

CUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE INFLUENCE OF TASK-BASED READING ACTIVITIES
ON EFL LEARNERS' ATTITUDE AND LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM THE
STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE

AYŞEGÜL DEMİR

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA, 2008

CUKUROVA UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

THE INFLUENCE OF TASK-BASED READING ACTIVITIES
ON EFL LEARNERS' ATTITUDE AND LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM THE
STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE

AYŞEGÜL DEMİR

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülten İLİN

MASTER OF ARTS

ADANA, 2008

To Cukurova University Institute of Social Sciences

We certify that this thesis is satisfactory for the award of the degree of M.A.

Supervisor : Assist. Prof. Dr. Glden İLİN

Member of Examining Committee : Assist. Prof. Dr. Rana YILDIRIM

Member of Examining Committee : Assist. Prof. Dr. Oğuz KUTLU

I certify that this thesis conforms to the formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences. .../.../2008

Prof. Dr. Nihat KÇKSAVAŞ
Director of Institute

PS: The uncited usage of reports, charts, figures, and photographs in this thesis, whether or original quoted from other sources, is subject to the Laws of Works of Art and Thought NO:5846.

Not: Bu tezde kullanılan zgn ve bařka kaynaktan yapılan bildiriřlerin, izelge, řekil ve fotoğrafların kaynak gsterilmeden kullanımı, 5846 Sayılı Fikir ve Sanat Eserler Kanunu'ndaki hkmlere tabidir.

ÖZET

GÖREV TEMELLİ OKUMA AKTİVİTELERİNİN İNGİLİZCEYİ YABANCI DİL OLARAK ÖĞRENEN ÖĞRENCİLERİN DAVRANIŞ VE ÖĞRENMELERİ ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

AYŞEGÜL DEMİR

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülден İLİN

Mayıs 2008, 107 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı görev temelli okuma aktivitelerinin Dicle Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi hazırlık sınıflarındaki İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin davranış ve öğrenmeleri üzerindeki etkisini incelemek. Araştırma için gerekli olan veriler görevler, geri bildirim formları, günlükler ve görüşmeler kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Görevlerin bir bölümü Rooney (1998)'den alınmıştır. Geri bildirim formları ve görevlerin geri kalanı araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanmıştır. Bunun yanı sıra yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme de araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanmıştır. Çalışmanın katılımcıları 25 kişilik 2 sınıftan oluşan orta öncesi düzeyde 50 öğrenciden oluşmuştur. Çalışmanın katılımcıları Dicle Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Uygulama ve Araştırma Merkezi hazırlık sınıfı öğrencileridir. Elde edilen bulgular, görev temelli öğretimin okuma sınıflarında yabancı dil öğrencilerinde okuma hevesi uyandırdığı, derslere aktif olarak katılımlarını sağladığı ve onların okuma sürecinde bireyselliğini koruyarak okuma dersinin öngördüğü dil hedeflerine ulaştıklarını göstermiştir. Aynı zamanda bu öğrenciler biliş ötesi ve bilişsel öğrenme taktikleri geliştirmeyi başarabilmişlerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Görev, Görev Temelli Öğretim, Okuma Görevleri, Öğrencilerin Tutumları, Öğrenme Sonuçları

ABSTRACT**THE INFLUENCE OF TASK-BASED READING ACTIVITIES ON EFL
LEARNERS' ATTITUDES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM THE
STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVE****AYŞEGÜL DEMİR****Master of Arts, English Language Teaching Department****Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülden İLİN****May 2008, 107 pages**

The purpose of this study was to examine the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learners' attitude toward reading classes and their learning outcomes as they perceive, in prep classes at Dicle University, Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre. The data were collected through tasks, feedback forms, diaries, and interviews. Some of tasks were taken from Rooney (1998). Both feedback forms and the rest of tasks were prepared by the researcher. Besides, semi-structured interview was prepared by the researcher too. The participants of the study consisted of totally 50 lower-intermediate level students in two classes of 25. The participants of the study were prep class students at Dicle University Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre. The data revealed that task based method in reading EFL class enabled FL learners to participate in reading tasks actively, and to be autonomous in the reading process and thus FL learners achieved what their reading class aimed. Also these learners managed to develop metacognitive and cognitive learning strategies throughout such learning method.

Key Words: Task, Task-based Instruction, Reading Tasks, Students' Attitudes, Learning Outcomes

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor Asst. Prof. Dr. Glden İLİN for her invaluable help, continuous support, and unceasing encouragement, without whose assistance, this thesis would not have been possible.

I also wish to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Rana YILDIRIM and Assist. Prof. Dr. Oğuz KUTLU not only for being in my examining committee but also for their encouragement, support and valuable comments on this study.

I owe special thanks to Prof. Dr. Tahir BALCI and Halime BALCI for their professional guidance and encouragement. In addition, they initiated me to start my academic career. They always found time for listening to my problems and advised me on my study and academic research.

I feel grateful to Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa BULUT, Director of Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre of Dicle University, for his understanding and support during my study and to Hamit SER for his tolerance, patience and organizing my class hours at my institution throughout the study. My thanks also go to my colleagues.

I would like to extend my sincere thanks to prep class students who participated in this study. With their invaluable contribution to my study, this research has been possible.

My greatest and sincere thanks also go to Dr. Yonca ÖZKAN, my dear friend for guiding and supporting me throughout the preparation of my thesis. I cannot thank to Dr. ÖZKAN enough for always listening to me, sharing the hardest times of me and for the things, which I cannot find any space to write now.

I would like to express my warm thanks to Suat BİLGİÇ, Aysun OTO, Fethiye ÇELİK and Kadri NAZLI for their invaluable friendship and endless support throughout the year.

Most of all, I wish to express my warm thanks to Dr. Ömer ULUÇAY without whose support I would never have been able to aspire for this level of education. Without his understanding and continuous support, I could have never completed this study.

Finally, I would like to thank to my dear mum Zeliha ÖZGER whose belief in education in my choices allowed me to move on during the hardest times of this

journey. Without her understanding and continuous support, I could have never been able to aspire for this level of education and completed this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ÖZET	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES	x

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Aim and Scope of the Study	2
1.4. Operational Definitions	2

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction.....	4
2.2. Definitions of ‘Task’	4
2.2.1. The Components of a Task	7
2.2.2. Variety of Tasks	8
2.3. Task-Based Language Teaching	13
2.3.1. Definition of task-based language teaching	13
2.3.2. General Principles and Characteristics of Task-Based Learning	14
2.4. Task-based Methodology Framework.....	15
2.4.1. Pre-task	15
2.4.2. Task Cycle.....	15
2.4.3. Language Focus.....	16
2.5. Focus on forms versus focus on form	17

2.6. Teacher Roles and Characteristics	18
2.7. Learner Roles and Characteristics.....	20
2.8. Advantages and Disadvantages of Task-Based Learning	21
2.9. The Difference between TBL and accepted PPP cycle	23
2.9.1. The problems with PPP.....	23
2.10. Research on Task-based Reading Activities.....	24
2.11. TBLT and Reading.....	28

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction.....	31
3.2. Research Design.....	31
3.3. Participants	33
3.4. Setting.....	33
3.5. Data Collection and Instruments.....	33
3.5.1. Tasks	34
3.5.2. Feedback forms	34
3.5.3. Students' Diaries	34
3.5.4. Semi-structured Interviews	35
3.6. Data Analysis	35
3.6.1. Analysis of Feedback Forms	35
3.6.2. Analysis of Students' Diaries	36
3.6.3. Analysis of Semi-structured Interview	36

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.1. Findings obtained from Students' Feedback Forms	38
4.2. Findings obtained from Students' Diaries	61
4.3. Findings obtained from Students' Semi-structured Interview	73

CHAPTER 5**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

5.1. Summary of the Study	78
5.2. Conclusion to Research Question I: “How do students respond to task-based reading activities?”	79
5.3. Conclusion to Research Question II: “Do students believe that they can improve their reading skills when taught through tasks?”	81
5.4. Implications	83
5.5. Limitations and Suggestions of the Study	84
REFERENCES	85
APPENDICES	95
CURRICULUM VITAE	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Task Varieties	8
Table 4.1.1: Students' response to the task "piano"	39
Table 4.1.2: Students' response to the task "the sound of music"	42
Table 4.1.3: Students' response to the task "smart movies"	44
Table 4.1.4: Students' response to the task "the daily grind"	45
Table 4.1.5: Students' response to the task "meeting and greeting customs"	47
Table 4.1.6: Students' response to the task "shop till you drop"	51
Table 4.1.7: Students' response to the task "amazing animals"	53
Table 4.1.8: Students' response to the task "your personality"	55
Table 4.1.9: Students' response to the task "dreams"	57
Table 4.1.10: Students' response to the task "potato salad"	59
Table 4.2.1: Students' response to the task "piano"	61
Table 4.2.2: Students' responses to the task "the sound of music"	62
Table 4.2.3: Students' response to the task "smart movies"	63
Table 4.2.4: Students' response to the task "the daily grind"	64
Table 4.2.5: Students' response to the task "meeting and greeting customs"	65
Table 4.2.6: Students' response to the task "shop till you drop"	66
Table 4.2.7: Students' response to the task "amazing animals"	68
Table 4.2.8: Students' response to the task "your personality"	69
Table 4.2.9: Students' response to the task "dreams"	70
Table 4.2.10: Students' response to the task "potato salad"	71
Table 4.3.1: Students' views on tasks used	73
Table 4.3.2: The extent to which the students learnt from task	74
Table 4.3.3: Views on the contribution of tasks to reading	75
Table 4.3.4: Task-Related Problems	76
Table 4.3.5: General Comments on Tasks	76

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures 1: Strategies Including Metacognitive Process.....	82
Figures 2: Strategies Including Cognitive Process	82

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	95
Appendix 2:	96
Appendix 3:	97
Appendix 4:	98
Appendix 5:	99
Appendix 6:	100
Appendix 7:	102
Appendix 8:	103
Appendix 9:	104
Appendix 10:	105
Appendix 11:	106
Appendix 12:	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

With the advent of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in the early 1980's and much emphasis on learners' communicative abilities over the last two decades, the term task-based language teaching (TBLT) came into prevalent use in the field of second language acquisition in terms of developing process-oriented syllabi and designing communicative tasks to promote learners' actual language use (Jeon and Hahn, 2006).

Task-based Instruction (TBI) based on the constructivist theory of learning and communicative language teaching methodology has evolved in response to some limitations of the traditional Presentation, Practice, Performance (PPP) approach. (Ellis, 2003; Long and Crookes, 1991).

Ellis (1999) on the other hand, points out that the theoretical base of task-based approach is 'Input and Interactionist Theory'. Yet, it is clear that the current interest in tasks stems largely from "the communicative approach" to language teaching (Cheng-jun, 2006).

Tasks are, as Ellis (2003) indicates, important components of the language learning environment, and "hold a central place" in the learning process. The type of tasks used in instruction may positively influence learners' performance.

In addition, it is important to find out learners' interests and to introduce them to books and other texts that relate directly to their interests. As Anderson (2006) argues, students generally do not like reading since they have never experienced the pleasure that comes from it:

"I have had some learners in my classes who told me that they did not like to read in their second language. They often qualified their statement by telling me that they didn't like to read in their first language either." (Anderson, 2006).

Similarly, anecdotal evidences obtained from the students in Dicle University suggest that reading is considered to be almost the most boring skill by the learners. For instance, the students did not give importance to the reading, they also did not attend the reading classes. In addition, they seemed they did not enjoy the reading classes. As

teachers, we feel the need to provide our students with various different methods and techniques to overcome reading related problems. Thus, using task in teaching reading skills seems to be a plausible solution to this problem.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Reading is generally thought to be very demanding for our prep students. There are various reasons for this difficulty. First of all, our students do not read in their first language, so they did not have any reading skill in their mother language. As a result it is really impossible to gain a reading skill in the target language.

Another difficulty may be the students may not like the method used in their reading class. They have found it very boring to read due to traditional methods such as read and answer comprehension questions.

Also when they read, they often use dictionary and they waste a lot of time during reading and they lose their concentration and motivation. A lot of dictionary use may interfere with them and they often stay out of meaning.

Regarding these problems this study aims to examine the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learners' attitude toward reading classes and their learning outcomes as they perceive, in prep classes at Dicle University Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre.

1.3. Aim and Scope of the Study

The aim of this study is to find out the influence of the task-based reading activities on the prep class EFL learners' attitude toward reading classes and learning outcomes. The following research questions constitute the basis of the study:

1. How do students respond to task-based reading activities?
2. How well do students believe that they improve their reading skill when taught through tasks?

1.4. Operational Definitions

Task-based Instruction: An approach in which communicative and meaningful tasks play central role in language learning and in which the process of using language appropriately carries more importance than the mere production of grammatically correct language forms (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 224).

Task: A task is an activity where the target language is used by the learner for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome (Willis, 1996, p. 23).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

Krashen (1982) claims that a second language is most successfully acquired when the conditions are similar to those present in first language acquisition that is, when the focus of instruction is on meaning rather than on form. Task-based language teaching can make language learning in classrooms “closer to the natural route and may reach a higher rate of language acquisition because it provides learners with a clear communicative goal, interaction is needed to reach the goal, and comprehensive input can occur, and then language acquisition is facilitated.” (Wang, 2006, p. 234).

For the past 20 years, task-based language teaching (TBLT) has attracted the worldwide attention of researchers, curriculum developers, teacher trainers and language teachers. The first person who has applied TBLT to teaching programs and practice is Prabhu (in Wang 2006 p. 10). It was in Bangalore of Southern India in 1979 when Prabhu began his bold experiments to put his theories into practice, which seemed radical at that time. Therefore, Prabhu is thought to be the originator of TBLT. Prabhu (1987) believes that students may learn more effectively when their minds are focused on the task, rather than on the language they are using.

On the other hand Richards and Rodgers (2001) add two more names as Beretta and Davies in 1985 and the Malaysian Communicational Syllabus which dates to 1975. Although these two early applications of task-based approach were “relatively short-lived”, they still received attention in the language teaching community (Richards and Rodgers, 2001, p. 223).

2.2. Definitions of ‘Task’

The notion of ‘task’ has the main role in TBLT and in order to construct task-based language instruction first of all, it is necessary to draw a proper definition of ‘task’ although there is not one single, accepted definition of task as they are used for different purposes.

In some books, the word “task” has been used as a label for various activities including grammar exercises, practice activities and role-plays. These are not tasks in

the sense the word is used in task-based learning (TBL). A number of definitions that describe the key features of tasks as the basic unit for educational activity are listed as follows;

In literature, Prabhu stands as a first significant person in the development of Task-Based Learning (TBL). His main contribution has been, according to Ruso (1999), “raising awareness of the ELT world to TBL” (p. 2). Prabhu (1987) defines task as 'an activity which require learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allows teachers to control and regulate that process' (in Van den Branden, 2006, p. 7). According to this definition, reading a train timetable and deciding which train one should take to get to a certain destination on a given day is an appropriate classroom task (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Besides Prabhu, Nunan (1989) acknowledges the special nature of classroom-based interaction defining a task as “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, middle and an end. (In Van den Branden, 2006, p. 7; Willis and Willis, 2007, p. 13; Ruso 1999, p. 2; Nunan, 1989, p. 10). Nunan suggests that in all definitions of tasks, one can see communicative language use where the learner focuses on meaning instead of form (Ruso 1999, p. 3).

According to Nunan (1989), both the teacher and the learner create ideas for the task design, and the information gained from learners is used in planning, implementing and evaluating language programs. In TBLT, the main role of tasks is to facilitate language learning, and the teacher and the learner work collaboratively to achieve this goal. A task is defined by Nunan as "an activity (or technique) where students are urged to accomplish something or solve some problem using their language. Preferably, this activity is open-ended; there is no set way to accomplish their goal".

Krahnke (1987) claims that the defining characteristic of task-based content is that it uses activities that the learners have to do for non-instructional purposes outside the classroom as opportunities for language learning and tasks are, as Ellis (2003) also indicates, important components of the language learning environment and “hold a central place” in the learning process. The type of tasks used in instruction may

positively influence learners' performance. According to Krahnke (1987) tasks are distinct from other activities to the degree that they have non-instructional purposes. (in Van den Branden, 2006, p. 7)

Willis (2007) is another considerable figure who contributes to the use of task in the language classroom. According to Willis (1996), a task is a goal-oriented activity with a clear purpose. Doing a communication task involves achieving an outcome, creating a final product that can be appreciated by others (in Willis and Willis, 2007).

Lee (2000) defines a task as; (1) a classroom activity or exercise that has an objective obtainable only by the interaction among participants, a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and a focus on meaning exchange; (2) a language learning endeavor that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and /or produce the target language as they perform some set of work plans. (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 7)

Ellis (2003) suggests that "a task is a work plan 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" (p. 6). To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 7). He (1999) further states that exchanging meaning rather than learning the second language is the goal of a task.

Skehan (1998) sets five criteria that define a 'task': (1) meaning is primary; (2) there is some sort of relationship to comparable real world activities; (3) learners are not given other people's meanings to regurgitate; (4) task completion has some sort of priority; and (5) the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome. Skehan also emphasizes the need for real world relationship for an activity to be taken as a task (in Willis and Willis, 2007).

Willis and Willis (2007) paraphrase the definitions of task by saying the definitions emphasize the primacy of meaning and, how a task can provide a formal framework for meaningful discussion by providing an explicit outcome or goal. They also claim that Skehan (1998) has the most complete definition. According to Skehan (1998) learners should be producing their own meanings, not simply regurgitating or repeating something that they have been told by someone else. Furthermore, a classroom task as we see in the above descriptions should relate in some way to an activity in the real world.

In the light of the above definitions, we may describe a task-like activity by considering the following questions;

- Does the activity engage learners' interest?
- Is there a primary focus on meaning?
- Is there an outcome?
- Is success judged in terms of outcome?
- Does the activity relate to real world activities?
- Is completion a priority? (Willis and Willis 2007; p. 13)

Willis and Willis (2007) argue that the first one is 'the notion of engagement' because without genuine interest, there can be no focus on meaning or outcome. Learners have to want to achieve an outcome; they want to engage in meaning (p. 13).

Task needs to be distinguished from exercises. Exercise requires a primary focus on form rather than meaning and typically asks learners to manipulate language given to them rather than to attempt to communicate using their own linguistics and non-linguistic resources. To sum up, tasks are a central component of TBLT in language classrooms because they provide a context that activates learning processes and promotes L2 learning. However, a task has some other components (Nunan, 1989) which will be discussed below.

2.2.1. The Components of a Task

Nunan (1989) points out that goals, input, activities, teacher role, learner role, settings are the components of a task. As he puts it, tasks can be analyzed according to the goals, the input data, the activities derived from the input, the settings and roles implied for teacher and learners.

Goals refer to the general intentions for the learning task. Input is the data that forms the point of departure for the task. Activities specify what learners will actually perform with the input. Roles on the other hand, refer to the social and interpersonal relationship between learners and teachers in a task. Settings mean the classroom arrangement affecting interaction entailed in the task, such as pair work or group work. When selecting, adapting, modifying and creating communicative tasks, Nunan (1989) believes that specification of all these components is needed (p. 11).

