

LANGUAGE IN INDIA
Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow
Volume 10 : 7 July 2010
ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.
Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.
Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.
B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.
A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.
Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.
K. Karunakaran, Ph.D.
Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.
S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.

**Importance of Task-Based Teaching in
Second Language Acquisition – A Review**

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.

Abstract

Task-Based language teaching has attracted the attention of second language learning which was coined and later developed by second language researchers and educators in reaction to other teacher-dominated, form-oriented methods. Since a better understanding of the theories of Task-Based English Teaching is a prerequisite to better understanding of the perceptions of teachers and how these perceptions affect their teaching, this paper attempts to deal with the issue of task-based in language teaching classrooms in detail.

Introduction

During the past decade, Task-Based language teaching has attracted the attention of second language learning. The term 'Task-Based' was coined and later developed by second language researchers and educators in reaction to other teacher-dominated, form-oriented methods (Long & Norris, 2000). Many researchers like Long and Prabhu advocated an approach in which students are given functional tasks that encourages their focus on the meaning and real world purposes.

A better understanding of the theories of Task-Based English Teaching (TBET) is a prerequisite to better understanding of the perceptions of teachers and how these perceptions affect their teaching. Therefore, the literature review will focus on the development of language teaching approaches towards TBET, and basic assumptions and the theories of TBET. These changes in teaching approaches should be made explicit to teachers; so that they can understand the rationale behind the implementation of TBET or that they may be aware of the inefficacy of the other approaches and the need to develop their knowledge and methodologies in adopting TBET.

The term task can mean different things to different people, and hence there are different interpretations of the word task. If we consider what the concept of task is and what other people have written about it, we find that the term has been defined in a variety of ways. In general education as well as other fields such as psychology, there are many different definitions of tasks. There is also quite a variety from within the field of second language teaching. A broad definition can be the following:

A task is an activity, which requires an individual, or a group of people to arrive at an outcome based on some given information. As a result, tasks include activities like cooking a meal, building a bookcase, buying a pair of shoes, filling out a form, making a hotel reservation, and finding an address. In other words, a task refers to different activities people do in everyday life.

This definition is a non-technical, non-linguistic one. In fact, it describes the sort of things that non-linguists would tell you they do if they were to be asked. In the same way as learners, if asked why they are attending a language course, are more likely to say, “So I can talk to my neighbors.” than, “So I can master the use of the subjunctive.” The Concept of “task” is defined differently among linguists advocating and researching TBLT. These definitions generally embed the criteria for task-based teaching. In fact, the differences are reflected in their scopes of coverage, which depend on the underlying assumptions of the linguists and researchers. Therefore a more specific definition, distinguishes language-mediated activities from other kinds of activities:

A task is an activity, which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective. In other words, a task can be considered as a piece of classroom work, which involves learners in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form.

In implementing Task-Based English Teaching, the design of the syllabus at the planning stage plays a significant role. The Task-Based approach to language teaching includes three types of syllabuses, namely the procedural, the process and the task syllabuses (Long & Crookes, 1992).

Long (p. 7) lists the seven stages of a task-based language programme:

1. Task-based needs analysis to identify target tasks
2. Classify into target task types:
3. Derive pedagogic tasks.
4. Sequence to form a task-based syllabus.
5. Implement with appropriate methodology and pedagogy.
6. Assess with task-based, criterion-referenced, performance tests.
7. Evaluate program.

Task-Based Syllabuses: Procedural, Process and Task Syllabuses

Swan (1985) stipulates that defective language learning often occurs because of faulty syllabus design, not teaching approach. He states that ‘the student does not learn the language properly because we do not teach the right things or because we organize what we teach in the wrong way’ (p. 10).

The task-based syllabus is based on “an analysis of human learning in general and/or second language in particular” (p. 55). However, it was suggested that the task-based syllabus has not received enough research interests in SLA investigation.

A task-based syllabus is “more concerned with the process dimensions of learning than with specific content and skills” (p. 231). Nunan (1989) specifies two types of tasks, real-world tasks and pedagogical tasks. Tasks form the basis of the syllabus in which these tasks can be grouped around a common theme.

