

# Task-Based Language Teaching

*David Nunan*

University of Hong Kong



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© Cambridge University Press 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without the  
written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*Typeface* 9/11pt Sabon *System* QuarkXPress™

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

ISBN 0 521 84017 1 hardback

ISBN 0 521 54947 7 paperback

# Contents

**Acknowledgements** xi

**Introduction** xiii

## **Chapter 1 What is task-based language teaching?**

Introduction and overview	1
Defining 'task'	1
Broader curricular consideration	4
Communicative language teaching	6
Alternative approaches to syllabus design	10
Experiential learning	12
Policy and practice	13
The role of the learner	14
Conclusion	16
References	16

## **Chapter 2 A framework for task-based language teaching**

Introduction and overview	19
A framework for task-based language teaching	19
Syllabus design considerations	25
Developing units of work	31
Seven principles for task-based language teaching	35
Conclusion	38
References	38

## **Chapter 3 Task components**

Introduction and overview	40
Goals	41
Input	47
Procedures	52
Task types	56
Teacher and learner roles	64
Settings	70
Conclusion	73
References	73

<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>An empirical basis for task-based language teaching</b>	
	Introduction and overview	76
	Early psycholinguistic models	76
	Interaction, output and the negotiation of meaning	79
	Task difficulty	85
	Conclusion	90
	References	91
<b>Chapter 5</b>	<b>Focus on form in task-based language teaching</b>	
	Introduction and overview	93
	Theoretical and empirical issues	93
	Focused versus unfocused tasks	94
	Consciousness-raising tasks	98
	Procedural language	100
	The place of a focus on form in an instructional sequence	101
	Focus on form in the communicative classroom	103
	Conclusion	111
	References	112
<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>Grading, sequencing and integrating tasks</b>	
	Introduction and overview	113
	Grading input	114
	Learner factors	118
	Procedural factors	122
	Task continuity	125
	Within-task sequencing: the information gap	128
	Topic-based / theme-based instruction	131
	Content-based instruction	131
	Project-based instruction	133
	Conclusion	135
	References	136
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Assessing task-based language teaching</b>	
	Introduction and overview	138
	Key concepts in assessment	138
	The purposes of assessment	147
	Self-assessment	149
	Techniques for collecting assessment data	153
	Criteria for assessing learner performance	161
	Conclusion	164
	References	164

<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>Tasks and teacher development</b>	
	Introduction and overview	166
	The self-directed teacher	166
	An in-service workshop	168
	Evaluating tasks	173
	Creating tasks	175
	Conclusion	177
	Postscript	177
	References	179
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Approaches and methods – an overview</b>	181
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>A unit of work based on the six-step procedure presented in Chapter 2</b>	187
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>A unit of work based on the task/exercise typology in Chapter 5</b>	195
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Graded activities for the four macroskills</b>	202
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>Common reference levels: self-assessment grid</b>	210
<b>Glossary</b>		212
<b>Index</b>		218

# 1 What is task-based language teaching?

## Introduction and overview

The concept of ‘task’ has become an important element in syllabus design, classroom teaching and learner assessment. It underpins several significant research agendas, and it has influenced educational policy-making in both ESL and EFL settings.

Pedagogically, task-based language teaching has strengthened the following principles and practices:

- A needs-based approach to content selection.
- 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 on language but also on the learning process itself.
- An enhancement of the learner’s own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
- The linking of classroom language learning with language use outside the classroom.

In this chapter, I will map out the terrain for the rest of the book. I will firstly define ‘task’ and illustrate the ways in which it will be used. I will then relate it to communicative language teaching and set it within a broader curriculum framework, as well as spelling out the assumptions about pedagogy drawn on by the concept. In the final part of the chapter I will look at the impact of the concept on the learner, on one hand, and on institutional policy and practice on the other.

## Defining ‘task’

Before doing anything else, I need to define the central concept behind this book. In doing so, I will draw a basic distinction between what I will call real-world or target tasks, and pedagogical tasks: target tasks, as the name implies, refer to uses of language in the world beyond the classroom; pedagogical tasks are those that occur in the classroom.

