lost in the scoring of the classroom observation video. This could shed light on whether or not teachers tended to provide recalls on areas where they performed in alignment with TBLT principles or areas where they did not align with TBLT principles. Stimulated recall data could also be examined in terms of a different coding scheme: one that examines resources that teachers recalled drawing from as they implemented their lessons. For example, in a lesson on motions, a teacher pointed to the first letter in the word and sounded out the letter to help students find the right word. In her stimulated recall interview, she recalled:
Because Abigail told us about the phonics…and how they used some of the words.
So, when we started planning this activity she told us like they do know some of
the letters if you tell them they might remember what word they start with…and
then she told us, “Remember most of them still don’t know how to read but if you
help them identify the first letter of each word then…they might understand
better.”

This indicates that this teacher was considering previous advice she had received from another
more experienced teacher (Abigail) as she decided how to help her students understand words in
her lesson. These strategies were also present in other teachers’ interviews and elsewhere in the
data and could be considered for an additional analysis of this data.

Additionally, a more fine-grained analysis could be pursued with the data from the beliefs
survey. The survey uncovered some areas where teachers had increased their disposition towards
TBLT post-training as well as areas where they remained neutral or became less disposed after
training. Individual teachers’ responses could be connected with the results of their classroom
observation to see whether or not their beliefs aligned with their classroom practices in particular
domains. For example, if a teacher increased their disposition towards TBLT in the category of
error correction on the survey, that teachers’ video data could be examined specifically in terms
of the application of error correction.

6.2.2. Future Research with New Data
The current study is part of a longitudinal collaboration between the researcher, BECA and the
bilingual schools in Honduras. Therefore, there are several areas of investigation planned for the
future. First, in keeping with best practices with research in the social sciences and applied
linguistics, the instruments and procedures of the current study should be replicated to promote
generalizability and validity of the findings. Replication of the beliefs survey and observation rubrics with additional novice teachers at future iterations of the TBLT training would enable more robust statistical testing and increase confidence in quantitative and qualitative findings. Replication of parent focus groups would also promote generalizability of parent perceptions and add further detail to their perspectives on success for their children in the bilingual schools.

The findings of the current study could be extended by examining teachers’ implementation throughout the school year. This would include follow-up interviews, ongoing classroom observations and additional stimulated recall interviews. The addition of a delayed-post training survey would be able to track teachers changing dispositions towards TBLT as they begin teaching in their classrooms during the academic year. Delayed posttests have been shown to determine whether the effects of interventions are durable or if they fade in subsequent weeks and months post-intervention (e.g. Mackey & Goo, 2007). Success of TBLT implementation could also be examined through other performance based tasks such as rating teacher-made TBLT lesson plans.

In addition to replicating and extending the current study, there are several areas of interest for new data collection. One area of interest to add to future iterations of the project would be to gather more background information on how participating teachers learned their second languages (e.g. in a classroom versus naturalistically, through didactic drill-and-kill methods or from a communicative-based pedagogy). While this information was gathered qualitatively, it was not done so in a manner that would allow for categorization of the teachers to be examined as a predictor of implementation scores. Additionally, while teacher, administrator and parent perspectives were accounted for in the current study, the perceptions of an additional key stakeholder, the bilingual school students themselves, should be taken into
account. Student interviews could be used to assess student buy-in and perceptions of the kind of language teaching they receive. This would add further data into whether or not the task-based program is meeting the authentic English needs of this group of students.

An additional area worthy of investigation are the effects of the training on student outcomes in terms of their L2 development. Connecting teacher cognitions, teacher training and student outcomes has been called for in prior research (Borg, 2015). This could be accomplished through assessment of students’ development in English complexity, accuracy, and fluency or through their performance in task-based assessments. Video observations with more robust audio-recording equipment could analyze students’ on-task behaviors to investigate how engaged students are at various stages of task-based lesson implementation in this context.
CHAPTER VII: IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

7.1. Implications

The current study has demonstrated the varied impact of a task-based teacher training program on novice language teachers’ TBLT beliefs and subsequent implementation. Findings indicated that teachers did not experience the training uniformly and that their beliefs and implementation were influenced by factors such as prior teaching experience, prior education and native language. These implications of these findings are discussed below in terms of their impact on SLA theory, methodology and pedagogy.

