

Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching Approach in Pakistani University Classrooms

Kalsoon Jahan¹

Aleem Shakir²

¹*Government College University, Faisalabad – Pakistan*

²*Government College University, Faisalabad – Pakistan*

Abstract

This research involved the impact of the implementation of task-based language teaching (TBLT) in Pakistani university classrooms. The study analyzed the effects of TBLT on learning four basic English language skills: listening speaking, reading, and writing. A case study was designed to evaluate the effects of TBLT on learning language skills at the university level. Pre-test and post-test were conducted to analyze the differences between experimental and controlled groups of students. T-test and ANOVA were applied by using Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS) 2.0. to analyze the quantitative data. Integration of four language skills while conducting the tasks, excited the student interest, and resulted in better outcomes. Students improved their listening, reading, and writing skills more significantly as compared to speaking skills. The results were quite similar in both control and experimental groups with minor differences in speaking skills. The implementation of TBLT in language classrooms at the university level addressed the fundamental needs of the students and nurtured a conducive environment for learning language skills with understanding.

Keywords: *Approach, Evaluation, Implementation, Pedagogy, Task-based language teaching, TBLT*

Author's Email: kalsoonjahan1@gmail.com

Introduction

Language learning and acquisition have been always an area of interest for language teachers. Many types of research have been conducted to improve the language learning process. This paper is about the implementation of task-based language teaching for the

development of communicative skills in university classrooms because in recent years task-based language teaching has been explored in many countries all over the world. Ellis (2000) mentioned that mostly the studies involved the definitions and the stages of learning, and task types but there was little effort into its

practical implementation in classrooms. Skehan and Foster (1997) mentioned that research focused on its practicality at the school level. Still, its utility at the university level has been a challenge for teachers. Long (2014) mentioned that less work has been done on the practical implementation of TBLT in language classrooms. Stroud (2018) implemented TBLT in language classrooms at the university level and found very positive results in the Japanese context. So, it was realized to implement TBLT in the Pakistani context to give a change to language teaching and learning process in Pakistani university classrooms.

The Rationale of the Study

In the Pakistani context, most students enter in universities after getting 12 years of education based on grammar-focused English instructions. The main focus is given to reading and writing skills whereas listening and speaking skills have been highly ignored. So, it was realized the dire need of combining listening and speaking skills with reading and writing tasks, so that interest level could be enhanced and the learner could feel more confident. In this current research, task-based language teaching (TBLT) is implemented at the university level to teach language skills: listening,

speaking, reading, and writing with proper integration.

Research Objectives

The study's aims are to explore the application of a Task-based language teaching technique in university classrooms in Pakistan. The study is related to evaluating the impacts of TBLT in Pakistani University classrooms for the learning of four major English language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

Research Questions

The research questions of the study are:

1. What are the effects of using a task-based language teaching approach in developing listening skills in Pakistani university classrooms?
2. Does the task-based language teaching approach affect in promotion of speaking skills in Pakistani university classrooms?
3. What are the effects of using a task-based language teaching approach to foster reading skills in Pakistani university classrooms?
4. Does the task-based language teaching approach affect the development of writing skills in Pakistani university classrooms?

Literature Review

A task is a well-structured, meaning-focused real-world activity designed for spontaneous communication as per the needs of the learners, which a learner can do independently to fulfill the needs of communication. Breen (1989) gave the most comprehensive definition of “task” as “a structured plan for the provision of opportunities for the refinement of knowledge and capabilities entailed in a new language and its use during communication.” Nunan (1989) considered the task a meaning-focused activity, the learner was required to focus on meaning rather than form. secondly, a task does not define the exact meaning of content to be handled because this will be susceptible to change throughout execution. The language required to complete a task can be negotiated as the task is completed. Thirdly, a task should resemble a task related to the activities that people normally do in real life. Long (1985) defined “tasks” as “the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play and in between.” Nunan (1989) was the first to differentiate the concept of "real-world tasks" and "pedagogic tasks." So, every task that is

completed during classroom activities is counted as a pedagogic task, the main difference is the “situational” and “interactional” authenticity (Bachman & Palmer 1996). Nunan (1989) first time differentiated the "real-world tasks" and "pedagogic tasks." So, every task used in a classroom is a pedagogic task and the main difference is between situational and interactional authenticity.