## *What is task-based language teaching?*

Long (1985: 89) frames his approach to task-based language teaching in terms of target tasks, arguing 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.

The first thing to notice about this definition is that it is non-technical and non-linguistic. It describes the sorts of things that the person in the street would say if asked what they were doing. (In the same way as learners, if asked why they are attending a Spanish course, are more likely to say, 'So I can make hotel reservations and buy food when I'm in Mexico,' than 'So I can master the subjunctive.')

Related to this is the notion that, in contrast with most classroom language exercises, tasks have a non-linguistic outcome. Non-linguistic outcomes from Long's list above might include a painted fence, possession – however temporary – of a book, a driver's licence, a room in a hotel, etc. Another thing to notice is that some of the examples provided may not involve language use at all (it is possible to paint a fence without talking). Finally, individual tasks may be part of a larger sequence of tasks; for example the task of weighing a patient may be a sub-component of the task 'giving a medical examination'.

When they are transformed from the real world to the classroom, tasks become pedagogical in nature. Here is a definition of a pedagogical task:

. . . an activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e. as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and performing a command may be referred to as tasks. Tasks may or may not involve the production of language. A task usually requires the teacher to specify what will be regarded as successful completion of the task. The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language teaching more communicative . . . since it provides a purpose for a classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

(Richards, *et al.* 1986: 289)

In this definition, we can see that the authors take a pedagogical perspective. Tasks are defined in terms of what the learners will do in class rather

than in the world outside the classroom. They also emphasize the importance of having a non-linguistic outcome.

Breen (1987: 23) offers another definition of a pedagogical task:

. . . any structured language learning endeavour which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. 'Task' is therefore assumed to refer to a range of workplans which have the overall purposes of facilitating language learning – from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision-making.

This definition is very broad, implying as it does that just about anything the learner does in the classroom qualifies as a task. It could, in fact, be used to justify any procedure at all as 'task-based' and, as such, is not particularly helpful. More circumscribed is the following from Willis (1996), cited in Willis and Willis (2001): a classroom undertaking ' . . . where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome'. Here the notion of meaning is subsumed in 'outcome'. Language in a communicative task is seen as bringing about an outcome through the exchange of meanings. (p. 173).

Skehan (1998), drawing on a number of other writers, puts forward five key characteristics of a task:

- meaning is primary
- learners are not given other people's meaning to regurgitate
- there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities
- task completion has some priority
- the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome.

(See also Bygate, Skehan and Swain 2001, who argue that the way we define a task will depend to a certain extent on the purposes to which the task is used.)

Finally, Ellis (2003: 16) defines a pedagogical task in the following way:

A task is a workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect,



## *What is task-based language teaching?*

to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills and also various cognitive processes.

My own definition is 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. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, a middle and an end.

While these definitions vary somewhat, they all emphasize the fact that pedagogical tasks involve communicative language use in which the user's attention is focused on meaning rather than grammatical form. This does not mean that form is not important. My own definition refers to the deployment of grammatical knowledge to express meaning, highlighting the fact that meaning and form are highly interrelated, and that grammar exists to enable the language user to express different communicative meanings. However, as Willis and Willis (2001) point out, tasks differ from grammatical exercises in that learners are free to use a range of language structures to achieve task outcomes – the forms are not specified in advance.

### **Reflect**

Drawing on the above discussion, come up with your own definition of a pedagogical 'task'.

In the rest of the book, when I use the term 'task' I will be referring, in general, to pedagogical tasks. When the term refers specifically to target or real-world tasks, this will be indicated.

## **Broader curricular consideration**

'Curriculum' is a large and complex concept, and the term itself is used in a number of different ways. In some contexts, it is used to refer to a particular program of study, as in 'the science curriculum' or 'the mathematics curriculum'. In other contexts, it is synonymous with 'syllabus'. Over fifty years ago, Ralph Tyler, the 'father' of modern curriculum study, proposed a 'rational' curriculum model that is developed by firstly identifying goals and objectives (syllabus), then listing, organizing and grading learning experiences (methodology), and finally finding means

for determining whether the goals and objectives have been achieved (assessment and evaluation) (Tyler 1949). I have placed ‘rational’ in quotation marks because Tyler’s approach is not necessarily more rational than previous curricular proposals. However, it was a clever rhetorical ploy because critics of the model could be accused of ‘irrationality’.

