



Teaching Grammar through Task-Based Language Teaching to Young EFL Learners

Mustafa Yildiz
 Anadolu University

Mufit Senel
 Ondokuzmayis University

ABSTRACT

The present study investigates the effects of Task-Based Language Teaching on students' grammar knowledge in the field of teaching grammar. It has been studied with 32 students from 8th grade during a two-and-a-half-month process. Throughout this process, students firstly are applied a pre-test to examine their level and to confirm whether there is homogeneity between experimental and control groups. The findings on the pre-test results of the students do not yield meaningful results; and the study, especially the instruction process of grammatical structures launches. At the end of the instruction process, a post-test is applied to students to evaluate whether the progress between pre and post-test results are meaningful or not. TBLT raises significantly the grammar knowledge of the experimental students. Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching grammar yields meaningful results compared to traditional language teaching method in this study.

INTRODUCTION

Teaching a foreign language is a process in which a language which has a different structure than mother tongue is taught. There are several methods and approaches used in teaching a foreign language. The success of foreign language teaching in a classroom largely depends on approaches, methods and techniques. These methods and approaches may vary according to students' mental level and age group, enabling different applications. Even though there is a list of methods and approaches for teaching language, effective language teaching is their common purpose. They all try to reach the same destination by using different routes.

The four basic language skills; reading, writing, speaking, and listening, are divided into two groups as receptive and productive skills. All these skills in fact are related to each other and one of them is a prerequisite of the others like the links of a chain. Effective use of the language prerequisites the effective use of the grammar, so the language users have to be efficient grammar users. To achieve this, a learner has to learn the grammar of the target language effectively.

In today's Turkey, people mostly complain about that they understand what they hear or read in English; however, their deficiency is to speak it correctly. However, language consists of four different skills and requires a good knowledge and competence in each of the four skills. Getting the message from what we read or what we hear is not enough to say that we have a satisfactory knowledge about a language. These frequently encountered complaints give form to the present research's starting point and direct the researchers towards performing a study aiming to determine the effects of communicative way of grammar teaching on grammar knowledge.

There are various language teaching methods and principles in which it is argued whether grammar should be done explicitly or not. Prabhu (1987) and Krashen (1982) argue that language learners should give importance to meaning rather than form and they should learn to use the language in terms of meaning. On the other hand, some of them, for example, Dickins and Woods (1988, p. 626) argue that knowledge of grammar is essential since the grammatical competence is viewed as a component of communicative competence. Task-Based Language Teaching (henceforth, TBLT) is one of these teaching methods and deals with grammar teaching through communicative use of the language. Learners work on tasks and face the language as a whole. In TBLT language is not a target but a tool for communication and it unites the features what Krashen (1982) and Prabhu (1987), even Dickins and Woods (1988) advocate within its content.

Nunan (1991, p. 279) defines the main characteristics of TBLT, which has an emphasis on tasks in teaching, as follows;

- * an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
- * the introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
- * the provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only to language, but also on the learning process itself.
- * an enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
- * an attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom.

As Nunan (1991) describes, TBLT does not aim at strictly teaching grammar. Essentially, it tries to let learners use the language effectively. At this juncture, our fellow citizen's problem in the production of the language comes to the mind. Especially, the last clause above that Nunan (1991) describes is completely addressed to the solution of our citizen's speech production problem. With the help of TBLT, they not only learn grammar but also acquire the competence of communication in the target language.

According to Farahani and Nejad (2009, p. 27), "Task-Based Language Teaching is predicated on the principle that having learners perform tasks which help them to develop knowledge and skill in the second language in accordance with the way their own language learning mechanisms work". Tasks applied in the classroom environment prepare real-life situations for students and let them use the target language to communicate with each other to complete the task. Sanchez (2004, p. 40) claims that "task based approach can only be fully understood if it is contrasted with preceding methods and analysed within mainstream of communicative methodology". The significance of the study, as Sanchez expressed, is that it will reveal whether TBLT is effective in teaching grammar or not by comparing Task-Based Language Teaching with traditional teaching method.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Task Based Instruction Model