7.1.1. Theory

Previous investigations of TBLT as a potential pedagogical innovation in language teaching and learning have focused on examining language programs as they attempted to implement TBLT pedagogy and then gone on to investigate specific TBLT variables, such as the effects of repeating tasks or providing students with time to plan before tasks, and other experimental variables (e.g., Bygate, 2009; Foster & Skehan, 2009). Much less work has investigated the role of teachers and teacher training programs in task-based contexts despite this being considered a critical issue for the pedagogy (Long, 2016). The current study contributes to this line of inquiry by shedding light on how novice teachers experience a task-based training program and documents their struggles and successes and the factors that contributed to their implementation. The study is the first of its kind to align implementation and stimulated recall data to the ten methodological principles laid out by Long (2015) in order to assess teacher effectiveness of implementation. By utilizing the ten MPs, the study sheds light on questions that commonly plague studies of TBLT implementations, which is that it is often unclear if programs are implementing TBLT in its strong form, or rather are merely using a task-supported curriculum.
This study is also the first of its kind to examine teachers’ beliefs about TBLT in connection with their implementation of the MPs and to investigate the contributions of teachers’ backgrounds and individual differences on findings. This study has been the first to uncover a connection between prior teaching and learning experiences and teachers’ beliefs and implementations of TBLT. The study is also first of its kind to provide training materials (see appendices) so that the implementation of the training program can be replicated in other contexts.

While there is a variety of published work on the complex role of teachers’ beliefs and the impacts of those beliefs of general education and language classrooms, there was limited prior research on novice language teachers’ beliefs especially in connection to TBLT implementation. Many studies have documented contradictory findings of the impact of teacher training on language teachers’ beliefs and lacked longitudinal data connecting training and beliefs to subsequent implementation. Results current study indicate that teacher beliefs may not be uniformly impacted by a teacher education program and therefore require more depth and nuanced investigations in order to uncover changes in teachers’ beliefs if they did occur.

7.1.2. Methodology

The current study utilized a mixed methodology design to investigate teachers’ changing beliefs about TBLT and the success of their implementation of the pedagogy. Previous work investigating teacher beliefs as mostly relied on quantitative survey data to investigate changes with some studies finding no changes to teacher beliefs after engagement in a training program. These researchers sometimes concluded that teacher training has no or a limited effect on changing teachers’ beliefs (e.g. Peacock, 2001). These findings were difficult to reconcile with other work that found teacher training did impact on teachers’ beliefs (e.g. Borg, 2001). The current study found no quantitative change in teachers’ beliefs about TBLT from pre- to post-
training, however qualitative data from interviews, written reflections and open-ended items revealed a more nuanced change had taken place and that changes to beliefs were moderated by prior teaching experiences. These findings highlight the need for more mixed methodology research to uncover complex relationship, which has been called for in the domain of applied linguistics research in general (Dörnyei, 2007; Hashemi & Babaii, 2013; Mackey & Bryfonski, 2018; Mackey, 2015).

In terms of TBLT research, the current study adopted several novel methods. Technologically, the study utilized 360 cameras to capture teachers implementing TBLT in Honduran bilingual school classrooms and utilized the resulting footage for stimulated recall interviews. The 360 cameras allowed the teacher to orient the camera towards themselves or towards the students (orienting towards or away from the viewpoint they would have had when they were previously standing in the classroom themselves). The is the first time such technology has been leveraged to enable novice language teachers to recall their cognitions and it is thus far unknown how this type of technology could impact on the reliability of stimulated recall data. For example, given more input that a traditional camera angle, teachers may be able to more accurately recall what they had been thinking at the time. However, these are empirical questions that require further research.

It has been suggested that a true implementation of TBLT at the programmatic level requires a cyclical process of needs analysis, implementation and evaluation (e.g. Long, 2015) and that program evaluation is critical to examining how theories and ideas from applied linguistics are utilized (or not) in authentic (non-experimental) contexts (e.g. Norris, 2016). The current study was the first of its kind to use a utilization-focused approach (Patton, 2008) to address the impacts of TBLT implementation in bilingual schools. The study triangulated data
from teachers, administrators and parents to understand how the teacher training program impacted on success of TBLT implementation. Stakeholders from the schools were included in the design of the training program and some of the instruments in order to promote utility of the results. By using this utilization-focused, triangulated approach, the study produced data on the utility of various aspects of the training from the teachers’ perspective and results aim to address concerns from teachers, administration and community members in an actionable way.

7.1.3. Pedagogy and Beyond

The study has clear implications for second language pedagogy both at the micro and macro level. At the school-level, the results of the study are immediately being put into use by the NGO BECA and the school administration. The results from this study will inform future implementations of the training program and provide ongoing resources to evaluate the program in future iterations. Future work with the schools is being planned in order to assess student outcomes of the pedagogy. Outside the context where the study took place, teacher trainers, program developers and administrators hoping to implement TBLT in their own schools may utilize the instruments and results examined here to inform practices of implementation and evaluation. Schools with similar approaches to bilingual education, such as dual immersion language schools and 50/50 bilingual schools in Latin America, the United States and elsewhere may profitably apply the results and instruments of the current study to their own training practices. The current TBLT training program’s lesson plans as they were implemented are reprinted in full as appendices so that other schools hoping to implement similar curricular innovations may replicate them.