Similarly Candlin and Murphy (1987, in Jeon and Hahn, 2006) point out 'feedback' that refers to the task evaluation as a component in addition to task

component definitions of Nunan (1998). The framework of task components provide some meaningful insight in a task-based syllabus design and authentic material development, since in can serve as the beginning point for designing task-based activities.

2.2.2. Variety of Tasks

In the literature on TBLT, several attempts have been made to group tasks into categories.

Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993), Nunan (2001), and Willis (2007) have developed slightly different analyses of the kinds of tasks.

Table 2.1: Task Varieties

Task designer	Types of tasks
Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. jigsaw 2. information-gap 3. problem-solving 4. decision-making 5. opinion exchange
Nunan (2001)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. real-world 2. pedagogic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rehearsal tasks - activation tasks
Willis (2007)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. listing 2. ordering and sorting 3. matching 4. comparing 5. problem solving 6. sharing personal experience 7. Project and creative tasks

Pica, Kanagy, and Falodun (1993, in Richards and Rogers, 2001, p. 234) classify tasks according to the type of interaction that occurs in task accomplishment and give the following categorization:

1. Jigsaw tasks: these involve learners combining different pieces of information to form a whole (e.g., three individuals or group may have three different parts of a story and have to piece the story together).

2. Information-gap tasks: these involve encouraging groups of students who have different sections of a text to share text information with each other in order to form a complete text.
3. Problem-solving tasks: Provide a problem and a set of information and students must arrive at a solution.
4. Decision-making tasks: Students are given a problem with a set of solution to the problem and they must choose one through negotiation and discussion.
5. Opinion exchange tasks: Learners engage in discussion and exchange of ideas. They do not need to reach agreement.

In addition, Nunan (in Furuta, 2002, p. 12) make a distinction between real-world target tasks and pedagogical tasks. In Nunan's point of view, a real-world or target task is a communicative act that we achieve through language in the world outside the classroom. A pedagogical task, on the other hand is defined as a piece of classroom work, which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, or producing in the language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than forms. (Nunan, 2004, p. 4).

Another definition on variety of tasks comes from Long (1985). According to him, target tasks are the things that people achieve through language in everyday life and when tasks are turned into learning opportunities, they become pedagogical tasks. In addition to Nunan and Long's definitions, Ellis (2003) defines a pedagogical task as;

A work plan 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 linguistic resources (p. 16)

Briefly, Nunan points out four principles to note from these definitions.

- Meaning is primary
- Grammar and form are not ignored
- The task is a complete unit
- There is a systematic relationship between pedagogical tasks and target/real-world tasks

Nunan (2001) further states that, “pedagogical tasks have a non-linguistic outcome, and can be divided into rehearsal tasks or activation tasks.” (p. 4);

According to Nunan, rehearsal task is conducted in class; it is a piece of classroom work in which learners rehearse, outside of the class; a communicative act they will carry out. On the other hands an activation task is a piece of classroom work involving communicative interaction, but not one in which learners will be rehearsing for some out-of-class communication, rather they are designed to activate the acquisition process (p. 13).

In addition, he defines other concepts that support the tasks as enabling skills, language exercise, and communication activity.

Enabling skills is the mastery of language systems as grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and the like, which enable learners to take part in communicative tasks.

Language exercise is a piece of classroom work focusing learners on, and involving learners in manipulating some aspect of the linguistic system.

Communication activity is a piece of classroom work involving a focus on a particular linguistic feature but also involving the genuine exchange of meaning (p. 4).

Lastly, Nunan (2001) proposes the steps, which he follows in designing task-based language plans.

- Selecting and sequencing real-world / target tasks
- Creating pedagogical tasks (rehearsal / activation)
- Identifying enabling skills: creating communicative activities, sequence, and integrate pedagogical tasks, communicative activities and language exercises (p. 5).

Beside, Nunan and Willis write about closed and open tasks. Nunan explains that “a closed task is one in where there is a single correct answer or a restricted number of correct answers” (1999). Willis (1996) makes much similar distinction as Nunan by saying that “closed tasks are the ones that are highly structured and have very specific goals for example “work in pairs to find seven differences between these two pictures”. There is only one possible outcome, and one way of achieving it. Most comparing tasks are like this (p. 28).

On the contrary of closed task, the other kinds of task as identified by Nunan (1999) is open task; “one in which there is no single correct answer”. Willis (1996) also note that “open tasks are ones that are more loosely structured, with a less specific goal,

for example, comparing memories of childhood journeys, or exchanging anecdotes on a theme”. Furthermore, all tasks can be closed or open (p. 28).

Willis on the other hand, focuses more on practical design suggestions for tasks. She divides tasks into seven parts as follows (Willis and Willis, 2007):

1. Listing

The simplest type of task is listing. Students can; hear/read other pairs’ lists and consolidate their own to see how many items they get together; vote on the most comprehensive list. Listing can be split into two kinds: brainstorming and fact-finding.

Brainstorming has been found to be an extremely effective way of getting even shy learners involved in topics and promotes richer task interaction. Some ideas for listing tasks are:

- qualities of a world leader
- criteria for choosing a place to stay for a vacation or weekend
- things that cats tend to do / like doing.

Fact-finding involves asking learners to search for specific facts in books or on a website, or to ask other people outside class. Some examples of fact finding activities are:

- finding out what three people outside this class think about cats and pets. Whether they like cats or not? Listing the reasons they give. Preparing a report of their views in English for the next lesson.
- finding out the birthdays of seven people students or students’ families know. Writing the names of the people, who they are, and the date of their birth. Bringing the list to the class.

2. Ordering and sorting

Students can; publicly justify their priorities to persuade each other. This broad category includes a variety of cognitive processes, including sequencing, ranking, and classifying, which all require a little more thought and cognitive effort than simply listing.

Sequencing may be chronological sequencing, for example, arranging a series of jumbled pictures to make a story, or a jumbled list of events to recreate the order in which they happen and the like:

- Describing in detail how to make your favorite food.

- Describing exactly what you have to do to make a phone-call overseas from a phone box in your country.

In Rank Ordering, learners could list and then rank their school subjects with their favorite ones at the top; they could list seven kinds of pet and then rank them according to how much trouble they are to keep at home. In both cases, to stimulate more language use, learners can be asked to justify their order of ranking.

In classifying, learners can either be asked to work out their own categories for classifying, or to allot items in a list to categories already given as in the following example:

- Classify your list of things that cats tend to do into nice things and not such nice things

3. Matching

A whole range of tasks can be generated under the heading “Matching” which is suitable for all levels. Many of them are teacher-led and are thus ideal for real beginners who need lots of exposure to language before having to speak themselves. For example,

- Photos of cats with descriptions of them can be given to students and they may be asked to match the photos and the descriptions.

4. Comparing

Students can find out how many of them have done the task in the same way, or have things in common with the presenter; find out how many agree/disagree with the content of the report and the reasons. They can compare;

- Their family trees and the balance of men and women in their close families,
- Cats or dogs-which make the best pets.

5. Problem solving

Students can compare (and list) strategies for solving the problem; justify/evaluate solutions; vote on the best/cheapest solution; recommend one solution. Problem solving tasks invite learners to offer advice and recommendations on problems ranging from the very general, like global warming, to the very specific, like what to do if your neighbor’s cat is causing trouble in your garden. An example for a task as such may be:

- Ways to stop your neighbor’s cats from coming into your garden.

6. Sharing personal experiences

Students can note points of interest and compare them later; write questions to ask speakers; set quiz questions as a memory challenge; keep a record of main points or themes mentioned for a review or classification later; select one experience to summarize or react to in writing. For instance;

- Think of a cat you know or remember, or a story about something amazing a cat has done, and prepare to tell your partner about it. Discuss and decide whose cat story is the most interesting. Write it up for the class to read.

7. Creative tasks

Students can say what they most enjoyed in the other groups' work; write a review of another group's product for them to read.

- Create a wall newspaper about cats, asking people in your group to contribute something. (p. 63)

Willis and Willis (2007) further point out that 'task generator' helps think up various kinds of tasks on topics of your choice. Not all seven types needs to be chosen to be used however the best three or four that that link together well can be chosen and used (p. 107).

2.3. Task-Based Language Teaching

TBLT is an approach to teaching a second / foreign language that seeks to engage learners in interactionally authentic language use by having them perform a series of tasks. It aims to both enable learners to acquire new linguistic knowledge and proceduralize their existing knowledge (Ellis, 2003), and also offers an alternative for language teachers. In a task-based lesson the teacher does not pre-determine what language will be studied, the lesson is based around the completion of a central task and the language studied is determined by what happens as the students complete it (Frost, 2004).

In the study of Wang (2006), Nunan maintains that "setting specific tasks for students so that they act as if they were using the language in real life—this is part of the essence of task-based teaching" (p. 26).

2.3.1. Definition of task-based language teaching

There are various definitions concerning TBL. As Nunan (1989) defines "Task based teaching and learning is teaching and learning a language by using the language to accomplish open ended tasks. Learners are given a problem or objective to

accomplish but are left with some freedom in approaching this problem or objective." (in Lochana and Deb 2006 p. 4).

Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out TBI as "an approach based on the use of tasks which is basic in planning and instruction in the language teaching" (p. 223).

Fruta (2002) claims that TBL involves meaningful tasks to organize the learning of the second language.

"Task-based teaching provides learners with opportunities for learner-to-learner interactions that encourage authentic use of language and meaningful communication" (Moss, 2003 p. 3).

2.3.2. General Principles and Characteristics of Task-Based Learning

Swan (in Ellis 2007) defines five characteristics of TBLT.

- 'Natural' or 'naturalistic' language use
- Learner-centered rather than teacher controlled
- Focus on form (intervention while retaining 'naturalness').
- Tasks serve as the means for achieving natural language use.
- Traditional approaches are ineffective. (p. 22)

Similarly Nunan (in Oura, 2005) outlines five characteristics of a task-based approach to language learning:

- An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.
- The introduction of authentic texts (teaching materials) 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.
- An attempt to link classroom language learning with language activation outside the classroom. (p. 71)

Richards and Rodgers (2001) also define task-based learning as the following:

Task-based learning is based on the use of tasks that are essential for language learning as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching. Learners learn language by interacting communicatively and purposefully while engaged in the

activities and tasks. This, on the other hand, implies that process is much more important than product, which is meaningful learning.

Activities and tasks of a task-based syllabus are sequenced according to difficulty. This difficulty depends on a range of factors including the previous experience of the learner, the complexity of the task, the language required to undertake the task, and the degree of support available (Richards and Rodgers 2001).

Ellis also (1994) emphasizes two roles of errors in TBLI where he argues that errors are not necessarily the result of bad learning, but are part of the natural process of interlanguage forms gradually moving towards target forms. This view places errors within natural process of learning.

2.4. Task-based Methodology Framework

For task-based instruction, there have been different sequencing frameworks proposed by researchers (Ellis, 2003; Lee, 2000; Prabhu, 1987; Skehan, 1996; Willis, 1996). Ellis (2003) names these phases ‘pre-task’, ‘during task’, and ‘post-task’, while Willis (1996) divides these into pre-task, task cycle and language focus as following:

2.4.1. Pre-task

Willis (1996) suggests that the teacher (facilitator) explores the topic with the group and highlights useful words and phrases, and helps learners understand task instructions and prepare. In other words, the teacher will present what will be expected of the students in the task phase. The instructor may also present a model of the task by either doing it themselves or by presenting picture, audio, or video demonstrating the task like:

- Material exploitation: using a picture/text etc. to lead into the topic
- Brainstorming: making a list; comparing ideas; sharing experiences
- Activating language: eliciting and providing vocabulary (p. 40).

2.4.2. Task Cycle

This phase offers students the chance to use whatever language they already know in order to carry out the task and then to improve their language under the teacher’s guidance while planning their reports on the task. Task cycle offers learners a holistic experience of language in use. There are three components of a task cycle:

a. Task: During the task phase, the students perform the task, typically in pairs or small groups, although this is dependent on the type of activity. Learners use whatever language they can master. Unless the teacher plays a particular role in the task, then the teacher's role is typically limited to one of an observer or counselor—thus, the reason for it being a more student-centered methodology. Since this situation has a “private” feel, students feel free to experiment. Mistakes do not matter.

b. Planning: Comes after the task and before the report, forming the central part of the cycle. Having completed the task, the students prepare either a written or an oral report to present to the class. The teacher acts here as a language adviser and helps students rehearse and oral reports or organize written ones otherwise simply monitors the students.

c. Report: This is the natural condition of the task cycle. In this stage learners tell the class about their findings or exchange written reports, and compare results. Thus, the report stage gives students a natural stimulus to upgrade and improve their language. It presents a very real linguistic challenge to communicate clearly and accurately in language appropriate to the circumstances. The teacher acts as a chairperson selecting who will speak next, may give brief feedback on the content and form, may play a recording of others doing the same or a similar task during planning phase.

2.4.3. Language Focus

The language focus stage often has a linguistic focus (Fruta, 2002, p. 20). Specifically, this stage allows a closer study of some specific features naturally occurring in the language used during the task cycle (Willis, 1996). Willis continues by indicating that at this stage learners are ready to focus on the form, as they will have already processed the language for meaning before. Language focus has two components:

a. Analysis: Here the focus returns to the teacher who reviews what happened in the task, in regards to language. This phase draw attention to the surface forms, realizing the meanings learners have already become familiar with during the task cycle and so help them to systematize their knowledge and broaden their understanding. It may include language forms that the students were using, problems that students had, and perhaps forms that need to be covered more or were not used enough.

b. Practice: Practice activities are based on features of the language that have already occurred in previous texts and transcripts or in features that have just been studied in analysis activities. In other words, the practice stage may be used to cover material mentioned by the teacher in the analysis stage. It is an opportunity for the teacher to emphasize key language. (p. 40)

2.5. Focus on forms versus focus on form

In the literature of language learning, there have been two opposite ways concerning language learning. One side mostly believes grammar rules are very important in acquiring L2, the other side in contrast claims meaning overweighs every kind of grammar rule in language classes. This support TBL approach which has got a positive and supportive atmosphere in a language environment.

Relating to this opposite ideas, Ellis (2007) proposes two divisions as focus on forms and focus on form.

Focus on forms is today considered the traditional approach, although it has not always been viewed that way. Wilkins (1976) defines focus on forms by means of presenting specific, preplanned forms one at a time in the hope that learners will master them before they need to use them to negotiate meaning.

Ellis (2000) makes the similar definition that focusing on forms entails the prior selection of a linguistic element, which is presented and practiced (e.g. PPP).

Furthermore, Long (1997) defines a wide explanation as follows;

The teacher or textbook writer divides the L2 into segments of various kinds (phonemes, words, collocations, morphemes, sentence patterns, notions, functions, tones, stress and intonation patterns, and so on), and presents these to the learner in models, initially one item at a time, in a sequence determined by (rather vague, usually intuitive) notions of frequency, valency, or . . . 'difficulty'. Eventually, it is the learner's job to synthesize the parts for use in communication. . (p. 3)

On the other hand, Long and Crookes (1991) postulate that “focus on form . . . overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (p. 45).

Even though TBI emphasizes the primacy of meaning, a focus on form has a parallel importance in the language learning process (Bygate, Skehan and Swain, 2001). Therefore, Ellis (2007) asserts that task-based language teaching involves 'focus on form' (i.e. attention to form occurs within the context of performing the task) means a strong form of communicative language teaching.

A focus on form is beneficial in two phases in the framework. The planning stage between the private task and the public report promotes close attention to language form. As learners strive for accuracy, they try to organize their reports clearly and check words and patterns they are not sure of. In the final component, language analysis activities also provide a focus on form through consciousness-raising processes. Learners notice and reflect on language features, recycle the task language, go back over the text or recording and investigate new items, and practice pronouncing useful phrases. (Lochana and Deb, 2006).

To sum up, focus on forms lessons tend to be rather dry, consisting mainly of the linguistic items, which students are expected to master one at a time, often to native speaker levels, with anything less treated as "error", and little if any communicative L2 use (Long, 2007). Unlike focus on forms, however focus on form is learner- centered in a radical, psycholinguistic sense: it respects the learner's internal syllabus. It is under learner control: it occurs just when he or she has a communication problem, and so is likely already at least partially to understand the meaning or function of the new form, and when he or she is attending to the input.

2.6. Teacher Roles and Characteristics

Among others, teacher role and characteristics play a central role on the effectiveness of any method, approach or technique used within a classroom setting. Similarly in TBLT teachers can take many different roles in regard to L2 tasks (Honeyfield, 1993; Nunan, 1989; Oxford, 1990; Scarcella and Oxford, 1992; Willis, 1996a, 1996b, 1998; cited in Oxford, 2006). Richards and Rodgers (2001) mention the following task roles for teachers:

- Selector/sequencer of tasks: A central role of the teacher is in selecting, adapting, and/or creating the tasks themselves and the forming these in keeping with learner needs, interests, and language skill level.

- Preparer of learners for task: The teacher prepare learners some sort of pre-task preparation such as; topic introduction, clarifying task instructions, helping students learn or recall useful words and phrases to facilitate task accomplishment, and providing partial demonstration of task procedure.
- Pre-task consciousness raiser about form: The teacher employs a variety of form-focusing techniques, including attention-focusing pre-task activities, text exploration, guided exploration, guided exposure to parallel tasks, and use of highlighted material.

In addition to Richards and Rodgers, Van den Branden (et. al, 2006) claims that teachers play a crucial role in task-based instruction and they define two core actions that teacher should take in order for tasks to elicit rich learner activity and then actual learning. These are:

- Motivating the learner to invest intensive mental energy in task completion;
- Interactionally supporting task performance in such a way as to the comprehension of rich input, the production (p. 175).

Furthermore, in their book ‘Doing Task-based Teaching’ Willis and Willis (2007) give more extensive descriptions in teacher roles as:

- Leader and organizer of discussion
- Manager of group/work
- Facilitator
- Motivator
- Language ‘knower’ and adviser
- Language teacher (p. 148).

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001), on the other hand, some specific roles are also assigned for the teacher in task-based instruction. First of all, the teacher has the central role of selecting, adapting and creating tasks. The teacher should also take learner needs, interests and current language skills into account before forming his or her adaptation of tasks into an instructional sequence.

To sum up, teachers adopting TBL should be a conscious raiser rather than the authority who is giving every rule for the language learner. In addition, such teachers should be a scaffolder who is always ready for any help for a student. Finally, TBL teachers should be positive and flexible who underlies motivation and attention in a language class.

2.7. Learner Roles and Characteristics

In task-based language teaching, the learner takes up the central role: he is given a fair share of freedom and responsibility when it comes to negotiating course content, choosing linguistic forms from his own linguistic repertoire during task performance, discussing various options for task performance, and evaluating task outcomes (Benson, 2001; Breen and Candlin, 1980, Nunan, 1988; Shohamy, 2001; in Van den Branden, et al, 2006).

