‘Task-as-Workplan’ and ‘Task-as-Process’: Reappraising the Role of the Teacher in Task Implementation

Mohammad Reza Anani Sarab
Shahid Beheshti University

Abstract
Task as a pedagogic and research tool has originally been used to elicit unscripted data to be used as evidence for interlanguage processes or as a basis for channelling the learners’ cognitive and linguistic resources to achieve desired learning outcomes. One of the central issues surrounding task-based instruction is the difference between what is planned as task pedagogic goals through manipulation of its design features and what ultimately emerges from the implementation process. The disparity has been attributed to the redefinition of the task by the learners to suit their learning goals (see Hosenfeld, 1976; Breen, 1989). Though this account can explain the gap from the learners’ perspective, it ignores the mediatory role of the teacher and his/her reinterpretation of the task to suit pedagogic goals which may not necessarily coincide with those of the task designer. This paper argues for a redefinition of the teacher’s role in task-based instruction using naturalistic data taken from a larger database of recorded and transcribed lessons. The paper concludes with the discussion of the implications of the suggested role redefinition for task-based syllabus design.

Key Words: Task-Based Language Teaching, Teacher role, Task, Interactive grammar task

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Introduction

The theoretical justifications of the use of task as a pedagogic device are originated from the main themes of communicative language teaching (see for example Widdowson, 1978, 1979; Brumfit and Johnson, 1979; Brumfit, 1984; Breen and Candlin, 1980) summarised as the shift of importance from method to the principles underlying the use of different classroom procedures, the explicit emphasis on authentic communication within classroom contexts and the shift of emphasis in measuring effectiveness from 'usage' to appropriate use in communicative contexts (Bygate, Skehan and Swain, 2001, p. 2). The major challenge to CLT practise has been the way the above themes can be operationalized. Task as a candidate potentially capable of meeting this challenge has been the subject of experimentation (see Prabhu, 1987 for a report of the implementation of a task-based syllabus in India) and extensive research over the last two decades (see for example Bygate, Skehan and Swain 2001; Van den Branden, 2006). The extensive use of task has so far faced hurdles which are basically derived from the issues surrounding its design and implementation. The major issues are: first, the incompatibility of the divergent learners' performance in the process of carrying out tasks and the goal of pedagogy to engineer systematic changes in learners' behaviour through leading the learning process in pre-specified directions; second, the absence of a clear specification of what learners are supposed to learn from a task (Kumaravadivelu, 1993) and third, the way a task can be fitted into the teaching cycle (Ellis, 2003). These issues have implications for the theory and practice of task-based language teaching. For example, the first issue implies the search for ways through which task design features can be manipulated to channel the learner' cognitive processes in pre-specified manners. This in turn implies the quest for the redefinition of the teacher's role in task-based instruction. The argument put forward in this paper is concerned with this first issue and its implications, especially the specification of the teacher's role in the process of implementing tasks.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Background

Task as a research tool has to some extent been drawn out of its pedagogic context. That is why some of the factors influencing the use of task in classroom settings have not received due attention. There are very few references in the literature of the field to the role of the teacher as one of the influential factors operating in institutional contexts (examples are Samuda, 2001; Van Avermaet et al., 2006; Verhelst, 2006; Van den Braanden, 2006). This seems a little bit surprising if the meagre attention to the role of the teacher is seen in the context of the tension identified by Skehan (1996) between naturalistic learning processes intended to be initiated in task-based instruction and the systematic management of the learning process as the major goal of instruction.

In the traditional transmission-based pedagogy, the management of the learning process has been interpreted simply as the control which is supposed to be exercised in one way or another by the teacher in all phases of the teaching-learning process. However, controlling the teaching side of the equation in the hope that the other side would in effect be controlled for the better often leads to the generation of 'scripted performance' or 'regurgitation' of rehearsed input with the inevitable result of explicit form-focusing and lack of authenticity and meaning communication in context. As a reaction to this background, task-based instruction has received warm welcome as a remedy to the poor outcome of the transmission-oriented type of language education. Task has the potential to provide opportunities for unscripted interactive talk which at some points might involve the learners in meaning negotiation and ultimately function as a precursor to a restructuring change in their interlanguage system.