On a macro level, as recently as January 2019, news agencies have reported on the ongoing “migrant caravans” many of which originate in Honduras (e.g. Washington Post author
Sarah Kinosian’s (2019) article: “‘I have to try’: New migrant caravan leaves Honduras and heads for the United States”). This news coverage has highlighted Honduran’s difficulties finding sustainable local employment and dangers of violence in their communities. Despite the demand for English speaking employees and the availability of more lucrative and sustainable employment for English-speakers, Spanish-English bilingualism is expensive in Honduras – bilingual schools are typically private and only accessible to the financially secure. The participating schools in the current project are battling these systemic structural inequalities by providing English language teachers to local bilingual schools at very low or zero cost to the local community. By engaging in a teacher-training program aimed at promoting pedagogical innovation, the current project’s benefit and immediate direct impact to partner schools in Honduras is indisputable and directly contributes to upending the systemic inequality that drives many young Latin Americans to migrate to the U.S.

7.2. Conclusion

Previously, much of what we knew about the role of teachers in task-based classrooms had come from a body of research that examined the various issues teachers face when attempting to implement TBLT for the first time (e.g. Carless, 2004; McDonough & Chaikitmongkol, 2007). Less empirical research had previously examined the connection between teacher education programs and subsequent successful TBLT implementation. Despite some previous studies on training teachers to implement TBLT (e.g. Ogilve & Dunn, 2010), few had described the training teachers received and connected training practices to successful TBLT implementation. Despite purporting to be a language pedagogy suitable for worldwide contexts, TBLT had yet to investigated in Honduras, and understudied in Latin American context as a whole. The current study addressed these gaps by triangulating data from novice teachers, administrators, students,
and parents to determine the effects of the implementation of the TBLT pedagogy in the Honduran context.

The results of the current study uncovered variation in the impact of the task-based teacher training program on novice language teachers’ TBLT beliefs and subsequent implementation. Findings indicated that teachers did not experience the training uniformly and that their beliefs and implementation were influenced by factors such as prior teaching experience, prior education and native language. The study is the first to connect these variables in a TBLT implementation context. When implementing TBLT lessons for the first time, teachers were overall successful at elaborating input and encouraging inductive learning through repetition and less successful at providing negative feedback, respecting learner syllabi and developmental processes and individualizing instruction. Stimulated recall findings uncovered that the majority of teacher recalls focused on promoting a cooperative and collaborative learning environment, suggesting teachers concentrated more on managing the classroom than implementing differentiated instruction when they taught TBLT lessons for the first time. The study has implications for TBLT theory and methodology, as well as pedagogical implications for the participating bilingual schools and for other language programs in similar contexts worldwide.
# Appendix A: Selection of Training Lesson Plans

## Title: English Language Development within the Context of a Bilingual Setting – Working with ELLs (English Language Learners)

### Focus – Big ideas about bilingualism and bilingual education; Introduction to work with ELLs

### Stage I: Desired Results

**Goals and Objectives:**
- Become familiar with major thinkers in the field of bilingual and ESL education.
- Create working definitions of vocabulary related to bilingual education and language learners. Use this vocabulary in group discussions (L1, L2, ELL, ESL, SLA, target language).
- Learn about the stages of language development. Analyze student profiles to determine where they might fall on the spectrum of language development.
- Upon reading a description of a variety of language development programs (two-way immersion, dual language, ESL, foreign language, etc.) teachers will determine BECA’s program and describe how the program is impacted based on its setting within Honduras.
- Become familiar with BECA’s updated language policy. Consider how this policy might look different across grade levels. Align this policy with some benefits and pragmatics related to the student population.
- Consider and practice some best practices for working with ELLs.

**Essential Questions:**
- What are some of the big ideas and theories about bilingual education? Why is it such a hot topic right now? Who are some of the big names in the field and what do they believe?
- How do people learn languages? How is this the same and different for people
learning a first, second or other language? What stages will a language learner typically go through as he or she develops? How will these stages be visible in my students at varying levels of English and Spanish language development? What are some of the decisions I need to make as I gather this information from my students?

- How have these ideas changed and developed overtime?
- How does effective instruction look different when working with ELLs? How can I take elements of general effective instruction into account, while making the necessary modifications and additions to reach a classroom full of ELLs? What might these changes and modifications look like?
- Is the Critical Period Hypothesis still a valid stance on Second Language Acquisition? How have the thoughts regarding second language acquisition throughout life changed and developed overtime? What are some of the most prominent arguments to support each?
- What are the components of Stephen Krashen’s Theory of Second Language Acquisition? How can I summarize each component? What does this mean for my classroom instruction?
- What are some theories and models for language and second language development? What does this mean for my classroom instruction?
- What are some of the best practices for working with ELLs? How can I plan to most effectively reach the learners in my classroom?