The more severe issue is that tasks are holistic in nature, including a plethora of variables. It is hard to see how a task might be created merely on the basis of two of the numerous variables that make up Robinson's (2001; 2011) model resource-directing and resource-dispersing variables. The cognitive load of the tasks was impacted by task factors other than those included in the design of Sasayama's tests, according to Sasayama's (2016) research, the clusters of variables are involved in every activity in forecasting its complexity. However, there was no way to discuss it. The third issue is that the complexity of every job is determined not just by the task work plan's design, but also by how it is carried out. Robinson's task sequence takes this into account by including +/- planning time, which

is clearly an implementation variable. However, there can be other variables to enhance the level of difficulty of the” task” during the process of its implementation. For Example, the students can be assigned a task similar activity to perform.

There can be various variables to affect the level of difficulty in “task performance”. As Prabhu (1987) mentioned that students should complete similar tasks first. Aston (1982) focuses on brainstorming the relevant ideas for the assigned task. Skehan (1996) gives pressure to complete the task quickly. So, in order to determine the criteria for investigating the influence of task complexity, one or more implementation choices must be considered. The learners in Sasayama's research, for example, completed a "practice" task before beginning the series of four narrative assignments, and they were allowed three seconds to look at the image tales before beginning to narrate them. These implementation elements might have influenced the cognitive burden that the students felt while completing the activities. Would the cognitive burden of the various activities have been different if they had been given more planning time,

say? In fact, a task's intricacy is inextricably linked to how it is carried out. It is also worth considering whether the task's design characteristics or the settings under which It is done have the most influence on the task's complexity and cognitive load. Skehan (2016) makes this point rather clearly. While he does not deny that design elements can have an influence on performance, he finds that they do not provide consistency or robust generalities and that presumed manipulations of task difficulty may not in actuality yield various degrees of complexity and go on to say that research that looked at the effects of task circumstances, like pre-task preparation, had more solid results. Finally, creating a task-based syllabus necessitates task sequencing both vertically and horizontally. Vertical sequencing, according to Ellis (2019), refers to the order in which certain activities (or task categories) appear in the syllabus. If, as Long (2015) suggests, the goal activities for a given set of students, then judgments regarding organizing the tasks which are functionally valuable and practicable must be constructed. The sequence in a horizontal way refers to the development of several versions

of the same task that lead to a recreation of the task. So, the researcher has designed task-based activities depending on task complexity and their own experience and intuitions that constitute the proper sort and amount of challenge for the University learners.

Especially at the university level, students belong to different courses such as medicine, engineering, computer sciences, social sciences, and many others. Language teachers should completely recognize the degree program before they allow to teach the related students. This thesis is about TBLT and its implementation and evaluation to meet the needs of university students but first, it is better to know the meaning of “task-based”.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

It is not easy to find out the origin of TBLT. Long (2014) argues that it was presented in courses first time at the University of Pennsylvania and publicly introduced in a plenary talk at the Georgetown Round table in Washington. TBLT started with task-based need analysis, which could identify the needs of a particular learner. The concept of “Tasks” is related to the real-life

activities that people normally do to plan, conduct, and recall their day such as brushing their teeth, reading a newspaper, preparing breakfast, responding to an email making a sale call, etc. After some changes, these tasks are the basic elements of the task-based syllabus that undergoes a series of pedagogical tasks, and students and teachers could work on it in the instructional classroom environment. Fotos and Ellis (1991) mentioned that TBLT is an analytical approach. Some commercially published pedagogic textbooks labeled exercises and activities as tasks that were linked to activities beyond the educational institution. This task has been considered fake tasks which are used to teach the structures of language in traditional grammar, notional-functional and skill-based linguistically simplified material which has been considered as form-focused tasks. On the other hand, using an interview provides an opportunity for the learner to practice questioning form. Ellis (2003) advocated conscience-raising tasks or focused tasks. Ellis (2003) is also referred to as task-supported in distinction from task-based. It has been also observed that the “focused tasks” can be used for the final