One factor which might affect the generation of unscripted interactive talk is the learners themselves who can redefine the task in ways which might be inconsistent with the task design features. For example, they might assume the role of learners instead of language users and as a result produce form-focused talk. The redefinition of the

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

task in this way by the learners reflects the phenomenon Breen (1989) refers to as the mismatch between 'task-as-workplan' and 'task-as-process'. Ellis (2003) makes a distinction between task outcomes and task pedagogic aims. In carrying out a task, the learners may achieve the non-linguistic outcome of the task but fail to go through the natural language processes which are considered as its pedagogic aims. As Ellis (ibid) argues, if we define task from the designer's perspective, the redefinition of the task and change of the process by the learners can be interpreted as 'task failure'; a feature which does not undermine the capacity of the task in generating unscripted talk.

The second factor might be the teacher and his/her mediating role between the learners and the task which can bring the task to its full potential or can stifle the learners' involvement with the task and minimize its potential. In this respect, as asserted by Verhelst (2006, p. 209), the syllabus by itself cannot provide the favourable conditions for the causal variables which are assumed to be at work in language learning. The causal variables which are underlined by first language research (see Wells, 1985) and second language learning research in the area of input and interaction (see Krashen, 1985; Long, 1983a, 1983b, 1985; Swain 1995; Doughty and Williams, 1998; Lyster and Ranta, 1997) are assumed to be rich input, the provision of sufficient opportunities for output and the provision of constructive feedback on the learners' comprehension of input and the production of output. These variables are assumed to work in a favourable condition conducive to rich interaction. In both creating the favourable conditions for interaction and mediating between the task and the learners' mental resources to comprehend input and make their output comprehensible to the audience through constructive feedback, the teacher role is undeniable.

How teachers play their role effectively in task-based lessons is still an open question. The evidence provided by the research done in the context of Flemish schools (see Van Avermaet et. al., 2006; Verhelst, 2006; Van den Branden, 2006) suggests that the success of teachers'

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

planned and unplanned interventions would very much depend on the extent to which they can motivate the learners, provide individualized support to them and can strike a balance between their own initiative and that of their learners. On the other hand, the pattern accompanied with low levels of success, as reported by Van Avermaet at al. (2006, p. 193-96), shows teachers as intruders whose interventions reduces the task potential and demotivate learners. Teachers as intruders, simplify tasks by introducing the new words themselves instead of embedding them in a meaningful discussion, asking closed questions and answering them pre-maturely, and raising the complexity of the task by overemphasising accuracy in functional speaking and writing.

Samuda's (2001) research on this issue provides evidence for the role of the teacher as 'leading from behind'. This role, as mentioned by Samuda (ibid), involves a meaning-form-meaning progression which is closer to natural language use. It is realised in practice through the three phases of task implementation process designed to expose the learners first to the task input data followed by operations on data and finally the presentation of task outcomes (p. 121). The progression from meaning to form and again to meaning involves the introduction of a semantic gap in the first phase which is then exploited by the teacher in the second and third phases to help learners first notice the gap and then in response to the need to fill the gap provide opportunities for attention to form-meaning relationships. The proactive role of the teacher in these types of tasks is realised in practice through the use of strategies which could provide opportunities for implicit and explicit focus on form depending on the phase of the lesson.

In spite of the leads provided in the literature about the role of the teacher in task-based lessons, we do not still know enough about their realisation in the context of different systems of education and especially about the type of language used by teachers for their realisation in classroom contexts. In response to this research need, the present study aims at exploring the way task design features are interpreted by teachers who perform their teaching duties under

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

different institutional arrangements. In specific, the question raised in this study deals with the interaction between task design features and their interpretation by teachers, that is the moderating effect that teachers' differential interpretations might have on the quality of discourse generated through task performance.

Method

The data used for the present study are taken from a larger database audio-recorded and transcribed over a period extending from July to October 2001 (for the detailed description of the data-base see Anani Sarab 2003). The participants were two teachers in two private language institutes in Tehran, here named A and B.

Teacher A was an experienced non-native speaker teacher, who had taught English as a foreign language for more than three years at different levels ranging from beginner to higher intermediate at the time the data were collected. He did not have a background in TEFL except taking part in short-term teacher training courses. He had majored in business and completed a post-graduate degree in business administration (M.B.A.). Before starting his career as an English teacher in Iran, he had resided in the United States for several years to study and work. He spoke the language with ease and fluency of a native speaker showing no signs of non-nativeness except in very few cases. The students were 20 male native speakers of Persian with the age range of 18 to 26. Teacher B had been teaching English as a foreign language at different levels again ranging from beginner to high intermediate for more than three years at the time of data collection. He had majored in English language and literature, and completed his MA in TEFL. He had also attended several short-term teacher training courses. The students were 20 male native speakers of Persian with the age range of 16 to 24. The students' level of English in both classes was described as lower intermediate by the teachers.