Task-Based instruction model is one of the language teaching methods based on communicative activities and consists of tasks in which learners try to perform these tasks in a classroom environment where mutual interaction is at the highest level. TBLT has the same several principles with Communicative Language Teaching. TBLT is based on communication like in CLT. In CLT, communicative activities are used as a part of the lesson, but in TBLT, the tasks are used as a part of the lesson. These tasks should be related to the daily life that may happen to all students so as to draw students' attention to the lesson and to the task. According to Cambridge International Dictionary of English (1995), a task is 'a piece of work to be done, esp. one done regularly, unwillingly or with difficulty'. Dictionary meaning is a bit formal when compared to tasks performed in a classroom environment. According to Bygate et al., "a task is an activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective" (cited in Branden, 2006, p. 4). Students are busy with the use of the language, but not acquiring the minimal grammatical details or rules of the language. They have a task to perform by using the target language and at the same time they are expected to learn about language functions.

Skehan defines a task as "an activity in which meaning is primary, there is a problem to solve, there is a relationship to the real world, and where there is an objective that can be assessed in terms of an outcome" (cited in Huang, 2010, p. 32). Students should focus on conveying the meaning by performing communication activities and there should be an objective which appears at the end of real world-like activity. According to Huang (2010, p. 32) there are four questions that should be asked to determine whether an activity is a task or not. These questions are as follows: "a) Is there a primary focus on meaning? b) Does the activity relate to real-world activities? c) Is there a problem to solve? d) Can it be assessed in terms of outcome?" All of these questions try to determine whether an activity used in the classroom is a task or not. An activity should not primarily focus on language forms and be related to real life events to denominate it as a task. It should contain a problem solving activity at the end of which a product that can be evaluated by all of the students should appear.

The tasks used in the classroom are divided into two groups as pedagogical tasks and target tasks. Pedagogical tasks are precision made classroom tasks in which learners perform communicative tasks limited to the classroom environment. They require interaction among the students and the usage of language functions, however, the ultimate aim is to complete the task. Errors are tolerated. Nunan (2004, p. 4) describes that "a pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form". Instead of studying on grammatical rules and patterns, the learners struggle to communicate with their classmates so as to achieve an output at the end of the tasks. Students are expected to form a product which will be evaluated by their classmates at the end of the activity in an interactional way. Pedagogical tasks are limited to the classroom and the students do not encounter with them out of the classroom. For example, students' talk about the picture on their books or their preparation for a role-play are a kind of pedagogical activities. They do not experience this kind of tasks out of the classroom.

A target task, named as rehearsal task, is a kind of tasks that students encounter with in their daily lives most probably. Preparing a CV, filling a traffic accident report, or booking a hotel room are examples of target tasks. Long argues that

“a target task is a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus examples of tasks include painting a fence, dressing a child, filling out a form, buying a pair of shoes, making an airline reservation, borrowing a library book, taking a driving test, typing a letter, weighing a patient, sorting letters, making a hotel reservation, writing a cheque, finding a street destination and helping someone across a road. In other words, by ‘task’ is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play and in between” (cited in Nunan, 2004, p. 2).

As Long mentions, anything we experience in our daily lives can be shown as an example to target tasks.

All of the different definitions by different scholars given above emphasize the importance of meaning rather than grammatical form in pedagogical task activities. Long’s definition is a bit different from the other linguists’ definition. He tries to explain the tasks that learners have to perform not in the classroom but outside the classroom. Ellis and Nunan try to explain the ‘task’ in the context of linguistic and by implying the classroom environment as well.

TBLT is a communicative approach in which students try to complete the task given by using the language instead of trying to use rules explicitly. Zhu (2007, p. 50) defines the aim of TBLT is to create an atmosphere of target language environment in the classroom, to develop the students’ ability of communication. Learners are exposed to target language and they feel themselves to use the target language to communicate with one another.

TBLT is a bridge between classroom and daily life environment out of the classroom with the assistance of its communicative activities, which requires the interaction between students to perform a task in the classroom. Learners are expected not only to know about the language but also to make use of what they know about the language.

The Effectiveness of Task Based Instruction

Task-Based Language Teaching is based on interaction between learners. It requires active use of the language to improve the communication skills of learners while trying to teach the pre-prepared language forms attached to the activities. The environment is designed to let the learners feel relaxed. “Task-based language learning is an approach of language learning that involves doing a familiar task by using the target language” (Büyükkarcı, 2009, p. 314). A wide variety of tasks can be used in the course of the lesson such as making an appointment for a dentist, taking a ticket for holiday, or making an interview.

