

# Review of: "Exploring English Communication Teachers' Perception of TBLT: A Case Study of B. Tech. Classroom Practice in Indian Engineering Colleges"

Elih Sutisna Yanto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Singaperbangsa Karawang

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Qeios Team

Please find enclosed my review to the manuscript entitled

Review of: "P Exploring English Communication Teachers' Perception of TBLT: A Case Study of B. Tech. Classroom Practice in Indian Engineering Colleges "

Overall, the authors should comprehensively revise this manuscript especially the introduction section. The following are my comments and suggestion on the manuscript.

This first paragraph of this introduction section needs improvement for engagement, general repetition of information, insufficient citations, lack of emphasis, overgeneralization, awkward transitions, and repetitive wording. Addressing these issues could make the introduction more compelling and effective for the reader and provide more informed context to the study that follows.

For examples:

1. The first few lines don't do a good job of getting the reader's attention. The first sentence of the paragraph is a pretty boring and general statement about how important English is. This doesn't give the study any specific context. In order to get the reader's attention, it's better to start with a short, interesting hook or statement about the problem or gap in the literature that this study fills.
2. The paragraph talks about how important English is in India over and over again without adding any new information or thoughts. This overuse of words makes the writing seem pointless, and the reader may get bored. Instead of restating facts that everyone already knows, the paragraph could focus on giving new ideas or background information about the study topic.
3. The line says a few things about how important English is in India, like how it is the co-official language, the link language, and the language of work. But these claims aren't backed up by any sources or references. To make the study more credible, it's important to back up these claims with evidence or references.
4. The paragraph talks about a lot of different things, such as how important English is for getting a job, going to college,

and getting access to global information. Even though these points are important, they are spread out and don't have a clear centre. In the opening, you should state the clear and specific research question or problem that you want to answer with your study.

5. The line says a lot of broad things about how important English is for students in business and professional schools. It makes the assumption that all students at these schools need to be able to speak and write English well, but it doesn't back this up with any data or study findings. This kind of broad generalisation can hurt the case.
6. There aren't any smooth transitions between the ideas and words in the paragraph. It goes from one place to another without a clear path. Better transitions would make it easier for the reader to follow the introduction's rational flow.
7. Wordy phrases like "good command over the English language" and "English Language communication skills" are not needed. The writing will be easier to understand and read if the language is simpler and the sentences are shorter.

There is a need for improvement in this second paragraph of the introduction due to repetition, unclear wording, oversimplification, unclear reference to the research topic, lack of context, and missing citations. Addressing these issues would make the introduction more informative, interesting and focused for the reader. It would also create a stronger link with ongoing research.

For examples:

1. The first sentence of the paragraph says that conversation can happen through any medium, even body language. This is an idea that applies to a lot of situations and doesn't add much to the context of this piece. The line then goes over the same point again, this time about how important it is to be able to communicate clearly in English in an Indian setting. This repetition is not needed and makes the piece longer.
2. The paragraph's explanation of the role of communication skills lecturers in engineering colleges is unclear. It indicates that their mission is to assist students in developing and improving excellent English language communication skills, but it does not explain how they do so or why this is especially important in the setting of engineering colleges. More specifics and context would improve the understanding and usefulness of this point.
3. The concept of communication skills is oversimplified in the text. While it emphasises nonverbal signs like as body language, it fails to recognise the complexities and nuances of effective communication, which include variables such as tone, context, cultural concerns, and more. The opening might benefit from a more sophisticated examination of communication skills.
4. The paragraph lacks a clear connection to the main study topic, "Exploring English Communication Teachers' Perceptions of TBLT." It should make the transition from the general discussion of communication skills to how this research applies to teaching communication skills at engineering institutions using TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching) easier.
5. Background information about the current state of English communication abilities in Indian engineering colleges is lacking in the paragraph. Providing statistics or pertinent data on existing concerns or issues would strengthen the argument for the investigation.
6. Similar to the first paragraph, this paragraph lacks citations or references to support the claims being made. If the paragraph is asserting the importance of English language communication skills in the context of Indian engineering

colleges, it should provide evidence or references to validate this claim.

The third paragraph of the introduction could be improved by integrating the teaching methods into the broader context of the article, elaborating on the importance of English in various fields, providing specific context on the challenges facing in engineering colleges, citing relevant sources, and improving the overall organization for a smoother flow. These changes would help the reader better understanding the purpose and significance of the study.