Both teachers used a task adapted from Riggenbach and Samuda (1997) (see Appendix A) with the linguistic theme of modals of

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

necessity, prohibition and permission and the topical theme of taking a trip to a foreign country. The task was intended to provide opportunities for consciousness-raising through implicit and explicit focus on the linguistic theme of the lesson. The sequential steps built in the task were supposed to lead the students through an initial stage of experiencing a need for the expression of certain meaning structures in this case 'obligation', 'prohibition', and ''permission' to the final stage of making a relationship between these conceptual categories and the formal features used to express them in oral interaction .

In the teacher's manual supplemented with the task (see Appendix B), two stages were suggested to the teachers in dealing with the task. First, they might set up the task describing the situation and checking the students' comprehension of the task input. It was recommended that a few warm-up questions precede setting the scene to focus attention and arouse curiosity and motivation. This stage could then be followed by the organisation of pair work and then a sum up of the students' pair work in the form of an oral report. Teachers were recommended to change the oral report into a discussion by asking the students to give their reasons for their decisions and then inviting the other students to express their views on the items under discussion. The writing part of the task was suggested to follow the discussion. Subsequent review of the table of modals could follow with instructions to the students to check their sentences in order to make sure that they had used the right structures.

Results

As can be inferred from the description of the task and based on the suggestions made to the teachers regarding task implementation, the instructors were supposed to assume a proactive role by priming the semantic gap in phases one and two followed by a focus on form-meaning relationships leading to the accurate use of modals in written production of what had already been expressed orally using alternative forms. To see how the task potential was used by the two teachers, a two-phase analysis was carried out. The first phase was intended to

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

provide an overview of the data using quantitative measures of questions types including dichotomies such as referential/display, content/form, and open/closed questions. These dichotomies are assumed to differentiate between a responsive learner-centred type of interaction and a tightly controlled teacher-centred one. The frequency count of the teachers' questions is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The percentage of teachers' question types

	T A	T B
Referential/Display	82%, 18%	2%, 98%
Content/form	82%, 18%	5%, 95%
Open/Closed	12%, 88%	0%, 100%

The percentages of pairs of question types indicate a clear-cut division for both teachers which suggest a transmission type of discourse for teacher B characterized by display, form-focused questions demanding one correct answer. This tendency implies touching the topics and relegating them prematurely which could lead to relatively shorter discourse. On the other hand, for teacher A, the high frequency of referential, content-based questions suggests a more genuine type of interaction which can lead to higher degrees of exhausting the potential of topics for generating interaction and as a result a tendency to producing longer stretches of discourse. Table 2 provides evidence that supports this inference.

Table 2
Overall distribution of teachers' and students' utterances

	T A	T B
Teacher's utterances	(913) 68%	(370) 82%
Students' utterances	(435) 32%	(80) 18%
Total	**(1348) 100%**	**(450) 100%**

The much longer stretch of discourse in T A's class compared with its shorter stretch in T B's class and the lower ratio of T A's talk compared with that of T B indicate a two-directional type of discourse

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

with more contributions on the part of the learners in T A's class and a one-directional type of discourse with much less learners' involvement in T B's class. This overall view was corroborated by the second phase of the analysis which focused on the following three categories:

- Creating favourable conditions for rich interaction
- making input comprehensible through interaction
- interactive assistance provided to learners for output production

Creating favourable conditions for rich interaction

The following two excerpts from the transcribed lessons of the two teachers show the way they introduced the task in the task planning phase.

Excerpt 1 (T B)

T:

1 you please

2 would you take the papers? (The student distributes the papers)

T:

3 if you didn't write this homework for the next class please, do it okay?

4 err close your books please okay?

5 take this

6 err there are two pieces of paper yes?

7 In front of you

8 at the beginning of this piece of paper you can see there is an opening task

9 yes?