The Procedural Syllabus

According to Long and Crookes (1992), an example of the procedural syllabuses is the Bangalore/Madras Communicational Teaching Project, which was conducted by Prabhu. The project focused on “meaning, i.e., task-completion, not language” through communication. Students needed to solve a problem or complete a task in each lesson. Opinion-gap, information-gap and reasoning gap activities were used in the project. The methods included the pre-task in which teacher presented or demonstrated the task, then it was followed by the task proper which was conducted by individual student. It ended with teacher feedback.

However, Long and Crookes (1992) criticized the project for being teacher-fronted and the preset tasks were not based on an analysis of students’ learning needs. In addition, it lacked the use of pair work or group work that could engage students in the experience of communication and language use. In fact, a formal evaluation was not conducted after the project.

The Process Syllabus

The process syllabus is another task-based approach to course design which looks into the learner development in terms of the learning processes and styles. Long and Crookes (1992) cite Language in India www.languageinindia.com 119
10 : 7 July 2010

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

Breen (1987) suggested incorporating a content syllabus within a process syllabus which includes “a *repertoire* of communication” for learners to work on. The basic idea is that the course design should provide the resources and materials for making general decisions about classroom language learning, alternative ways for making the decisions, alternative activities and a resource bank of pedagogic tasks for students (Long & Crookes, 1992).

However, the process syllabus has received some criticism including lack of a formal evaluation, unrealistic expectations in the performance of teachers and learners, a radical teacher-student relationship in the classroom, immense requirement for materials and resource. Indeed, the process syllabus also demonstrates lacks in the following aspects - a needs analysis prior to course, criteria for grading and sequencing tasks, focuses on form and SLA theory or research base.

The Task Syllabus

Richards and Rogers (2001) illustrate the differences of a conventional syllabus and a task-based syllabus. A conventional syllabus includes the following categories: themes and topics, text types, vocabulary items, language structures, functions, macro-skills – reading, writing, listening, speaking, competencies etc.

Task-based language teaching is more acceptable to SLA researchers when a focus on form is advocated. Long and Crookes (1992) favor the task-syllabus for a number of reasons.

An integrated approach to TBET ensures an integration of language and content instruction but it does not guarantee accuracy as learning outcome. The selection of tasks is the starting point which looks into learner interest and level of development. The course designer needs to pay attention to both a content syllabus and a linguistic syllabus. Prabhu (1987) points out that, “no syllabus of generalized task can identify or anticipate all the sources of challenge to particular learners” (p. 89). Thus, grading tasks cannot follow a precise algorithmic procedure but rather must proceed intuitively in accordance with a general assessment of task complexity (Ellis, 2003, p. 73-74). Tasks do not need to be graded as the same level of precision as linguistic content, so in a task-based syllabus, it is not so strict that the teaching and the learner’s syllabi need to match. So, both focused and unfocused tasks are selected. The linguistic syllabus may include content obligatory language (i.e. the language that is required to learn a particular content) and content-compatible language (the language that can be usefully taught within the context of a particular content domain but which is not required for its successful mastery) (p. 76). The shortcoming of an integrated approach is that ‘learners may not be developmentally ready to process the linguistic forms that have been targeted for acquisition’ (Ellis, 2003, p. 76).

From the descriptions given by Ellis, it is appropriate to conclude that teachers need to experiment with different design because as ‘there can be no guarantee that the links the designer establishes between form and meaning will be valid for the learner’ (Ellis, p.78). By doing so,

learners are given different designs some of which may be suitable for their learning style. They should be psychologically ready and prepared to design a TBL syllabus which will be taught by them. Their decisions on designing the syllabus, sequencing the tasks...can ultimately affect the learning outcomes. Tasks provide students with the chance to experience real-world like language communication in the classrooms, nevertheless, teachers or syllabus designer can still incorporate a focus on form in the syllabus by using traditional instructional devices like exercises or focused tasks.

Types of tasks

The classification of tasks can be different depending on the perspectives of the linguists or researchers. Some classifications are general and others are more specific. The following is on the different types of tasks described in the literature.