production stage of “traditional practice”, and produced by the overt and covert grammatical syllabus. Shehadeh (2005) bridged between outdated syllabi and real task-based approaches, but still, it was pending to denote something different and opposed to the real meaning of task-based. “Task-based” is dependable on the theory and research results reflecting the process of learning languages about progressive social progressive values. It must be accountable, relevant, must avoid the known problem, learner- centeredness and functional.

The task must be according to the needs of the students and their coursework. Crookes (1989) defined a “task” as “a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course or at work,” Skehan (1998) also stated task is a meaningful goal-oriented, and real-world activity and provides the criteria for evaluation. There are many examples of definitions of 'task' that we find in applied linguistic literature. Candlin (1987) defined a task as: “one of a set of differentiated, sequences, problem-posing activities involving learners and teachers in some joint selection from a range of

varied cognitive and communicative procedures applied to existing and new knowledge in the collective exploration and pursuance of foreseen or emergent goals within a social milieu”. Candlin (1987) and many others have characterized classroom tasks from task-supported approaches without analyzing the needs of the learners outside the classroom. Ellis (2003) considers “tasks” as the work plan that involves learners processing language pragmatically to achieve the outcomes. The appropriacy of these tasks could be evaluated as to whether it has propositional content. It needs basic attention to meaning by the use of linguistic properties and the “task design” may prompt to a selection of a specific form. A task intends the use of language in the real world through direct or indirect resemblance and should involve the learner in both productive and receptive skills along with the various cognitive process. Willis and Willis (2001) have also defined a task as an activity that involved the use of the target language by the learner to achieve communicative goals. Nunan (2004) provides more depth in view that classroom tasks engage learners in various activities like comprehension, interpretation, and interaction that

could help in producing the target language. The main emphasis should be given to conveying grammatical knowledge to interpret the meaning of the word. The learner should be involved in tasks that could be completed by themselves to perform the communicative act.

These definitions help in understanding the concept of 'Task', as Breen (1987) related it with problem-solving and decision-making are pedagogical tasks, sometimes, it is focused to deliver grammatical items, Ellis (2003) makes a difference between focused and unfocused tasks. Focused tasks work in two ways: stimulating communicative language use with unfocused tasks and the other is to target the predetermined feature of meaning-centered communication. This study defines a language task as “it is a classroom activity that involves the learner in the real-world task in comprehending, manipulating, producing and interacting the target language and where the focus should be on grammatical knowledge to express meaning rather than form. The independency of the tasks could also be used in problem-solving and decision-making in real communicative context”. Now the

question arises that how to identify, analyze and implement these tasks to enhance the process of language teaching and learning in language classrooms.

Task-Based Material

Task-based material should be relevant to students' needs, requirements, and motivation. It should also be close to real-world language use as much as possible according to psychological constraints. According to the definition, the material should be task-based and dynamic, not static. The use of genuine texts to impede the learning process can be better for advanced learners. Jawaid (2014) referred to the simple tasks for language learning such as the description of monitoring tasks, shopping at school, role play, painting, model making, and queue making. Ellis (2019) supported the simplified text, which helps incomprehension by the use of shorter sentences with restricted grammatical patterns and vocabulary. Elaborated texts also help in better comprehension similar to simplified texts boast the learning process without impeding acquisition. It improves comprehension through redundancy and transparency,

especially in spoken texts with a slower rate of delivery. Long (2014) suggests modified material in the early stage of learning, and for listening tasks elaborated texts are suitable. But these texts should not be used just as a static object task-based program they should be added as a natural component in doing tasks. Doughty and Long (2003) observed that elaborated input is always theoretically motivated and empirically supported according to the methodological principles of language teaching. Listening and reading materials that can be developed from political speeches to academic lectures can be formed in elaborated ones not simplified ones. Elaborated texts are also as good as simplified texts and better for language learning which is the basic concern of Language teaching courses. Language teaching materials need to be updated and rethought. Normally observed that materials are written locally and adapted by the teacher to use with his or her students. In such contexts, more materials are required especially field-related material is required. Mostly TBLT materials are delivered with face-to-face interactions but in some cases in blended learning

courses for a distance learning program, the computer can be a good choice.