10 The beginning of the steps

11 look at step one and see what is going to happen

12 a friend of yours from the UK, is planning a short vacation in Iran

13 UK United?

SS:

14 /kingdom/

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

T:

15 kingdom
16 as he is a UK citizen he will have to deal with
17 yes?
18 Manage immigration and customs
19 immigration?

As the extract shows, there is no introduction to the task in T B's lesson and the teacher's sudden plunge into the task deprives the students from any opportunity to find links between the task topic and content and their interests. Without such an opportunity, it is less likely that the students would set goals which could motivate them to get involved in performing the task with an 'achievement orientation' (Breen, 1987). The teacher's instruction to the students to close their books and shift to the handout might reflect a syllabus-oriented attitude toward classroom activities which considers whatever included in the syllabus as inherently interesting and motivating. This might account for the teacher's tendency to skip the warm up phase of the lesson. In contrast, the following excerpt from T A's lesson indicates a different approach to task introduction.

Excerpt 1 (T A)

S:

1. what's this?

T:

2. what's THAT?
3. if you kindly distribute, I would let you know in a second

SS:

4. /quiz/

T:

5. yes another quiz,

SS:

6. /oh/

T:

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

7. huh huh huh, but this one is a very PLEASANT one (The student distributes the papers)
8. all right, this is a task you're doing tonight,
9. something different
10. but before doing the task, let me ask you some questions
11. ah how many of you guys have friends abroad?
12. friends and or relatives leaving abroad?

The teacher's taking up the opportunity provided by the student's question to lighten up the atmosphere and his start of a warm up by asking the students to say whether they have family members and relatives abroad are more likely to create interest and enthusiasm among the students for task performance.

With these two different ways of approaching the task, there is an expectation that the students in the two classes should show different levels of involvement in the task performance phase. The evidence for this was sought through looking at the topic nomination by the students. In the transcript of T B's class, there was no instance of topic nomination by the students while in T A's class there were a few instances among which the following is a more illustrative example:

Excerpt 2 (T A)

T:

1. okay, do you need more time to work out the list

S:

2. about the gun in America
3. every person can buy any guns?

T:

4. aha! that- it takes- it takes me at least fifteen minutes to try to- to- describe the whole situation
5. it's not as: sim- it's not a yes no answer
6. so it dif- not aa: so far I can tell you it differs from state to state
7. different states have different laws

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

8. and then when it comes to the question whether you are a citizen or you aren't or you are a non-citizen, okay?
9. If you are a resident or you are a visitor

S:

10. did you buy a gun?

T:

11. I am a collector
12. I have sixteen pieces in my collection
13. I'm a gun collector myself

S:

14. gun?

T:

15. oh, yeah

S:

16. really gun collector!

T:

17. yeah

T:

18. yeah, but not here
19. aaa: hold on! hold on! not in Iran! No!

S:

20. you didn't kill someone?

T:

21. no sir, fortunately not huh

SS:

22. huh huh huh

T:

23. I did not kill anybody
24. err I have not killed anybody

S:

25. and animals?

T:

26. I used to haunt
27. I used to HAUNT but not anymore
28. when I was younger

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

S:

29. excuse me, what kind of guns are you interested in?

T:

30. ah oh! you're making- making- making the question- you know- hold on to your question
31. I'll answer it later
32. let us get to this part first
33. I'll answer your question later on
34. err all right(.) let's view that list you made
35. ah let's talk about the necessities first
36. what are the most important things you take with you?

The above episode starts with the teacher's calling the students' attention to the end of pair work time followed by a student's topic nomination. The teacher takes it up as time out from the task in hand. Though the topic is not related to the task, it might indicate the student's willingness to use the class time to generate more input on a topic of interest.

Making input comprehensible through interaction

Teachers can promote input comprehension through sensitivity to different levels of comprehension and providing individualised responses in which, according to Verhelst (2006, p. 210), they can make input comprehensible by relating it to task actions or the students' previous knowledge and experiences using different modalities. They can also do it through assuming different linguistic strategies like paraphrasing, rephrasing or topicalization.

In T B's lesson transcription, there are very few indications of comprehension sensitivity. In the following excerpt, almost all the words related to the task topic are defined by the teacher irrespective of the fact that some of the introduced words might be known to the students and that some of the students might have problems with the definitions provided by the teacher.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Excerpt 2 (T B)

T:

1. as he is a UK citizen he will have to deal with yes?
2. manage immigration and customs
3. immigration?
4. coming from one country to the other country
5. and live there forever
6. and customs?
7. an organisation to ask for taxes and money yes?
8. If you bring something into the country
9. when he enters Iran
10. so when he comes to Iran he has two problems
11. one problem is to go through the immigration office
12. and the other problem is to go through the?