Another perspective was presented in the mid-1970s by Lawrence Stenhouse who argued that at the very minimum a curriculum should offer the following:

*A. In planning*

1. Principles for the selection of content – what is to be learned and taught.
2. Principles for the development of a teaching strategy – how it is to be learned and taught.
3. Principles for the making of decisions about sequence.
4. Principles on which to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of individual students and differentiate the general principles 1, 2 and 3 above to meet individual cases.

*B. In empirical study*

1. Principles on which to study and evaluate the progress of students.
2. Principles on which to study and evaluate the progress of teachers.
3. Guidance as to the feasibility of implementing the curriculum in varying school contexts, pupil contexts, environments and peer-group situations.
4. Information about the variability of effects in differing contexts and on different pupils and an understanding of the causes of the variations.

*C. In relation to justification*

A formulation of the intention or aim of the curriculum which is accessible to critical scrutiny.

(Stenhouse 1975: 5)

Stenhouse’s perspective provided a refreshing antidote to the rather mechanistic ‘rational’ curriculum model because it emphasized process as well as product, elevated the teacher as an important agent of curriculum development and change, and highlighted the importance of seeing the curriculum in action. The focus on process and action make it an interesting model for those interested in task-based curriculum proposals. (I should note parenthetically that even though his model is comprehensive, it is by no means exhaustive. It says little, for example, about curriculum management and monitoring.)

## *What is task-based language teaching?*

My own approach to curriculum has been strongly influenced by Stenhouse. I draw a distinction between the curriculum as plan, the curriculum as action, and the curriculum as outcome. The curriculum as plan refers to the processes and products that are drawn up prior to the instructional process. These will include plans and syllabuses, textbook, and other resources, as well as assessment instruments. The curriculum as action refers to the moment-by-moment realities of the classroom as the planned curriculum is enacted. The curriculum as outcome relates to what students actually learn as a result of the instructional process.

The curriculum as plan consists of three elements: syllabus design, which is concerned with selecting, sequencing and justifying content; methodology, which is concerned with selecting, sequencing and justifying learning experiences; and assessment/evaluation, which is concerned with the selection of assessment and evaluation instruments and procedures.

This tripartite division works well enough in traditional approaches to curriculum. However, after the emergence of communicative language teaching (CLT), the distinction between syllabus design and methodology becomes more difficult to sustain. At the initial design stage, one needs to specify both the content (the ends of learning) and the tasks and learning procedures (the means to those ends) in an integrated way. This suggests a broad approach to curriculum in which concurrent consideration is given to content, procedure, and evaluation. In the next chapter, I will set out a framework for doing this.

### **Reflect**

To what extent does the curriculum you currently use, or a curriculum with which you are familiar, contain the different dimensions described in this section? In terms of the dimensions, where are the gaps in your curriculum? What are the strengths?

## **Communicative language teaching**

Although it is not always immediately apparent, everything we do in the classroom is underpinned by beliefs about the nature of language, the nature of the learning process and the nature of the teaching act. These days it is generally accepted that language is more than a set of grammatical rules, with attendant sets of vocabulary, to be memorized. It is a dynamic resource for creating meaning. Learning is no longer seen

simply as a process of habit formation. Learners and the cognitive processes they engage in as they learn are seen as fundamentally important to the learning process. Additionally, in recent years, learning as a social process is increasingly emphasized, and sociocultural theories are beginning to be drawn on in addition to (or even in preference to) cognitive theories (see, for example, Lantolf 2000).

Another distinction that has existed in general philosophy and epistemology for many years is that between 'knowing that' and 'knowing how' (see, for example, Ryle 1949), that is, between knowing and being able to regurgitate sets of grammatical rules, and being able to deploy this grammatical knowledge to communicate effectively. In the days of audiolingualism 'knowing that' was eschewed in favour of 'knowing how'. However, now, the pursuit of both forms of knowledge are considered valid goals of language pedagogy. (This issue is taken up in greater depth in Chapter 5.)