Furthermore, according to Richards and Rodgers (2001), primary task roles for learners are:

- Group participant: Many tasks will be done in pairs or small groups.
- Monitor: In TBLT, tasks are not employed for their own sake but as a means of facilitating learning. Class activities have to be designed so that students have the opportunity to notice how language is used in communication. Learners themselves need to “attend” not only to the message in the task work, but also to the form in which such messages typically come packed.
- Risk-taker/innovator: Many tasks will require learners to create and interpret messages for which they lack full linguistic resources and prior experience. In fact, this is said to be the point of such tasks. Practice in restating, paraphrasing, using paralinguistic signals (where appropriate), and so on, will often be needed (p. 235).

Others (Honeyfield, 1993; Nunan, 1989; Oxford, 1990, cited in Oxford, 2006) have also discussed learners' task's roles. A particularly important learner role in a task situation is that of task-analyzer. The learner must analyze task requirements and find suitable strategies to match them.

The learner can take control of the task—that is, be responsible for his or her performance on the task—by considering the task requirements and employing learning strategies to accomplish the task more efficiently and more effectively (Cohen 1998; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990). On the part of the learner, this involves a serious commitment, motivation, confidence, clarity of purpose, and willingness to take risks (Dörnyei 2001; Dörnyei and Schmidt, 2001; Honeyfield, 1993; Oxford, 1996; Skehan, 1998b; Willis, 1996a, 1996b, 1998), but these may be dampened by language anxiety (Arnold, 1998; Oxford, 1998; Young, 1998). Learners are mainly expected to be group participants, monitors, risk-takers and innovators.

In addition to the tasks roles for learners, there are some metacognitive and cognitive strategies that students may obtain during the task-based instruction.

In the EFL classroom, many readers tend to rely on the slow and careful reading of texts from start to finish, and they have difficulties with reading activities requiring the use of strategies for reading quickly and efficiently, such as skimming a lengthy research article for main ideas (Urquhart and Weir 1998; Weir 1983). As many practitioners have found, metacognitive strategies are one way to overcome these problems.

Metacognitive strategies are strategies for regulating and directing learning. Within the language-learning context, these strategies will allow the learner to make informed choices, to plan, monitor and evaluate any learning process effectively. Metacognitive strategies also help the learner build on their metacognitive knowledge such as knowledge about individual learning styles and preferences, different strategies and the nature and demands of different learning tasks. Examples of metacognitive strategies are over viewing task demands and linking with previous knowledge, setting goals and objectives, planning for a language task, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation (Meng, Nyet and Suthiwan, 2007).

Cognitive strategies involving the manipulation or transformation of learning materials / input (e.g., Resourcing, Grouping, Imagery, Inferencing) are techniques used during the performance of a task to ease comprehension or production. They are more situation-specific; that is they are linked to specific tasks (Mendelsohn, 1995, p. 43). Cognitive strategies are varied but share the common objective of allowing learners to manipulate or restructure language items and tasks. These strategies facilitate the processing of language tasks and enhance the effectiveness of their communication and learning. Such strategies include highlighting and marking items in a text, analyzing words and expressions, linguistic transfer from first language to target language, repeating, and using learning aids (Meng, Nyet and Suthiwan, 2007).

2.8. Advantages and Disadvantages of Task-Based Learning

Task-based learning is advantageous to the learner as it is more learner-centered. Although the teacher may present language in the pre-task, the students are free to use what they want. This allows them to use all the language they know and are learning, rather than a single construct. Furthermore, as the tasks are supposed to be familiar to

the students, students are more likely to be engaged, which may further motivate them in their language learning.

Some other important advantages of task-based learning are:

The main advantages of TBL are that language is used for a genuine purpose meaning that real communication should take place, and that at the stage where the learners are preparing their report for the whole class, they are forced to consider language form in general rather than concentrating on a single form as in the PPP model (Willis and Willis, 1996).

Task-based learning is widely applicable to all ages and backgrounds. During any task in TBL, the learners are free to use any kind of language. The underlying idea is to carry the content or the message. (Krahne, 1987).

The context of task emerges personal experiencing of students in a language class. This experience includes a whole range of lexical phrases, collocations and patterns as well as language forms. Such tasks provide data for teachers in assessment and evaluation. These tasks also contribute to progress by encouraging the students to be more ambitious in language use rather than just saying the first thing that comes into their heads. Language learners tend to be cooperative during these tasks. All these contribute to non-threatening and supporting environment in language classes (Frost, 2004). There are also some disadvantages in TBL.

Disadvantages of task-based learning are:

The weaknesses of task-based learning lie not so much in the potential effectiveness of this type of instructional content but in problems of implementing the instruction (Frost, 2004; İnözü, İlin and Yumru, 2007). Frost (2004) believes that task-based learning requires a high level of creativity on the part of the teacher. If teachers are traditional and far from any creativity, then TBLT might be impossible to apply. Thus, İnözü, İlin and Yumru (2007) state that “achievement of success in task-based pedagogy depends largely on the degree to which teacher intention and learner interpretations of a given task converge” (p. 61).

Another disadvantage that Frost (2004) defines is that task-based learning requires a lot of resources apart from textbooks which is often hard to gain. Also TBL puts lots of responsibility on the part of students. This sometimes creates anxiety and when tasks are difficult to perform, learners tend to use their first language (L1) in class, which is very disappointing for any language teacher.

Skehan (1996) claims that pressure of time will force learners using language that can be readily accessed rather than to attempt creating language in real time and therefore he believes accuracy is neglected in TBL classes.

Another criticism to TBL comes from Krahne (1987) who points out that evaluation of task-based learning in class is difficult since there is no traditional test in such classes.

Lastly, it is argued that task-based learning is not appropriate as the foundation of a class for beginning students. Others claim that students are only exposed to certain forms of language, and are being neglected of others, such as discussion or debate. (Harmer, 2001; Ellis, Oxford, Nunan, 2006).

2.9. The Difference between TBL and accepted PPP cycle

The traditional presentation-practice-production (PPP) teaching/learning cycle was at one time virtually the only acceptable second language (L2) task sequence. In the PPP cycle, grammar presentation came first, followed by controlled and less controlled practice and then by actual production. However, Willis' (1996) task-based model offers a task cycle that opposes the PPP sequence. In this model, which effectively combines meaning and form, the communicative task comes before the focus on form (language analysis and practice). Another special feature is that students not only do the task but also report on it (in Oxford, 2006).

According to Willis (1996), task-based framework differs from a Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) cycle because in TBLT the focus on the language is at the end. The communication task forms the centre of the framework. While performing the task, learners use the language they have learnt from previous lessons or from other sources. Then they write and talk about how they did the task and compare their findings. Finally, attention is directed to the specific features of the language form. The last step is to have a close look at the specific language forms.

2.9.1. The problems with PPP

Although PPP teaching / learning cycle is highly accepted among teachers of L2, it has some drawbacks. For example, as Frost (2004) puts forward, students can give the impression that they are comfortable with the new language as they are producing it accurately in the class. Often though a few lessons later, students will either not be able to produce the language correctly or even won't produce it at all.

Contrary to PPP cycle, in Frost's (2004) view, task-based learning has some clear advantages. For instance, unlike a PPP approach, the students are free of language control. In all three stages, they must use all their language resources rather than just practicing one pre-selected item. A natural context is developed from the students' experiences with the language that is personalized and relevant to them. With PPP, it is necessary to create contexts in which to present the language and sometimes they can be very unnatural. The students will have a much more varied exposure to language with TBL. They will be exposed to a whole range of lexical phrases, collocations and patterns as well as language forms, which is not the concern in PPP. In TBL, the language explored arises from the students' needs. This need dictates what will be covered in the lesson rather than a decision made by the teacher or the course book. It is a strong communicative approach where students spend a lot of time communicating. PPP lessons on the other hand seem very teacher-centred by comparison.

PPP offers a very simplified approach to language learning. It is based upon the idea that you can present language in neat little blocks, adding from one lesson to the next. However, research shows us that we cannot predict or guarantee what the students will learn and that ultimately a wide exposure to language is the best way of ensuring that students will acquire it effectively. Restricting their experience to single pieces of target language is unnatural.

Willis (1996) also asserts some limitations about the 'Presentation, Practice, Production' (PPP) method in EFL classes. One of the main ones is the overuse of the target form at the expense of meaning. In other words, the learner utters unnatural sentences including the target form; they are concerned with the practice of structure rather than communicating their own meanings. Another problem is that learners can produce the required forms in the classroom, but they do not use them outside classroom or use them incorrectly.

Ellis (2003) indicates that in PPP method; students are seen as "language learners", whereas in TBI pedagogy, they are treated as "language users" (p. 252). That's why TBI has gained a significant place in second language teaching classes.

2.10. Research on Task-based Reading Activities

In a workshop, Kim and Moon (2007) presented how myriads of authentic reading, listening and speaking resources available a few clicks away can be integrated successfully into homework for technology-savvy language learners. The primary focus

of the workshop was to show how modern technology—computer, internet, iPod, cell phone, MP3 player, VCR, TV, etc—can be integrated into homework.

The main purpose of the study conducted by Chou (2006) was to explore the effects of reading and writing on the L2 literacy development of EFL young learners. The findings of the study were:

1. Young English as a foreign language (EFL) learners from both early-starter and late-starter groups enlarged their vocabulary size after the reading treatment in the task-based instruction.
2. Students regarded the reading instruction enhanced their motivation to learn English, and reading short stories helped them enlarge their vocabulary size.
3. Students agreed that the English writing task enhanced their reading efficiency and improved their ability to use words appropriately. However, they did not wish to receive more reading-to-writing tasks in class. They considered the task rather difficult and they suffered the anxiety to conduct English writing.
4. The results of the questionnaire indicated that students considered teacher comments enhance their English writing.
5. Both late starters already had the competence to conduct simple English writing tasks, and students' writings from both groups were selected and published in the school quarterly column.

The result may also suggest that appropriate reading materials must be carefully selected to help young EFL learners develop reading and writing skills.

Another study focusing on task-based learning belongs to Yaylı (2006). In her study, she investigated the effects of TBLT on learners' proficiency and noticing levels with respect to gender in a primary school setting in Turkey. According to study, TBLT did not prove to be superior to PPP in the teaching of the Simple Present Tense in a public school in Turkey. Besides, gender did not play a significant role in the scores the learners achieved in the pre- and post-tests.

Green (2005) was concerned with integrating extensive reading in the task-based curriculum. He argues that while extensive reading per se is an important medium for long-term second language acquisition, extensive reading schemes may not be the most effective means of promoting acquisition. He presented the extensive reading programs used in Hong Kong secondary schools and paid close attention to the top-down fashion.

Furthermore, he described a program that incorporates both extensive reading and task-based instruction that includes interaction, sharing, and modeling of good reading practices.

Nodoushan (2005) searched the cognitive style as a factor affecting task-based reading comprehension test scores. The results of data analysis revealed that subjects' cognitive styles resulted in a significant difference in their overall test performance in proficient, semi-proficient, and fairly proficient groups, but not in the low-proficient group. The findings also indicated that cognitive style resulted in a significant difference in subjects' performance of true-false, sentence completion, outlining, skimming, and elicitation tasks in all proficiency groups.

Razi (2005) after briefly discussing techniques such as 'the cloze test' and 'gap-filling' employed in assessing reading, Razi points out that the main focus of the study resides in the scoring process of 'ordering tasks', where students were asked to rearrange the order of sentences given in incorrect order. Razi stated that since the evaluation of such tasks is quite complex, reading teachers rarely use them in their tests. Razi introduced to a new approach, namely Weighted Marking Protocol, for ordering tasks in order to achieve a fairer evaluation. According to Razi, this new approach makes it possible for reading teachers to reward their students for all right answers and not penalize them just for a single mistake.

Khand (2004) set problems and suggestions in teaching reading skills. He argues that reading is a skill that comes from experience and needs to be constantly improved through different types of reading material. But that efficient reading involves many skill that need to be fostered in a classroom is a new idea. In order to elucidate this point, some task-based reading activities have been suggested for teachers of English to point out ways to inculcate independent reading habits in the students. Furthermore, according to the study conducted by Khand (2004), reading comprehension is one of the most important skills to be learned by the students. This will make them efficient reader.

Ortenberg and Antokhin (2003) investigated the pedagogical implications and challenges of developing web-based Russian reading comprehension activities. This included such issues as selecting relevant authentic material and designing accompanying activities. In addition, the defining factors of instructional design: general reading proficiency objectives, the primary learning tasks of each learning

object (LO) and the challenges encountered in the areas of lexical, structural, discourse, and sociolinguistic competencies in the Russian language. They showed how these factors were applied through the sequence of reading tasks and activities, which provided the learner with opportunities to use a variety of reading skills. One of the most important issues of their presentation was the selection of specific Russian lexical, structural, and discourse features, as well as how they were addressed in Russian LOs.

A descriptive study conducted by Hislope (2003), investigated the self-reported reading habits and levels of ability in reading of ten heritage speakers of Spanish enrolled in Spanish classes at Purdue University. Results for this small sample warrant more explicit focus-on-form instruction and activation of background knowledge, even on a familiar topic, for heritage speakers.

In another study, Nodoushan (2002) analyzed the effects of text familiarity, task type, and language proficiency on university students' language for specific purposes (LSP) test and task performances, 541 senior and junior university students majoring in electronics took the TBRT (Task-Based Reading Test). Variance analyses indicated that text familiarity, task type, and language proficiency, as well as the interaction between any given pair of these and also among all of them resulted in significant differences in subjects' overall and differential test and task performances. In addition, regression analyses revealed that the greatest influence on subjects' overall and differential test and task performance was due to language proficiency.

Joseph and Ramani (2001) explored the role of 'reading for pleasure' or extensive reading in language and literacy development. They demonstrated that even with beginning learners of a new language, reading for pleasure has a significant contribution to make to the holistic development of cognitive, linguistic and critical development. They focused to show samples of pedagogic tasks graded linguistically and cognitively, and classroom interactions around these tasks and to demonstrate the use of reading tasks to assess the impact of the Northern Sotho comics on reading development and grammar acquisition and in time, to use second language learning contexts to build a reading culture for African first language users. In other words, they focused to maintain and promote multilingualism by transferring multimodal literacy materials from highly-resourced languages like English to marginalized languages.

Wright and Cockburn (2001) identify three fundamental learning activities in the development of literary skills -writing, reading, and watching-and describe the potential

benefits of supporting these activities when learning to program computers. They analyze the support for writing, reading and watching provided by current educational programming environments and show that no current systems offer comprehensive and integrated support for the three activities. In particular, support for watching the relationship between the program code and the resultant program behavior is poor.

Knutson (1998) claims in describing reading proficiency that, the relative difficulty or ease that an individual reader experiences in reading a particular text are both ‘text’ and ‘reader-based factors’. In this reason, she focuses on the factor of purpose, as determined by the reader or the instructional context. Having a purpose means having a reason to read and approaching a text with a particular goal in mind, whether that goal involves learning or entertainment. She claims that in real-world and classroom situations, purpose affects the reader's motivation, interest, and manner of reading.

A study that Johnson (1997) conducted looked into the ways in which pairs of engineering students accessed instruction texts in a real-life setting. He argues that procedural, meta-cognitive, and content-specific knowledge either instantiated individually or negotiated by the pair has a crucial role in task completion and in accessing the manual text successfully. Depending on individual orientation and the approach negotiated between the partners, the lack of "what-to-do" knowledge could be offset by joint reading, shared problem-solving, and heuristics. On the other hand, if the gap of knowledge between the pair is wide and the individual approaches in reading-to-do are very different, the pair is likely to end up in sub-tasking, with a low level of collaboration.

2.11. TBLT and Reading

“Many people believe that TBT focuses almost entirely on the spoken language. There is certainly a lot of talking in the TBT classroom, from both teachers and learners, but TBT can also be used to teach reading.” (Willis and Willis, 2007, p. 3).

A common misunderstanding of task-based instruction as Willis and Willis (2007) mentioned is that, it necessarily involves oral interaction. However, tasks can be designed to develop any of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing).

In his study, Green (2005) argues that extensive reading should be included fully in the language curriculum as a vital component of a task-based approach to second

language learning. According to Green (2005) “Extensive reading, if done in interactive mode, supports the negotiation of meanings in texts, helps prevent the fossilization of interlanguage structures, and provides contexts in which learners can encounter and debate ideas, and analyze and practice language features found in the texts. For these reasons, it is vital to introduce extensive reading within the purposeful and interactive framework of the task-based language curriculum.” (p. 311). As Willis and Willis (2007) mentioned in their study, we need a purpose to read a text. For instance, we read a newspaper or magazine since the topic interest us and we want to learn more about it. Furthermore, sometimes a headline draws our attention and we read an article to satisfy our curiosity. To sum up, “in all of these activities we engage with a text for a purpose, and purposeful reading means reading for meaning”. (Willis and Willis 2007, p. 33).

Willis and Willis (2007) points out that in the classroom there is a danger that reading takes place without purpose or challenge. Then, they (2007) define that designing tasks which will provide a context for reading texts to provide the purpose or challenge is possible.

According to Green (2005), extensive reading in a task-based approach is useful in terms of learners both for aesthetic reasons and for increasing cross-cultural understandings, furthermore because it aids cognitive development and promotes learning through interaction.

Green (2005) defines that extensive reading in task-based approaches acquires purpose automatically by becoming a key component in gathering information on a topic or as input to solving problem. In addition, it is beneficial in language analysis and practice stage. For instance, learners can be encouraged to explore texts to raise their awareness of features of the grammatical, lexical and discourse systems in the texts.

For developing reading skills through communicative language teaching Ziauddin (2004) suggested task-based activities. He claims that the interaction between the teacher and the learners and between the learners themselves will be made effective by such activities. According to him, through the task-oriented teaching reading the language learning can be made purposeful and meaningful.

“In fact, we are living in a ‘reading’ world where it is difficult to manage without reading.” (Ziauddin, 2004, p. 43). Ziauddin claims that task-based activities are backbone of teaching since the teacher’s success or failure depends on the way she/he

plans, organizes and controls the tasks. Reading serves as an important tool in every field of professional service. In many situations, reading is considered to be the indispensable channel of communication in an ever-widening world.

“It has been argued that reading as a valuable source of language acquisition (Krashen, 1982, p.164), accompanied by meaningful and interesting activities that require the use of the foreign/second language, increases learners' motivation, challenges their language processing capacities, and helps improve interlanguage” (Doughty, 2001, Robinson 2001 p. 206-57). Task-based reading lesson may serve to this purpose.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY

3.1. Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learners' attitude toward reading classes and their learning outcomes, as they perceive.

The analysis of the collected data was qualitative as this type of a technique is appropriate whenever there is not a numeric translation of data beyond the translation to absolute or percentage frequencies. The usual focus is on the meaning of the information collected either by way of a content analysis, in a more descriptive manner (Bardin, 1977, Ericsson and Simon, 1984).

As explained in Miles and Huberman (1994), this qualitative analysis proceeds coding the information into categories or levels looking for similarities and differences among data. Similarly, in this study, the data gathered from the participants were coded and decoded to draw conclusions.