TBLT as a meaning-based approach advocates that the language teaching process will be more effective by using the tasks prepared for the students. Students who do not have to have the right grammar do not deal with the rules of the language. Their only aim is to complete the task. Even though they are not informed about the structure, they try to do their best to convey the meaning and at the end of this process, they learn the language forms unconsciously. Willis (1996, p. 24) underlines that “learners are free to choose whichever language forms they wish to convey what they mean, in order to fulfil, as well as they can, the task goals”. Even though a student has not a satisfying grammar knowledge and despite of his lots of inaccurate usage of rules, he can manage to express himself. “One of the most important things about TBLT is that it promotes learners’ confidence by providing them with plenty of opportunities to use language in the classroom without being constantly afraid of making mistakes” (Willis&Willis, 2007, p. 2). That

learners feel themselves secure supplies a stress-free environment and this does not affect the communication phase negatively. Skehan asserts that “if a task creates pressure to communicate, learners may respond with inaccurate use of language or with first language” (cited in Cameron, 2001, p. 108). Although the use of learners while communicating is incompetent, it is preferable than using mother tongue.

TBLT was first developed by N. Prabhu. Branden (2006, p. 1) highlights that “Long and Prabhu supported an approach to language education in which students are given functional tasks that invite them to focus primarily on meaning exchange and to use language for real-world, non-linguistic purposes”. Prabhu believes that “students may learn more effectively when their minds are focused on the task, rather than on the language they are using” (cited in Büyükkaracı, 2009, p. 314). In that style, the main aim is to perform the task by expressing meaning instead of using an absolute language form. “The main focus is on the tasks to be done and language is seen as the instrument necessary to carry them out. TBLT thus highlights the instrumental value of language” (Estaire & Zanon, 1994, p. 12). Learners focus on completing the task by using the language, but not on the correct use of the language. In this style, language use is an instrument to attain the object but not a goal.

The tasks prepared for making students ready for real life situations aim at developing students’ communication competence by designing precision made activities. Learners are prepared for the real life situations with the assistance of pedagogical tasks performed in the classroom.

Grammatical Tasks

Grammatical tasks require learners to use a particular language items to complete the task. Learners have to use some predetermined linguistic items. Rashtchi and Keyvanfar (2007, pp. 173-174) underline that a grammatical task is different from an exercise in that learners are free to say anything that comes to their mind regarding the situation; it is a task in that learners’ attention is primarily to the meaning they want to convey to their partner and is focused in that for the best performance they have to use the suitable grammatical form. Learners try not only to convey meaning but also to use definite grammatical items to complete the task.

Consciousness-Raising (C-R) Tasks

Grammar consciousness-raising tasks (henceforth, GCRTs) are the integration of students’ interaction and development of grammatical knowledge in students’ mind. Shokouhi (2009, p. 56) underlines that “CR tasks are aimed at assisting learners to notice grammar forms through meaning-focused interaction”. Learners find out the linguistic rules and principles by themselves while they are busy with grammar consciousness-raising tasks. Teacher does not give any explicit rule, but learners are expected to deduce grammatical rules and patterns. Moumene (2010, p. 69) underlines that “GCRTs aim at integrating the teaching of grammar with the provision of communicative tasks where learners talk about grammar and exchange information about its problematic issues. In short, grammar becomes the content of the task”. These kinds of activities draw students’ attention to the language forms while performing their communicative tasks. “In a consciousness raising task, students do focus on forms, not because the students are required to use them, but because the forms are the content of the task (Peterson, 1997, p. 5)”.

Mcnicoll and Lee (2011, p. 127) assert that “consciousness-raising is one available method which allows for students to collaboratively improve their grammatical knowledge through discussion, thereby keeping the classroom communicative and maximising student talk time”.

Students' grammar knowledge gets higher while they are busy with their tasks. Teachers do not interfere in students' interaction because in consciousness-raising tasks students are expected to acquire grammatical rules on their own. It is possible for teachers to fix teaching grammar into students' communication. Learners find chance to practice forms and to communicate at the same time.