These views underpin communicative language teaching. A great deal has been said and written about CLT in the last 30 years, and it is sometimes assumed that the approach is a unitary one, whereas in reality it consists of a family of approaches. And, as is the case with most families, not all members live harmoniously together all of the time. There are squabbles and disagreements, if not outright wars, from time to time. However, no one is willing to assert that they do not belong to the family.

The basic insight that language can be thought of as a tool for communication rather than as sets of phonological, grammatical and lexical items to be memorized led to the notion of developing different learning programs to reflect the different communicative needs of disparate groups of learners. No longer was it necessary to teach an item simply because it is 'there' in the language. A potential tourist to England should not have to take the same course as an air traffic controller in Singapore or a Columbian engineer preparing for graduate study in the United States. This insight led to the emergence of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) as an important subcomponent of language teaching, with its own approaches to curriculum development, materials design, pedagogy, testing and research.

The CLT view of language as action, was nicely captured by Savignon (1993), one of the key architects of CLT, in a state-of-the-art survey article in which she wrote:

In Europe, during the 1970s, the language needs of a rapidly increasing group of immigrants and guest workers, and a rich British linguistic tradition that included social as well as linguistic context in description of language behavior, led to the Council of Europe development of a syllabus for learners based on

## *What is task-based language teaching?*

functional–notional concepts of language use and . . . a threshold level of language ability was described for each of the languages of Europe in terms of what learners should be able to *do* with the language (van Ek 1975). Functions were based on assessment of learner needs and specified the end result, the *product*, of an instructional program. The term *communicative* was used to describe programs that used a functional–notional syllabus based on needs assessment, and the language for specific purposes (LSP) movement was launched.

(Savignon 1993: 37)

While the ESP/LSP movement initially focused on the end *product* of instructional programs, CLT also forced a re-evaluation of learning *processes*. This created a dilemma for syllabus designers whose job it was to produce ordered lists of items graded according to difficulty, frequency or pedagogical convenience. With the emergence of CLT, these may no longer have been principally structural or lexical lists, but lists of functions and notions. However, lists they remained. Processes belonged to the domain of methodology. They were someone else's business. They could not be reduced to lists of items. For a time, it seemed, the syllabus designer was out of business.

One of the clearest articulations of this dilemma came from Breen. He suggested that the solution to the syllabus designer's dilemma and the resolution to the dichotomy between language product and learning process were to see them as one and the same. Rather than separating the destination and the route of language learning, they should be seen as indistinguishable. Pedagogy should:

. . . prioritize the route itself; a focusing upon the means towards the learning of a new language. Here the designer would give priority to the changing process of learning and the potential of the classroom – to the psychological and social resources applied to a new language by learners in the classroom context. . . . a greater concern with capacity for communication, with the activity of learning a language viewed as important as the language itself, and with a focus upon means rather than predetermined objectives, all indicate priority of process over content.

(Breen 1984: 52–3)

Breen is suggesting that when we place communication at the centre of the curriculum the goal of that curriculum (individuals who are capable of communicating in the target language) and the means (classroom procedures that develop this capability) begin to merge: learners learn to communicate by communicating. The ends and the means become one and the same.

Under this scenario, what happens to the product-oriented approach which emphasizes the listing of structures and the specifying of end-of-course objectives? Can a place be found for them in CLT? This issue is particularly crucial when considering the place of grammar. For some time after the rise of CLT, the status of grammar in the curriculum seemed rather uncertain. Some linguists maintained that an explicit focus on form was unnecessary, that the ability to use a second language ('knowing how') would develop automatically if learners focused on meaning in the process of completing tasks. (See, for example, Krashen 1981, 1982). In recent years, this view has come under challenge (Swain 1985, 1996; Doughty and Williams 1998), and there is now widespread acceptance that a focus on form has a place in the classroom. It is also accepted that grammar is an essential resource in making meaning (Halliday 1994; Hammond and Derewianka 2001). At present, debate centres on the extent to which a grammar syllabus should be embedded in the curriculum, some arguing that a focus on form should be an incidental activity in the communicative classroom (Long and Robinson 1998). These issues are taken up and elaborated on in Chapter 5.