Enduring Understandings:

- Bilingual education is a major asset in a developing country, such as Honduras, as people who are bilingual are able to access the tourism industry, to seek out higher managerial positions in companies, and to access different fields and industries than those who are monolingual.
- The critical period hypothesis, in summary, states that people best learn a second language within their early childhood years. While there might be some benefits to beginning language learning within this period, such as a lower monitor and affective filter, older students and adults are also capable of becoming high
functioning within a second or third language.

- The stages of language development look similar in people learning a first and second language.
- There are a number of theories to describe key aspects of second language acquisition. Stephen Krashen focuses on language acquisition through comprehensible input The Interaction approach focuses on the importance of input, output, negotiation for meaning and corrective feedback as key elements of language learning.

### Stage II: Acceptable Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Tasks:</th>
<th>Other Evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers will analyze an area of Second Language Acquisition theory and create a visual representation to share.</td>
<td>• Teachers will use content specific vocabulary in writing and in whole and small group discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers will read a brief summary of the Interaction approach to SLA. They will relate their language learning experience to one of his four main elements.</td>
<td>• Teachers will be assessed through a variety of formal and informal methods (written response, finger checks, thumbs up, whole and small group conversations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers will write and deliver a task-based lesson plan.</td>
<td>• Teachers will read and discuss BECA’s language policy. They will consider how the language policy will be challenging at different age levels and will investigate possible support systems to aid in maintaining the policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage III: Learning Experiences

5 minutes

- To review yesterday’s lesson, the trainer will ask all teachers to turn and talk with partners to answer the following:
  - What components of the lesson reached the bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal, interpersonal, logical-mathematical, and spatial
learners? What were some additional modifications that might have been added?

15 minutes (Intro.)

- As a warm up, the following quotes/common misconceptions will be read to the group and teachers will be asked to show whether they agree or disagree or are unsure by giving a thumbs up, down or thumb in the middle:
  - Adults learn languages the same way children learn their first language
  - It is necessary to begin learning a language early in life in order to become fluent
  - Only native speakers can teach children second languages
  - Exposing a child to two or more languages will confuse them
  - Children learn languages more quickly and easily than adults
  - Trainer will write the following quote on the board: “Although generic effective instruction is almost certainly a necessary base, it is probably not sufficient to promote accelerated learning among language learners.” (Goldenberg, 2013)
  - Teachers will have five minutes to write about this quote. What does it mean? How can they connect it to their classrooms? To their own language learning experiences?
    - Each teacher will share out something from his or her writing.

35 minutes

- Teachers will physically move from one side of the classroom to the other as they compare various forms of instruction for second language learning including: grammar translation, PPP model, the natural approach and TBLT/Communicative language teaching. Each group will write down a reaction to the description with an elbow buddy and move to the next poster. After rotating around the room the teachers will see videos of each method of instruction and discuss the benefits and drawbacks to each method for ELLs.

10 minutes (Vocabulary)

- Each teacher will receive a vocabulary word pertaining to the information
about teaching methods they just received, definition and piece of computer paper. His or her job is to fold the paper in half, write the word on the outside and a paraphrased description or drawing on the inside to help others understand the word.

- These words will be added to the class constructed word wall.

---Part 1: 55 minutes---

10 minutes
- Teachers will brainstorm a list of first language acquisition versus second language acquisition with their elbow buddies. They will use space in their training manuals to make a t-chart comparing and contrasting the two.

15 minutes
- Trainer will pose the question
- “Based on your experiences, in education, or in your personal language learning, is there a critical period for learning language?”
- The trainer will pass out sentence frame cards to aid quiet students in engaging in the discussion.
- The trainer will create a flow chart of discussion and will model stringing together connected ideas. She may ask if teachers notice one or two strings to connect.

15 minutes
- Teachers will divide into groups of 4 or 5 using random grouping sticks. Each will be assigned one of four elements of the Interaction Approach to Second Language Acquisition. Teachers will create a song or poem to share this idea with the group. (All teachers should view the image or description as the song or poem is being presented).

5 minutes
- Trainer will correct any misconceptions / answer any questions regarding The Interaction Approach theory.

15 minutes (time permitting)
Teachers will work in grade level teams to construct a Language Acquisition puzzle, according to Krashen and Terrell’s Natural Approach (1983). Each group will receive a color-coded set of cards. They will include the five stages of production: preproduction, early production, speech emergence, intermediate fluency, and advanced fluency, and the characteristics and time frames of each. Additionally, they will receive a card with teacher prompts. The goal is to construct the puzzle within the time period and be able to defend the responses.

- Teachers will discuss: Where will our students fall along this progression? Will it look different at different school sites? How much will production levels vary within our own classrooms?
- The volunteer will have a few moments to share any final reflections about the exercise.