3.2. Research Design

As mentioned above, this study aimed to examine the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learner's attitude toward reading classes and their learning outcomes, by investigating their own perceptions the participants were asked to indicate their views. First with the feedback forms (See Appendix 11) they filled in after each task, then by means of diaries they wrote after the implementation of tasks, and finally with face to face interviews that were held at the end of the term they indicated their views on tasks.

In this study, a descriptive design is used in order "to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately" (Isaac & Michael, 1997, p. 18)

The participants of the study were the preparatory reading class students at Dicle University Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre. Both males and females took part in the study.

In the study, the students were given various reading tasks (i.e. as listing, ordering and sorting, matching, comparing, problem solving, and creative tasks). Each task (See Appendixes 1-10) required students to deal with a specific reading skill. They found out what people outside the class think about dreams (See Appendix 9), they described in detail how to make a potato salad (See Appendix 10), found out how many of them had done the task in the same way by drawing something they read or they listened (See Appendixes 8-11). The aim of giving them sort of tasks was to examine the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learner's attitude.

After the tasks were used, the participants were given the feedback forms by which they were asked to comment on each of the tasks used. On the forms, the students also stated what they learnt or did not learn. Besides, they wrote about whether or not they thought the tasks were enjoyable. In addition, they stated why they enjoyed the tasks or why did not they enjoy studying on them. Finally, they wrote about their general views about the tasks. This procedure enabled the researcher to have a deeper understanding of how the students perceived the use of these tasks in the reading lessons.

Moreover, for each of the tasks some randomly selected participants were asked to keep diaries. Elliot (1991) refers to the diaries as a valuable research tool as they can include "observations, feelings, reactions, interpretations, reflections, hunches, explanations" of the students and the teachers (McDonough, 1994, p. 6).

On the diaries, the participants were asked to write about their attitudes toward the tasks and share their ideas. Diaries were used since "it is useful to keep a record of their research progress because a research diary is a personal rather than a formal document, you can be as individual and creative with it as you like" (Mardigian Library, 2002, p.1)

In addition, 15 of totally 50 participants were selected randomly for the interviews. Their age, gender, social and cultural backgrounds were not taken into consideration. These 15 students were interviewed at the end of the term. They were asked about their views on the tasks, and also the problems they encountered. Besides, they were asked what they learned by the help of tasks.

Finally, the participants' views from the feedback forms, diaries and face-to-face interviews were analyzed by means of content analysis. "Content analysis is systematically analyzing texts" (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2006, p.310). It facilitates the

production of core constructs from textual data through a systematic method of reduction and analysis (Miles and Huberman, 1994). There are several reasons to do a content analysis: to obtain descriptive information of one kind or another; to analyze observational and interview data; to test hypotheses; to check other research findings.

In this research, content analysis was used since “qualitative content analysis facilitates contextual meaning in text through the development of emergent themes (Bryman 2001, p. 19)”. In addition, the “content analysis is unobtrusive and it is comparatively easy to do (Fraenkel and Wallen 2006 p. 3)”.

3.3. Participants

This study was conducted with totally 50 lower-intermediate level students in two classes consisting of 25 students. The participants were attending at Dicle University Foreign Languages Application and Research Centre in Diyarbakır.

Both male and female students participated in the study. Students’ age, gender, social and educational backgrounds were not taken into consideration.

3.4. Setting

The study was carried out at Dicle University, Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre in Diyarbakır, Turkey. The students who participated in the study came from different departments such as Mining Engineering Faculty of Engineering and Architecture; Physics, Chemistry and Biology Departments from Faculty of Science and Letters; and the students of Faculty of Agriculture were attending preparatory classes at the Foreign Languages Centre.

3.5. Data Collection and Instruments

In this study, data were collected from the feedback forms that were filled by the members of totally two classes, the diaries that derived from seven to 15 students, and finally the interviews, which were held with totally 15 students.

In this study, the aim of using the feedback forms was to get students’ understanding of tasks and their ideas. The diaries were used as an instrument to support data acquired from the study. The aim was to get individual and creative data supporting the feedback forms. Semi-structured interviews were used because they are more detailed than structured interviews as they involve inquiries in order to get further explanatory information concerning the questions.

The instruments that were used for data collection in this study were obtained in several steps such as; tasks, feedback forms, students' diaries, and interviews with students.

3.5.1. Tasks

In this study, totally ten tasks were used to teach reading skills to two prep classes. The students surveyed the idea of people outside the class about dreams, they prepared a potato salad at the same time they described it in English, drew what they read. During the classes, the students were given tasks following the principles of the task-based approach. The topics were selected to match to students' ages, culture, and interests. Some of tasks were adapted from Rooney (1998).

3.5.2. Feedback forms

After the tasks, feedback forms were given to the students to be filled with their comments on each of the tasks. Feedback forms included six questions. The questions were about the reading tasks they did. The data on participants' thoughts, their ideas and their success were elicited by means of these feedback forms. In addition, the forms required the participants to evaluate the tasks. The number of students who filled in feedback forms varied from 22 to 49 depending on the attendance of the students on each of the specific task. On the forms, the students wrote about what they learnt or did not learn. Moreover, they wrote about whether or not they thought the tasks were enjoyable. In addition, they indicated why they enjoyed the tasks or why did not they enjoy studying on them. Lastly, they wrote about their general views about the tasks. This procedure enabled the researcher to have a deeper understanding of how the students perceived the use of these tasks in the reading lessons.

3.5.3. Students' Diaries

Volunteering students were asked to keep diaries on the tasks they did to provide data on the research process. After each task, they kept diaries about the task they did. The number of volunteers in 50 participants differed from task to task. For instance, there were at least seven, maximum 15 volunteers that kept diary among 50 students in two classes. They kept diaries after each task in each lesson.

3.5.4. Semi-structured Interviews

In addition to the feedback forms and diaries, fifteen of the totally 50 participants were chosen randomly for the semi structured interviews. The semi-structured interview is one of the most frequently used qualitative methods. As defined in Education Research Education Research Methods Glossary (n.d.), semi-structured interview is a “research that involves some closed questions for collecting straightforward data and some open-ended questions to allow the respondent to explain more complex feelings and attitudes” (p. 1). Interviews were held with the students at the end of the term. During the interviews, they were asked about their attitudes towards studying reading skills, what they thought about the type of tasks implemented throughout the study. Interviews contributed to our understanding of what students thought about the classroom environment, activities conducted and teaching methodology used while teaching reading skills.

3.6. Data Analysis

In this study, by means of the instruments used, triangulation technique was used. This way a more reliably analysis and solid conclusions were reached. Munn and Drever (1990) think that when the participants respond to different instruments in the same way, the data become more reliable.

“An analysis is qualitative whenever there is not a numeric translation of data beyond the translation to absolute or percentage frequencies. The usual focus is on the meaning of the information collected either by way of a content analysis, more descriptive (Bardin, 1977, Ericsson and Simon, 1984, p.3) either by way of the interpretation of the responses in terms of levels of complexity (Selman, 1979)”. This qualitative analysis proceeds coding the information into categories or levels looking for similarities and differences among data. Similarly, in this study, qualitative data gathered by feedback forms, diaries and interviews were compiled and coded in order to find out answers to the research questions.

3.6.1. Analysis of Feedback Forms

Data analysis started with the analysis of the feedback forms. While analyzing the data, coding-recoding process was used. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), “Coding is analysis. To review a set of field notes, transcribed or synthesized, and to

dissect them meaningfully, while keeping the relations between the parts intact, is the stuff of analysis. This part of analysis involves how you differentiate and combine the data you have retrieved and the reflections you make about this information.”(p. 56). Some codes did not work. Other codes flourished. Too many segment got the same codes, thus creating the familiar problem of bulk. This problem called for breaking down codes into sub-codes. So every chunk had been coded before had to be relabeled.

First, the feedback forms were analyzed and the most frequently cited views were identified. As the second step, all the feedback forms were reread and the parts reflecting the students’ statements about the tasks and the learning resulted from these tasks were underlined. The third step was to code the data gained from the feedback forms according to comments made for each task in terms of learning and to generalize. After coding and decoding, categories were made.

3.6.2. Analysis of Students’ Diaries

This set of data, which were concerned with the diaries written by the students, consisted of coding-recoding process. Initial data were collected, written up, and reviewed line by line, within a paragraph. Beside the paragraph, categories/labels were generated, and a list of them was formed. The labels were reviewed and, typically, a slightly more abstract category was attributed to several incidents or observations. The incidents then was put onto a qualitative data category card (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; cited in Miles and Huberman, 1994)

3.6.3. Analysis of Semi Structured Interview

The last phase of the analysis was concerned with the semi-structured interviews. The process of a semi-structured interview involved the interviewer presenting the context of the study and its objectives to the interviewee. As the aim was to capture as much as possible the participant's thoughts about a particular topic or a practical task, the interviewer followed in depth the process of thinking posing new questions after the first answers given by the subject.

Questions were simple, with a logical sequence to help the discussion flow. The interviews were tape recorded and then transcribed. The analysis consisted of three steps. The first step was to listen to the interview cassette and to write down the opinions stated for each question one by one, whereas in the second step all the statements was analyzed, categories/labels were generated, and a list of them grows to

classify the answers of each interviewee in terms of learning and variety. In the third and final step the incidents was put onto a qualitative data category table after reading and focusing on all the answers given for each question.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

In this section, the research findings will be presented on the basis of the research questions:

1. How do students respond to task-based reading activities?
2. How well do students believe that they improve their reading skill when taught through tasks?

As an initial data collection instrument, feedback forms, diaries and interviews were used. The data were analyzed qualitatively.

4.1. Findings from the Feedback Forms

Table 4.1.1 demonstrates the participant students' responses to the task "Piano". As can be seen in Table 4.1, of the 31 students, 20 learnt vocabulary, 17 students learnt indirectly by drawing and practicing the task that is a 'manipulating / acting out' process of metacognitive strategy. In addition to these, seven students stated in their feedback forms that they learnt reading strategies like using context clues by 'inferencing'; and the meaning of what they read. Furthermore, five students learnt language structure; and improved their drawing skills. Three students gained not only general but also cultural information; on the other hand, two students indicated that they learnt making use of dictionary that is a 'resourcing' process of cognitive strategies; and classroom tools effectively; as well, one student pointed out that s/he learnt realizing himself or herself (self-management) that is a process of metacognitive strategies.

Table 4.1.1. Students' response to the task "piano"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Piano	31	Vocabulary	20	Enjoyable	30	Did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment	7
		Learnt by drawing 'manipulating acting out'	17	Fruitful	28	The task took long class hours	6
		Reading Strategies 'using context clues'	7	Original / new technique	17	Turning the written story into drawing as original was difficult	6
		The meaning of what students read	7	Triggered students cooperation	12	Drawing was difficult	5
		Language structure	5	Enhanced / Activated creativity	9	Did not enjoy because of personal reasons	3
		Improving drawing skill	5	Enhanced group work	9	Did not learn adequately because of personal reasons	2
		General / cultural information	3	Wonderful / Fascinating	8	Difficult to gain self confidence	2
		Using classroom tools effectively	2	Interesting	7	Not enjoyable task	2
		Making use of dictionary 'Resourcing'	2	Memorable	7	Task was waste of time	1
		Realizing capacity 'Self-Management'	1	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	5	Task was not adequate for learning	1
				Motivating	5	Did not enjoy the topic	1
				Provided competition among groups	5	Did not like teacher's mood / attitude	1
				Enhanced self-confidence	4	Difficult to comprehend the story exactly	1
				Triggered communication	4	Difficult to frame sentences in English	1
				Enjoyable and interesting topic/content	3	Difficult to know what to focus on	1
				Supplied visual learning 'Using Imagery'	3	Difficult to memorize vocabulary	1
				Improved students' role/activation	3		
				Easy to do	2		
				Led to a more relaxed classroom climate	2		
				Well-Prepared / Well-Performed	2		
				Purposeful	1		
				Enabled to think in a concrete and abstract way	1		
				Enabled to learn classmates' personality	1		
Total	31		69		168		41

The majority of students (30 of 31 students) thought that the task was enjoyable. Twenty-eight students stated that it was fruitful and 17 students found the task as an original or a new technique. Furthermore, 12 students thought the task triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies. Besides nine students indicated that the task triggered and activated students' creativity, and also enhanced group work. Seven students found the task wonderful and fascinating; in addition, they described it as interesting; and memorable. Furthermore, five students thought that the task provided positive, successful learning outcome; and competition among groups, and also defined that the task was motivating. Four students indicated that the task triggered communication; and it enhanced self-confidence. Three students thought that the task had enjoyable and interesting topic/content; it improved students' role and activation; besides, it supplied visual learning that is a 'using imagery' process of metacognitive strategies. Furthermore, two students found the task easy to do; well-prepared/ well-performed; and they noticed that the task led to a more relaxed classroom climate and lastly one student described the task as purposeful; and also thought that it enabled to think in a concrete and abstract way; in addition, the task gave them the opportunity to learn classmates' personality.

Contrary to these views, there were some students who held the belief that the tasks were not enjoyable. For instance, seven students thought that they did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment; and six students stressed that the task took long class hours; and they think that turning the written story into drawing was difficult. Besides, five students found drawing difficult; and three students noted that the tasks were not enjoyable the task because of personal reasons. In addition, two students similarly stated that they did not learn adequately because of personal reasons; they also stated that the task was not enjoyable; and had difficulties to gain self-confidence. Lastly, one student thought that the task was a waste of time; and not adequate for learning. Besides, s/he indicated that s/he did not enjoy the topic; and did not like teacher's negative mood/attitude. Furthermore, a student noted that s/he had some difficulty to comprehend the story exactly; to frame sentences in English; to know what to focus on; and to memorize vocabulary.

Above findings indicate that the task piano contributed to the students' (vocabulary, reading strategies, and language structure, ect.) learning in a positive way. In addition, we may suggest that the task was fruitful, enjoyable, and improved students' motivation toward the reading lesson taking into account the students'

feedback forms. In terms of negative comments, we see that the students found the task boring and also difficult. According to the students, this may have derived from the long class hours and students inadequate knowledge of language structure. On the other hand, it appears that the task served well to the students' activation.

Table 4.1.2. Students' response to the task "the sound of music"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	Fr	Negative	fr
The Sound of Music	34	General knowledge / cultural information	34	Enjoyable	30	Difficult to memorize some vocabularies	5
		Learnt by practicing / doing (indirect learning)	18	Fruitful	14	Not enjoyable task	4
		Vocabulary	10	Interesting / creative	11	Did not like teacher's mood/attitude	3
		Reading strategies (i.e. scanning) 'Selectively Attend'	10	Practical	8	Pronunciation of some vocabularies was difficult	3
		Language structure	6	Motivating	8	Did not enjoy because of personal reasons	3
				Led to positive / successful learning outcome	6	Did not learn adequately because of personal reasons	2
				Fascinating	6	Listening part was difficult	2
				Interesting topic / content	6	Difficult to gain self confidence	1
				Improved students' talking time	5	Difficult to answer the related questions	1
				Memorable	5	Task was not adequate for learning	1
				Improved students participation	5	Did not enjoy the topic/content	1
				Enhanced group work	4	The task took long class hours	1
				Triggered communication	3	Did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment	1
				Enhanced meaningful activities	3	Did not learn adequately because of poor motivation	1
				Enhanced language development	2	Did not learn adequately because the number of tasks was not adequate	1
				Enabled to use authentic materials (Resourcing)	2		
				Easy to do	2		
				Original / new technique	2		
				Supplied visual learning 'Using Imagery'	1		
				Improved students' activation	1		
Total	34		78		124		30

Students' responses to the task "the sound of music" are displayed in Table 4.1.2. All the participant students (34) in table 4.2 indicate that they gained general

knowledge and cultural information by the task. Eighteen students learnt indirectly by practicing and doing the task. Besides, 10 students learnt related vocabulary; and reading strategies such as scanning which is a selectively attend process of metacognitive strategies. Similarly, six students defined that they learnt language structures; and lastly two students noted that they improved drawing skills.

Of 34 students, 30 found the task enjoyable and amusing; and 14 students also found it fruitful. Eleven students described it as creative; and interesting, in addition eight students described the task as practical; and motivating. Six students stated that the task was fascinating; and it led to positive, successful learning outcome; and it has interesting topic / content. According to five students, the task was memorable; it improved students' participation; and Improved students' talking time. The number of students thinking the task enhanced group work was four. Besides, three students noted that it triggered communication; and enhanced meaningful activities. Two students defined that it enhanced language development; enabled to use authentic materials that is a 'resourcing' process of metacognitive strategies; it was easy to do; and was original technique. Lastly, one student stated that it improved students' activation; and supplied visual learning that is a 'using imagery' process of metacognitive strategies.

On the other hand, five students had some difficulties to memorize some vocabularies; in addition to these, four students found the task not enjoyable. Three students did not like teacher's mood / attitude; they also found the task not enjoyable because of personal reasons; and thought that pronunciation of some vocabularies was difficult. In addition, two students found the listening part difficult; and did not learn adequately because of personal reasons. Last of all, one student had difficulties to gain self-confidence; and to answer the related questions. The student thought that the task was not adequate for learning; and also s/he did not enjoy the topic / content; and long class hours; as well, defined that s/he did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment; and poor motivation. Lastly, the student indicated that the number of tasks was not adequate to learn the subject.

To conclude, we may say that the task the sound of music was considered as successful in terms of enabling positive learning outcome. Besides, we may conclude that the task enhanced indirect learning and increased students' critical thinking. However, it did not work well in terms of vocabulary memorization. In addition, we may indicate those students' personal problems as also affected learners' thoughts about the task negatively.

Table 4.1.3. Students’ response to the task “smart moves”

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Smart Moves	30	Reading Strategies (i.e. skimming, scanning, guessing the meaning from context) <i>‘selectively attend’</i>	30	Enjoyable	26	Not interesting topic	9
		Vocabulary	24	Fruitful	20	Did not enjoy	5
		General / cultural information	24	Current / generating topic	12	Difficult to pronounce some vocabularies	1
		Language structure	16	Improved students’ role/activation	11	Learning outcome was poor	1
		How to use language <i>‘Self-Management’</i>	11	Enhanced group work	9	Unable to motivate the task	1
				Led to extensive use of language (i.e. chatting on the net with foreigners, sending and receiving messages in English)	8		
				Useful teaching techniques	7		
				Provided competition among groups	7		
				Motivating	3		
				Triggered discussion on topic	3		
Total	30		105		98		17

Table 4.1.3 demonstrates the participant students’ responses to the task “Smart Moves”. As can be seen in the table above, 30 students stated that they gained ‘selectively attend process’ and ‘inferencing’ of metacognitive strategies like skimming, scanning and guessing the meaning from context, 24 students defined that they gained not only general but also cultural information and vocabulary. Furthermore, 16 students indicated that they learnt new language structures and lastly, 11 students thought that they improved self-management strategy that provided them learning how to use the language.

According to 26 students, the task was enjoyable. Twenty students found the task fruitful; and 12 students thought the topic was current and generating. According to 11 students, the task improved students’ role and activation in the lesson, in addition, nine students stated that the task enhanced group work. The number of students thought that tasks led to extensive use of language (i.e. chatting on the net with foreigners, sending and receiving messages in English) was eight.