General types of tasks

Willis (1996) proposes six task types according to knowledge hierarchies:

1. listing
2. ordering and sorting
3. comparing
4. problem solving
5. sharing personal experience
6. creative tasks

Pica, Kanagy and Falodun (1993) classify tasks according to the types of interaction in the product:

1. jigsaw tasks
2. information-gap tasks
3. problem-solving tasks
4. decision-making tasks
5. opinion exchange tasks

It is important for course designers and teachers to familiarize themselves with the ways to classify tasks. The different components of a syllabus can be fulfilled as to be made up of different types of tasks.

Real World Tasks versus Pedagogical Tasks

Richards (2001) distinguishes tasks into two types – *pedagogical tasks* and *real world tasks*. “Pedagogical tasks are based on SLA theory and are designed to trigger second language learning processes and strategies” (p.162). Examples of pedagogical tasks are jigsaw tasks, information-gap tasks, problems solving tasks, decision-making tasks and opinion exchange tasks. According to Richards (2001), real world tasks “are designed to practice or rehearse those activities that are found to be important in a needs analysis and that turn out to be important and useful in the real world” (p.162). He further comments on the concerns teachers have on TBET including the broad definition of tasks, the unclear procedures for task design and selection and the emphasis on fluency over accuracy. The above concerns have inhibited the implementation of TBET in English teaching.

Focused Tasks versus Unfocused Tasks

Ellis (2003) distinguishes tasks into ‘unfocused’ and ‘focused’. “In the case of unfocused tasks, no attempt is made to design the task to ‘trap’ learners into using a specific linguistic feature...In contrast, focused tasks aim to induce learners to process, receptively or productively, a predetermined linguistic feature...Focused tasks, then, have two aims; one is to stimulate communicative language use as with unfocused tasks, the other is to target the use of a particular, predetermined target feature in meaning-centred communication” (p. 65).

In language pedagogy, there are two rather different attitudes regarding the use of tasks. ‘In task-supported language teaching, focused tasks have been incorporated into traditional language-based approaches to teaching. For example, the PPP approach makes use of focused tasks in the final stage of a sequence of learning activities that begins with the presentation of a pre-selected linguistic form followed by controlled practice. Learners are made aware of the linguistic focus and the task serves to provide opportunities for learners to use the pre-selected language item in free production. In such an approach, then, focused tasks serve as a methodological device for implementing a *structural syllabus*. In TBET, tasks whether of the unfocused or focused kind, are treated as units of teaching in their own right and serve as the basis for designing complete courses. In this case, a task is the actual means for constructing the syllabus’ (Ellis, p. 65).

Sequencing Tasks

Appropriately sequenced tasks are very important to the effectiveness of the task-based syllabus. The process of selection and sequencing of tasks plays an important role in a task-based syllabus. The selection of appropriate tasks, either focused or unfocused, could promote the use of focused linguistic forms. The sequence of tasks including the linguistic forms as well as content can ensure the level of difficulty is appropriate for learners at certain stages of learning. That means learners are linguistically and semantically prepared and ready to perform more challenging tasks and to achieve ‘maximum learning’ (Ellis, 2003, p. 67).

A task-based syllabus should have focused tasks and unfocused tasks (Ellis, 2003). Ellis (2003) also attempted to identify the criteria for task sequencing in terms of complexity including task input, task conditions, the process of performing a task and task outcomes.

“To sequence tasks, appropriate criteria for grading their level of difficulty for the learner have to be identified. This will suffice in the preparation of a task-based syllabus consisting entirely of linguistically focused tasks or a mixture of focused and unfocused tasks. Such a syllabus introduces a focus on form into a meaning-centred curriculum; that is, the syllabus consists of ‘tasks’ as defined above but also allows also for the systematic treatment of linguistic form” (p. 66).

Nunan (1989) provides some useful advice on sequencing and integrating tasks. He suggests that it is important to ‘look at the integration of communicative tasks with other tasks and exercise types which are designed to help students develop the enabling skills they will need to communicate successfully, or which are designed to develop such skills as learning-how-to-learn’ (p.118). In this way, teachers are able to exercise their professional judgment to choose appropriate teaching approach for their context in which students can obtain optimal learning of knowledge as well as skills.