SS:

13. /customs

T:

14. [customs office yes?
15. And he doesn't have much room
16. here room means space yes?
17. He doesn't have much space to pack a lot of things okay?
18. he cannot carry with him a lot of things
19. because he is planning to travel with just a bag pack
20. what did what does he have to travel with?
21. Just a?

SS:

22. /bag pack/

T:

23. bag pack
24. here are some of the things he's thinking of taking with him

The teacher does not invite the students to provide the definitions, and as the points of departure are not shared by the students, it is less

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

likely that the input would have become comprehensible to all. On the contrary, the following excerpt from T A's lesson shows sensitivity to the level and personalized responses.

Excerpt 3 (T A)

T

1. read- read the items
2. if you have questions ask me

S:

3. [hi:king] boots

T:

4. [heiking] boots

S:

5. [heiking] boots

T:

6. [heiking] when you go hiking like this
7. hiking boots

S:

8. mountain climbing

T:

9. for mountain climbing
10. not these- these are not for mountain climbing
11. but good for going to the mountains
12. mountain climbing is err one take more like a professional item

As the extract indicates, the teacher leaves the decision about unfamiliar items to the students, and provides definitions when an item is nominated as unfamiliar by a student/s. This strategy makes the information provided more useful, and as feedback from the students is available, it is more likely that individual problems in comprehension are addressed by the teacher.

Interactive assistance provided to learners for output production

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Teachers can assist learners to make their output comprehensible through eliciting elaborations using open-ended questions. Obviously, learners would be more willing to elaborate on their output if teachers behave like an interested supportive interlocutor. In the following excerpt, teacher B signals a problem in the student's answer which is then self-corrected. The teacher's subsequent turns show that he is passing over the student's answer to continue his own pedagogic talk

Excerpt 3 (T B)

T:

1. who knows what a surf board is?

S:

2. go on with this on the sea

T:

3. hum on the!

S:

4. waves

T:

5. [waves okay?
6. so what is the verb?
7. The verb is surf okay?
8. to surf means to move on the water yes?
9. usually wave yes?
10. wave of the sea
11. now for example go wind surfing
12. the sport is wind surfing
13. now, what is surf board?
14. surf board is a (.)is something like a panel
15. a board for surfing
16. there's something under the feet
17. yes under the feet of that person who is going to ride at the waves that is called surf board
18. on television you can see yes?
19. did you understand?

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Teacher B's tendency to only touch the students contributions on the surface and not eliciting any extensions or elaborations left the students unassisted to express fully what they had in mind. Teacher A's conversational style is more cooperative and supportive in the following excerpt which could be considered as a typical episode from this teacher's lesson.

Excerpt 4 (T A)

S:

1. once upon a time, when I was a child I lived in London for one year

T:

2. once upon a time
3. you are that old that it sounds like a story to you
4. once upon a time in- in London right?
5. good(.) and you were four years old?

S:

6. not four, but five, six

T:

7. do you remember anything from the trip?

S:

8. n: for example something that was interesting for me
9. I have seen in Iran that the birds scare you
10. but there, for example because of being child I was interested in that

T:

11. aha!

S:

12. that the birds comes near that err forget the name of the clock

T:

13. the Big Ben!

S:

14. yes, and they came and they sit on you

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

T:

15. [they come sit in your hand and you_feed them =

S:

16. [yes- yes

T:

17. = birds don't scare you
18. birds are not SCARED of people
19. yes you- that was strange to you
20. in here in our country birds run away
21. they are scared of people
22. there birds are not scared
23. all right, let me ask you the question
24. when you go back to the day of the trip can you- can you make a little time travel backwards?
25. err did you go alone or did you go:: with: family and friends?
26. the trip you made

The teacher succeeds in eliciting the details of what the student had in mind through showing interest in what he had to say and asking questions which assisted him to see what was needed for message understanding by the audience. It is interesting that the teacher deliberately delayed his reformulation of the student's erroneous sentence so as not to block his train of thought while trying to communicate his message.

