

# The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Grammar of EFL Adolescent Learners

Lam Ky Nhan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Master, Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam

**Abstract** – Many pedagogical studies have concentrated on the problem of task-based language education and its impact on the English learning and teaching process. The process of teaching and learning English, including grammar, has been facilitated and improved as a consequence of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The aim of the current study is to determine how task-based language education affects students' understanding of grammar. Over the course of eight weeks, it was studied by 70 students in the 12th grade. Students initially take a pre-test to gauge their proficiency and determine if the experimental and control groups are homogeneous throughout the process. The study, particularly the grammatical structures education procedure, is launched when it is discovered that the students' pre-test results did not produce any conclusive conclusions. A post-test is administered to learners at the conclusion of the instructional process to determine whether or not the differences between the pre- and post-test findings are relevant. The experimental students' knowledge of grammar improves dramatically as a result of TBLT. In this study, task-based language education in grammar instruction produces more significant outcomes than conventional language teaching methods.

**Keywords:** Strategy, Tasked-based Language Teaching (TBLT), Grammar retention

## I. INTRODUCTION

A post-test is administered to learners at the conclusion of the instructional process to determine whether or not the differences between the pre- and post-test findings are relevant. The experimental students' knowledge of grammar improves dramatically as a result of TBLT. In this study, task-based language education in grammar instruction produces more significant outcomes than conventional language teaching methods.

The process of teaching a language that is structurally different from one's native tongue is known as teaching a foreign language. When teaching a foreign language, a variety of techniques and strategies are employed. Approaches, methods, and tactics have a significant role in the effectiveness of foreign language instruction in the classroom. These tactics and methods may change depending on the age and mental capacity of the children, allowing for various applications. Although there are many different techniques and strategies for teaching languages, they are all aimed at producing effective language learners. They all make an effort to get there utilizing various ways.

Reading, writing, speaking, and listening are the four fundamental language abilities, and they are separated into two categories: receptive skills, and productive skills. In actuality, all of these abilities are interconnected, and one of them functions as a requirement for the others, much like a chain link. The efficient use of grammar is a need for the effective use of language, hence language users must also be proficient grammar users. A student must successfully master the grammar of the target language in order to do this.

However, good grammar mastery of a foreign language usually results from multiple phases and procedures that need to be properly organized throughout efficient grammar instruction.

In the past, learners have received conventional education in foreign language grammatical structures through curriculum and even various teaching approaches. The conventional approach used a grammatical translation procedure that required students to acquire English in a mechanical manner. Such methods were shown to be ineffective, which caused students to lose interest in studying English and resulted in the adoption of fresh methods for teaching grammar.

As a consequence, innovative and effective grammar teaching strategies were developed, which helped students acquire the subject matter effectively and facilitated the teaching process. One method for teaching and learning languages, including grammar, called task-based language teaching and learning, was initially used to encourage students to master language structures. TBLT utilizes communicative competencies to deliver effective grammar instruction.

In a TBLT, the learner participates in a variety of tasks and activities where language is used as a tool for communication rather than as a target language. However, there are two camps when it comes to studying grammar: those who believe that grammar is crucial to learning a foreign language and those who believe that learners should place more emphasis on meaning than form. However, TBLT demonstrated that the two ideas merge when learners acquire grammar through tasks and activities because they pick up both the form and the meaning of the language.

According to Baleghizadeh and Ghobadi (2012), the following are qualities of TBLT:

- Learners are motivated to use language through social interaction;
- They use language creatively and spontaneously through tasks and problems;
- Learners relate language to real-world activities;
- Learners are firstly assessed based on the task/activity outcome;
- TBLT is student-centered.

Task-Based Language Teaching is based on the idea that by giving students tasks to do, they would be able to learn and master the second language in a way that is consistent with how their own language learning processes operate, according to Farahani and Nejad (2009).

Overall, TBLT gives students communicative tasks and activities that are applicable to everyday life and that enable them to engage with one another at the maximum level. But what is the function of TBLT in grammar learning, and what are the outcomes and implications of such teaching strategies? Is there a discernible difference between students who get grammar instruction through task-based language teaching and those who do not in terms of their grasp of grammar?

These are the major inquiries that this study seeks to address by examining the experiences of English instructors who have made public their regular teaching methods.