One way to sequence tasks using a psycholinguistic processing approach (Nunan, 1989) in which tasks are sequenced according to the cognitive and performance demands exerted upon students as demonstrated in three levels – processing in the form of comprehension tasks, productive in the form of controlled production activities and interactive in the form of authentic communications.

Another way of sequencing task emphasizes task continuity within a unit of work. According to Nunan (1989), task continuity “refers to the chaining of activities together to form a sequence, in which the successful completion of prior activities is a prerequisite for succeeding ones” (p. 119). In fact, a textbook *The Challenge* is used to demonstrate how text continuity is dealt with; and the flexibility that teachers should enact in designing a task-based course. The textbook includes “modules” that are then divided into “chains” and there are various steps in each chain and two tasks at the end of the chain.

These chains in the module are related to the theme but they are not interdependent. The omission of one chain does not affect the quality of the learning. In fact, teachers and students can decide which chain they want to undertake depending on student ability and progress. The four macro-skills are included in each chain and students are required to listen, write, analyze, make notes, interview and report or discuss in pair or group.

Students must complete each step in the chain, as the preceding step is necessary for the succeeding step as it provides necessary information related to the task. The approach used in *The Challenge* is flexible as it allows teachers and learners to choose the direction for

learning. The needs and language proficiency of learners can be catered for if textbooks can provide such flexible approach to material design.

The aim of sequencing task is to make sure that it is at the appropriate level of demand for students. The danger of inappropriately sequenced tasks is that it can lead to unfavourable learning outcomes. Difficult tasks lead to the reliance on lexicalised interaction which would result in “fossilization and may produce only routine solutions to communication problems” (p. 23). Easy tasks hinder interlanguage development as no further consolidation has gained in the learning process. Skehan (1996a) proposes using language factors and cognitive factors to sequence tasks. These factors are described as follows:

Language factors

- syntactic complexity and range
- lexical complexity and range

Cognitive factors

- familiarity of material in the task
- nature of material: abstract vs. concrete
- reasoning operations required
- degree of structuring contained (p. 24)

Richards and Rogers (2001) points out that sequencing of tasks according to task complexity plays an important role besides selecting tasks. However, it is undeniable that ‘task difficulty is itself a concept that is not easy to determine’ (p. 232). Richards and Roger (2001) cite Honeyfield’s (1993) criteria for deciding task complexity: Procedures, input text, output, amount and type of help given, role or teachers and learners, time allowed, motivation, confidence, learning styles (Richards & Rogers, 2001).

Task Complexity

Task complexity plays an integral role in selection and sequencing of tasks. Task complexity in task design is based on the following criteria (Ellis, 2003):

1. Factors relating to input include:

(i) Input medium – whether the information is presented in written or pictorial form, whether learners can decode it in their own time or in the lesson, or whether it is culturally familiar or unfamiliar. It is believed that pictorial input is easier than writing and then oral, also familiar information is easier than unfamiliar information.

(ii) Code complexity – it relates to the lexical and syntactical complexity of the input. Texts with high-frequency vocabulary and a low level of subordination are easier to understand

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

124

10 : 7 July 2010

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.

Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

than texts with low-frequency vocabulary and complex sentence structure. Research indicates that elaborate input (input that includes paraphrases and glosses) is more comprehensible than simplified input.

(iii) Cognitive complexity – it concerns the ‘cognitive demands of processing the content’ of the input information, whether the information type is static, dynamic or abstract. It was found that tasks with abstract ideas are more challenging than tasks with names of objects and actions (Prabhu, 1987). Another factor is the amount of information – including the elements or relationships involved. The degree of structure is also an element that affects cognitive complexity. Tasks with identifiable time sequence and clear structure are easier to comprehend.

(iv) Context dependency – whether contextual support like visual information is included. Context-free input is more complicated for learners. It was found that “texts supported by photographs, drawings, tables and graphs are easier to understand” (Nunan, 1989).

(v) Familiarity of information – it relates to ‘the relationship between the thematic content of the task and the individual learner’s world knowledge’ (Nunan, 1989, p.70). Learners may feel stressful when they are asked to communicate in an unfamiliar topic.