--- Part II: 60 minutes---

5 minutes

- Trainer should choose a willing volunteer (preferably someone with low–medium proficiency in Spanish or another language). The trainer and teacher should stand back-to-back and have a general conversation about the coming weekend. The trainer will lead the discussion in rapid Spanish. She will end the conversation with a question, expecting that the teacher will be unable to respond.
- As the conversation ends, the trainer will ask the volunteer how he or she is currently feeling.
- The trainer and teacher will then face each other. They will have the same conversation. This time the trainer may provide some hand motions, slower speech, and/or explanations to aid the listener in comprehending.
- Again, the trainer will ask the volunteer how he or she is currently feeling.

5 minutes

- The trainer will ask the group what they noticed during the model. Teachers will ideally mention some of the scaffolds that were provided during the second
15 minutes

- Teachers will divide into groups of three using the animal sound grouping activity. (Each teacher will receive an animal card and will have to make his or her animal’s noise to find other group members.) Each team will randomly select one theory of language learning, behaviorism, contrastive analysis theory, Krashen’s Theory for Second Language Acquisition (i + 1, natural order etc), and interaction hypothesis. They will create a visual representation of the theory.

10 minutes

- Each group will present the visual representation with the rest of the group. Prior to each presentation, teacher will take 1 minute to read the description located in the training manual.

- Teachers will respond with compliments and questions about the representation and connection to the theory.

10 minutes:

- Teachers will take this time to read and digest BECA’s language allocation policy.

- Each teacher will write about the language policy. They might consider how the policy will look in their classrooms, what might be challenging about the policy, etc.

10 minutes:

- Teachers will meet with their grade level teams to discuss the challenges and possible solutions to these challenges. They can do this in the form of a T-Chart.

---Part III: 55 minutes---

Total time 3 hours and 15 minutes

Materials:

- Random Group Sticks
- Computer paper (20 sheets) to copy double bubble map
- Large chart paper for double bubble map
- 4-8 sets of markers / crayons
- Language Acquisition Puzzle
- Animal grouping cards
- Medium chart paper for visual representations of SLA theory
- Gluesticks
- 2 post-it notes per teacher for plus/delta
- Copy of Agreement for Whole Class Open-Discussion
- 1-2 sheets of poster paper to record key ideas from open discussion.

**Trainer Responsibilities Prior to the Lesson:**
- Record summary of objectives on the board.
- Record sentence frame on the board.
- Write guiding question for open discussion on poster paper, leaving space to record teacher comments and questions during whole group discussion.
## Providing Quality Feedback

Small groups, 1 hour per rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage I: Desired Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals and Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will be able to know about the types of feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will be able to describe the pros and cons of each type of feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will be able to explain how to vary feedback in interaction with students and say why it is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will be able to see and identify examples of feedback in videos and categorize them by type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will make a plan for feedback in their own classrooms using student profiles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Questions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the kinds of feedback teachers can provide students in ELL classrooms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it important to recognize the kind of feedback you most typically use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do different types of feedback affect different learners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can you vary your feedback in the classroom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enduring Understandings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrective feedback comes in many different forms and more explicit or implicit forms are appropriate for certain students at certain times. Knowing the type of corrective feedback to use with groups of students is known to assist in second language development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should know that they should vary their corrective feedback style much like they vary lessons for multiple intelligences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage II: Acceptable Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Tasks:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will act out skits of corrective feedback episodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will categorize types of feedback in videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Evidence:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers will make a plan for feedback use using their student profiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage III: Learning Experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warm-up question: How to teachers correct language learners’ errors in both written and oral modes? List some examples. What kinds do you prefer in your own language learning? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watch example videos: Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What kinds of corrections work the best?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What might affect how well the corrections work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading groups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Groups of 4: Reader, summarizer, questioner, predictor, encourager (6+ word wizard, skeptic, the enthusiast, recorder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passages to discuss: see handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of corrective feedback lecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide handout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discuss for ages, levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do worksheet on types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video lesson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analyze for types + fill in worksheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total time 60 minutes

**Materials:**
- Identify the feedback handout
- Videos
- Worksheet handout for video
- Tips and trick handout
- Readings handout
- Labels for who is which reading part

**Mentor Responsibilities Prior to the Lesson:** Gather materials get videos prep'd
Appendix B: Semi-structured Interview Protocol for Post-training Interviews

Entrevista 1 para maestros de inglés:

1. What areas of language teaching have been the easiest for you?
   a. ¿Qué áreas de enseñanza (de idiomas) son la más fáciles para usted/tu?

2. What areas of language teaching have been the most challenging for you?
   a. ¿Qué áreas de enseñanza (de idiomas) son la más difíciles para usted/tu?

3. To what extent did the summer institute training prepare you for your teaching?
   a. ¿Hasta qué punto las capacitaciones los preparó para su enseñanza?

4. What were the most useful elements of the summer training for your teaching?
   a. ¿Cuáles fueron los elementos más útiles de las capacitaciones para su enseñanza?