Overall, TBLT provides learners with communicative tasks and activities that are related to real life situations, and that allows learners to interact at the highest level with each other, But, when it comes to grammar learning, what is the role of TBLT, and what are the effects and results of such instructional methods? Is there any significant difference between the grammar knowledge of student who are taught grammar through Task-Based Language Teaching and those who are not?

These are the main questions that this study will try to answer, by investigating the experience of English teachers, who brought their everyday teaching process into light.

---

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Task-based Instruction Model

The task-based education model is one of the communicative language teaching approaches that comprises of tasks that learners attempt to complete in a classroom setting when mutual contact is at its peak. 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 assignments should be tied to events in students' everyday lives in order to focus their attention to the lesson and the activity. A task, according to the Cambridge International Dictionary of English (1995), is "a piece of work to be done, especially one done on a regular, unwilling, or difficult basis."

Skehan describes 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" (quoted in Huang, 2010, p.32). Students should concentrate on transmitting meaning through communication activities, and there should be a goal that arises at the end of a real-world-like activity.

In essence, TBLT is based on the ideas and efficacy of experiential learning, which John Dewey (1859–1952) first presented, and real-world scenarios are acted out in language instruction classes (Ellis, 2009; Hu, 2013). The constructive theory of learning provides the foundation for more current theories of learning, like TBLT. The origins of TBLT may be traced back to the 1980s, when Prabhu (1987)'s Communicational Language Teaching initiative in India was launched. The lack of performance in the creation of the target language and other shortcomings of the traditional language education approaches based on the structural approach following the PPP (Presentation-Practice-Production) paradigm are what gave rise to its development. The PPP technique is founded on the behaviorist school of learning, and learners are given language chunks that emphasize rote memorization of the target language structures and abstract grammatical concepts (Ellis, 2003; Long & Crookes, 1993). It was often believed that language learners could only become fluent in a language if they remembered and repeatedly used the grammar of the target language. It ultimately turned out to be incorrect since students who only knew theoretical grammar principles were unable to communicate effectively in the target language in everyday settings (Krashen, 1985; Prabhu, 1987; Willis & Willis, 2007; Ellis, 2003).

The activities utilized in the classroom are classified as pedagogical tasks or target tasks. Pedagogical tasks are specifically designed classroom activities in which students complete communicative tasks that are restricted to the classroom setting. They necessitate student engagement and the use of language skills, but the ultimate goal is to finish the assignment. Errors are accepted. According to Nunan (2004, p. 4), 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 where the intention is to convey meaning rather than manipulate form." Instead of learning grammatical rules and patterns, the students struggle to interact with their peers in order to complete the objectives. Students are required to create a product that will be reviewed by their peers in an interactive manner at the end of the exercise. Pedagogical duties are restricted to the classroom, and pupils are not exposed to them outside of it. Students' discussions regarding the artwork on their books, for example, or their preparation for a role-play are examples of pedagogical activities. They are not exposed to such responsibilities outside of the classroom.

TBLT is a communicative strategy in which students utilize language to achieve a task rather than trying to apply rules directly. According to Zhu (2007, p. 50), the goal of TBLT is to create a target language

environment in the classroom in order to strengthen students' communication skills. Learners are exposed to the target language and feel comfortable using it to communicate with one another.

TBLT bridges the gap between the classroom and the outside world through communicative activities that require students to communicate in order to complete a task in the classroom. Learners are expected to not only know about the language but also to put what they know to use.

## 2.2 The Effectiveness of Task Based Instruction in Grammar

Learners must interact with one another in task-based language learning. As a result, it necessitates active contact between learners via communicative tasks and activities. TBLT provides an atmosphere in which learners may be themselves while becoming acquainted with the target language. As a result, via these exercises, learners utilize target language naturally even if they are unfamiliar with the grammatical structures. The Task method provides more effective approaches for learners to acquire and learn structures. Moreover, TBLT necessitates active use of the language to increase learners' communication abilities while attempting to teach the pre-prepared language forms associated with the activities. The setting is intended to make the students feel at ease. "Task-based language learning is a method of learning a language that involves performing a familiar task in the target language" (Büyükkarcı, 2009, p. 314). During the class, a number of activities such as booking a dental appointment, purchasing a vacation ticket, or conducting an interview can be employed. In such procedures, learners have the opportunity to complete a task in which they are involved, and their sole goal is to complete this assignment, even if they do not understand the language, but they will try their best to utilize it appropriately. When such procedures are repeated and intensified, learners tend to absorb grammatical structures more quickly and precisely than standard grammar learning approaches (Büyükkarcı, 2009).