2. Factors relating to task conditions:

(vi) Conditions influencing the negotiation of meaning – the chance and time for negotiation of meaning can affect the task complexity. A one-way task does not have as many chances for negotiation of meaning rather than two-way tasks.

(vii) Task demands – whether the task involves a single or a dual demand, for example, to mark the route on the map imposes a single demand and to mark the route and describe it imposes a dual demand.

(viii) Discourse mode – a monologue promotes fluency and a dialogue can enhance accuracy and complexity.

3. Factor relating to the process of performing a task:

(ix) Reasoning needed – information-gap tasks are the easiest, reasoning-gap intermediate and opinion-gap tasks the most difficult. The number of steps involved can also affect the complexity in the process of performing a task.

4. Factors relating to task outcomes:

(x) Medium of the outcome – pictorial and written products are easier than oral ones. For beginner learners who have not yet learned to speak or write in the language, it may be Language in India www.languageinindia.com 125
10 : 7 July 2010

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

appropriate to use simple comprehension tasks.

(xi) The scope of the outcome – tasks with closed outcomes are easier than those with open outcomes.

(xii) The discourse domain of the outcome – the level of complexity is ranked from easy to difficult: lists/ description – narration/ classification – instruction/ arguments. The degree of complexity is related to the level of detail in the product. The complexity of instruction depends on the number and content of the specific directives.

(xiii) Complexity of the outcome – straightforward outcomes with a simple decision is easier than those with multi-faceted judgments. The greater the precision of the outcome, the more complex the task is as it requires greater lexical and syntactical accuracy (Ellis, 2003, p. 73).

In considering task complexity, it is appropriate to look at individual learner differences which in turn impact on task difficulty. According to Ellis, task difficulty can be adjusted by certain methodological procedures which “increase or ease the processing burden placed on the learner” (Ellis, 2003, p. 67). Teachers are responsible for imposing these procedures, for example, use of pre-task activities such as pre-teaching of vocabulary useful for the tasks or provision of planning time.

Task Cycle

Task designers have to ensure that a particular group of learners are given appropriately sequenced tasks with the right level of difficulty for learners’ competence. Skehan (1996b) points out that teachers need to be decisive of their choices in the different stages of task implementation. He has devised a comprehensive table to demonstrate the different stages of a task cycle.

Table 1: Stages in task implementation (Skehan, 1996b, p.24)

	<i>Purpose of phase</i>	<i>Examples</i>
<i>Pre-task</i>	Cognitive: ease subsequent processing load	<i>foregrounding, e.g. introduction to topic of task</i> <i>observing</i> <i>doing similar tasks</i> <i>planning</i>
	Linguistic: Introduce new forms into attention	<i>explicit teaching</i> <i>implicit teaching</i> <i>consciousness-raising</i>

<i>During task</i>	Manipulate pressure: influence processing balance	<i>speed, deadlines stakes number of participants</i>
	Calibrate: influence processing balance	<i>provide visual support introduce surprise elements</i>
<i>Post-task</i>	Retrospect: remind learners of importance of form	<i>public performance analyse consciousness-raise</i>

It is clear that there are stages in the task implementation: the pre-task, during task and post-task. Each stage has its specific purposes to achieve. It is crucial that teachers realize these purposes in helping them facilitate students' learning.

According to Nunan (2001), language teaching pedagogy in the different stages needs to take into account three components:

(1) Language data: samples of spoken and written language. With exposure to a language, learning of its form, function and use is more likely to happen. Both authentic and non-authentic materials are useful for learners.

(2) Information: refers to 'experiential information about the target culture and the linguistic information about the language systems' (p. 2). This information of the grammatical principles and rules can be presented inductively or deductively.

(3) Opportunities for practice: extensive practice is essential for language learning. Nunan (2001) distinguishes practice into tasks, exercises and activities. 'A task is a communicative act' which has no focus on form and no linguistic outcome. An exercise has a focus on form and a linguistic outcome. An activity also has a focus on form and a communicative outcome (p. 3). As mentioned earlier, tasks are then further classified into real-world tasks and pedagogical tasks. Pedagogical tasks are carried out in the classroom to 'activate acquisition processes' (p. 5). Once the pedagogical tasks are specified, it is necessary for the syllabus designer to identify the knowledge and skills that learners need to have as to carry out the tasks in the lessons (p. 5). Therefore, teachers need to be properly informed and trained in the methodologies in order to achieve more effective implementation.