Besides, seven students found teaching techniques useful; and indicated that the task provided competition among groups. Lastly, three students thought that it triggered discussion on topic and was motivating.

However, nine students stated that the topic did not interest them. Five of them found the task not enjoyable; and one student found it difficult to pronounce some vocabularies; this student thought that his/her learning outcome was poor; and was not motivated toward the task.

When we consider the above findings, we may suggest that the task was effective and useful regarding the students' responses to the feedback forms. In addition, it constituted a base for the following strategies to be presented. In terms of negative aspects, we see that the students found the task somewhat boring and hard. This may have derived from the fact that the topic of the task was not of interest to some students.

Table 4.1.4. Students' response to the task "the daily grind"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
The Daily Grind	32	Vocabulary	25	Enjoyable	32	-	
		General / cultural information	25	Interesting	15		
		Reading Strategies	25	Enhanced group work	11		
				Fascinating	7		
				Fruitful	7		
				Interest generating topic	4		
				Triggered students cooperation	4		
				Enabled discussion on topic	4		
				Memorable	4		
				Improved students' role/activation	2		
				Improved my idea about other students	2		
				Motivating	2		
				Improved students' talking time	2		
Total	32		75		96		

Students' responses to the task "The Daily Grind" are demonstrated in table 4.1.4. According to the table, 25 students thought that they learnt vocabulary; gained general / cultural information; and reading strategies.

All participant students (32 students) found the task enjoyable. Fifteen students thought that the task was interesting; in addition, 11 students stated that it enhanced group work. The number of students finding the task fascinating and fruitful was seven. Besides, four students thought that it was interest generating, triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies; enabled discussion on topic, and was memorable. Lastly, two students stated that the task improved students' role/activation, improved his/her idea about other students; and the student found it motivating; and improved students' talking time. There were no negative comments on this task. The findings reached show that the task was successful and fruitful. In addition, the task reached its learning goals.

Table 4.1.5. Students' response to the task "meeting and greeting customs"

Activity Meeting and Greeting Custom	n	Learnt	n	About Task	n	Negative	n
	49	General/cultural information	49	Enjoyable	49	Difficult to practice the task	5
		Learnt by role playing (indirect learning) 'manipulating/ acting out'	45	Fruitful	32	The task took long class hours	5
		Vocabulary	30	Memorable	29	Didn't enjoy because of personal reasons	3
		Reading Strategies (i.e. guessing the meaning) 'using context clues / inferring'	5	Fascinating	17	Difficult to speak in English	2
		Language structure	2	Supplied visual learning 'using imagery'	17	Didn't learnt some parts	2
				Interesting	14	Did not like teacher's harsh attitude	2
				Enabled positive learning environment	12	Didn't enjoy the topic	2
				Original / new technique	10	Didn't enjoy the repetitions	2
				Improved students' role/activation and talking time	9	Didn't enjoy the poor classroom management	1
				Led to positive/successful learning outcome	7	Didn't enjoy the negative classroom environment	1
				Enhanced students' interaction each other	5	Difficult to frame /understand the sentences in English	1
				Improved students participation	5	Difficult to gain self	1

As displayed in Table 4.1.5, all of the students (49) commenting on the task “Meeting and Greeting Custom” stated that they gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information. Besides, 45 students defined that they learnt by role-playing, that is indirect learning which is one of the main components of task-based instruction and consequent of this task participants gained a ‘manipulating / acting out’ and ‘inferencing’ process of metacognitive strategy. Thirty students learnt vocabulary; and five students learnt reading strategies like guessing the meaning and translation. In addition, two students stated that they improved their language structure.

All the students responding to this task reported that they enjoyed the task. In addition, 32 students found the task fruitful. The number of students finding the task memorable was 29. Furthermore, 17 students thought that the task was fascinating; and it supplied visual learning that is a ‘using imagery’ process of metacognitive strategies. Fourteen students noticed that, the task was interesting, and 12 students indicated that it enabled positive learning environment. Besides, 10 students stated that it was an original and a new technique to them. Furthermore, nine students thought that it improved students’ role, activation and talking. In addition, seven students pointed out that that it led to positive and successful learning outcomes. According to five students, the task improved students’ participation; and interaction one another, besides it was motivating. Inasmuch as four students, the task was original and it also enhanced and activated students’ creativity; and group work. Furthermore, it enabled students to learn about the classmates’ personalities. Three students noted that the task had enjoyable and interesting topic, content. In addition, it triggered student cooperation, and led to a more relaxed classroom climate. In accordance with two students, the task triggered communication; it was well prepared / well performed; and easy to do. It added to their schema and the students also described the task like a game rather than a lesson. Lastly, one student thought that the task was purposeful; it enabled them to think in a concrete and abstract ways. The task also provided competition among groups; and enhanced self-confidence.

Contrary to these views, five students found the task difficult to practice and they also indicated that the task took long class hours. Three students stated that they did not enjoy because of personal reasons. In addition, two students stated that they had some difficulty in speaking English, and also in learning some parts. Furthermore, they added that they did not like teacher’s negative and harsh attitude; besides, they did not enjoy the topic; and the repetitions. Lastly, one student stated that the classroom

management was poor; and did not enjoy the negative classroom environment. In addition, it was difficult to frame and understand the sentences in English; and lastly gaining self-confidence was difficult according to one of the participating student.

Taking the given responses as a base, we may say that the task “Meeting and Greeting Customs” was seen by the students useful and enjoyable. In addition, we can say that all the students learnt related things and also liked the task. However, there were some students who did not enjoy the class hours; and had difficulties to do the task.

Table 4.1.6. Students' response to the task "shop till you drop"

Activity	n	Learnt	n	About Task	n	Negative	n
Shop Till You Drop	30	General / cultural information	19	Enjoyable	14	Did not enjoy because of hot weather	3
		Vocabulary	15	Interesting topic / content	11	Did not like teacher's mood/attitude	2
		Language structure	6	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	11	Did not enjoy because the topic was boring	1
		Reading Strategies	3	Original / new technique	5	The task took long class hours	1
		Learnt by practicing (indirect learning) 'a metacognitive process'	2	Improved students participation	4	Did not enjoy because of personal reasons	1
		How to use the language 'Self Management'	2	Improved students' role / activation	4	Difficult to memorize vocabulary	1
		Pragmatic Knowledge	1	Fruitful	4	Difficult to speak in English	1
				Improved schema	4	Difficult to pronounce some words	1
				Original/creative	4		
				Fascinating	3		
				Enhanced group work	3		
				Well-Prepared / Well-Performed	3		
				Memorable	2		
				Improved students' talking time	2		
				Led to a more relaxed classroom climate	2		
				Enabled to discuss on topic	1		
				Triggered students cooperation	1		
				Triggered communication	1		
				Motivating	1		
Total	30		48		80		11

In Table 4.1.6, we see the task “Shops Till You Drop”. According to the table, nineteen students gained not only general but also cultural information; and also 15 students learnt vocabulary. In addition, six students learnt language structure; similarly, three students stated that they learnt reading strategies. Besides, two students stated that they learnt indirectly by practicing and doing the; and learnt how to use the language task that is a ‘manipulating / acting out’ process of metacognitive strategies. Lastly, one student indicated that s/he learnt pragmatic knowledge.

The number of students finding the task enjoyable was 14. Furthermore, 11 students found the topic / content interesting; they also stated that tasks led to positive/successful learning outcome. Inasmuch as five students, the task had a new, original technique. Four students thought that it improved their schema; improved students participation; improved students’ role / activation; and also they indicated that it was fruitful. In addition, three students found the task original and creative; they also described it as fascinating. They added that it enhanced group work. Two students described it as a well prepared / well performed; memorable task; and added that it improved students’ talking time. Furthermore, one student stated that the task led to a more relaxed classroom climate; enabled them to discuss on topic; moreover, it was motivating; it triggered communication; and it triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies.

The lesson was conducted in the garden; these three students stated that they found the task not enjoyable because of hot weather. In addition, two students did not like teacher’s negative mood / attitude when they did not do their homework or they had made uproar (indeed teacher’s mood or attitude is not directly related to the task, but it still effects the effectiveness of the task). Finally, one student found the task not enjoyable because of the boring topic; long class hours; and personal reasons. S/he also found it difficult to memorize vocabulary; to speak in English; and to pronounce some words.

As a conclusion, we may suggest that the participants found the task fruitful. Furthermore, they learnt about related topics and improved their linguistic knowledge. Besides, they enjoyed the task. On the contrary, to these findings, though, we have some negative comments such as “difficult” and “boring”.

Table 4.1.7. Students' response to the task "the smell of bread"

Activity	n	Learnt	n	About Task	n	Negative	n
The Smell of Bread	22	General / cultural information	17	Enjoyable	18	Difficult to make a sentence in English	1
		Vocabulary	12	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	15	Difficult to speak in English	1
		Learnt by role-playing (indirect learning) <i>'manipulating / acting out'</i>	5	Motivating	8	Difficult to get the meaning of some sentences	1
				Fascinating	7	Difficult to answer related questions	1
				Fruitful	7	Not enjoyable	1
				Original / new technique	6		
				Interesting topic / content	4		
				Enabled to use different skills	4		
				Memorable	2		
				Improved students' role / activation	2		
				Led to a more relaxed classroom climate	2		
				Triggered communication	1		
				Improved students participation	1		
				Activate Background Knowledge	1		
				Eased getting information from each other	1		
				Enabled discussion on the task	1		
Total	22		34		79		5

As seen in Table 4.1.7, of the 22 students, 17 gained not only general but also cultural information (they thought the task enhanced their schema). In addition, 12 students defined that they learnt related vocabulary; and five students learnt indirectly by role-playing, that is a 'manipulating / acting out' process of metacognitive strategies.

Eighteen students found the task enjoyable. Fifteen students defined that the tasks led to positive, successful learning outcome. Besides, eight students thought that it was motivating; seven students described the task as fruitful; and fascinating. According to six students, the task has original / new technique; beside, four of them thought that it has interesting topic / content; and it enabled to use different skills. Furthermore, two students noted that the task was memorable; original and had a new technique; it improved students' role, and activation; it led to a more relaxed classroom climate. Lastly, one student thought that it triggered communication; improved participation; another one defined that the task helped to gain a metacognitive strategy that activated background knowledge; the other student thought that it eased getting information from each other; and discussing on the task; and similarly,

On the other hand, one student had difficulty in making English sentences; to speak in English; to comprehend the meaning of some sentences; and to answer related questions. S/he also found the task not enjoyable.

In that respect, we may summarize that students added to their schema and they learnt indirectly. Furthermore, we can say that they learnt how to study, how to deal with a reading text. However, they had some difficulties in understanding the text and speaking about it.

Table 4.1.8. Students' response to the task "Drawing a Dog Picture"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Drawing a Dog Picture	27	Learnt by drawing / practicing / doing (indirect learning)	20	Enjoyable	26	Difficult to draw	7
		General knowledge/cultural information	15	Original / new technique	18	Difficult to use new vocabulary into sentences	1
		Vocabulary	10	Fruitful	10		
		Language structure	6	Fascinating	10		
		Improving drawing skill	6	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	10		
				Enhanced knowing each other better	7		
				Original / creative	6		
				Motivating	5		
				Improved students' activation	4		
				Interesting topic / content	3		
				Easy to learn/to do	3		
				Improved students talking time	3		
				Communicative	2		
				Memorable	2		
				Led to a more relaxed classroom climate	1		
				Improved students participation	1		
Total	27		57		111		8

Table 4.1.8 displays the students' responses to the task "Drawing a Dog Picture". As can be seen in the table, 20 students thought that they learnt by drawing, practicing, doing (indirect learning); and 15 students gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information. Furthermore, ten students learnt vocabulary; and lastly six students learnt language structure; and improved drawing skill.

According to 26 students, the task was enjoyable; and 18 students described it as original and new technique. In addition, ten students found the task fruitful; fascinating; and added that it led to positive, successful learning outcome. Seven students noted that it enhanced knowing each other better; besides, six students thought that it was original and creative. Furthermore, five students found it motivating; and four students stated that it improved students' activation. Three students thought that the task had interesting topic / content; it was easy to learn/to do; and it Improved students talking time. The number of students describing the task as communicative; and memorable was two. Finally, one student stated that the task led to a more relaxed classroom climate; and improved students' participation. Contrary to these views, seven students stated that they found it difficult to draw; and one student had difficulty in using new vocabularies into sentences.

Taking into account these findings, we may conclude that the task was useful. They stated that they learnt indirectly by enjoying. However, it did not work in terms of vocabulary use. They complained that using the new words into sentences was difficult.

Table 4.1.9. Students' response to the task "dreams"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Dreams	35	Learnt by practicing / doing (indirect learning)	26	Enjoyable	32	Difficult to report the findings of task	6
		General /cultural information (enhanced schema)	20	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	23	Difficult to translate the answer of survey	6
		Vocabulary	13	Fruitful	23	There was time constraint	2
		Reading Strategies	8	Enhanced group work	12	Did not enjoy the noises	2
				Enhanced communicating with outdoor people	9	Difficult to prepare the survey questions	2
				Triggered students cooperation	6	The task took long class hours	1
				Interesting topic / content	5		
				Original / new technique	5		
				Memorable	5		
				Creative / interesting	5		
				Triggered communication	5		
				Improved students participation	3		
				Improved the students friendship	3		
				Improved students' talking time	3		
				Fascinating	2		
				Motivating	2		
				Realizing capacity 'Self-Management'	1		
				Enabled discussion on topic	1		
				Enabled competition among groups	1		
				Activate Background Knowledge	1		
				Improved our research skills	1		
				Improved students' role / activation	1		
				Led to a more relaxed classroom climate	1		
Total	35		67		150		19

In table 4.1.9, the responses about the task “dreams” can be seen. According to the table, 26 students learnt indirectly by practicing and doing. Twenty students gained not only general but also cultural information (enhanced their schema). Furthermore, 13 students learnt vocabulary, and eight students learnt reading strategies.

Thirty-two students found the task enjoyable; and 23 students thought that the task led to more positive / successful learning outcomes, they found it fruitful. Besides, 12 students thought it enhanced group work. In addition, nine students stated that it enhanced to communication with outdoor people. The number of students who noted that it triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies was six; and five students defined that it had interesting topic/content; had original / new technique. Then they added that it was memorable; creative/interesting; and it triggered communication. Furthermore, three students stated that the task improved students’ participation; Improved the students’ friendship; and students’ talking time. Two students described the task as fascinating; and motivating. Finally, one student thought that the task helped realizing capacity (self-management) that is a strategy of metacognitive process; it enabled discussion on topic; competition among groups; and activate background knowledge. In addition, it improved their research skills; and students’ role / activation; and lastly it led to a more relaxed classroom climate.

However, six students found it difficult to report the findings of task; and to translate the answer of survey. In addition, two students did not enjoy time constraint; the noise; and they found difficult to prepare survey questions. Lastly, one student stated that the task took long class hours.

With the answers, we can say that students believed that they got successful learning outcomes and improved their general and cultural knowledge. This may be due to the fact that the task led them being highly active. On the other hand, the basic difficulty was, the reporting phase, as the students thought that reporting the task, meanly talking on the task, was difficult.

Table 4.1.10. Students' response to the task "potato salad"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Greg's purple potato salad	38	Vocabulary	30	Enjoyable	30	Did not learn adequately because of personal reasons	4
		Learnt by applying (indirect learning)	29	Fruitful	30	Did not enjoy because of personal reasons	4
		General / cultural information	17	Original / new technique	29	Did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment	3
		The meaning of what students read	14	Real life like	27	Not enjoyable task	1
		Reading Strategies	14	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	20	Task was waste of time	1
		Making use of dictionary 'Resourcing'	8	Enhanced group work	16	Difficult to frame sentences in English	1
		Language structure	3	Triggered students cooperation	11		
				Motivating	9		
				Led to retention	9		
				Enjoyable and interesting topic / content	9		
				Enhanced students' role / activation	7		
				Well-Prepared / Well-Performed	5		
				Supplied visual learning 'Using Imagery'	5		
				Triggered communication	3		
				Purposeful	3		
				Wonderful / Fascinating	3		
Total	38		115		216		14

As displayed in Table 4.1.10, of the 38 students 30 stated that they learnt vocabulary, 29 of them said that they learnt indirectly by applying the task. In addition, 17 students thought they gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information. The number of students who learnt some reading strategies, and the meaning of what they read were 14. Furthermore, eight students learnt making use of dictionary that is a 'resourcing' process of cognitive strategies. Lastly, three students noted that they learnt language structure. Thirty students stated that the tasks were

enjoyable and fruitful. Twenty-nine students found the technique was original / new. According to 27 students, the tasks were real life like. Besides, 20 students thought that the tasks led to positive / successful learning outcome; and according to 16 students, they enhanced group work. Moreover, 11 students stated that tasks triggered students' cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies. Nine students found the tasks motivating; led to retention; and they thought the tasks have enjoyable and interesting topic / content. Seven students indicated that tasks enhanced students' role/activation. Five of 38 students defined that tasks supplied visual learning that is a 'using imagery' process of metacognitive strategies; and they were well prepared / well performed. Last of all, three students defined the tasks as triggered communication; purposeful; and wonderful / fascinating.

However, four students stated that because of personal reasons; they did not learn adequately, and found the task not enjoyable. Besides, the number of students that did not learn adequately because of negative classroom environment was three. Last of all one student found the tasks not enjoyable; waste of time; and difficult to frame sentences in English.

These findings indicate that the students learnt (vocabulary, various reading strategies, general knowledge and cultural information) indirectly by applying the task. Beside, they also found the task enjoyable and fruitful. They thought the task was real life like, an important aspect of task-based instruction. They believed that they got successful learning outcomes. On the other hand, the basic difficulty was grow out of personal reasons, as they defined that they did not learn adequately or enjoy.

4.2. Findings obtained from Students' Diaries

Table 4.2.1. Students' response to the task "piano"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Piano	7	Reading Strategies	2	Enjoyable	7	There were misunderstanding	1
		Time management	1	Fruitful	6	The task took long class hours	1
		Vocabulary	1	Enhanced my enthusiasm	4	Negative classroom environment	1
		Improving drawing skill	1	Memorable	3		
				Triggered communication	3		
				Triggered students cooperation	3		
				Original/creative	3		
				Led to positive / successful learning outcome	2		
				Enhanced group work	2		
				Fascinating	2		
				Enhanced language development	1		
				Instructive	1		
				Motivating	1		
				Purposeful	1		
				Original / new technique	1		
Total	7		5		40		3

Table 4.2.1 displays the comments obtained from the diaries kept for the task "piano". In the table, we see that two students learnt reading strategies. In addition, one student learnt time management; vocabulary; and improved his/her drawing skill.

Seven students found the task enjoyable, and six students found it fruitful. Furthermore, four students thought that it enhanced their enthusiasm toward the lesson. Three students found the task memorable; triggered communication; triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies; and they thought that the task was original / creative. In addition, two students stated that it led to a positive, successful learning outcome; enhanced group work; and they defined it as fascinating. Finally, one student noted that it enhanced language development; furthermore, the student found the task instructive, motivating; purposeful; and original / new technique.