Littlewood (1981) draws a distinction between a strong and a weak interpretation of CLT. The strong interpretation eschews a focus on form, while a weak interpretation acknowledges the need for such a focus. In making his case for a weak interpretation, Littlewood argues that the following skills need to be taken into consideration.

- The learner must attain as high a degree as possible of linguistic competence. That is, he must develop skill in manipulating the linguistic system, to the point where he can use it spontaneously and flexibly in order to express his intended message.
- The learner must distinguish between the forms he has mastered as part of his linguistic competence, and the communicative functions which they perform. In other words, items mastered as part of a linguistic system must also be understood as part of a communicative system.
- The learner must develop skills and strategies for using language to communicate meaning as effectively as possible in concrete situations. He must learn to use feedback to judge his success, and, if necessary, remedy failure by using different language.
- The learner must become aware of the social meaning of language forms. For many learners, this may not entail the ability to vary their own speech to suit different social circumstances, but rather the ability to use generally acceptable forms and avoid potentially offensive ones.

(Littlewood 1981: 6)

## *What is task-based language teaching?*

### **Reflect**

What do you see as the role of grammar in the communicative language curriculum? Do you think that an explicit focus on grammar should be part of the learning experience? If so, do you think that the selection and grading of linguistic elements (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation features, function, notions, etc.) should be carried out separately from the selection and sequencing of learning tasks?

My own position is that the curriculum needs to take account of both means and ends, and must, in consequence, incorporate both content and process. In the final analysis, it does not matter whether those responsible for specifying learning tasks are called ‘syllabus designers’ or ‘methodologists’. What matters is that both processes and outcomes are taken care of and that there is compatibility between them. Whatever the position taken, there is no doubt that the development of CLT has had a profound effect on both methodology and syllabus design, and has greatly enhanced the status of the concept of ‘task’ within the curriculum.

This last comment raises the question of the relationship between communicative language teaching and task-based language teaching. Are the terms synonymous? If so, why have two terms for the same notion? If not, wherein lies the difference? The answer is that CLT is a broad, philosophical approach to the language curriculum that draws on theory and research in linguistics, anthropology, psychology and sociology. (For a review of the theoretical and empirical roots of CLT, see Savignon 1993). Task-based language teaching represents a realization of this philosophy at the levels of syllabus design and methodology. Other realizations that could fairly claim to reside within the CLT family include content-based instruction (Brinton 2003), text-based syllabuses (Feez 1998), problem-based learning, and immersion education (Johnston and Swain 1997). It is also possible to find essentially grammar-based curricula that fit comfortably within the overarching philosophy of CLT. This is particularly true of curricula based on genre theory and systemic-functional linguistics (Burns 2001; Hammond and Derewianka 2001).

### **Alternative approaches to syllabus design**

In a seminal publication in 1976, David Wilkins suggested a basic distinction between what he called ‘synthetic’ approaches to syllabus design

and ‘analytical’ approaches. All syllabuses, he suggested, fitted one or other of these approaches.

In ‘synthetic’ approaches, ‘Different parts of the language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of parts until the whole structure of language has been built up’ (Wilkins 1976: 2). Such approaches represent the ‘traditional’ way of organizing the syllabus, and reflect the common-sense belief that the central role of instruction is to simplify the learning challenge for the student. One way to simplify learning is to break the content down into its constituent parts, and introduce each part separately and step by step.

A related concept that was popular in the 1960s was that of mastery learning. Having broken the subject matter down and sequenced it from easy to difficult, each item of content was introduced to the learner in a serial fashion, and a new item was not supposed to be introduced until the current item had been thoroughly mastered (thus the label ‘mastery learning’).

In the case of second language acquisition, however, it seemed that learners did not acquire one item perfectly one at a time. Rather they learned numerous items imperfectly, and often almost simultaneously. In addition, the learning was unstable. An item that appeared to have been acquired at one point in time seemed to have been ‘unlearned’ at a subsequent point in time (Ellis 1994).