"One of the most important aspects of TBLT is that it fosters learner confidence by giving them numerous opportunities to use language in the classroom without being constantly afraid of making mistakes," (Willis & Willis, 2007).

Tasks offer learners with a stress-free atmosphere that does not interfere with conversation. When students are under pressure in any assignment, their communication may become improper or they may speak their mother tongue. However, even if their language is poor, it is preferable than utilizing their mother tongue.

N. Prabhu was the first to create TBLT. Long and Prabhu endorsed an approach to language instruction in which students are given functional activities that urge them to focus primarily on meaning exchange and to utilize language for real-world, non-linguistic objectives, according to Branden (2006, p. 1). According to Prabhu, "students may learn more effectively when their minds are focused on the task, rather than the language they are using" (quoted in Büyükkarcı, 2009, p. 314). The fundamental goal in that approach is to complete the objective through communicating meaning rather than employing an absolute linguistic form. "The primary focus is on the tasks to be completed, and language is viewed as the tool required to carry them out."

## 2.3 Grammar Tasks & Teacher

Task-based activities in grammar instruction require students to employ specific language components to fulfill a task. Grammatical tasks differ from classroom exercises in that learners are free to say whatever comes to mind (regarding the topic) while engaged in tasks; they focus on conveying meaning and giving their best performance to their pair, which leads to successful use of grammar structures. Keyvanfar and Rashtchi (2007), learners attempt not just to express meaning but also to fulfill the assignment using specific grammatical components.

Grammar consciousness-raising tasks (GCRTs) are the merging of student engagement and the growth of grammatical knowledge in the students' minds. According to Shokouhi (2009, p. 56), "CR tasks are aimed at

assisting learners to notice grammar forms through meaning-focused interaction.” While working on grammar awareness assignments, students discover language rules and concepts on their own. Although the teacher does not provide any explicit guidelines, students are required to discern grammatical norms and patterns. According to Moumene (2010, p. 69), “GCRTs aim to integrate grammar teaching with the provision of communicative tasks in which learners talk about grammar and exchange information about its problematic issues.” In short, language becomes the task’s substance. While performing communicative tasks, these exercises engage students’ attention to language forms. “In a consciousness-raising task, students focus on forms not because they must use them, but because the forms are the task’s content” (Peterson, 1997, p. 5).

According to Mcnicoll and Lee (2011, p. 127), “consciousness-raising is one available method that allows students to collaboratively improve their grammatical knowledge through discussion, keeping the classroom communicative and maximising student talk time.” While students are occupied with their assignments, their grammatical knowledge improves. Teachers do not intervene in student interactions since students are supposed to learn grammatical norms on their own through consciousness-raising exercises. Teachers can include teaching grammar into their students’ conversation. Learners get the opportunity to practice forms while also communicating.

## 2.4 Phases of TBI Model

### 2.4.1 Pre-Task

In the pre-task stage, the topic and assignment are introduced to the students, and the instructor helps the pupils retain previous or new language. “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 assist students in remembering prior subjects that may be relevant and in doing the assignment. “During the pre-task phase, the teacher emphasizes useful words and phrases, assists students in understanding task directions, and prepares them for the task” (Huang, 2010, p. 33). Learners recall previous information during the pre-task stage, which aids them in effectively completing the task cycle stage. According to Willis and Willis (2007, p. 160), “learners who are given five to ten minutes just before the task to plan what to say produce task interactions that are not only longer but linguistically richer, with a higher degree of fluency and clause complexity.” The pre-task stage prepares pupils for writing grammatically correct sentences by allowing them to think about the next steps quickly.