Basic Principles of TBLT for Developing Tasks

Use Task, Not Text, as the Unit of Analysis

TBLT uses task analysis from need analysis through student evaluation. Long (2014) said that teachings are based on tasks. No hidden grammar curriculum. Text-based curricula fulfil analytical approach needs, and text is the living entity. Text-based courses teach content. They employ condensed texts and staged conversations. Texts document others' tasks. observing someone doing a task and reading about it have different learning benefits.

Promote Learning by Doing

The task should be selected as a unit of analysis as learning by doing. Long (2014) gave much more importance to interesting and relevant tasks to improve the communication need of the students are more likely to hold their attention than repetitively. "Through the eyes and hand to the brain" it is more reliable to transfer abilities to the world outside. Moreover, context-embedded learning is more understandable and

can be stored in long-term memory that a person can easily recall.

Elaborated Input

Elaborated input is more appropriate psychologically for both types of input, simplified or genuine. Long (2014) suggests that elaborated input enhances comprehensibility without artificiality and helps in retaining unknown linguistic items and the meaning to which learners are exposed. Input elaboration also helps teachers as it helps the learner in the teaching and learning process. Chaudron (1982) also supported the idea that elaborated input helps in the negotiation of the meaning.

Provide Rich Input

Providing rich input to language learners is another aspect. Rich input means that it must be relevant to the task and It is a matter of linguistic complexity that should be well elaborated as compared to simplified input at the level of quantity, quality, variety, genuineness, and relevance. Simplification deals with a synthetic approach that entails structural and lexical controlled exercises by publishers and commercial material. The same is relevant to the teacher's speech in focus on forms instructions. So, if small samples are seeded with

grammar input to the students, it will take learning in an artificial environment. Shintani, Li, and Ellis (2013) added that these production-based instructions are better to enhance production control for partially acquired features of the language. It is much better if they are prepared according to the context of the tasks. It means, the task must be relevant to the target discourse.

Encourage Inductive "Chunk" Learning

Materials published commercially have a trend to teach collocations through the focus on forms. Since it has been realized that repeated encounter is required to teach collocation. Webb, Newton, and Chang (2013) noticed that 8-10 exposures constitute a threshold, which enhances the learning process. Sometimes it requires more repetition with low-frequency words in the text. Long (2014) added that text related to background knowledge also affects the scores of pre-tests and post-tests. So, the choice of words in text and collocation matters a lot more than how it should be introduced and repeated in the text. Moreover, repeating a word or collocation in text in multiple ways can be more helpful in language learning.

Focus on Form

“Focus on the form” is a reactive use of a wide variety of pedagogic procedures to draw the attention of the learner towards a linguistic problem in context. The idea is not difficult as focusing on form involves the learners. They may also be attracted or directed to language form and its meaning that is connected with a sequence in communication. It can also be switched from meaning to form. It is reactive in the sense that it is a response to a difficulty such as: missing a vocabulary item, ending with a problematic verb, and so on.

Provide Negative Feedback

Tradition holds that "error correction" is the most prevalent aspect of language instruction. As a corrective to the problem, Krashen and Seliger (1975) advocated more positive evidence, not negative evidence. Long (2014) indicated that in certain circumstances, negative evidence is required, while in others, it is helpful. TBLT acknowledges the inevitability of mistakes and their beneficial function in language acquisition.