Research into processes of second language acquisition would appear to offer support for the alternative offered by Wilkins to synthetic syllabuses. These are known as ‘analytical’ approaches because the learner is presented with holistic ‘chunks’ of language and is required to analyze them, or break them down into their constituent parts:

Prior analysis of the total language system into a set of discrete pieces of language that is a necessary precondition for the adoption of a synthetic approach is largely superfluous. . . . [Such approaches] are organized in terms of the purposes for which people are learning language and the kinds of language that are necessary to meet these purposes.

(Wilkins 1976: 13)

All syllabus proposals that do not depend on a prior analysis of the language belong to this second category. In addition to task-based syllabuses, we have project-based, content-based, thematic, and text-based syllabuses. Despite their differences, they all have one thing in common – they do not rely on prior analysis of the language into its discrete points.

Of course, one needs to exercise judgement when introducing learners to texts and tasks containing a wide range of language structures. This is particularly true in the early stages of the learning process.



## *What is task-based language teaching?*

### **Reflect**

Make a list of the pros and cons of analytic and synthetic approaches to syllabus design.

## **Experiential learning**

An important conceptual basis for task-based language teaching is experiential learning. This approach takes the learner's immediate personal experience as the point of departure for the learning experience. Intellectual growth occurs when learners engage in and reflect on sequences of tasks. The active involvement of the learner is therefore central to the approach, and a rubric that conveniently captures the active, experiential nature of the process is 'learning by doing'. In this, it contrasts with a 'transmission' approach to education in which the learner acquires knowledge passively from the teacher.

Experiential learning has diverse roots in a range of disciplines from social psychology, humanistic education, developmental education and cognitive theory. The person who pulled these diverse, though related, strands together was the psychologist David Kolb, who argued for an integration of action and reflection. In his model (Kolb 1984), learners move from what they already know and can do to the incorporation of new knowledge and skills. They do this by making sense of some immediate experience, and then going beyond the immediate experience through a process of reflection and transformation.

The most articulate application of experiential learning to language teaching is provided by Kohonen (1992). In many respects, his model can be seen as a theoretical blueprint for TBLT, as can be seen from the following list of precepts for action derived from his work.

- Encourage the transformation of knowledge within the learner rather than the transmission of knowledge from the teacher to the learner.
- Encourage learners to participate actively in small, collaborative groups (I see group and pair work as important, although I recognise that there are many contexts where class size makes pair and group work difficult).
- Embrace a holistic attitude towards subject matter rather than a static, atomistic and hierarchical attitude.
- Emphasize process rather than product, learning how to learn, self-inquiry, social and communication skills.
- Encourage self-directed rather than teacher-directed learning.
- Promote intrinsic rather than extrinsic motivation.

Kohonen highlights the fit between experiential learning and other key concepts introduced in this chapter, particularly those of learner-centredness and autonomy:

Experiential learning theory provides the basic philosophical view of learning as part of personal growth. The goal is to enable the learner to become increasingly self-directed and responsible for his or her own learning. This process means a gradual shift of the initiative to the learner, encouraging him or her to bring in personal contributions and experiences. Instead of the teacher setting the tasks and standards of acceptable performance, the learner is increasingly in charge of his or her own learning.

(Kohonen 1992: 37)

### **Reflect**

Select two or three of these principles and brainstorm ways of implementing them in the language classroom.

## **Policy and practice**

Fifteen years ago, task-based language teaching was still an innovation at the level of official policy and practice, although it was used as a central construct in a number of emerging research agendas (which are reviewed in Chapter 4). While there were several exciting proposals for pedagogy, few had actually been implemented.

If official documents are to be believed, TBLT has become a cornerstone of many educational institutions and ministries of education around the world. It seems to be the new orthodoxy with major publishers, most of whom claim at least one major series to be ‘task-based’. In a recent study into the impact of the emergence of English as a global language on policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific region, government informants in all seven of the countries surveyed claimed that task-based teaching was a central principle driving their English language curricula (Nunan 2002, 2003). The following quote from the Hong Kong Ministry of Education is typical of the kinds of governmental pronouncements being made:<sup>1</sup>

The task-based approach [upon which the curriculum is built] aims at providing opportunities for learners to experiment with

1 The quote refers to ‘task-based language learning’, but in this book I follow the conventional terminology of calling such an approach ‘task-based language teaching’.