### 2.4.2 Task Cycle

The task cycle stage is the stage in which students attempt to complete the work that has been assigned to them in an interactive setting. This stage attempts to provide an atmosphere in which students may practice their communication abilities. Yayl (2006, p. 450) emphasizes that learners discover the opportunity to utilize the target language in order to accomplish the work at the task cycle stage, and if necessary, learners use instructor feedback and help. This level is divided into three sections. The task cycle’s sub-titles are task, planning, and report. Teachers provide the input that Yayl (2006) emphasizes on, particularly during the planning or report stages. At the task stage, learners attempt to complete the assignment assigned by their teacher in small groups or pairs. Teachers do not intervene with pupils and instead observe them. Students are intended to be in a stress-free classroom setting and to concentrate solely on fluency rather than the precise usage of linguistic components. During the planning stage, students attempt to produce a report on how they completed the work. Even though students neglect correctness while speaking during the work phase, they endeavor to be exact during the preparation step and ask their teacher for assistance with grammatical rules. The reports created in the planning stage are given to the entire classroom during the report stage, or students may control one another’s groups’ presentations by exchanging written reports.

#### 2.4.3 Post Task

The post task stage is referred to as language attention by Willis and Willis (2001, p. 178). They examine the post-task period under two headings: language attention and language practice. During the language focus stage, students attempt to comprehend the usage of the language as well as the rules of the target language. At this point, students understand certain specialized terminology as well as the precise application of language functions. On the language practice stage, a range of various tasks may be studied to increase the learners' knowledge.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Research design

This is a quantitative study that aims to examine the impact of using TBLT on Grammar of EFL students.

#### 3.2 Participants

The participants of the study are 10th grade students attending a state school in Soc Trang, Vietnam. The sample of the study is composed of both experimental and control groups. Each group consists of 35 students. Taking into account the number of students that the two groups consist, there is homogeneity between two groups.

#### 3.2 Procedure

In this study, two groups with the same competency level were compared using two distinct grammar teaching approaches. The first was TBLT, while the second was a more traditional approach called Grammar Translation approach. To perform this study, two classrooms were chosen as one experimental group and one control group, with each class receiving four hours of English instruction each week.

Following group selection, grammatical items aligned with the curriculum were picked, and the researchers created a test. Without previous notification, the experimental and control groups were given a pre-test of 40 items comprising of multiple choice items and fill-in-the-blanks questions testing the target grammatical items.

Throughout the next eight weeks, the grammatical topics were taught in two separate methods. Grammatical objects were taught using TBLT in the experimental group, whereas Grammar Translation Method was used in the control group. The participants were taught to five distinct grammatical themes, including Present Simple Tense, Present Continuous Tense, Simple Past Tense, Present Perfect Tense as well as Since-For.

What the TBLT model needs was tried to be implemented to the pupils in the experimental group. As material, pre-prepared TBLT exercises and sheets were employed. The kids completed the duties assigned to them by the teacher throughout the course of eight weeks. They were obliged to engage with one another in order to perform their jobs. Throughout the eight weeks of the study, the teacher's function was to serve as a guide. The interactional feature of the language was neglected in the control group, while overt grammatical training was stressed. 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 goal of this study was to see if there was a significant difference in learning the target grammar items between the groups that were exposed to the target grammar items using TBLT and the groups who were exposed to the standard Grammar Translation Method. To accomplish this purpose, the two groups were given a pre-test of 40 questions examining their target grammar knowledge, followed by the introduction of 5 additional topics over the course of 8 weeks. Finally, the students were given a post-test with the same 40 questions measuring their understanding of the target grammatical knowledge.

#### IV.FINDINGS

This section presents the findings of the study regard to students' Grammar performance before and after the intervention. Two Grammar tests selected from achievement tests for students were used to measure participants' achievement in Grammar in English. Two tests were nearly identical in terms of structure and difficulty. Scoring for each is ranked from zero as the minimum to ten as the maximum. Scores were transferred to SPSS 24.0 for data analysis.

##### 4.1 Participants' Grammar retention within the two groups before and after the intervention.

In order to identify students' changes in grammar retention, the General Linear Model test was carried out. Initially, the result of control group's pre-test and post-test were collected and analyzed. With  $p=0.00$ , it is confident enough to conclude that the pre-test's mean score and the post-test's mean score are different. Then, the Descriptive Statistic Test was performed to identify mean score of each test.