5. What were the least useful elements of the summer training for your teaching?
   (Suggestions for topics or areas of instruction to add to training?)
   a. ¿Cuáles fueron los elementos menos útiles de las capacitaciones para su enseñanza? (¿Sugerencias/recomendaciones para otros temas que incorporar a la capacitación?)

6. What outcomes have you achieved so far?
   a. ¿Qué resultados has logrado hasta ahora?
Semi-structured Teacher Interview questions for post-lesson interviews / Entrevista 2 para maestros de inglés:

1. What did you intend to teach in this lesson?
   a. ¿Qué intentaba enseñar en esta clase/lección?

2. How did you organize your lesson to achieve the lesson goals?
   a. ¿De qué manera organizó su lección para lograr/alcanzar los objetivos de la materia?

3. What considerations did you make when sequencing the lesson stages?
   a. ¿Qué consideró cuando estaba ordenando las etapas de la lección?

4. Why did you plan your lesson in this way?
   a. ¿Por qué planeó su lección de esta manera?

5. Why did you use the following activities (list examples)? What are the benefits for you and the students by using them?
   a. ¿Por qué usó estas actividades (dar ejemplos)? ¿Cuáles son los beneficios para usted y sus alumnos al usarlos?

6. Did you encounter any difficulties in planning or teaching this lesson? Why?
   a. ¿Encontró algunas dificultades en planificar o enseñar la lección? ¿Por qué?

7. Did anything occur that was unexpected during the lesson? If so, why was it unexpected? How did you react?
   a. ¿Encontró algunas cosas inesperadas durante la lección? Si es así, ¿por qué fue inesperado? ¿Cómo reaccionó?

8. To what extent do you think you achieved the goals of this lesson?
   a. ¿Hasta qué punto piensa que logro los objetivos de la lección?
9. Is there a part that you think you would want to re-teach in the future? Why?
   a. ¿Hay alguna parte de la lección que piense que le gustaría re-enseñar de nuevo en el futuro? ¿Por qué?

10. Based on today’s lesson, do you think you need to revise your teaching plans for your next lesson? If yes, what needs to be revised, adapted or changed? Why?
   a. ¿Basado en su lección de hoy, piensa que necesite revisar sus planes de enseñanza para su próxima lección? Si es así, ¿qué necesita revisar, adaptar o cambiar? ¿Por qué?
Appendix C: Entrevista para Padres de Familia

1. How long has your child been studying English with BECA schools?
   a. ¿Por cuánto tiempo su hijo ha estudiado inglés con las escuelas BECA (a San Jerónimo)?

2. How would you define a high-quality English teacher?
   a. Según su opinión, qué características tiene un(a) maestro de inglés de alta calidad? / ¿Cómo definirías a un maestro de inglés de alta calidad?

3. What skill set do you envision your child having when they graduate from BECA schools?
   a. ¿Qué habilidades o competencias imagina que tendrá su hijo cuando se gradúe de las escuelas BECA?

4. What opportunities (if any) will be afforded to your child once they graduate due to their English proficiency?
   a. ¿Qué oportunidades (si hay algunas) obtendrá a su hijo(a) cuando se gradúe gracias a su aptitud/competencia en inglés?

5. What are your dreams for your child after graduating from BECA schools?
   a. ¿Cuáles son sus sueños para su hijo(a) después de graduarse de las escuelas BECA?
All BECA teachers are language models. Their primary role is to aid students in acquiring academic and social English, while simultaneously teaching grade level appropriate content, as outlined in the curriculum documents. With the exceptions of when students are in a state of emotional distress or danger, teachers will use English to communicate with all students. Students will be expected to use English to communicate with BECA teachers and their peers as they progress through the stages of language acquisition. While all teachers will use English as a medium of instruction and interaction during school hours, they will be expected to uphold a sense of respect towards bilingualism, Honduran culture, home cultures, and the Spanish language through their words and actions.

What might this look and sound like in my classroom?
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

What might this look and sound like at other grade levels?
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

What does this mean for my teaching practice? Why?
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
Appendix E: Pre- and Post-training Surveys