However, one student had difficulty because of misunderstanding; and define that the task took long class hours; and negative classroom environment.

Therefore, we can say that the task was enjoyable and useful. On the other hand, we cannot ignore that the students found the class hours too long. This may have derived from the fact that the reading lesson lasted four class hours consecutively.

Table 4.2.2. Students' responses to the task "the sound of music"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
The Sound of Music	8	General / cultural information	8	Enjoyable	7	Did not enjoy because of personal problems	1
		Reading Strategies (i.e. guessing the meaning, scanning, skimming) 'inferencing'	4	Fruitful	6	Did not like teacher attitude	1
		Vocabulary	3	Successful learning outcome	6	Did not enjoy negative classroom environment	1
		Language structure	3	Fascinating	5	Found the content boring	1
				Provided experiencing the task	4	Found the task less fruitful	1
				Improved self-confidence	2		
Total	8		18		30		5

Table 4.2.2 indicates diary of the task "The Sound of Music". In the table; all of the participant students (eight students) noted that they gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information; and four students learnt reading strategies like guessing the meaning, scanning and skimming that are 'inferencing' and 'selectively attend' processes of metacognitive strategies. Besides, three students learnt vocabulary; and language structure.

The frequency of citation of the comment "enjoying the task" was seven. In addition, six students found the task fruitful; and they thought it provided successful learning outcome. Five students described it as fascinating; and four students thought that it provided experiencing the task. Lastly, two students stated that it improved self-confidence.

On the contrary, one student did not enjoy because of personal problems; teacher's negative attitude; and also negative classroom environment. In addition, s/he found the content boring; and found the task less fruitful.

To conclude, it can be said that the task the sound of music was considered as enjoyable and useful. In addition, we may conclude that they learnt related strategies to read text. However, we cannot ignore that a student did not enjoyed teacher's attitude since the student think that the teacher get angry easily.

Table 4.2.3. Students' responses to the task "smart moves"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Smart Moves	13	General / cultural information	9	Enjoyable	6		
		Vocabulary	4	Interesting	4		
				Enhanced successful learning outcome	4		
				Effective teaching technique	3		
				Fruitful	3		
				Increased curiosity	2		
				Improved students participation	2		
				Triggered student cooperation and group work	2		
				Memorable	1		
				Motivating	1		
				Triggered discussion on topic	1		
Total	13		13		29		

Table 4.2.3 displays diary findings of the task "Smart Moves". As displayed in the table, nine students gained general and cultural information; and they defined that they also learnt vocabulary.

According to six students, the task was enjoyable. Four students found it interesting; and as they state, it enhanced successful learning outcome. Furthermore, three students indicated that the task was used by an effective teaching technique; and thus, it was fruitful. Two students noted that it increased curiosity; improved students participation; triggered student cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies

and group work. Finally, one thought that it was memorable; motivating; and it triggered discussion on topic. There were no negative comments on the task.

As a conclusion, we can be sure that the participants gained some general and cultural knowledge. In addition, it can be said that the task was original and effective.

Table 4.2.4. Students' responses to the task "the daily grind"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
The Daily Grind	8	Vocabulary	4	Enjoyable	4		
		Learnt how to learn ' <i>Self-Management</i> '	3	Enhanced group work	3		
				Triggered discussion on topic	2		
				Interesting topic	2		
				Fascinating	2		
				Motivating	1		
				Interest generating	1		
				Triggered students cooperation	1		
				Improved students role / activation	1		
Total	8		7		17		

Table 4.2.4 displays the findings of the diaries kept for the task "The Daily Grind". As can be seen in the table four students defined that they learnt vocabulary; and three students stated that they learnt 'how to learn' that is a 'self-management' process of metacognitive strategies.

The number of students who enjoyed the task was four. Besides, three students thought that the task enhanced group work. Two students thought that it triggered discussion on topic; and they stated that it was an interesting topic; and it was fascinating. Furthermore, one student stated that the task was motivating; interest generating; triggered students cooperation that is a process of metacognitive strategies; and also improved students role/activation. There were no negative comments on the task.

In that respect, we may summarize that the students learnt how to learn by themselves, and also they liked the task. Besides, the task improved their self-confidence.

Table 4.2.5. Students' responses to the task "meeting and greeting custom"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Meeting and Greeting Custom	15	Learnt by doing (indirect learning)	14	Enjoyable	11		
		General / cultural information	8	Fruitful	10		
		Vocabulary	5	Motivating	10		
				Memorable	9		
				Enabled positive / successful learning outcome	8		
				Original / interesting topic	4		
				Well prepared / well performed	3		
				Original / new technique	3		
				Turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one.	2		
				Improved students participation	2		
				Task placed more responsibility on students	2		
				Purposeful	1		
				Improved schema	1		
				Improved self confidence	1		
				Fascinating	1		
Total	15		27		68		

In table 4.2.5, we see students' comments in the diaries for "Meeting and Greeting Customs". As can be seen in the table, there are 14 students who learnt indirectly by doing or practicing. In addition, eight students improved general and cultural information. Five students learnt vocabulary.

Eleven students enjoyed the task; and 10 students found the task fruitful and motivating. Similarly, nine students described the task as memorable. Furthermore, eight students thought that it enabled positive and successful learning outcome. Four students stated that the task had original / interesting topic. The number of students who

described the task well prepared / well performed, and had original / new technique was three. Two students stated that it turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one; improved students participation; placed students more responsibilities. Finally, one student thought that it was purposeful and fascinating also stated that improved their schema; and self-confidence. There were no any negative comments about the task.

Above findings indicate that the task meeting and greeting customs contributed to the students' learning. On the other hand, it appears that the task served well to the students' general and cultural knowledge. Furthermore, students enjoyed the task.

Table 4.2.6. Students' responses to the task "shop till you drop"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Shop Till You Drop	11	Learnt by doing/practicing (indirect learning)	4	Enjoyable	7	Did not enjoy because of getting bored	1
		General / cultural information	4	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	7	Did not enjoy the topic	1
		Vocabulary	4	Fruitful	5	Did not like negative teacher attitude	1
		Reading strategies	2	Improved students participation	4		
		Language structure	1	Motivating	3		
		How to use the language	1	Memorable	3		
				Improved students role / activation	3		
				Fascinating	3		
				Interesting	3		
				Original / new technique	2		
				Improved students talking time	2		
				Improved schema	2		
				Triggered communication	1		
				Enabled discussion on topic	1		
				Turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one	1		
		Total	11		16		47

Table 4.2.6 displays the results of the diaries of the task “Shop Till You Drop”. According to the findings, four students learnt indirectly by doing and practicing. Besides, they gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information; and also vocabulary. In addition, two students learnt reading strategies; and lastly one student learnt language structure; and how to use the language.

The number of students deeming the task enjoyable was seven; and they also thought that the task led to positive and successful learning outcome. In addition, five students found it fruitful; and four students stated that it improved students’ participation. Furthermore, three students found the task motivating; and memorable; besides, they defined it as fascinating; interesting; and improving students’ role, activation. In two students’ point of view, the task was original and had a new technique; it improved students’ talking time; and improved their schema. Finally, one student noted that it triggered communication; it triggered discussion on topic; and it turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one. However, one student stated that s/he did not like the task because of getting bored; and the student stated that s/he did not enjoy the topic; and negative teacher attitude.

When we consider the above findings, we may suggest that the task was fruitful for the students. It enhanced students learning. In terms of negative findings, we see that the students found the task boring. This may be because the topic was not relevant to the students’ interests.

Table 4.2.7. Students' responses to the task "The Smell of Bread"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
The Smell of Bread	7	Learnt by role playing (indirect learning) <i>'manipulating / acting out'</i>	7	Fruitful	5	Difficult to get the meaning of some sentences	1
		General / cultural information	3	Enjoyed the task	4		
		Vocabulary	3	Interesting topic	4		
		Language structure	3	Led to positive / successful learning outcome	3		
				Original / new technique	2		
				Triggered discussion on topic	2		
				Improved students role / activation	2		
				Easy to learn/to do	2		
				Enhanced group work	2		
				Fascinating	2		
				Motivating	2		
				Interesting	1		
				Improved students participation	1		
				Turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one	1		
				Memorable	1		
				Creative	1		
				Eased getting information from each other	1		
Total	7		16		36		1

Table 4.2.7 displays diary results of the task "The Smell of Bread". Seven students learnt indirectly by role-playing that is a 'manipulating / acting out' process of

metacognitive strategies. In addition, three students gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information; vocabulary; and language structure.

Furthermore, five students found the task fruitful; besides, four students stated that they enjoyed the task; and defined that it has interesting topic. According to three students, it led to positive and successful learning outcome. Two students noted that it was an original / new technique to them, it served to discussion on topic; in addition, they added that it enhanced group work; improved students' role/activation. In addition, it was easy to learn/to do; fascinating; and motivating. Lastly, one student stated that it was interesting; it improved students' participation. Furthermore, it created relaxed class climate, eased getting information from each other. Finally, it was memorable; and creative. On the other hand, just one of the students stated some difficulties to get the meaning of some sentences.

Considering these findings, we may say that the task was fruitful. In addition, it constituted a base for the following strategies, tasks to be presented. However, it did not work well in terms of getting the meaning of some sentences.

Table 4.2.8. Students' responses to the task "Drawing a Dog Picture"

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr		
Drawing a Dog	7	Learnt by drawing (indirect learning)	2	Enjoyable	6				
		Vocabulary	2	Fruitful	5				
				Led to positive / successful learning outcome	4				
				Motivating	4				
				Original / new technique	3				
				Turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one	2				
				Improved students participation	1				
				Memorable	1				
				Improved students' role / activation	1				
				Enhanced curiosity	1				
				Enabled exertion to do the task	1				
				Constituted an effective learning environment	1				
		Total	7		4		30		

Table 4.2.8 displays diary results / findings of the task “Drawing Dog”. Two students learnt indirectly by doing / practicing; and learnt vocabulary.

Six students found the task enjoyable; and five students found it fruitful. In addition, four students thought that it led to positive, successful learning outcome; and it was motivating. Three students defined that it was original / new technique. According to two students, it turned the class atmosphere into a more relaxed one. Finally, one student thought that it improved students’ participation; besides, it was memorable; it improved students’ role/activation. It also enhanced curiosity; enabled exertion to do the task; and constituted an effective learning environment. These findings indicate that the students enjoyed and benefited from the task.

Table 4.2.9. Students’ responses to the task “dreams”

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Dreams	10	Learnt by practicing /doing research (indirect learning)	10	Enjoyable	10	Difficult to report findings of task	7
		General / cultural information	1	Fruitful	7		
		Learnt to be objective	1	Original/interesting	6		
				Fascinating	5		
				Memorable	5		
				Enabled positive / successful learning outcome	4		
				Triggered communication	3		
				Improved students’ role / activation	2		
				Triggered students cooperation	2		
				Enhanced group work	2		
				Triggered discussion on topic	1		
				Improved students participation	1		
				Improved the students friendship	1		
				Improved students’ talking time	1		
				Original / new technique	1		
				Interesting topic/content	1		
Total	10		12		52		7

Table 4.2.9 displays the results reached by the diary of the task “Dreams”. All the students learnt indirectly by doing / practicing. In addition, one student stated that s/he gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information (enhanced his/her schema); and learnt to be objective.

The students also found the task enjoyable. In addition, seven students described it as fruitful; six students found it original/interesting. Five students thought that it was fascinating; and memorable. Besides, four students pointed out the task led to that, it enabled positive and successful learning outcomes. In addition, three students stated that it triggered communication. According to two students, the task improved students’ role / activation; triggered students ‘cooperation’ that is a process of metacognitive strategies; and enhanced group work. Lastly, one student thought that it constituted a based for discussion on topic; improved students participation; besides, it improved the students’ friendship; and students’ talking time. In addition, it was original, new technique; and interesting topic, content. However, seven students found it difficult to report findings of task.

To conclude, we may say that the task was considered as useful and fruitful. It improved learning strategies. In addition, students enjoyed the task very much. However, it appears that drawing was difficult for students.

Table 4.2.10. Students’ responses to the task “Potato salad”

Activity	n	Learnt	fr	About Task	fr	Negative	fr
Greg’s purple potato salad	14	Vocabulary	13	Enjoyable	14	Did not learn adequately because of personal reasons	1
		Learnt by applying (i.e. indirect learning)	13	Real life like	13	Task was waste of time	1
		Making use of dictionary ‘Resourcing’	8	Original / new technique	13	Difficult to frame sentences in English	1
		General / cultural information	3	Enhanced students’ role / activation	13		
				Led to positive/successful learning outcome	10		
				Fruitful	7		
				Purposeful	4		
				Motivating	4		
				Led to retention	3		
				Enjoyable and interesting topic / content	3		
Total	14		37		84		3

In Table 4.1.10, of the 14 students 13 stated that they learnt vocabulary and learnt indirectly by applying the task. Furthermore, eight students stated that they learnt how to use a dictionary that is a 'resourcing' process of cognitive strategies. In addition, three students thought they gained not only general knowledge but also cultural information.

Fourteen students stated that the tasks were enjoyable. Thirteen students defined that the tasks were real life like; the technique was original / new; and enhanced students' role/activation. Besides, among ten students, thought that the tasks led to positive/successful learning outcome; and seven students found the tasks fruitful. The tasks were purposeful; and motivating for four students. Lastly, three students stated that the tasks led to retention; and they thought the tasks had enjoyable and interesting topic / content.

However, one student stated that because of personal reasons; s/he did not learn adequately; besides, one student found the tasks as a waste of time; and found it difficult to frame sentences in English.

Considering these findings, we may say that the task was enjoyable and real life like. Furthermore, according to the table, they learnt by applying, indirectly. They also learnt how to use the dictionary. In this respect, we may suggest that the tasks used in reading classes were evaluated positively by the participants.

4.3. Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews

4.3.1. Students' views on tasks used.

n: 15			fr
What do you think about the type of tasks your teacher used?	Contribution to language learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Strengthened English · Instructive · Contributed to students' participation · Contributed to how to use the language · Made me like reading · Helped me use English outside of class 	2 2 1 1 1 1
	Personal Attitude	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Interest generating · Enjoyable · Marvelous · Activating · Fruitful · Exciting · Lesson outside was enjoyable 	7 6 5 4 4 3 1
	Retainment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Memorable · Useful · Led to retention 	9 4 1
	The nature of activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Real life like · Useful group work 	1 1
Total			60

Table 4.3.1 displays students' views on tasks used. According to the table, two students indicated that tasks strengthen their English; and they found the tasks instructive. Lastly, one student thought in terms of contribution to language learning that the tasks contributed to his/her participation; contributed to how to use the language; made him/her like reading; and helped him/her use English outside of class.

Whereas, seven of the 15 students found the tasks interest generating; six of them thought they were enjoyable. Five said that tasks were marvelous; and four students noted that tasks were activating and fruitful. The number of students found the tasks exciting was three. Furthermore, one student thought that lessons outside the classroom were enjoyable.

Nine students defined the tasks as memorable, four of 15 defined them useful and one of them thought that the tasks led to retention. Last of all, one student found the nature of activities as real life like; and useful group work. As a conclusion, we can say that the task was memorable, interest generating, and fruitful.

4.3.2. The extent to which the students learnt from task.

n: 15			fr
How much do you think you learned from the tasks?	Personal Gains	· Improved general / cultural knowledge	6
		· Attracted my attention to language learning	4
		· Helped me use English outside the class	3
		· Enhanced confidence	3
		· Learnt while enjoying	2
		· Helped me to be successful in other English courses	2
		· Enhanced my determination in learning English	2
		· Provided me to enlarge future goals in English	2
	Gains in Reading Skills	· Improved my reading strategies (i.e. scanning, skimming) that are parts of ' <i>selectively attend</i> ' process of metacognitive strategies	6
· Reading comprehension		6	
· Learnt guessing the meaning of a word from context ' <i>inferencing</i> '		5	
· Learnt Making use of dictionary ' <i>resourcing</i> '		3	
Language Learning Gains	· Learnt getting the meaning without translation	3	
	· Strengthened pronunciation	7	
	· Learnt vocabulary	5	
	· Learnt grammar	1	
Total			60

In table 4.3.2, the responses about the extent to which the students learnt from task can be seen. Six students defined that tasks improved their general/cultural knowledge; four students noted that the tasks attracted their attention to language learning; according to three students, task helped them use English outside the class; and enhanced their confidence. Two students said that they learnt while enjoying; the tasks helped them to be successful in other English courses; they also thought the tasks enhanced their determination in learning English; and lastly they thought the tasks provided them to enlarge their future goals in English.

In terms of gains in reading skills, six students defined that tasks improved their reading strategies (scanning, skimming) that are parts of '*selectively attend*' process of metacognitive strategies, and reading comprehension. Five students said that they learnt guessing the meaning of a word from context that is an '*inferencing*' process of metacognitive strategies. Finally, the students learnt making use of dictionary, which is a '*resourcing*' process of cognitive strategies, were three, and learnt getting the meaning without translation.

Inasmuch as language-learning gains, seven students defined that tasks strengthened their pronunciation; five students learnt vocabulary; and one student learnt grammar.

In that respect, we may summarize that the task strengthened their pronunciation, improved some important reading strategies like scanning, skimming, guessing the meaning of a word from context. Beside, the task enhanced their not only general knowledge but also cultural information.

4.3.3. Views on the contribution of tasks to reading

n: 15		fr	
In what ways do you think tasks contributed to reading classes?	Change in Personal Attitude Toward Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Lessons became more enjoyable · Lessons became easier · Improved students participation · Lessons became more exciting · Strengthened the learning desire · Lesson became more interest generating 	12 9 5 4 3 3
	Contribution of Tasks to Reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Tasks made reading more fruitful · The lesson were useful · Tasks were enjoyable · Strengthened pronunciation 	11 3 1 2
	Nature of activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Useful group works · Real life like 	8 3
Total		64	

In table 4.3.3, in terms of personal attitude, 12 students thought that lesson became more enjoyable; nine students indicated that lesson became easier. Beside, as five students perceived, tasks improved students' participation; whereas four students thought lessons became more exciting. Lastly, three students noted that tasks strengthened their learning desire; and by tasks, lesson became more interest generating by tasks.

The number of students found the tasks enjoyable was 11. Besides, three students thought the lessons were useful; and one student defined that tasks made reading more fruitful.

Eight students indicated that in the nature of activities there were useful group works. Furthermore, three students found the tasks real life like. Finally, two students noted that tasks eliminated some drawbacks of reading lessons.

Findings indicate that task got reading easier, enjoyable, and more fruitful. Beside, task improved students' participation and useful group works.

4.3.4. Task-Related Problems

n: 15			fr
Do you think there were any problems with the tasks? If yes, what were they?	Problems	· Filling feedback forms were boring	6
		· Lessons took long	4
Total			10

Table 4.3.4 displays task-related problems. According to the table, six students thought that filling feedback forms were boring; and four of 15 students complained about the long class hours. Therefore, we can say that filling in the feedback forms were boring according to the students. However, this complaint is more related with the nature of the lesson, not with the task.