The excerpts from the two lessons reported above show two different patterns of task realization with far-reaching consequences for the learners' thought process and ultimately for their learning. It seems that the different interpretations made by the two teachers of the aims of the task led to different approaches to task implementation.

Discussion

Based on the two phases of the data analysis, it can be concluded that the two teachers approached task implementation differently which might be an indication of two different ways of task interpretation.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Teacher A, consistent with the task design features, tried to enhance genuine interaction through which the learners could be involved in meaning expression. In contrast, teacher B's approach led to the transformation of the task into an exercise which stifled genuine interaction. This result suggests that what is intended by the designer of the task as the task pedagogic objectives are subject to reinterpretation by the teacher. The teachers in the present study interpreted differently the designer's intention in creating a semantic gap in the first step of task implementation to be followed by opportunities for form-meaning relationship in the subsequent steps. Teacher A seemed to have succeeded not only in accomplishing the pedagogic objective shared by all tasks, i.e. the production of unscripted data but also in achieving the pedagogic objective specific to the present task discussed above. It can be argued that the phenomenon referred to in the literature as the redefinition of task by the learners should be complemented by the idea of reinterpretation of task by teachers, especially when the task introduces new linguistic items to be added to the learners' interlanguage system. As argued by Ellis (2003) in relation to the redefinition of tasks by learners, the reinterpretation of tasks by teachers could reduce and simplify the task and change it into an exercise and as a result lead to task failure in achieving the intended pedagogic objectives. The teachers in cooperation with the learners were able to accomplish the outcome of the task, but the pedagogic objectives were probably not achieved in teacher B's class.

The reasons why teachers interpreted the task in different ways is beyond the scope of the current study. It is generally accepted that teacher's practice is affected by a number of factors among which we can refer to the institutional arrangements, the course approach and syllabus, the type of teaching-learning activities frequently used in the instructional setting and finally 'teacher cognition' (Woods, 1996). Based on the researcher's informal observations, as the two institutions were quite different in terms of the first three factors referred to above, one can speculate that they were at work in forming the teachers'

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

interpretation of the task. As for the fourth factor, nothing can be said since the teachers' perspective was not checked in this study.

The idea of task pedagogic objectives being subordinated to the teacher's interpretation implies the reappraisal of the teacher's role in task-based instruction. The role of the teacher as a controlling agent in all phases of traditional form-based instruction is in contrast with the 'standby' role of the teacher in task-based instruction. As mentioned by Stevick (1980, p. 20) the teacher's overuse or misuse of control may stifle learners' initiative. On the other hand, reducing teacher's control to a standby agent monitoring and observing the learners' performance and intervening when they experience difficulty might be counterproductive in the case of knowledge-constructing tasks. Samuda's (2001) suggested role for the teacher as an agent 'guiding from behind' to complement the function of the task design features provides a happy medium between the two extremes which might strike the optimum balance between Stevick's (1980) control and initiative referred to above. However, the results of this study suggest that the balance is subordinated to the teacher's interpretation of the task and his/her role in task implementation. The implication is that the teacher's complementary role is subject to a number of other factors which need to be considered in task design and implementation.

Due to the narrow scope of the study, the results cannot be considered as definitive. More rigorous studies need to be conducted to draw a more vivid picture of the nature of teacher role in task-based instruction and the way it might interact with other variables involved in instruction.

Received 10 January, 2008
Accepted 2 October, 2008

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

References

Anani Sarab, M. R. (2003). *Communication strategies in second language teacher talk with special reference to Iranian teachers of English.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Leeds. Leeds, WY.

Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Eds.), *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M. & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum for language teaching, *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 89-112.

Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, C. & Johnson, K. (Eds.). (1979). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bygate, M., Skehan, P. & Swain, M. (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.

Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching, *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (1), 39-60.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Hosenfeld, C. (1976). Learning about language: Discovering our students' strategies, *Foreign Language Annals*, 9, 117-29.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximizing learning potential in the communicative classroom, *ELT Journal*, 47 (1), 12-21.

Long, M. (1983a). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research, *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 359-82.

Long, M. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input, *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-41.

Long, M. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hylstenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 77-99). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Riggenbach, H. & Samuda, V. (1997). *Grammar Dimensions 2* (2nd edition). Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Skehan & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching and Testing*. Harlow: Longman.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction, *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 62.