Respect Learner Syllabi and Developmental Process

The acquisition of language involves a fixed developmental and independent instructional sequence. These learning stages can never be skipped. TBLT takes into account the process of learning ability and teachability. The unnatural sequence of instructions cannot be imposed on the students. Long (2014) suggests that input should be roughly tuned to the learner's current processing ability so the learner could negotiate meaning during collaborative work. Teachers should not teach whatever they want, whatever they select, but should think about its beneficial effects. Instructions must be carefully designed according to the level of the students and their developmental process.

Promote Cooperative Collaborative Learning

Individual, pair, and small group tasks are typically offered before whole-class projects in TBLT, as opposed to their more typical use as a means of organizing classroom participation to optimize listening and speaking chances after public lockstep activities. For the benefits and drawbacks of a few of the numerous alternative configurations

for small group work at the level of pedagogical technique. Iddings, Jacobs, and McCafferty (2006); Jacobs (1998); Long (1977) The amount and quality of this work may be affected by the group's size, the manner in which information is dispersed when tasks are allocated, and the group's internal communication structure, among other variables. The research findings and advice on relevant topics in group projects involve network-based language instruction. (Fukuda, Komori, Zimmerman, Komatsu-Yonezawa, 2001; Warschauer & Kern, 2000). These instructions proved very helpful in developing tasks for the learning of language skills.

Individualize Instruction

TBLT is profoundly learner-centered in at least two major areas, unlike the majority of other techniques. First, the needs of the students decide the course material. Second, instruction is guided and mediated by universal developmental processes and the internal syllabus of the learner.

Individualizing learning and teaching is nothing new but a traditional one. Sawyer and Ranta (2001) also supported the tailored

instructions to individual differences in goal, motivation, interests, cognitive style, and exclusive learning strategies to enhance the learning process. Doughty (2013) finds that keeping in view the individual differences and accurate measurement of the individual variables specifically in language learning aptitude and short-term memory plays a vital role in language learning. In task-based language teaching and learning students also need individual instructions for the successful task-completion process.

Review of Past Research

Task-based modular have been very popular among ELT researchers. They have been trying to develop the most suitable framework for language teaching. Ellis (2019) introduced a modular language curriculum for using tasks. He made a case for the module where he used task-based and structure-based components. He considered different models to develop fluency first and then accuracy which is the primary principle of communicative language teaching. My research is also following these principles in developing tasks for language classrooms.

Most researchers applied task-based learning for beginners but a few have done this effort for university students. Stroud (2018) conducted a study on task-based learning in Japanese university students. It was an empirical study related to goal setting and feedback. He used surveys, and peer interviews with only ten teachers but here in my research, I selected 24 teachers for the interview to enhance the utility of the results. He also used interviews with 132 students. The difference with my research in methodology is prominent that my research is experimental and the experiment will deal with 120 university students.

East (2019) conducted semi-structured interviews to explore the understanding and enactment of task-based principles in their classrooms. They find out that teachers successfully implemented task-based principles in their classrooms, but theoretical, practical, and contextual constraints lemmatized the process of implementation. The current study was more comprehensive in the sense that it was practically implemented in live classrooms.

Methodology

The current research dealt with a quantitative approach to data

collection and data analysis. By doing so, the researcher intended to produce useful data and recommendations for teachers and researchers on the implementation of a task-based language teaching approach for the development of English language skills in Pakistani university classrooms. For quantitative data, pre-test and post-tests were conducted after planning, designing, and implementing the tasks in Lahore Garrison University classrooms.

Population

All students enrolled in Bs Programs at Lahore Garrison University were the population of the study. Approximately 5000 students are enrolled in Bs Programs at Lahore Garrison University.