**Table II**  
Mean difference of students' grammar performance within control group

Group	Tests	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Control	Pre-test	35	3.50	6.50	5.02	.92
	Post-test	35	2.50	7.00	5.06	1.12

As shown in Table II, participants' grammar performance in the control group changed after the study. The pre-test ( $M_{pre}=5.02$ ;  $SD=.92$ ) and post-test ( $M_{post}=5.06$ ;  $SD=1.75$ ) averages varied ( $df=34$ ,  $p=0.00$ ). The post-test mean score exceeded the pre-test mean score. The grammatical retention of students in the control group improved after eight weeks of instruction.

Afterward, the General Linear Model test was carried out to identify the difference of mean score of experimental group's pretest and posttest ( $p=0.00$ ) led to a conclusion that it was fully confident that the grammar retention of the experimental group was different at pretest and posttest. Later, the mean scores of the pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test were clarified by Descriptive Statistic Test

**Table III**  
Mean difference of students' grammar performance within experimental group

Group	Tests	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Experimental	Pre-test	35	4.00	8.50	6.65	.90
	Post-test	35	5.50	9.50	7.36	.87

The pretest's mean score differed from the posttest's mean score. ( $Df=34$ ,  $p=0.00$ ) ( $M_{pre}=6.65$ ,  $SD=.90$ ,  $M_{post}=7.36$ ,  $SD=.87$ ). The result shows that the post-test mean was greater than the pre-test mean. Following the trial, the experimental group's grammar retention improved noticeably.

##### 4.2 Participants' grammar retention between the two groups before and after the intervention

The Descriptive Statistic Test, the Independent Sample T Test, and the General Linear Model test were used to compare students' vocabulary retention between the two groups before and after the intervention. First, the Descriptive Statistic Test results are shown in the table below.

Table IV

## Students' vocabulary retention between the two groups

Tests	Conditions	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD
Pre-test	Control	35	3.50	6.50	5.02	.92
	Experiment	35	2.50	7.00	5.06	1.12
Post-test	Control	35	4.00	8.50	6.65	.90
	Experiment	35	5.50	9.50	7.36	.87

#### 4.2.1 Students' grammar retention between the two groups before the intervention

The control group's mean score ( $M=5.02$ ) in the pre-test was somewhat lower than the experimental group's mean score ( $M=5.06$ ). An Independent Sample T-Test was utilized to examine if there was a significant difference in the control and experimental groups' grammar retention in the pre-test. In the pre-test, there was no significant difference in students' grammar retention between the two groups ( $t = -.146$ ,  $df= 68$ ,  $p=.84$ ). This shows that both groups of students remembered the same grammar during the pretest. The two groups were evenly distributed prior to the intervention.

#### 4.2.2 Students' vocabulary retention between the two groups after the intervention

Table IV further demonstrated that the students' grammar retention differed between the two groups following the intervention. After eight weeks of intervention, both groups' post-test averages had significantly improved ( $M_{post}= 6.65$  for the control group, experimental  $M_{post}=7.36$  for the experimental group).

In conclusion, after eight weeks, there was an improvement in grammar retention between the control and experimental groups' pretest/posttest. The results revealed that there was significant difference in grammar retention between the two groups following the intervention. This fact leads to the conclusion that students who use TBLT in their learning were able to retain terminology over time.

## V. 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 results may be discussed using TBLT's highlighting tools. First and foremost, students' anxiety levels are extremely low in TBLT since the classroom is a stress-free setting; hence, the first and most crucial requirement for students' success is met.

The lessons are made up of TBLT tasks. The activities constitute the foundation of the teaching approach, and it is widely assumed that students do not need to focus on how to use the language but rather on completing the assignment. The main issue is to express the message in order to complete the work, not to utilize the language correctly. While attempting to complete the assignment, the students acquire confidence in their capacity to communicate in English as a result of this study. When compared to traditional approaches, students' confidence in themselves and an enjoyable classroom setting make the learning process more successful than any other teaching method.

Regarding the use of TBLT as an appropriate approach for language acquisition, the findings of this study confirm Nemat Tabrizi (2011), who discovered the favorable impacts of task-based strategies on the growth of EFL learners' speaking competency. Also, Zhang and Hung (2012) concluded that using task-based instruction in large-sized classes in China for college students' learning attainments, motivation, and attitudes,



as well as their oral English performance, leads to learning development, which is consistent with the findings of this study, which both confirm the positive effect of TBLT on grammar development.