Phases of TBI Model

Three stages, in other words pre-task, task cycle and post task (language focus and language practice) form the framework of TBLT. In a course planned according to the standards of the TBLT, there should be at least three stages. These stages help the teacher to plan the teaching process more effectively and give the teacher a chance to control the progress of the course.

Pre-Task

The topic and the task are introduced to the students in the pre-task stage and the teacher makes the students remember the old or new vocabulary. "The purpose of the pre-task phase is to prepare students to perform the task in ways that will promote acquisition" (Ellis, 2003, p. 244). Teachers can help students remember the old subjects that may be relevant and help them perform the task. "At the pre-task phase, the teacher highlights useful words and phrases, helps students understand directions for the task, and prepares them for the task" (Huang, 2010, p. 33). In the pre task stage learners remember their old knowledge which helps them to perform the task cycle stage successfully. Willis and Willis (2007, p. 160) underline that "learners who are given five to ten minutes just before the task to plan what to say tend to produce task interactions that are not only lengthier but linguistically richer, with a higher degree of fluency and clause complexity". The pre task stage prepares students for producing grammatically accurate sentences because it gives them the chance to think about the next stages shortly.

Task Cycle

The task cycle stage is the stage in which students try to perform the task given to them in an interactional context. This stage aims at developing an environment in which students try to improve their communication skills. Yaylı (2006, p. 450) underlines that learners find the chance to use the target language in order to complete the task in task cycle stage and if it is needed, the teacher feedback and support are applied by learners. This stage has three different stages in it. Task, planning and report are the sub-titles of the task cycle. The feedback that Yaylı (2006) insists on is given by teachers, especially in planning or report stage. At the task stage, students try to perform the task given by their teacher either in small groups or in pair. Teachers does not interfere with the students and only monitors them. Students are expected to be in a stress-free classroom environment and only to focus on fluency instead of the exact use of the linguistic items. At the planning stage, students try to prepare a report about how they have performed the task. Even though students omit the accuracy while communicating in the phase of the task, they try to be accurate in the planning stage and ask their teacher for help about grammatical rules. On the report stage, the reports prepared in the planning stage are presented to the whole classroom or students may control one another groups' report by exchanging their written report.

Post Task

Willis & Willis (2001, p. 178) call the post task stage as language focus. They analyze the post task phase under two different titles as language focus and language practice. On language

focus stage, students try to understand the usage of the language and the rules of the target language. At this stage, students have the knowledge about some special usage and the exact use of language functions. On language practice stage, a wide variety of different exercises can be studied to strengthen the understanding of the learners.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Questions

Experimental research design is used in the present study and the following three research questions have been answered.

- 1) Is there any significant difference between the grammar knowledge of students who are taught grammar through Task-Based Language Teaching and those who are not?
- 2) Is there any significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the experimental group?
- 3) Is there any significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the control group?

Participants

The participants of the study are 8th grade students attending a state school in Samsun, Turkey. The sample of the study is composed of both experimental and control groups. The experimental group is composed of the first section (A) of the eight grade students; and the control group is composed of the second section (B) of the eight grade students. Each group consists of 16 students. Taking into account the number of students that the two groups consist, there is homogeneity between two groups.

Data Collection

First, a pre-test for grammar items was administered to both groups at the beginning of the study in order to see the level of the subjects. Then, a post-test was administered to the subjects following the instruction of TBLT for teaching grammar in order to see the efficiency of the instruction. In order to evaluate the comprehension level of the students, a test consisting of 28 items (multiple choice, fill in the blanks) was applied to them in the test.

Data Analysis

Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation, frequencies, percentage, ANOVA variance analysis and paired samples T-tests were used to analyze the statistical data. "SPSS 11.0" data analysis program was used to make the calculations. While conducting statistical analyses, the cut-off value for significance was accepted as $p < 0.05$.

Procedure

In this study, two groups at the same proficiency level were compared according to two different methods for grammar teaching. The first one was TBLT and the second one was a traditional method, Grammar Translation Method. To conduct this study, two classes as one experimental group and one control group were chosen and each class has four hours of English lesson in a week.

After the selection of the groups, grammar items in accordance with the curriculum were chosen and a test was prepared by the researchers. A pre-test of 28 items consisting of multiple

choice items and fill-in-the-blanks questions testing the target grammar items was applied to the experimental and control group without a prior announcement.