**BECA Pre-Training Survey (English)**

*Please indicate below whether you strongly agree, agree, are neutral, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements about language learning and teaching by placing an 'X' in the appropriate column.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All of students’ English errors must be immediately corrected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explicit grammar instruction should be limited in a language program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tasks/activities should be adapted to suit the students' needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Language students learn more by cooperating with each other in group activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a second language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>When students speak in their first language during group work, their learning is limited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Explicit grammar instruction should be the focus of a language program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Students acquire each other's language errors during group work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The primary role of a language teacher is to create an environment conducive to interaction in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The primary focus of a language program should be students’ accuracy in the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Errors are a natural part of language learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult tasks/activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Students’ language errors represent bad habits they have developed in the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task/activity rather than studied in an explicit manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Grammar exercises/drills are necessary for developing skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The primary focus of a language program should be on students’ ability to use the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom looks different for every student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The primary role of the language teacher is to provide grammatical explanations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Language courses should be organized around progressively more difficult grammar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Grammar exercises/drills don’t develop skills that can be transferred to real-life situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Success in tasks/activities in a language classroom should look the same for every student.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A good language class is mainly led by the needs of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Learners don’t know what’s best for their language learning in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Large amounts of explicit correction of students’ English errors is counterproductive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Group work activities are important for creating an environment in which students feel comfortable interacting in the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Training language students to take responsibility for their own learning is not effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The language teacher should help students develop individual strategies for improving their learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>A good language class mainly follows the order presented in a textbook.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate below whether you feel well prepared, prepared, neutral, somewhat prepared, or not prepared to do the following teaching activities by placing an ‘X’ in the appropriate column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not prepared</th>
<th>Somewhat Prepared</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Well Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Write objective-driven lesson plans using the BECA curriculums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Execute lesson plans in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Create routines and procedures to organize your classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Use classroom management techniques in the classroom to manage student behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assess student learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please answer the following questions by writing a few sentences.

1. Describe your own previous language learning experiences (include what languages, where/how you learned them and type of instruction if applicable):

2. How would you define a high-quality language instructor?

3. What aspects of language teaching do you anticipate being the easiest to implement?

4. What aspects of language teaching do you anticipate being the most difficult to implement?

5. Optional: any additional comments:
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Por favor, indique a continuación si está totalmente de acuerdo, de acuerdo, neutral, en desacuerdo o totalmente en desacuerdo con las siguientes afirmaciones sobre el aprendizaje de idiomas y la enseñanza al colocar una 'X' en la columna correspondiente.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Afirmaciones</th>
<th>Totalmente en desacuerdo</th>
<th>Desacuerdo</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>De acuerdo</th>
<th>Totalmente de acuerdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Todos los errores de inglés de los alumnos deben ser corregidos inmediatamente.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>La instrucción de gramática explícita debe ser limitada en un programa de idiomas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Las tareas / actividades se deben adaptar para satisfacer las necesidades de los alumnos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Los alumnos de idiomas aprenden más cuando cooperan entre sí durante actividades grupales.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>El conocimiento explícito de las formas gramaticales y las reglas es esencial para aprender un segundo idioma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cuando los alumnos hablan en su primer idioma durante el trabajo en equipo, su aprendizaje es restringido.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>La instrucción de gramática explícita debe ser el enfoque de un programa de idiomas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Los alumnos adquieren los errores de lenguaje de los demás durante el trabajo en equipo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>El papel principal de un maestro de idiomas es crear un ambiente favorable para la interacción en el idioma objeto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>El enfoque principal de un programa de idiomas debe ser la precisión de los alumnos en el idioma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Afirmaciones</td>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Desacuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Los errores son una parte natural del aprendizaje de idiomas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Los cursos de idiomas deben organizarse en torno a tareas / actividades progresivamente más difíciles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Los errores de idioma de los alumnos representan los malos hábitos que han desarrollado en el idioma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Se aprende mejor un idioma cuando se usa como vehículo para realizar una tarea / actividad en vez de estudiarse de manera explícita.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Los ejercicios / simulacros de gramática son necesarios para desarrollar habilidades que pueden transferirse a situaciones de la vida real.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>El enfoque principal de un programa de idiomas debe ser la capacidad de los alumnos de usar el idioma.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>El éxito en tareas / actividades en una clase de idioma parece diferente para cada alumno.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>El papel principal del maestro de idiomas es proporcionar explicaciones gramaticales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Los cursos de idiomas deben organizarse en torno a la gramática progresivamente más difícil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Los ejercicios / simulacros de gramática no desarrollan habilidades que puedan transferirse a situaciones de la vida real.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>El éxito en tareas / actividades en el aula de idiomas debe parecer igual para cada alumno.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Afirmaciones</td>
<td>Totalmente en desacuerdo</td>
<td>Desacuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>De acuerdo</td>
<td>Totalmente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>El enfoque principal de los programas de idiomas es desarrollar alumnos que puedan comunicarse de manera efectiva.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Una buena clase de idioma está dirigida principalmente por las necesidades de los alumnos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Los alumnos no saben qué es lo mejor para su aprendizaje de idiomas en el aula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Un montón de corrección explícita de los errores de inglés de los alumnos es contraproducente.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Las actividades de trabajo en equipo son importantes para crear un ambiente en el que los alumnos se sientan cómodos interactuando en el idioma objeto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Capacitar a los estudiantes de idiomas para que se hagan cargo de su propio aprendizaje no es eficaz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>El maestro de idiomas debe ayudar a los alumnos a desarrollar estrategias individuales para mejorar su aprendizaje.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Una buena clase de idioma sigue principalmente el orden presentado en un libro de texto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>La corrección gramatical es el criterio más importante para juzgar el desempeño del lenguaje.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Por favor, indique a continuación si se siente bien preparado, preparado, neutral, un poco preparado, o mal preparado para realizar las siguientes actividades al colocar una 'X' en la columna correspondiente.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Actividad</th>
<th>Mal preparado</th>
<th>Un poco preparado</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Preparado</th>
<th>Bien preparado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Escribir un plan de clase dirigidos por objetivos utilizando los currículos de BECA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Realizar un plan de clase en el aula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crear rutinas y procedimientos para organizar su clase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Usar las técnicas para manejar la clase y para gestionar el comportamiento de los alumnos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluar el aprendizaje de los alumnos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por favor, contesta las siguientes preguntas con algunas oraciones.