Role of Teacher and Learner

The role of teacher and the role of learner are interactive and inseparable. Regarding the role of teachers, CDC (1999) points out that the main role of teacher in TBET is a facilitator of learning: "teachers should always facilitate learning which involves balancing the amount of exposure and use of language, and ensuring they are both of suitable quality" (p. 57). It also highlights the learner-centeredness of TBET which suggests teachers to pay attention to learners'

needs, to motivate them and help them build up self-confidence, positive learning attitudes and strategies. The process of learning is seen as important as the outcome. In addition, teachers should value the significance of cooperative and collaborative learning. The overall learning environment should be supportive for students to improve their language proficiency.

Willis (1996) states that the role of the teacher “is to select topics and tasks that will motivate learners, engage their attention, present a suitable degree of intellectual and linguistic challenge and promote their language development as efficiently as possible” (p. 23).

“One can generalize here and say that the teacher, in a task-based approach, needs to command a significantly wider range of skills than in more structural approaches. These include:

- an ability to select and sequence tasks for supplementary activities
- the competence to organize, appropriately, pre- and post-task activities
- a willingness to adapt task difficulty during the actual task phase
- a sensitivity to individual differences and the capacity to adapt tasks to take account of differences in learner orientation.” (Skehan, 1996b, p. 30)

Therefore, teachers should aim to develop the skills suggested by Skehan (1996b) in order to improve their teaching effectiveness.

Teachers are confronted with immense challenge in catering for individual variation in TBET because they need to maintain a balance between providing appropriate instructions to individual learners and designing tasks for learners in general. In implementing tasks, it is important to create conditions for a focus on form while the actual learning of the specific structure may not be effective due to the individual developmental sequence of the learners. Nevertheless, a focus on form helps learners notice the structure and may eventually lead to acquisition. Teachers, as syllabus and task designers as well as instructors, must take into account learner needs and then derive appropriate types of instruction.

Swan (1985) also thinks that ‘theoretical confusion can lead to practical inefficiency, and this can do a lot of harm, with time and effort being wasted on unprofitable activities while important priorities are ignored’ (p. 9).

TBET requires different and distinctive roles of learners, teachers and learning processes. Willis (1996) points out that exposure, use and motivation are essential conditions for language learning and task-based approach can engage learners in real interaction and fulfill the above conditions. Mok (2001) illustrates explicitly the change in the role of learner:

“...learners should be involved in evaluating their learning. The learning goals and/or objectives should be made explicit to them so that they can be responsible for checking, monitoring and finally evaluating their own

learning...the teacher is in a position of offering preparation and different support to the learners, beside being an organizer of activities and a resource person” (p. 4).

Murphy (2003) attempted to establish the importance that learners actually interact with the tasks in the classroom besides focusing on accuracy, fluency and complexity (p. 352). He cited Skehan (1998) and suggested that “teachers are primarily concerned with pragmatic issues, such as how learners can be encouraged to engage with tasks more effectively, and how tasks can be linked to form a coherent scheme of work (p. 353). Indeed, Murphy pointed out that learner participation could influence task performance ultimately.

“Learning outcomes are a product of three main factors; the contribution of the individual learner, the task, and the situation in which the task is carried out. This means any pre-designed task will be changed by the way the learner interacts with it” (Murphy, 2003, p. 353).

Murphy proposed that it is essential for the teachers to make clear the pedagogical objectives of the task to the learners as they need to realize their learning purposes to achieve the pre-designated learning outcome. In order to cater for individual differences, a task should allow flexible procedural routes to the same learning goal, “Tasks should therefore involve learners in reflecting on the way in which they carried them out, as well as on the language they used, thereby helping them to develop autonomy” (p. 354) – (critical evaluation by students themselves). The evaluation by students is useful for implementing future task-based courses and that teachers should also be course designers. In this way, they can fully understand the whole process involved in a teaching and learning cycle.