Throughout the following eight weeks, the grammar items were tried to be taught in two different ways. In the experimental group, grammatical items were taught by using TBLT, however, in the control group they were taught by using Grammar Translation Method. Seven different grammar subjects consisting of Simple Past Tense, Present Perfect Tense, Since-For, yet-just-already, so-such, would like, would rather-prefer, were introduced to the participants.

In the experimental group, what TBLT model requires was exactly tried to be applied to the students. Pre-prepared activities and sheets related to TBLT were used as material. Throughout eight weeks, the students performed the tasks given by the teacher to them. They forced themselves to interact with one another to be able to complete their tasks. The role of the teacher was being a guide throughout the eight weeks that the study was conducted. Whereas, in the control group, interactional dimension of the language was omitted and overt grammar teaching was emphasized. The rules and the usages were explicitly presented to the students by writing on the board. It was aimed to teach grammatical rules strictly but the students never felt the necessity to interact with each other.

The purpose of this study was to find out whether there would be a significant difference in learning the target grammar items between the group that was exposed to the target grammar items by using TBLT, and the group that was exposed to the traditional Grammar Translation Method. To achieve this goal, the two groups were asked 28 questions testing the target grammar knowledge as a pre-test, and the next step was the introduction of 7 new themes throughout the 8 weeks. At last, a post-test including the same 28 questions testing the knowledge of the target grammar knowledge were applied to the students.

RESULTS

Findings about the Pre-Tests

Experimental and control groups were subjected to an examination to determine that both groups had homogeneity and had no significant difference in terms of their grammar knowledge before the initial of the study. The scores analyzed is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Comparison of the Pre-test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Groups	N	Mean	St. Deviation	t	Significance
Experimental	16	11,3125	2,24258	1,949*	,758
Control	16	9,6875	2,46897		

*p>0,05

According to the analysis of the pre-test results of both groups, the significance level is 0,758 (p>0.05). This result may be interpreted that there is a homogeneity between both groups and there is not any significant difference between grammar knowledge of both students in the experimental group and students in the control group.

Findings about the 1st research question

The first research question of the study was that ‘Is there any significant difference between the grammar knowledge of the students who are taught grammar through TBLT and those who are not?’ With the aim of assessing this research question, paired samples t-test was applied for the post-test results of the students included in both experimental and control groups. The analysis of the post-test scores of the students is a response to the first research question of the study. The Table 2 below presents the analysis of the post-test scores.

Table 2. Comparison of the Post-test Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Groups	N	Mean	St. Deviation	t	Significance
Experimental	16	17,0625	3,80296	2,664*	,016
Control	16	12,5625	5,58532		

*p<0,05

The results of the t-test administered to both the experimental and the control group show that the significance level is 0,016 (p<0,05). This result shows that it does not exceed the cut-off value and it shows that there is a significant difference between the students’ post-test scores in both groups.

Findings about the 2nd research question

The second research question of the study was that ‘Is there a significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the experimental group?’ With the aim of assessing this research question, paired samples t-test was applied to the pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the experimental group. It shows whether there is a progress between the pre and post test scores of the students or not. Table 3 below presents the analysis of the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental students.

Table 3. Comparison of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Experimental Group

	Mean	N	St. Deviation	t	Significance
Pre-Test	11,3125	16	2,24258	5,600*	,000
Post-Test	17,0625	16	3,80296		

*p<0,05

The results of the t-test applied to the pre and post-test scores of the experimental group show that the significance level is 0,000 ($p < 0,05$). As it appears within the significance threshold, it can be said that there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the experimental group.

Findings about the 3rd research question

The third research question of the study was ‘Is there any significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the control group?’ With the aim of assessing this research question, paired samples t-test was applied to the pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the control group. It shows whether there is a progress between the pre and post-test scores of the students or not. Table 4 below presents the analysis of the pre-test and post-test scores of the students in the control group.

Table 4. Comparison of the Pre-test and Post-test Scores of the Control Group

	Mean	N	St. Deviation	t	Significance
Pre-Test	9,6875	16	2,46897	2,304*	,036
Post-Test	12,5625	16	5,58532		

* $p < 0,05$

The results of the t-test applied to the pre and post-test scores of the control group show that the significance level is 0,036 ($p < 0,05$). As it appears within the significance threshold, it can be said that there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the students included in the control group.