Sample

Three departments were selected for purposive sampling: Bs Information technology, Bs. Computer sciences, Bs. Software Engineering for this case study. 40 students from each program from 2nd semester were randomly selected as a sample of the study. 20 students for the Experimental group and 20 for the control group. A total of 120 students were selected as the sample of the study. All these students were enrolled in the Communication and

Presentation skill course which was consisting of four basic language

skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Table 1

The description of the students for the case study

	Bs Information Technology		Bs Computer sciences		Bs Software engineering		
	E-group	C- Group	E-group	C- Group	E-group	C- Group	Total
No. St.	20	20	20	20	20	20	120
Level	2 nd Sem	2 nd Sem	2 nd Sem	2 nd Sem	2 nd Sem	2 nd Sem	
Age	18-24	18-24	18-24	18-24	18-24	18-24	
Total number of students							120

Procedure

To answer the first question of my study, the researcher designed and implemented a task-based language teaching approach that included all four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. All sections were divided into two groups (experimental and controlled groups) consisting of 20 students of the 2nd semester enrolled in the course “Communication and Presentation Skills”. Before the teaching phase, demographic information such as gender, educational background, age, and socio-economic background was also collected from students to check the effects of these factors on learning. The students were taught a “communication and presentation Skills” course for eight weeks. The teaching methodology was explained

to the students before its implementation. In this way, students became familiar with the process and consider the available estimated time for the completion of the task. In the first stage, all the requirements of the task, topics, goals, task procedure, and additional instructions to complete the activity were elaborated to the students. As the students got familiar with the task, goals, and instructions, students were provided with reading an article and watching videos or audio related to the topic which involved students in listening or reading activities. In the second stage, students were provided with a worksheet based on the previously watched video or audio or the article read by the students. In the third stage, the students were involved in group discussions on the work they had produced on the worksheet

concerning the input given to them. In the fourth stage, the students were asked to present, or practically produce the task assigned to them. In the end, students were given the chance to evaluate themselves and they also discussed with other students regarding their performance. The teacher assisted, and resolved their issues at the pre-task, during a task, and post-task stages.

Data Analysis

Pre- and post-test data were statistically analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.0. an independent sample T-test was used to examine Pre- and Post-test scores. ANOVA was used to assess the differences between the experimental and control groups' pre- and post-tests for language abilities.

Table 2

The effects of using a task-based language teaching approach in developing language skills.

Dependent Variables	Groups	N	M	SD	T	Sig
Pre-Test	Control	60	8.50	1.61035	-1.440	.206
Listening	Experimental	60	8.95	1.80794		
Post-Test	Control	60	12.75	1.62215	-8.072	.025
Listening	Experimental	60	14.93	1.32597		
Pre-Test	Control	60	9.71	1.36657	-8.315	.243
Speaking	Experimental	60	12.08	1.73001		
Post-Test	Control	60	13.70	1.41780	-4.822	.948
Speaking	Experimental	60	15.05	1.64085		
Pre-Test	Control	60	10.28	1.18023	-.979	.080
Reading	Experimental	60	10.51	1.42009		
Post-Test	Control	60	11.68	1.01667	-17.627	.047
Reading	Experimental	60	15.40	1.27824		
Pre-Test	Control	60	10.26	1.58239	-4.633	.380
Writing	Experimental	60	11.43	1.14042		
Post-Test	Control	60	13.73	1.32597	-5.060	.046
Writing	Experimental	60	15.18	1.78023		

A t-test on independent samples was done (Table 2) to compare the findings of the control and experimental groups to determine the differences in the student's English language learning progress. After treatment, a significant difference was observed between the controlled and experimental groups for learning listening skills ($t=-8.07$, $p=.025$). There was no significant difference in the results of the pre-test between the control and experimental groups for listening skills ($t=-1.44$, $p=.206$), and the students in both groups were at the same level of learning. The students in the experimental groups performed better than those in the control group, as the experimental group's mean score ($M=12.75$) was higher than the control group's mean score ($M=14.93$), reflecting the increase in listening abilities in both groups. The pupils were engaged in listening exercises and appreciated the linked audio and movies.

In terms of speaking abilities, there was no significant difference between the control and experimental groups on the speaking skills pre-test ($t=-8.31$, $p=.24$), indicating that the students in both the control and experimental groups were at the same

level. As the p-value was greater than 0.05, there was no significant difference between the control and experimental groups on the post-test for acquiring listening skills ($t=-4.82$, $p=.94$). Students in both experimental and control groups demonstrated improvement in speaking skills, but there was no difference based on treatment or teaching method, as the mean scores of the experimental group ($M=15.05$) were higher than the mean scores of the control group students ($M=13.70$), despite minor differences.