4.3.5. General Comments on Tasks

n: 15			fr
Do you have any further comments?	Personal attitude	· Enjoyable	2
		· Good	2
		· Got pleasure from reading	1
		· Created a desire to learn English	1
	Contribution to language learning	· Instructive	5
· Made students like English		2	
Retainment	· Made students love reading	1	
	· Memorable	2	
The nature of language	· Real life like	1	
Reading skills	· Learnt many reading strategies (i.e. skimming, scanning) that are parts of 'selectively attend' process of metacognitive strategies	1	
Total			15

Table 4.3.5 displays students' comments on the tasks. Two students found the tasks enjoyable; and good. One student stated that s/he got pleasure from reading; and indicated that tasks created a desire in her/him to learn English.

In terms of contribution to language learning, five students defined that tasks were instructive. Two of 15 students thought that tasks made them like English. Two

students pointed out that tasks made them like English. Lastly, one student thought that tasks made him/her love reading.

Besides, two students found the tasks memorable in terms of retainment. One student found the tasks real life like due to the nature of activities. Finally, one student indicated that s/he learnt many reading strategies (i.e. skimming, scanning) that are parts of selectively attend process of metacognitive strategies.

To sum up, according to the students' comments, the tasks were instructive, memorable and good. Furthermore, the tasks made students like English.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1. Summary of the Study

This study can be regarded as a descriptive study that aimed to investigate the probable effects of task-based reading activities on the learner's attitude toward reading classes and their learning outcomes, as they perceive. In the study, data were collected and analyzed qualitatively. This study was conducted with two groups of lower intermediate students who were receiving reading courses at Dicle University, Foreign Languages Teaching Application and Research Centre. Totally 50 lower-intermediate level students in two classes consisting of 25 students participated in the study. In order to find out how the students respond the task based reading instruction, totally ten tasks were used throughout one semester.

Triangulation is a principal strategy to ensure for validity and reliability. Denzin (1970) identified four types of triangulation; multiple investigators, multiple theories, multiple sources of data and multiple methods to confirm emerging findings. Triangulation multiple data collection method is commonly used in qualitative studies. This was the strategy applied in the present study. Data were collected through a combination of data collection methods including: feedback forms that were distributed after the tasks, diaries that derived from the volunteers and interviews conducted with 15 volunteer students after the treatment at the end of the term in order to find answers to the following research questions:

1. How do students respond to task-based reading activities?
2. Do students believe that they can improve their reading skills when taught through tasks?

In this study, a descriptive design was used in order "to describe systematically the facts and characteristics of a given population or area of interest, factually and accurately" (Isaac & Michael, 1997, p. 18).

In the light of the data obtained, we reached the following conclusions.

5.2. Conclusion to Research Question I: “How do students respond to task-based reading activities?”

One of the major inquiries of this study was to find out how students responded to task-based reading activities. Feedback forms and diaries served this purpose. Analysis of feedback-forms, diaries and interviews revealed that the tasks used in the treatment were responded to positively; there were few negative responses.

These results may suggest that task-based teaching tend to create *high participation* (See Tables 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, and 4.3.3), enhanced *student creativity* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.2.1, 4.2.7), and *provide meaningful learning* (See Table 4.1.2), which is one of the main aspects of task-based instruction. Moreover, after being exposed to the task-based reading activity tasks, students’ *interest and curiosity* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 4.2.8, 4.3.3, 4.3.5) toward the reading courses enhanced. This finding echoes in Willis and Willis (2007) argument that the task-like activities should engage learners’ interest because they claim that without genuine interest, there can be no focus on meaning or outcome (See Section 2.2).

The most crucial effect of task-based teaching throughout this specific study was that the students found the activities *enjoyable and fruitful* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, 4.2.10, 4.3.1, 4.3.3). These two effects can be said to increase EFL learners’ ambition for language learning. In addition, by being ambitious EFL learners can also easily *enhance positive learning outcome* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, 4.12.10, 4.3.2) in their classes that is what Skehan (1998) states “judging success in terms of outcome”, is one component of the task-like activity (See Section 2.2).

In spite of positive responses to particular statements in the feedback forms and diaries, overall analysis of the feedback forms and diaries reveals that tasks used in the treatment received dominantly positive, partially negative responses. The reason for this can be that although students liked the tasks however, *filling the feedback forms* might have been distracting and regarded as an extra burden for them (See Table 4.3.4). Indeed this was not one of the steps in TBI, this was one of the data collection tools. So it was not related to the TBI directly.

We can argue that the reason why some of the students negatively commented on the tasks was that there were some external factors such as *personal problems* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.10, 4.2.2, 4.2.10). In addition, some of EFL learners did not enjoy the *teacher's mood / attitude* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.2.2, and 4.2.6). Indeed, this is not important in task-based learning directly. In the phase of collecting the data the teacher was also the researcher. That's why the students felt that they did not like the teacher's mood. Another negative aspect according to participants' respond is that '*drawing*' since they needed to draw pictures especially in two tasks. Some students found drawing difficult (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.8). A small number of students could not gain *confidence* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.5), therefore we may make sense that this negative effect prevented some students from doing tasks. Finally, just a few EFL learners saw the *contents not enjoyable* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.2.2, 4.1.6).

Apart from data gathered by feedback forms and diaries, interviews were another source that provided valuable data that brought insight to the study. The analysis of the interview data revealed that task-based learning *contributes to real life use of target language* (See Tables 4.1.10, 4.2.10, 4.3.1, 4.3.3, 4.3.5). Therefore, EFL learners learn the language as well as *experiencing it* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, 4.12.10). The target sample of this study underlines the fact that task-based learning encompasses outside world thus they feel secure by observing concrete events in EFL atmosphere which is one of the main criteria according to Skehan (1998). As stated previously when defining 'task', he emphasizes the need for real world relationship for an activity to be taken as a task (See Section 2.2.).

In addition, task-based learning leads to *easiness* of EFL elements especially reading tasks in our study (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.8, 4.2.7, 4.3.3). Task-based learning clearly prepares pedagogical background for EFL learners by simplifying language input and making this input comprehensible. What is more is the fact that task-based teaching results in *noticing and awareness* in targeted language items (See Sections 4.1 and 4.2). EFL learners can easily focus on such items by means of a task-based approach.

The qualitative data gathered through the interviews indicated that students were interested in the tasks and the TBI treatment classes. The reason for that can be

explained in two ways: students might really have liked the tasks or it might have been only the novelty effect, which caused students to respond positively.

According to the interview analysis, *filling feedback forms* (See Table 4.3.4) at the end of the classes including task-based method have made students get bored (6 out of 15 students). Apart from filling feedback forms, the students complained that the *lessons took very long* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.2.1, 4.3.4) (4 out of 15 students). Generally, the interview data gives a positive result concerning task based methodology. These minor negative points are only related to some physical conditions such as length of hours etc.

5.3. Conclusion to Research Question II: “Do students believe that they can improve their reading skills when taught through tasks?”

One of the other concerns of this study was whether students believed that they improved their reading skill when taught through tasks.

The most prominent result is *vocabulary improvement* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.10, 4.3.2) by means of task-based teaching. This improvement was achieved by discovering the language in which students *took active part* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.8, 4.2.9, 4.12.10). In language acquisition process they improved their reading skills by *performing kinesthetic* tasks such as drawing what they read (See Appendix 1), turning the text they read into role-play (See Appendix 7), preparing a survey and implementing it to the outdoor people (See Appendix 9), making a salad after reading a recipe (See Appendix 10). These findings also mean; doing a communication task involves achieving an outcome, creating a final product that can be appreciated by others (Willis and Willis 2007) that are components of TBI (See Section 2.2).

Another crucial effect of task learning is that EFL learners become aware of *metacognitive strategies* (see section 2.7) that are 'higher order executive skills that may entail planning for, monitoring, or evaluating the success of a learning activity' (O'Malley and Chamot 1990, p. 44). Figure 1 comprises the related tasks conducted in our study and all these strategies in this figure represent metacognitive process-that is our learners have been encouraged to apply their meatcognitive skills in task-based classes, which is our underlying motto in language learning process.

Strategies Including Metacognitive Process	Definition
Activate Background Knowledge (see tables 4.1.7, 4.1.9)	Think about and use what you already know to help you do the task (Use what you know, elaborate on prior knowledge)
Self-Management (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.2.4)	Arrange for conditions that help you learn (Know yourself, Plan how to study)
Selectively Attend (see tables 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.3.2, 4.3.5)	Focus on key words, phrases, and ideas (Scan, find specific information)
Use Imagery (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.10,)	Create an image to represent information (Visualization, Draw a picture)
Manipulate / Act Out (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.2.7)	Handle tangible objects, role-play,
Cooperate (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.4, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.9)	Work with others to complete tasks, build confidence, and give and receive feedback (Work together)
Inferences (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.2.2, 4.3.2)	Make guesses based on previous knowledge (Use context clues)

Figure 1. Some Cognitive Strategies That Emerged During The Data Analysis

Figure 2 indicates some of the metacognitive strategies used by EFL learners in task based classes that Chamot and O'Malley (1990) defined. According to the data analysis, they emphasize self more in learning process, for instance they discover the *limits of their capacities* by doing the tasks (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.2.4), or *finding out to study* and / or *to learn on their own* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.5, 4.1.9, 4.2.2, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.3.2,).

In addition, they improved their metacognitive learning strategies by predicting the meaning of a word from the context without using a dictionary (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.3, 4.1.5, 4.2.2, and 4.3.2), *skimming and scanning strategies* (See Tables 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.3.2, 4.3.5).

Strategies Including Cognitive Process	Definition
Resourcing (see tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.10, 4.2.10, 4.3.2)	Making use of language materials such as dictionaries.

Figure 2. Some Cognitive Strategies That Emerged During The Data Analysis

Figure 2 indicates some of the cognitive strategies (see section 2.7) used by EFL learners in task based classes that Chamot and O'Malley (1990) defined. According to the findings, students learnt *making use of dictionary*, which is a cognitive strategy.

Cultural input (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.7, 4.1.8, 4.1.9, 4.1.10, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, 4.2.7, 4.2.9, 4.2.10, 4.3.2) is another positive effect of task-based learning in reading classes. They can easily learn *universal themes*

and *cultural differences* around these themes such as learning greeting customs from other countries, and realizing on how exercise helps people (See Appendixes 2, 3, 5, and 10).

Task-based learning also leads students to extensive use of language that comprehends chatting with a foreign person on the net, sending and receiving a message in English, or having a part-time job. In their feedback forms, we can easily see their *practical use of language* such as in tables (See Tables 4.1.3, 4.3.1, and 4.3.2.)

The findings of feedback forms, diaries and interviews corresponded to one another, which was matched which is the aim of triangulation. There are some more useful findings in the analysis of interviews. For instance, students *strengthened their EFL knowledge* (See Tables 4.3.1, 4.3.2) and *gained reading comprehension* throughout the reading tasks (See Table 4.3.2).

Apart from these, there are some negative aspects gained from feedback forms and diaries. The most important one is that the students could not learn adequately because of *negative classroom environment like uproar* in the class while doing the task (See Sections 4.1, 4.2), and *poor classroom management* (See Sections 4.1, 4.2). One more complaint about task learning is *long class hours* (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 4.1.9, 4.2.1, 4.3.4) that students did not like and got bored. Another aspect of task-based learning is that, some of the students had difficulty *framing sentences* (See Sections 4.1, 4.2). In addition, one participant complaint about *vocabulary retention* that was the other negative aspect (See Sections 4.1, 4.2).

All in all, the analyses of three instruments (feedback forms, diaries, and interviews) of the study proved that there were more students who responded positively to the tasks designed in TBI treatment.

5.4. Implications

The results of the study indicate that tasks used in the treatment-aroused students' interest in the reading classes and improved their reading skill in the classroom, which was the aim of the treatment. This study shows that it is worth experimenting further with task-based instruction in classrooms and exploiting the role of tasks in students' higher motivation in classroom language learning.

This study mostly underlines the fact that EFL reading classes should include learner as active participants whose feelings play important role in EFL classes.

This study also implies EFL learners should be curious (See Tables 4.1.1, 4.2.1, 4.2.3, 4.2.8, 4.3.3, 4.3.5) throughout language learning process. Curiosity leads to discovery in language classes learners. Discovery learning leads to academic success since EFL learners hold their automaticity and independence in language learning process. Task based methodology comprises such discovery learning in the sense that it give an opportunity to EFL learners to produce and use language spontaneously and meaningfully.

Task-based Instruction should be included in the current curriculum. Since the findings of this study shows that implementation of TBI in reading classes is successful.

Task-based learning implies EFL learners should be motivated especially; EFL learners should have intrinsic motivation that is they can be encouraged to love / enjoy language-learning process. Since, rather the extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation is essential in task-based learning. Intrinsic motivation drives them to do things just for the fun of it, or because they believe, it is a good or right thing to do. In other words, motivation can be strengthened by the task itself. Ellis (1993) points out the potential of the task- based motivation that means students will do better if the task itself motivates them to do it. Being motivated, foreign language learners can easily complete their tasks without any support from the teacher. Task based methodology refers to students' motivation to be competent learners in foreign language learning process.

5.5. Limitations of the Study for Further Research

Based on the findings and limitations of the study, several suggestions for further research can be done. This study had certain limitations in examining the effects of task-based instruction on the improvement of students' reading skills.

In this study, only lower intermediate EFL learners participated. This study can be enhanced by a wide variety level of foreign language learners. Upper intermediate and advanced sample of learners can be chosen for the task-based methodology.

Another limitation or even a variable could be that they improved positive attitudes towards TBI since they were thought by a teacher they like.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, N. (2006), *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading. Lesson 01 Chapter 2*, Retrieved June 18, 2007 from http://www.ed2go.com/elt_demo/3e5_demo/11c2.htm
- Bardin, L. (1997), *L'analyse de contenu [Content analysis]* (8eme ed.), Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Bryman, A. (2001), *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bygate, M., P. Skehan, & M. Swain (eds). (2001), *Researching pedagogical tasks: second language learning, teaching, and assessment*, London: Pearson
- Chou, P. (2006), *A Research on Developing Young EFL Learners L2 Literacy through. Task-Based Reading-to-Writing Instruction*, Publishing Unit; National Chengkung University, Retrieved July 3, 2007 from http://etdncku.lib.ncku.edu.tw/ETD-db/ETD-search-c/view_etd?URN=etd-0627107-192007
- Courtesy of Marygrove College Library (2002), *Keeping a Research Diary: Information Bulletin #20*. Jly, Retrieved December 18, 2002.
- Denzin, N. (Ed.) (1970), *Sociological methods*, A source book. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Doughty, C. (2001), *Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form*. In Robinson, P. (ed.), *Cognition and Second Language Instruction* (pp.206-57). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Education Research Methods Glossary (n.d.), Dissertation *Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment for the Degree Of M.A. in English Language and Literature*, School of Foreign Languages and Literature Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China, Retrieved September 5, 2008 from <http://www.lts.leeds.ac.uk/glossaries/search.php?SUBJECT=4&PHPSESSID=109c86a700a88816b01268c013b89e96>

Elliot E. W. (1991), *The enlightened eye: qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*, New York: Macmillan.

Ellis, R. (1994), *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford University Press

Ellis, R. (1999), *Learning a second language through interaction*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ellis, R. (2000), *Task-based language teaching and learning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Ellis, R., R. L. Oxford, & D. Nunan (2006), "Task Based Teaching", *Asian EFL Journal*, Volume 8. Issue 3, Article 6.

Ellis, R. (2007), "Task-Based Language Teaching: Sorting Out the Misunderstandings". *12th East Shikoku JALT Conference*, Retrieved October 17, 2007 from <http://eng.core.kochi-tech.ac.jp/eastshikoku/>

Ericsson, K. and H. Simon (1984), *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fraenkel J. R. & N. E. Wallen (2006), *How to design and evaluate research in education*, (International Edititon), Boston: McGraw Hill.

Frost, R. (2004), *A Task-based approach*, British Council, Turkey. Retrieved 26 April, 2006 from

http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/methodology/task_based.shtml

Furuta, J. (2002), *Task-Based Language Instruction: An Effective Means of Achieving Integration of Skills and Meaningful Language Use*, Retrieved June 12, 2006 from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED475019&_ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=eric_accno&accno=ED475019

Green, C. (2005), "Integrating extensive reading in the task-based curriculum", *ELT Journal* 2005 59(4), pp. 306-311

Harmer, J. (2001), *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd Edition. pp. 79-80. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.,

Hesse-Biber, S. N. & P. Leavy (2006), *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London.

Hislope, K. (2003), "A Reading Study Of Spanish Heritage Speakers". *The Reading Matrix*, Vol.3. No.2, Retrieved September 10, 2003 from <http://aatseel.org/program/2003/program.htm>

Isaac, S. & W. B. Michael (1997), *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego, CA: EdITS Publishers.

İnözü, J., G. İlin, & H. Yumru, (2007), "Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions of Tasks: Objectives and Outcomes". *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. Retrieved December 3, 2008 from

http://eku.comu.edu.tr/index/3/1/gilin_jinozu_hyumru.pdf

Jeon In-Jae & Hahn Jung-won (2006), "Exploring EFL Teachers' Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching: A Case Study of Korean Secondary School Classroom Practice". *Asian-efl-journal* 8(5). Retrieved 2007.

Johnson, E. (1997), *How to Develop Reading-To-Do Skills in Engineering Education. Literacy Across Cultures* Retrieved June, 2007.

Joseph, M. & E. Ramani (2001), "Task-based multimodal literacy materials for extensive reading in African languages". *International Literacy Conference*, Cape Town. 13- 17

Kasap, B. (2005), "The Effectiveness of Task-based Instruction in the improvement of Learners' speaking skills", *Dissertation Thesis, the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences of Bilkent University, MA*.

Khand, Z. (2004), "Teaching Reading Skills: Problems & Suggestions". *Journal of Research (Faculty of Languages & Islamic Studies)*, Retrieved 2006 Vol.5 p. 3

Kim, S. & S. Moon (2007), *Integrating technologies into homework*. CSUMB School for World Languages and Cultures. Retrieved December 3, 2008 from <http://php.csUMB.edu/wlc/ocs/viewabstract.php?id=54&cf=1>

Knutson, E. K. (1998), "Reading with a Purpose: Communicative Reading Tasks for the Foreign Language Classroom". *CALL: Digests*, Volume 30, number 1, Retrieved October 8, 2006.

http://www.cal.org/resources/Digest/reading_digest.html

Krahnke, K. (1987), *Approaches to syllabus design for foreign language teaching*, Englewood:Cliffs, NJ: Regents Prentice Hall.

Krashen, S. (1982), *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*, Oxford: Pergamon.