DISCUSSION

It is obvious that the research attains its objective in terms of both experimental and control groups’ statistical analyses of post-test scores. The outcome of the research satisfies the expected results and final aim. According to the statistical data, TBLT is more effective than traditional language teaching method in the field of teaching grammar. The main and the first hypothesis of the study asserts that ‘*There will be a significant difference between the grammar knowledge of the students who are taught grammar through task based language teaching and those who are not*’. Table 2 shows that there is a significant difference between the post-test scores of the two groups to the advantage of experimental group at the end of the teaching process. The results can be explained with the highlighting features of TBLT. First of all, in TBLT, the anxiety level of students is really low because there is a stress-free environment as a classroom, thereby; the first and the most important condition for the success of the students is satisfied. The lessons are composed of tasks in TBLT. The tasks form the basic principle of teaching style, and the common

estimation is that students do not need to concentrate on how to use the language but to complete the task. The important thing is conveying the meaning in order to accomplish the task instead of the accurate use of the language. This study makes the students gain confidence about their capability in English while trying to accomplish the task. Students' confidence in themselves and an entertaining classroom environment compared to the traditional methods make the learning process more effective than any other teaching methods. Eventually, it is not a surprise ending to get a meaningful difference in favor of the experimental group. All features mentioned above support the dominance of TBLT to traditional methods.

The second hypothesis of the study asserts that *'There will be a significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the experimental group'*. The main hypothesis of the study gets meaningful yields and normally this hypothesis does, too. The finding is in conformity with the second hypothesis of the study and it shows a significant difference in terms of the improvement of the experimental students with regard to their pre and post-tests. The second hypothesis is directly related to the success of the first and the main hypothesis of the research. The progress achieved by the experimental students in pre and post-tests supplies the realization of getting meaningful yields from both the first and the second hypothesis.

The third hypothesis of the study asserts that *'There will also be a significant difference between pre-test and post-test results of the students included in the control group'*. Table 4 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test scores of the students included in the control group. Maybe the rate of the increase in the control group is not the same with the rate of increase in the experimental group; however, it is obvious that there is a statistically significant difference between pre and post test scores of the students included in the control group. If the researcher could not have obtained a significant difference in the control group, this situation would have caused a disadvantage for students included in the control group. Students would have an eight-week gap at the end of the process and students would be unsuccessful in the SBS exam at the end of the semester if the third hypothesis did not get meaningful yields. The main reason for getting meaningful result in the third hypothesis can be associated with the students' habituation about traditional techniques used in a classroom environment. Despite of lots of different and up-to-date techniques, traditional techniques are still mostly used in language teaching classrooms. Therefore, the progress in the pre-test and the post-test results of the students in the control group may be related to the fact that the students' experience about traditional way of teaching/learning.

Although both groups in this research are successful, there are some reasons why should teacher use TBLT in language teaching. The classroom environment in which Task-Based Language Teaching is applied by the teacher is more motivating than any other teaching methods. Learners feel themselves secure because they feel as if they were not in a classroom. Real-life situations take their attention and make the learning environment much more entertaining. Students' needs can be given as a task instead of using a course book which is not prepared by taking into account the needs of the learners. Thus, the teacher can create an interesting atmosphere where all students are eager to be active.

The results prove that the use of Task-Based Language Teaching is effective in increasing the grammar knowledge of the learners. As a result, TBLT should be a considerable alternative and be used in teaching grammar.

The new English teaching program prepared by the Ministry of Education puts the students in the center of the learning process. The program claims that all activities applied in the

classroom should support the student-centered classroom atmosphere. At that point, TBLT stands out with its properties suitable for the purpose of the Ministry. TBLT requires the high level of participation of the learners to the learning process. The use of TBLT not only supplies the participation of students to the classroom activities but also help to create the classroom environment expected by the Ministry of Education. English teachers using TBLT while teaching English serve the realization of the objective of the ministry.