Stevick, E. (1980). *Teaching Languages: a way and ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and Practice in Applied Linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-44). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Avermaet, P., Colpin, M., Van Gorp, K., Bogaert, N. & Van den Branden, K. (2006). The role of the teacher in task-based language teaching. In K. Van den Branden (Eds.), *Task-based Language Education: From Theory to Practice* (pp.175-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K. (2006). Training teachers: task-based as well? In K. Van den Branden (Eds.), *Task-based Language Education: From Theory to Practice* (pp.217-248). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Task-based Language Education: From Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verhelst, M. (2006). A box full of feeling: promoting infants' second language acquisition all day long. In K. Van den Branden (Eds.), *Task-based Language Education: From Theory to Practice* (pp. 197-216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Wells, G. (1985). *Language Development in the Pre-School Years.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (1979). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning*. Harlow: Longman.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Appendix A

Task

Step 1

A friend of yours from the UK is planning a short vacation in the Iran. As he is not an Iranian citizen, he will have to deal with Immigration and Customs when he enters Iran. He doesn't have much room to pack a lot of things because he's planning to travel with just a backpack. Here are some of the things he is thinking of taking with him:

a passport		a map of the Iran
an umbrella		
a surfboard	a laptop computer	hiking boots
fresh fruit	a credit card	
an international driving license		a tourist visa
books about the Iran	photographs of his/her hometown	
a return airline ticket	tapes and CDs	

Step2

Use the boxes below to help him organise the things he wants to take to Iran. Work with a partner and put them in the boxes where you think they belong.

1 It's necessary and obligatory: You can't enter the Iran without this: You must take this with you.
2 It's prohibited by law: You must not take this into Iran.
3 It's a good idea to bring this: You should take this with you.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

4 It's OK to bring this, but it isn't really necessary:
You don't have to take this.

Step 3

Can you and your partner add any other things to this list? Try to think of at least three more items and put them in the appropriate boxes.

Step 4

With your partner, write sentences about one or two items in each box, explaining why you think they belong there.

Modals of Necessity, Prohibition, and Permission

Examples	**Explanation**
a) You **must** have a passport. Or b) You **have to** have a passport. Or c) You **have got to** have a passport.	Use *must, have to,* or *have got to* to show something is necessary and obligatory (something that is strongly required, often by law).
d) You **must not (mustn't)** bring fresh fruit into Iran . e) You **cannot (can't)** bring fresh fruit.	Use *must not (mustn't)* or *cannot (can't)*to show something is prohibited and absolutely not permitted (often by law).
f) You **can** bring a surfboard.	Use *can* to show that something is permitted.
g) You **should** bring a credit card.	Use *should* to show something is a good idea.
h) You **don't have to** bring a surfboard.	Use *do not (don't) have to* to show something is permitted, but not necessary. You can do this if you you want to, but you are not required to.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

Look back at the sentences you wrote in Step 4. Did you use *must, have to, have got to, should, can, can't, mustn't,* and *don't have to*? If you did, check to see that you used them correctly. If you didn't use them, rewrite the sentences.
Example: He must have a valid passport- it is required by law.

Appendix B
Teacher's Manual
As the tasks are going to be used in different classes with different teachers, the following stages are suggested for the lesson to ensure the use of the same procedures in doing the tasks in different classes.

Setting up 1 (warm up)
This can be an introduction to the task telling the students what they are supposed to do, and checking whether they know the items they are going to classify or not. As a warm up, we can start this stage with some questions asking whether they have a friend in another country and whether they have ever travelled abroad. We can further ask them what they think they might need to take with them when they intend to travel abroad. The questions and answers, which are basically intended to focus the attention on the task topic, can then be followed by the instructions to the task itself. We can do this by reading the instructions and then checking the items in the box one by one. Then we can explain the four categories and ask the students to come into a decision in pairs about what they think should go in each box. The students should think of at least two more items to be added to each category.

Summing up 1
The summing up phase can be an oral report by the students. We can change the oral report into a discussion by asking the students to give their reasons and then inviting the other students to express their views on the items under discussion.

Setting up 2

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]

We can ask the students to work on step 4 writing sentences for at least 2 items in each box explaining why they think they should go there.
We can then review the table on page 3 and ask the students to turn back to the sentences they have written in step 4 correcting them in case they have not used the modals correctly.

Summing up 2

The summing up can be an oral report of the sentences they have corrected.

[Downloaded from system.khu.ac.ir on 2024-10-12]