For examples:

1. The list of teaching methods is offered without regard for the article's entire context. It might be more useful to discuss how these diverse strategies have been applied in Indian engineering institutions or what problems they hope to solve.
2. The paragraph quickly highlights the importance of English in numerous sectors, but no specifics or examples are provided to back up these claims. Providing particular instances or figures about the role of English in higher education, journalism, or business in India will deepen and strengthen the argument.
3. The paragraph emphasises the importance of English but does not go into detail about the specific obstacles or issues that students and teachers in Indian engineering colleges experience when it comes to English communication skills. This backdrop is critical for comprehending the study's motivation.
4. While it discusses the importance of English in India and the various teaching methods, there are no citations or references to scholarly sources or studies. Citing related research would support the statements stated and give a foundation for the study's significance.
5. While useful, the list of teaching approaches emerges abruptly in the paragraph without a logical transition. The organisation might be strengthened by providing background and describing how these approaches relate to the article's focus on investigating teachers' perspectives of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT).
6. The paragraph reiterates the fact from the first paragraph that India has the second greatest population of English speakers in the world after the United States. To make the content briefer, this repeat may be avoided.

The literature review part offers various merits, including a comprehensive discussion of language teaching's historical backdrop and the creation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). However, there are some flaws that must be addressed in order to create a more robust and effective literature review. Consider the following points:

1. The review of literature appears to be more descriptive than critical. It gives information about the history and evolution of TBLT without critically analysing the approach's strengths and faults. A more critical approach would entail synthesising current research, identifying gaps, and debating opposing points of view.
2. The majority of the works cited are quite ancient, with the most current reference dating from 2020. It is critical to incorporate new studies and opinions to demonstrate the present state of the discipline as well as any recent advancements or shifts in thought.
3. While the historical context is crucial, the literature review tends to focus on the history of language teaching methods and the emergence of TBLT. A more concise exposition of historical background would allow for more opportunity to explore recent findings and contemporary challenges.

4. Some ideas and concepts are repeated, such as the emphasis on TBLT's communicative nature. Redundancy should be reduced to allow for more depth in investigating other areas of TBLT.
5. The article briefly discusses the situation in India, indicating that the lecture format is still widespread. It does not, however, provide a thorough examination of the cultural and contextual aspects influencing the uptake and efficiency of TBLT in Indian engineering colleges.
6. The literature review discusses studies on TBLT that were undertaken in India, but it lacks specifics on the techniques, conclusions, and limitations of these investigations. More information regarding these studies would improve the review.
7. The evaluation does not appear to feature any alternate viewpoints or criticisms of TBLT. To offer a balanced view of the topic, it is critical to acknowledge different points of view within the academic community.
8. Throughout the literature evaluation, the citation style should be constant. In addition, ensure that all works cited are included in the reference list, and vice versa.
9. Some sentences are long and complex, which may cause readability challenges. Consider reducing difficult ideas down into simpler terms to improve comprehension.

While the research design of the stated journal article has certain positives, such as clear aims and research questions, it also has some flaws:

1. The study's participants are confined to lecturers at Engineering Colleges in India's National Capital Region (NCR). This geographical and institutional limitation may limit the findings' generalizability to a larger community of English language teachers. The findings may not apply to teachers in different locations or institutions.
2. The questionnaire was given to just 66 teachers in the study. This sample size may not represent the whole population of English language teachers at NCR engineering colleges. A bigger sample size would improve the study's external validity.
3. The emphasis on respondents' qualifications, such as the fact that 80% had doctorates in English, may not reflect their practical understanding and application of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Experience and certification as a language instructor may be more important markers of skill in this particular teaching method.
4. The assumption that teachers are already well-versed in TBLT may be incorrect. The study depends on the premise that all respondents are familiar with TBLT ideas because there is no baseline assessment of their knowledge.
5. The measure, a questionnaire based on Nunan's checklist, may not fully capture the nuanced thoughts and expectations of teachers. While commonly used, a Likert scale may oversimplify complex sentiments towards TBLT. Furthermore, the instrument's alteration raises concerns regarding its validity and reliability in the setting of engineering colleges in the NCR.
6. For data gathering and analysis, the study only uses a quantitative technique. Incorporating qualitative methodologies, such as interviews or focus group discussions, could provide more in-depth insights into teachers' attitudes and expectations, enriching the findings.
7. There is no mention of the questionnaire being pilot tested before it is administered. A pilot test could have assisted in identifying and addressing any ambiguities, inconsistencies, or flaws with the instrument, hence improving the validity

and reliability of the data acquired.

8. The study is particularly concerned with instructors' perceptions and preferences of TBLT. Other contextual elements, such as institutional support, resources, or student characteristics, that could influence the successful adoption of TBLT in engineering classes may be overlooked.
9. The article claims that replies were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively, but it does not go into detail on the methodologies used for qualitative analysis. A more detailed explanation of the analytical process would improve the study's transparency and replicability.
10. The study makes no mention of potential publication bias, such as whether or not negative or inconclusive data were included in the analysis. This lack of transparency has the potential to undermine the overall validity of the study's conclusions.

I suggest a revision to improve the readability of the article.

Elih Sutisna Yanto