The idea of learning to learn is realized and the language competence and skills of learners will allow them to achieve accuracy, complexity and fluency in English and to meet the multi-dimensional demands of the 21st century. Such a change subsequently imposes a challenge on teachers and requires them to think and act differently in the classroom. The role of learners in TBET has also become more multi-faceted than in traditional approaches.

The role of learners and teachers are also described – the learners as group participants, monitors, risk-takers and innovators and the teachers as selectors and sequencers of tasks, preparing learners for tasks and consciousness-raising. Teachers need to introduce the topic, clarify task instructions, lexis and phrases to help task completion or even provide a demonstration of the procedures. It was argued that teachers need to focus on form before asking learners to participate in a task. Therefore, teachers can employ ‘a variety of form-focusing techniques, including attention-focusing pre-task activities, text exploration, guided exposure to parallel tasks and use of highlighted material’ (Richards & Roger, 2001, p. 236).

Conclusion

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
10 : 7 July 2010

129

Hosseini Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

Task-based English Teaching (TBET) is a new teaching method. “Task” is a special term in language teaching and is different from language exercise. It has its specific features, forms and teaching steps. There are various tasks in language teaching and learning, but the focus of every task is on solving a communicative problem which has some connection with the real world, learners’ lives and learning experience that motivates their interests and participation.

Some of the concerns of teachers and educators related to the importance of Task-Based English Teaching and Learning were discussed in this paper, as well as how they have adapted new ideas to suit their situation. By way of conclusion, it may be considered that this study can be viewed from a more global and theoretical perspective, as an example of what is called the “Post method condition” in language pedagogy. There is now widespread acceptance that no single method or set of procedures will fit all teachers and learners in all contexts. Teachers can draw on the ideas and experience of others but cannot simply adopt them as a ready-made recipe; they need to develop a pedagogy based on Task-Based principles suited to their own specific context.

References

- Breen, M. (1987). *Learner contribution to task design*. In C. Candlin & D. Murphy (Eds.), *Language Learning Tasks* (pp.23-46). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- CDC. (1999). *Syllabus for Secondary Schools English Language. (Secondary 1-5)*. Hong Kong: Education Department.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Honeyfield, J. (1993). Responding to task difficulty. In M. Tickoo (Ed.), *Simplification: Theory and practice* (pp. 127-138). Singapore: Regional Language Center.
- Long, M.H. and Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(2) 55-98.
- Long, M.H. and Norris, J.M. 2000: Task-based language teaching and assessment. In Byram, M., editor, *Encyclopedia of language teaching*. London: Routledge, 597–603.
- Mok, A. (2001). *Task-based learning, language arts and the media: a resource book for secondary English teachers*. Hong Kong: The University of Hong Kong.
- Murphy, J. (2003). Task-based learning: the interaction between tasks and learners. *ELT Journal*, 57, 4, 352-360.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Nunan, D. (2001). Aspects of task-based syllabus design. *Karen's Linguistics Issues*.
- Pica, R., R. Kanagy, and J. Falodun (1993). Choosing and using communication tasks for second language research and instruction. In S. Gass and G. Crookes (Eds.), *Task-based learning in a second language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Skehan, P. (1996a). A framework for the implantation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (1996b). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. (pp. 17-30). Oxford: Heinemann.
- Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 268-286.
- Swan, M. (1985). A critical look at the communicative approach. *The Royal Society of Arts Diploma in TEFL*, 39(1) and 39(2), 1-20.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.
-

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Linguistics
KIKS University of Mysore
Manasagangotri
Mysore
Karnataka, India
h.shams.h@gmail.com

N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Central Institute of Indian Languages
Manasagangotri

Language in India www.languageinindia.com
10 : 7 July 2010

131

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition

Mysore
Karnataka, India
nadarajapillai@rediffmail.com

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

10 : 7 July 2010

Hossein Shams Hosseini, Ph.D. Candidate, and N. Nadaraja Pillai, Ph.D.
Importance of Task-Based Teaching in Second Language Acquisition