The fact that there was no significant difference in the results of the pre-test between the control and experimental groups ($t=-0.979$, $p=.08$) indicates that the reading skills of the students in both groups were equivalent. As the p-value was less than 0.05, the post-test revealed a statistically significant difference between the control and experimental groups in the acquisition of reading abilities ($t=-17.627$, $p=.04$). The students in the experimental groups performed better than those in the control group, as the experimental group's mean score ($M=11.68$) was higher than the control group's mean score ($M=15.4$), which demonstrated

the development in reading abilities in both groups.

There was no significant difference in the results of the pre-test between the control and experimental groups ($t=-4.63$, $p=.38$), indicating that the speaking abilities of the students in both groups were equivalent. As the p-value was more than 0.05, there was no significant difference between the control and

experimental groups on the post-test for acquiring listening skills ($t=-4.82$, $p=.04$). On post-tests, the mean scores of the experimental group ($M=13.73$) were higher than those of the control group ($M=15.18$). Students in the experimental groups performed better than those in the control group, demonstrating the efficacy of TBLT in university-level language classes.

Table 3

The differences in scores of pre-tests and post-test for using a task-based language teaching approach in developing language skills.

		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Listening skills	Between Groups	90.133	1	90.133	24.606	.000
	Within Groups	432.233	118	3.663		
	Total	522.367	119			
Speaking Skills	Between Groups	31.008	1	31.008	14.132	.000
	Within Groups	258.917	118	2.194		
	Total	289.925	119			
Reading Skills	Between Groups	364.008	1	364.008	223.036	.000
	Within Groups	192.583	118	1.632		
	Total	556.592	119			
Writing skills	Between Groups	2.408	1	2.408	.780	.379
	Within Groups	364.183	118	3.086		
	Total	366.592	119			

One-Way ANOVA was used to compare the differences between

pre-tests and post-tests of controlled and experimental groups in learning

listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Table 3 is showing highly significant differences in the results of listening ($F=24.606$, $Sig=.000$), speaking ($F=14.132$, $Sig=.000$), and reading skills ($F=223.036$, $Sig=.000$). According to this ANOVA, there was no significant difference in the learning of writing skills while comparing it with other language skills where highly significant differences were being observed.

Results and Discussions

Task-based language teaching approach produced significant results for listening, reading, and writing skills. On the contrary, speaking skills were improved in both cases of controlled and experimental groups. The scores of the pre-test and post-test were analyzed statistically by using a statistical package for social sciences (SPSS 2.0 version). The tasks for the language classrooms were designed very carefully as per the basic principles of TBLT. Students at the university level took much interest in real-life tasks such as

listening to audio and videos, solving puzzles, mock interviews, discussion sessions, etc. Listening tasks such as requiring learners to complete a similar task first (Prabhu 1987), requiring learners to listen to model performance of the task (Aston 1982), brainstorming ideas relevant to the task's topic (Skehan 1996), and applying pressure to complete the task quickly (Skehan 1996). (Yuan & Ellis 2003). The relevancy of the task was controlled by the researcher and students reflected their best in the classrooms. Speaking skills were also improved in both groups (control and experimental). On the other hand, impressive results were observed in the case of reading and writing skills. As Namaziandost et al. (2019) also conducted a comparative study to evaluate the effects of content-based language teaching and task-based language teaching with pre-intermediate learners. He found that both task-based language teaching and content-based language teaching methods both were effective in reading comprehension. Though the

students faced difficulty in understanding the task many times, the researcher assisted and explained the task to control the situation.

The differences between the pre-test and post-test were also highly significant between the groups and within the groups in the case of listening, speaking, and reading skills. On the contrary, no significant differences were observed in writing skills. The integration of all language skills to develop language tasks made the teaching and learning process more effective, fruitful, and enjoyable in language classrooms at the university level.