1. Describa sus propias experiencias de aprendizaje de idiomas (incluya los idiomas, dónde / cómo los aprendió y el tipo de instrucción, si corresponde):

2. ¿Cómo definirías un maestro de idiomas de buena calidad?

3. ¿Qué aspectos de la enseñanza de idiomas anticipa que serán los más fáciles de implementar?

4. ¿Qué aspectos de la enseñanza de idiomas anticipa que serán los más difíciles de implementar?

5. Opcional: cualquier comentario adicional:
Your Background:

1. First name: ______________
2. Gender? ______________
3. Age: ______________
4. What is your first (native) language or languages? ______________
5. How would you describe your general English language proficiency? (circle one, or fill in.)
   Native   Advanced   Intermediate   Beginner   Other: _______
6. What is the highest degree or level of schooling you have completed? (circle one, or fill in)
   High school/secondary school   University/college degree   Master’s degree   Doctorate/PhD
      None of these   Other: _______
7. How much previous teaching experience do you have? (circle one)
   None   <6 months   6-12 months   1-2 years   2+ years
8. If you taught before, what age range were the students you taught? (circle all that apply)
   Preschool (~2-4 years)   Elementary school (~5-11 years)   Middle school (~11-13 years)
      High school (~14-18 years)   University/college age   Adults   N/A
9. What kind of teaching credential do you have? (circle all that apply, or fill in.)
   None   Degree in education   Degree in a language/linguistics
   Teaching certificate/license   TESOL certificate   Other: _______
10. What grade(s) will you be teaching this year with BECA? ____________________
Appendix F: Delayed-Post Training Survey

BECA Summer Training Survey 2018

[conducted using Google Forms]

Congratulations on all your success so far in your classrooms. Now that you have several months of BECA teaching under your belt, we would like you to take the time to reflect back on your experience in summer training (both Institute sessions and teaching during Academy). We are interested in capturing your ideas, impressions and suggestions now that you have entered your classroom and started to confront the realities of teaching your students and experienced their needs first hand. We take your feedback seriously as we work to develop next year's summer training for BECA teachers. We are asking for your email here so that we can follow-up with you about your answers if necessary. Thank you for your support!

1. Now that you have been teaching in your own classroom, please rate on a scale from 1 (not at all useful) to 5 (extremely useful) the extent to which you found the following aspects of summer training useful to you:

- Sessions on foundations of educational theories
- Sessions on theories of bilingual education and second language learning
- Sessions on lesson planning
- Sessions on teaching ELA
- Sessions on teaching math
- Sessions on teaching science
- Sessions on procedures and routines
- Sessions on incorporating literacy into content
- Sessions on cultural exchange and multicultural understanding
- Session on how to work with your resource teacher
- Session on promoting student interaction
- Parent focus groups
- Session on providing quality feedback
- Session on literacy assessments
• Sessions on informal and formal task-based assessments
• Sessions on social and emotional learning
• Independent work time
• One-on-one or small group mentor meetings
• Academy teaching
• Academy debriefs

2. If there were sessions you wish you had been provided during training that were not, please write suggestions here:

3. Now that you have been teaching in your own classroom, please indicate on a scale from 1 (way too little) to 7 (way too much) the extent to which you received enough training on the following topics:
   • Lesson planning
   • Teaching ELA
   • Teaching math
   • Teaching Science
   • Assessments
   • Working with bilingual learners
   • Multicultural understanding
   • Routines and procedures
   • Classroom culture and environment
   • Social-emotional learning

4. If you have any additional comments regarding the amount of training content, please write them here:

5. Please indicate on a scale from 1 (way too little) to 7 (way too much) the extent to which you received enough time during training for the following activities:
   • Time for independent work
   • Time for independent reflection
   • Time working one-on-one with your mentor
   • Time teaching in academy
   • Time debriefing about academy lessons

6. If you have any suggestions for content that could be provided as part of your ongoing professional development training, please briefly describe them here:

7. If you have suggestions for how we can best provide ongoing professional development (e.g. online vs. in-person, days and times that work best) please describe them here:

8. If you have any specific comments on summer training and/or specific suggestions for improvement, please write them here:
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