Some ideas can be suggested for prospective researchers aiming at making a study about teaching grammar by using variable of TBLT. In this research, 7 grammatical subjects are tried to be taught in 8 weeks. In the following studies, the number of the subjects can be decreased and the process of the instruction can be extended. Alternatively, only one or two different grammar subject can be used in a longer instruction period. English teachers in state schools have some difficulty about the selection of the subject to instruct and the time that the research will last. Especially researchers who are in charge as a teacher in private school with private aim or researchers who do not have to complete the curriculum and have a flexible operation time may have a chance to make an elaborate study.

Moreover, a study which investigates the level of success of male and female students separately can be made by prospective researchers. Thus, the effects of TBLT on female students and on male students can be evaluated independently. This kind of research can give a viewpoint to English teachers and help them give shape to their teaching habits in a classroom environment.

In brief, this study is considered to guide the prospective studies related to the language learning/teaching. The findings gathered at the end of this study are evaluated to reflect the usefulness and effectiveness of teaching grammar through focused tasks in TBLT. It is believed that the use of TBLT in language class will yield meaningful results in terms of learners' success in general-especially tested via written tests- and will multiply the interaction between learners in terms of learners' communication skills as well. More studies conducted on the effectiveness of TBLT are supposed to excite English teachers' interest in the usage of up-to-date language teaching methods. It is clear that EFL teachers who are conscious of effectiveness of TBLT tend to use it in the classroom environment. Creating an awareness of efficiency of TBLT on EFL teachers raises the rate of TBLT usage in classrooms.

Mustafa Yildiz is an English Teacher at Sema-Cengiz Büberci Vocational and Technical High School in Samsun, Turkey. He is also a Ph.D candidate in the field of English Language Teaching at Anadolu University, Turkey. His research interests include corpus linguistics and second language acquisition.

Email: myildiz55@yahoo.com

Mufit Senel is an Assist. Prof. Dr. at Samsun Ondokuz Mayıs University, ELT Dept. He has been teaching English as a foreign language for 16 years. He earned his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at Hacettepe University in the field of Language Education and Teaching. His research interests are mainly language teaching to young learners, language teaching methods, e-learning, and teaching language through technology.

Email: mufitsenel@gmail.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The present study is produced from the M.A. thesis of the first author.

REFERENCES

- Branden, K. (2006). (Ed.). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Büyükkarcı, K. (2009). A critical analysis of task-based learning. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(1), 313-320.
- Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dickins, P.R.M. & Woods, E. G. (1988). Some criteria for the development of communicative grammar tasks, *Tesol Quarterly*, 22(4), 623-646.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Estaire, S. & Zanon, J. (1994). *Planning classwork: A task based approach*. Oxford: Heinemann Publishers.
- Farahani, A., & Nejad, M. (2009). A study of task-based approach: The effects of task-based techniques, gender, and different levels of language proficiency on speaking development: *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanha-ye Khareji*, 49, Special Issue, 23-41
- Huang, J. (2010). Grammar instruction for adult English language learners: A task-based learning framework. *Journal of Education*, (39), 29-37.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Mcnicoll, J., & Lee, J. H. (2011). Collaborative consciousness-raising tasks in EAL classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, Vol 10(4), p. 127-138.
- Moumene, A. (2010). *Grammar tasks and the learning of English as a foreign language: A case study*. Constantine: Mentouri University.
- Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(1), 279-295.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, J. A. (1997). Grammar Consciousness Raising Tasks. Unpublished MA Assignment. University of Reading: England.
- Prabhu, N. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Procter, P. (1995). *Cambridge international dictionary of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rashtchi, M., & Keyvanfar, A. (2007). *ELT quick and easy (3rd ed.)*. Rahnama Publication: Tehran.
- Sanchez, A. (2004). The task-based approach in language teaching. *International Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 39-71.
- Shokouhi, A. H. (2009). Consciousness-raising tasks versus deductive approach: Two form-focused instruction types in teaching grammar to Iranian high school EFL learners. *Journal of Education*, 4(4), 51-70.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Willis, D. & Willis, J. (2001). Task based language teaching. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds), *Teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Willis, D. & Willis, J (2007). *Doing task based teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yaylı, D. (2006). The effects of task-based learning on male and female learners' proficiency and noticing. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(1), 449-468.
- Zhu, X. (2007). Integrating task-based teaching approach into grammar teaching. *Sino- US English Teaching*, 4, 50-53.