The findings of this study are also consistent with the findings of Rezaeyan (2014), who evaluated the influence of task-based language education on the academic accomplishment of Iranian EFL female students at Yasuj High School. Data research demonstrated that implementing task-based teaching can have a considerable impact on students' academic progress in high school.

## V. CONCLUSION

This research report looked into the function of Task Based Language Teaching in grammar instruction. It was a research from the perspective of the instructors, including theoretical background. The findings of this study suggest that teaching grammar using the Task-Based paradigm is better to standard grammar training.

Based on the findings of the research, this study might give the following insights and ideas to EFL learners and teachers. Researchers interested in the fields of grammar learning techniques should consider the implications offered in this paper. Based on the findings, it is proposed that some time in grammar classes be allocated to using various forms of task-based exercises. In reality, participants should be given enough chance in the classroom to follow the pre-task, task cycle, and language focus stages of the task-based method.

This study, hopefully, will raise the attention of material designers to the inclusion of unique task-based activities sections in grammar resources. By offering more opportunities in the books for undertaking various types of task-based activities, there may be more acceleration in the grammar process as well as inspiring students to be active in the interactions to be more accurate learners. Furthermore, by assigning linguistic assignments to students, a wealth of information may be gleaned. The study's findings give useful information regarding students' grammar learning and how to improve it. The findings might help task designers and teachers better comprehend the TBLT.

## About the Authors

**Lam Ky Nhan** earned his M.A in English Education from Can Tho University in 2021. He is a lecturer of general English and English for specific purposes at Nam Can Tho University, Vietnam, currently pursuing his Ph.D's, with anticipated graduation in 2026. His teaching interests include teaching grammar and academic writing, teacher and learner motivation, testing and assessment.

## References

- [1] Baleghizadeh, s. & Ghobadi, s.(2012). "The effect of teaching grammar through the task-supported structural model on efl learners". *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education Articles* Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/633>
- [2] Branden, K. (2006). (Ed.). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Büyükkarçı, K. (2009). A critical analysis of task-based learning. *KastamonuEğitimDergisi*, 17(1), 313-320.
- [4] Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Ellis, R. (2009). Task-Based Language Teaching: Sorting out the Misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 221-246. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- [6] 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
- [7] Hu, R. (2013). Task Based Language Teaching: Responses from Chinese Teachers of English. *TESL-EJ*, 16, 1-21.

- 
- [8] Huang, J. (2010). Grammar instruction for adult English language learners: A task-based learning framework. *Journal of Education*, (39), 29-37.
- [9] Ishikawa, T. (2006). The Effect of Task Complexity and Language Proficiency on Task Based Language Performance. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 3, 193-225.
- [10] Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Beverly Hills, CA: Laredo Publishing Company.
- [11] Long, M., & G. Crookes (1993). Units of Analysis in Syllabus Design: The Case for Task. In G. Crookes, & S. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in Language Learning* (pp. 9-54). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [12] Mcnicoll, J., & Lee, J. H. (2011). Collaborative consciousness-raising tasks in EAL classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, Vol 10(4), p. 127-138.
- [13] Moumene, A. (2010). Grammar tasks and the learning of English as a foreign language: A casestudy. Constantine: Mentouri University.
- [14] Nemat Tabrizi, A. R. (2011). The effect of using task-based activities on speaking proficiency of EFL learners, *The Third Asian Conference on Education 2011 Official Osaka, Japan Proceeding*. 334-345.
- [15] Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
- [16] Peterson, J. A. (1997). Grammar Consciousness Raising Tasks. *Unpublished MA Assignment*. University of Reading: England.
- [17] Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [18] Rezaeyan, M. (2014). On the impact of task-based teaching on academic achievement of Iranian EFL learners (case study: female high school students in Yasuj). *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World (IJLLALW)*, 7 (3), 476-493.
- [19] 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.
- [20] 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.
- [21] Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing Task-Based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [22] 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.
- [23] Zhang, X., & Hung, S-C. (2012). A case study of exploring viability of task-based instruction on college English teaching in big-sized class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(4), 693-699.
- [24] Zhu, X. (2007). Integrating task-based teaching approach into grammar teaching. *Sino- US English Teaching*, 4, 50-53.