## *What is task-based language teaching?*

and explore both spoken and written language through learning activities that are designed to engage learners in the authentic, practical and functional use of language for meaningful purposes. Learners are encouraged to activate and use whatever language they already have in the process of completing a task. The use of tasks will also give a clear and purposeful context for the teaching and learning of grammar and other language features as well as skills. . . . All in all, the role of task-based language learning is to stimulate a natural desire in learners to improve their language competence by challenging them to complete meaningful tasks.

(CDC 1999: 41)

Whether the rhetoric matches the reality is another matter. In a study published in 1987, I reported a large gap between the rhetoric and the reality in relation to CLT. Schools that claimed to be teaching according to principles of CLT were doing nothing of the sort (Nunan 1987). I suspect the same is true today of TBLT. When asked to describe what TBLT is and how it is realized in the classroom, many people are hard pressed to do so. There are two possible interpretations for this. On the one hand it may partly reflect the fact that, as with CLT, there are numerous interpretations and orientations to the concept. That multiple perspectives and applications have developed is not necessarily a bad thing; in fact, it is probably good that the concept has the power to speak to different people in different ways. On the other hand it may simply be a case of ‘old wine in new bottles’: schools embracing the new ‘orthodoxy’ in their public pronouncements, but adhering to traditional practices in the classroom.

### **Reflect**

If possible, obtain a copy of the curriculum guidelines from a ministry of education or official agency where you teach or where you are contemplating teaching. Does ‘task-based language teaching’ have a place in the curriculum? What is it?

## **Learner roles**

So far, we have looked at task-based teaching from the perspective of the curriculum developer and the teacher. In this final section of the chapter, I would like to look at the approach from the perspective of the learner.

Learner-centredness has been an influential concept in language pedagogy for many years, and, like TBLT, it has strong links with communicative language teaching. While the learner-centred curriculum will

contain similar elements to traditional curricula, a key difference is that information about learners and, where feasible, from learners will be built into all stages in the curriculum process, from initial planning, through implementation, to assessment and evaluation. Curriculum development becomes a collaborative effort between teachers and learners, since learners will be involved in decisions on content selection, methodology and evaluation (Nunan 1988). The philosophical reasons for adopting a learner-centred approach to instruction have been informed by research into learning styles and strategies (Willing 1988; Oxford 1990), as well as conceptual and empirical work in the area of learner autonomy (Benson 2002).

Breen – a frequent contributor to the literature on learner-centred teaching – has pointed out the advantages of linking learner-centredness with learning tasks. He draws attention to the frequent disparity between what the teacher intends as the outcome of a task, and what the learners actually derive from it. (We may parallel this with a similar disparity between what curriculum documents say ought to happen and what actually happens in the classroom. Learning outcomes will be influenced by learners' perceptions about what constitutes legitimate classroom activity. If the learners have been conditioned by years of instruction through a synthetic approach (see the section 'Alternative approaches to syllabus design'), they may question the legitimacy of a program based on an analytical view of language learning.

As Breen notes, outcomes will also be affected by learners' perceptions about what they should contribute to task completion, their views about the nature and demands of the task, and their definitions of the situation in which the task takes place. Additionally, we cannot know for certain how different learners are likely to carry out a task. We tend to assume that the way we look at a task will be the way learners look at it. However, there is evidence to suggest that, while we as teachers are focusing on one thing, learners are focusing on other things. We cannot be sure, then, that learners will not look for grammatical patterns when taking part in activities designed to focus them on meaning, and look for meaning in tasks designed to focus them on grammatical form.

One way of dealing with this tendency is to sensitize learners to their own learning processes by adding to the curriculum a learning strategies dimension. Eventually, it should be possible for learners to make choices about what to do and how to do it. This of course implies a major change in the roles assigned to learners and teachers. By using 'task' as a basic unit of learning, and by incorporating a focus on strategies, we open to the students the possibility of planning and monitoring their own learning, and begin to break down some of the traditional hierarchies. This is not to say that the teacher and learner will view the same task in the same