Conclusion

The research was conducted to Implement the Task-Based Language Teaching Approach in Pakistani University Classrooms. It was deduced that the task-based language teaching approach has been proven very effective in developing English language skills in university classrooms. Integration of four language skills while conducting the tasks, excited the student interest, and

resulted in better results. Students improved their listening, reading, and writing skills much more considerably as compared to speaking skills. The results were quite similar in both control and experimental groups with minor differences in speaking skills. Overall, the best outcomes were observed. Successful implementation addressed the fundamental needs of the students and nurtured a conducive environment for learning language skills with an understanding. It reshaped the language classroom to promote balanced development and reorient the major challenges in real-life tasks.

References

- Breen, M. P. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design Part II. *Language Teaching*, 20(3), 157-174.
- Candlin, C. (1987). Towards task-based language learning. *Language learning tasks*, 7, 5-22.
- Chaudron, C. (1982). Vocabulary elaboration in teachers' speech to L2 learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 170-180.

- Crookes, G. (1989). Planning and interlanguage variation. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 367-383.
- Doughty, C. J. (2013). Optimizing post-critical-period language learning. *Sensitive periods, language aptitude, and ultimate L2 attainment*, 153-175.
- Doughty, C. J., & Long, M. H. (2003). Optimal psycholinguistic environments for distance foreign language learning. *Language learning & technology*, 7(3), 50-80.
- East, M. (2019). Sustaining Innovation in School Modern Foreign Language Programs: Teachers' Reflections on Task-Based Language Teaching Three Years After Initial Teacher Education. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47(1), 105-115.
- Ellis, N. C. (2003). Constructions, chunking, and connectionism: The emergence of second language structure. *The handbook of second language acquisition*, 14, 63.
- Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 193-220.
- Ellis, R. (2019). Towards a modular language curriculum for using tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 454-475.
- Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL quarterly*, 25(4), 605-628.
- Fukuda, C., Komatsu-Yonezawa, S., Komori, S., & Zimmerman, E. (2001, March). A meta-analysis of a CMC project for L2 Japanese learners. In *Hawai'i Association of Language Teachers Conference*. Honolulu.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880000400302>
- Jacobs, B. (1988). Neurobiological differentiation of primary and secondary language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 303-337.
- Jawaid, A. (2014). *TESOL quality audit framework: Benchmarking for curriculum improvement*. Universiti Malaysia Sarawak.
- Krashen, S. D., & Seliger, H. W. (1975). The essential contributions of formal instruction in adult second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 173-183.
- Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based*

- language teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Long, M. H. (1977). Group work in the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language—problems and potential. *ELT Journal*, 31(4), 285-292.
- McCafferty, S.G., Jacobs, G.M., & DaSilva Iddings, A.-M. (2006). *Cooperative learning and second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, P. J. (2018). Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 1-7.
- Namazandost, E., Nasri, M., & Ahmadi, S. (2019). The comparative effect of content-based language teaching and task-based language teaching on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' reading skills. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(10), 1278-1286.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Sawyer, M., & Ranta, L. (2001). 1 1 Aptitude, individual differences, and instructional design. *Cognition and second language instruction*, 319.
- Shehadeh, A. (2005). Task-based language learning and teaching: Theories and applications. In *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching* (pp. 13-30). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Shintani, N., Li, S., & Ellis, R. (2013). Comprehension-based versus production-based grammar instruction: A meta-analysis of comparative studies. *Language learning*, 63(2), 296-329.
- Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language teaching research*, 1(3), 185-211.
- Stroud, R. (2018). *A task-based language teaching approach to group discussions in Japanese university classrooms: an empirical study of goal-setting and feedback* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham).
- Warschauer, M., & Kern, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Network-based language teaching: Concepts and practice*. Cambridge University Press.

- Webb, S., Newton, J., & Chang, A. (2013). Incidental learning of collocation. *Language learning*, 63(1), 91-120.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2001). Task-based language learning. In Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 173–179). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.