Lee, I. (2000), *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Lochana M. & G. Deb (2006), "Task Based Teaching: Learning English without Tears". *Asian EFL Journal*, PDF Full Journal, Volume 8. Issue 3, Article 7, Retrieved September 3, 2006 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/September_06_home.php

Long, M. H. (1985), *A role for instruction in second language acquisition*, In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (eds.) *Modelling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition*. Clevedon Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H. & G. Crookes (1991), "Three approaches to task-based syllabus design". *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27-56

Long, M. H. (1985), *A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language training*, In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 77-99). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Long, M. H. (1997), "Focus on form in task-based language teaching". *Fourth Annual McGraw-Hill Satellite Conference*. Retrieved June 12, 2005 from <http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/foreignlang/conf/task1.htm>

Mc Donough, J. (1994), "A Teacher Looks at Teacher's Diaries". *English Language Teaching Journal*, 48, 1, 57-65

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1995), *Applying learning strategies in the second/foreign language listening comprehension lesson*. D. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening*. San Diego, CA: Dominic Press.

Meng, C. W., C. K. Nyet, & T. Suthiwan (2007), *Towards Common Goals in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning: A Proposed Framework Syllabus for the CLS*. Centre for Language Studies Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences National University of Singapore 9 Arts Link, Singapore 117570

Miles, B. M. & A. M. Huberman (1994), *Qualitative Data analysis*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moss, D. (2003), *Second Language Acquisition in Adults: From Research to Practice*, ESL Resources/Digests.

Munn, P., & E. Drever (1990), *Using questionnaires in small-scale research. A teacher's guide*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Nodoushan, S. (2002), "Text Familiarity, Reading Tasks, And Esp Test Performance: A Study on Iranian Lep and Non-Lep University Students". *The Reading Matrix* Vol.3. No.1, April 2003

Nodoushan, S. (2005), *Cognitive Style as a Factor Affecting Task-Based Reading Comprehension Test Scores*. ED491465, 2006

Nunan, D (2001), *Aspect of task-based syllabus design*. Retrieved January 13, 2002 from the World Wide Web :

<http://WWW.cal.org/ericcll/digest/0105oxford.html>

Nunan, D. (2006), "Task-based language teaching in the Asia context: Defining 'task'". *Asian EFL Journal*; Volume 8. Issue 3, Article 1, Retrieved September 3, 2006 from http://asian-efl-journal.com/Sept_06_dn.php

Nunan, D. (1989), *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Nunan, D. (1999), *Second Language teaching & learning*, Boston: Heinle & Heinle

Nunan, D. (2004), *Task Based Language Teaching*, Cambridge Language Teaching Library. CUP.

O'Malley, M. & A. Chamot (1990), *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ortenberg, M. & N. Antokhin (2003), "Focus on form in online task-based instruction: developing reading comprehension learning objects (LOs) for Russian intermediate and advanced learners". *AATSEEL Annual Meeting*, 27-30, San Diego, Retrieved December 3, 2006.

Oura, G. K. (2005), *Authentic Task-Based Materials: Bringing the Real World Into the Classroom*. Retrieved December 3, 2006 from <http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/kiyou/ki21/gaio.pdf>

Oxford, R. L. (1990), *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R.L. (2006), "Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning: An Overview". Proceedings from the *Asian EFL Journal International Conference*, Retrieved April 2007, Volume 8 Issue 3.

http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Sept_06_ro.php

Pica, T., R. Kanagy, & J. Fladun (1993), *Choosing and using communication tasks for second language instruction*, University of Pennsylvania, Retrieved December 3, 2006 from

<http://www.iei.uiuc.edu/tesolonline/texts/pica/index.html>

Prabhu, N. S. (1987), *Second language pedagogy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. *QUARTERLY*, 25 (2), 279-295.

Razi, S. (2005), "A Fresh Look At The Evaluation Of Ordering Tasks In Reading Comprehension: Weighted Marking Protocol". *The Reading Matrix* Vol. 5, No. 1, April 2005

Reinharz, S. (1992), *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Retrieved 2 Sept. 2005.

Richards, C. J. & T. S. Rodgers (2001), *Approach and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Robinson, P. (2001), *Task complexity, cognitive resources, and syllabus design*, In P. Robinson (ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.287-318). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooney, K. (1998), "Designing a Task-Based Syllabus and Materials for Tyndale Level 1". Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of *Master of Arts* at Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Ruso N. (1999), "The influence of task-based Learning on the EFL Classrooms". *Asian EFL Journal*. Volume 18, Retrieved February 2007, Article 2; http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/pta_February_2007_nr.php

Skehan, P. (1996), "A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction". *Applied Linguistics*. 17, 38-62

Strauss, A. & J. Corbin (1990), *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Urquhart, A., & C. Weir. (1998), *Reading in a second language: Process, product and practice*, London: Longman.

Van den Branden, K. and others (2006), *Task-Based Language Education. From theory to practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wang, C. (2006), "Designing Communicative Tasks for College English Courses. Asian-efl-journal". *A Dissertation Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment for the Degree Of M.A. in English Language and Literature. School of Foreign Languages and Literature Chongqing Normal University & Yangtze Normal University, China*

Wilkins, D. (1976), *Notional syllabuses*, Oxford: OUP

Willis, J. (1996), *A framework for task-based learning*, Harlow, U.K. Longman Addison- Wesley

Willis J. & D. Willis (eds) (1996), *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*, Oxford: OUP

Willis, D. & J. Willis (2007), *Doing Task-based Teaching*,. Great Clarendon Street, Oxford: OUP

Wright, T. & A. Cockburn (2001), "Writing, Reading, Watching: A Task-Based Analysis and Review of Learners' Programming Environments". *Advanced Learning Technologies*, 2000. IWALT 2000. Proceedings. *International Workshop*, Volume , Issue , 2000 Page(s):167 - 170 The Pennsylvania State University CiteSeer Archives, Retrieved December 3, 2006 from <http://www.cosc.canterbury.ac.nz/ACMchapter/NZCSPG/papers/tnw13@cosc.canterbury.ac.nz.pdf>

Weir, C. J. (1983), "Identifying the language problems of overseas students in tertiary education in the United Kingdom". Degree of *Doctor of Philosophy* Dissertation., University of London.

Yaylı, D. (2006), "The Effects of Task-Based Learning on Male and Female". *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Cilt 15, Sayı 1, 2006, s.449-468

Ziauddin, K. (2004), "Teaching Reading Skills: Problems and Suggestions". *Journal of Research* (Faculty of Languages & Islamic Studies), vol. 5, p.43

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

<p>Lesson Objectives: 1) to give practice how to began reading a story in English 2) to practice making inferences</p>		
<p>Pre-task (Piano)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at the cover of the book. Making guesses about what the story is about. • Explaining the topic with students and teaching useful words and phrases. • Having a short class discussion on the pre-reading question <p>e.g. <i>What is going to happen in the story? Can you guess?</i></p>		
<p>Task cycle</p>		
<p>Task</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>Report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting students into groups. Having them read the text. Discussing on the school description. Then, drawing the school described in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work together to decide on the similarity of drawings with the description of the school in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking up the results of discussion, and deciding which drawing is the most similar with the one in the text.
<p>Language focus</p>		
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>Practice</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to look through the text again and mark any words whose meanings they can not guess from context. • Explaining/eliciting the meanings of any words or expressions that students do not understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students work in pairs to do the comprehension questions. Taking up the answers with the whole class.. 	

Appendix 2

Adapted from Rooney (1998)

Lesson Objectives: 1) to give practice at scanning for specific information, 2) to give practice in reading for specific information.

Pre-task (The Sound of Music)

- Writing the opening discussion question (What are some traditional kinds of music in Turkey?) on the board. Eliciting/teaching them the meaning of “traditional” in this context. Having a short class discussion on traditional kinds of music that are popular in Turkey.

e.g.

T: People say rock and jazz are both traditional kinds of music in the U.S., but what about Turkey?

Task	Task cycle Planning	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telling students they are going to read about three musicians. Writing the names of the musicians on the board and modeling the correct pronunciation: Caetano Veloso / /, Bonnie Raitt / /, Cui Jian / /. • Asking students if they have heard of any of these musicians and, if they have, what they know about each one. • Asking students to read the passage silently looking for answers to the statements. • Eliciting/teaching the meaning of blends 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reproducing the chart on the board and telling students that after receiving the text, they will have two minutes to scan it and fill in the chart with each singer's nationality and the types of music that he/she blends. • Handing out the text by placing one copy face down in front of each student. Having students do the task and stop reading or writing when time is up. • Having students compare answers with a partner. After that taking up the answers with the whole class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going over all four questions and allowing pairs to find and discuss the answers. Going around the room and checking students' answers. Giving help as needed. • Taking up the answers with the whole class.
Language focus		
Analysis	Practice	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting students into pairs and providing each pair with one copy of the Exercise C. Having partners work together to match the sentences with the different meanings of <i>like</i>. • Taking up the answers with the whole class. • Informing students that the use of <i>like</i> demonstrated in sentence a2 is officially incorrect, but is used often in colloquial speech. • Providing each pair with a second copy of the exercise so that all students get a copy. Then asking students to work individually to write complete sentences using the prompts in the text. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telling students to consult their partner if they run into difficulties and compare answers with their partner when they finish. • Going around the class, checking students' answers, and giving help as needed. Taking up the answers with the whole class 	

Appendix 3

Adapted from Rooney (1998)

<p>Lesson Objectives: To practice the reading sub-skills of scanning, identifying details, and making inferences</p>		
<p>Pre-task (Smart Moves)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brainstorming with the class on how exercise helps people • Writing students responses on the board in point form. <p>e.g. <i>How does exercise help you?</i> <i>Exercise... makes you fit, Can improve your mind and body, Helps you relax.</i></p>		
<p>Task</p>	<p>Task cycle Planning</p>	<p>Report</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handing out the text to students. Reading aloud the pre-reading question. Having students read the statements and having them deciding individually or in pairs which ones they think are generally true. • Conducting a quick class vote to see which statements students think are generally true. • Asking students to read the passage silently looking for answers to the statements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting students into pairs and having them work together to decide on and check the statements that are true according to the information given in the article. Then having them scan the passage again and underline the words and phrases that helped them decide which statements are true. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • taking up the answers with the whole class.
<p>Language focus</p>		
<p>Analysis</p>	<p>Practice</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to look through the text again and mark any words whose meanings they cannot guess from context. • Explaining/eliciting the meanings of any words or expressions that students do not understand. <p>e.g. <i>lifts the spirit = makes a person feel happier</i> <i>builds confidence = makes a person believe in him/herself.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to read the instructions and the questions. Making sure students understand the meaning of benefits (helpful things, advantages). • Having students discuss the questions with the same partner or having them switch partners for the sake of variety. Going around the room, taking note of students' responses, and providing help as requested or needed. When students finish, addressing any problems that were noticed with the whole class. • Going over the answers with the whole class by having a few pairs volunteer their responses for each question 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to work in pairs to choose their phrases and then exchange them with another pair. 	

Appendix 4

Adapted from Rooney (1998)

Lesson Objectives: To practice reading for specific information.

Pre-task (The Daily Grind)

- Asking students the pre-reading question: Is it a good idea for students to have a job? Why or why not? Then writing the following on the board:

STUDENT + JOB = Good idea? Or Bad idea?

- Eliciting some comments and writing some of the students' ideas on the board under the appropriate heading. Arriving at a general consensus.

Task cycle

Task	Planning	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to read the instructions on the text and then look at the chart below the text. Explaining that since this is a scanning task, they will be given a time limit for completing the chart (give them approximately two and a half minutes and then ask them to stop). Having students know that they may need to make some inferences ("educated guesses"). • When time is up, taking up the answers with the whole class. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to look through the text and underline, circle, or highlight any words whose meaning they can not figure out from context. Then, writing the following questions on the board. Having students write them in their notebooks. Telling them they can use these questions whenever they want to ask about unfamiliar words: <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><i>What does...mean?</i> <i>How do you define ...?</i> <i>What's the definition for...?</i></p> • Asking students to look at the text. If they find a word they don't understand, having them ask about this word using any of the questions above. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work in pairs to answer the questions. Presenting this as a fun activity with interesting questions for pairs to debate and figure out. Going around the class and giving help as needed.

Language focus

Analysis	Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students look through the text and find the words or phrases that have to do with money. Possible words: cost, expensive, save, earn, buy, spend, pays, a lot of (money), much money, some money. • Have students compare their findings with a partner and then eliciting the words or phrases from the whole class and writing them on the board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Putting students into groups and having them think of ways of classifying these words and phrases.

Appendix 5

Adapted from Rooney (1998)

<p>Lesson Objectives: a) to explore the topic of meeting and greeting customs from around the world, b) to practice scanning for specific information.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Pre-task (Meeting and Greeting Customs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing the names of the five countries mentioned in the text on the board: Chile, Finland, the Philippines, Korea, and the United States. Eliciting from the students where these countries are located. Using a map. • Asking the pre-reading question as a topic warm-up. e.g. How do you think the people in these countries greet each other?, How do two women/two men from ... greet each other? <p style="text-align: center;">Pre-task (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Handing out copies of the text for students to read. Encouraging them to guess new words from context. If there are words whose meaning they still can't figure out, telling them to underline, circle or highlight the words. Then explaining, or if possible, having other students try to explain what the words mean, or allowing students to check their dictionaries. 		
<p style="text-align: center;">Task (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining that they will be shown the text <i>Meeting and Greeting Customs</i> on an overhead. Having them read the text as quickly as possible looking only for the answer e.g. <i>In which countries do people shake hands when they meet?</i> Also telling them that they will have forty seconds to find the answer. After forty seconds, the overhead will be turned off. <p style="text-align: center;">Task (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Going over the task. Having students scan the text and check the names of the correct country or countries for each statement. Setting a time limit of two minutes. • Taking up the answers with the whole class. • Having the students read the instructions on the text and modeling the task with one or two students. e.g. <i>T: Hakan, how do two male friends greet each other in our country, Turkey?</i> <i>S1: Well they sometimes shake hands or hug each other.</i> <i>T: Dicle, how do male and female friends in Diyarbakır (in Istanbul, Urfa, Ankara) greet each other?</i> <i>S2: They...</i> 	<p style="text-align: center;">Task cycle</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Planning (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Telling them that they will have forty seconds to find the answer. After forty seconds, the overhead will be turned off. <p style="text-align: center;">Planning (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work in pairs to do the task. Matching students coming from different cities or giving students a role as if they come from a different culture or city. Encouraging students to perform the style of greeting. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Report (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After turning off the overhead, eliciting the answer from the students <p style="text-align: center;">Report (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having volunteers demonstrate for the class some of the greetings they discussed.
Language focus		
<p style="text-align: center;">Analysis (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking the students if they had to read every word to find the answer. Then teaching the term scanning: searching a text for specific information. • Writing the definition on the board and having students write it in their notebooks. <p style="text-align: center;">Analysis (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing each pair with one copy of the text. • Modeling the exercise by working with the whole class to fill in the first blank. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Practice (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking the students what other kinds of texts we typically scan <p style="text-align: center;">Practice (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work in pairs to complete the exercise. Going around the room, checking students' answers, and giving help as needed. Taking up the answers with the whole class or address problems that arise. 	

Appendix 6

Adapted from Rooney (1998)

Lesson Objectives: 1) to explore the different kinds of shopping available in the U.S., 2) to practice scanning for facts and key words, and making inferences.

Pre-task (Shop Till You Drop)

- To introduce the topic, writing the heading “kinds of shopping in my country” on the board. Eliciting the kind of shopping the students did in catalogue shopping.
- Asking students to work individually to make a brainstorming map and then share ideas in small groups. Eliciting examples of how, when, and where they shop in their own countries. Write the information on the board.

Task cycle

Task (1)

- Asking students to read the instructions. Going over any unfamiliar words (e.g. Home shopping network).

Task (2)

- Going over questions 1 and 2. Eliciting/explaining any unfamiliar vocabulary (e.g. discount stores, secondhand or thrift stores, mall). Asking students to work individually to check the boxes.
- Putting students into groups and telling them to take turns asking and answering the questions.

Planning (1)

- Asking students to complete the true/false statements individually. Setting a time limit of about one minute for this to encourage students to scan and not read every word. When finished, asking students to compare their answers with a partner.

Planning (2)

- Working with the whole class to elicit/teach phrases groups can use to write a report about what the most popular times for shopping and the most popular types of shopping are for the members of their group.
e.g.
In our group, the most popular time is/most people like/everyone is different...).
- Assigning the roles of group spokesperson and secretary to students whose turn it is have these roles.

Report (1)

- taking up the answers with the whole class.

Report (2)

- Having group members work together to plan their report. Then having spokespersons practice giving the report to their fellow group members. Making the other members listen and then either approve the report as **it** is, or suggest possible additions or ways to improve it.
- For the report stage, having students assign to listen for what the most popular kinds of shopping and the most popular times are for shopping in the class. Checking students' answers after the spokespersons finish their reports.

Language focus

Analysis (1)

- Having students look through the three passages again. Asking them to underline, circle, or highlight any word whose meaning they can't guess from context. Eliciting/explaining the meaning of some words.

e.g.

Music club = a mail-order company from which members order music (CDs, cassettes, music videos) at discount prices.

QVC = "Quality, Value, and Convenience"
households = homes

Analysis (2)

- Asking students to read the sentences and then work with the whole class to answer question 2.
- Asking students to work individually to fill in the blanks in question 3 and then compare their answers with a partner. Taking up the answers with the whole class.
- Asking students to read the various uses of by in the text.

Practice (1)

- Asking students to work in pairs to use these words in sentences and then exchange them with another pair.

Practice (2)

- Having students read the instructions. Modeling the exercise by working with the whole class to match sentence 1 with one of the four uses of by.
- Having students do the exercise. Going around the class, checking students' answers, and giving help as needed. Giving hints if their answers are right or wrong, but trying to avoid simply giving them the correct answers.
- Taking up the answers with the whole class.

Appendix 7

Lesson Objectives: 1) Presenting role-play		
Pre-task (The Smell of Bread)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brainstorming with the class on the title. • Guessing the story looking at the pictures • Working with useful vocabulary 		
Task cycle		
Task	Planning	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scanning the text and identifying the conversation. • Re-reading the dialogue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working in groups and preparing their own dialogue on a similar situation or lengthening the original dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting the role-play to the class.
Language focus		
Analysis	Practice	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinforcement on structures and vocabulary. • Eliciting the order of a paragraph and how to write a summary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students do the exercise on the text by putting the sentences in order and retelling the summary of the story to the class. • Having students state their ideas on some discussion questions: e.g. <i>Is the baker a good man? Why or why not?</i> 	

Appendix 8

<p>Lesson Objectives: 1) to practice the vocabulary related to people's personality</p>		
<p>Pre-task (Drawing a Dog Picture)</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brainstorming with the class on their own personalities • Asking them work in pairs and match the words describing people's personality to the pictures • Asking them match the words to their opposites. 		
<p>Task cycle</p>		
<p>Task</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working in pairs. Reading the text (Astrology Chart). Having them circle the words they do not know and having them ask their partner to explain the unknown words. If they do not know the meaning of words having them use a dictionary to look up the words. Then answer the questions below: <p><i>When is your birthday? What is your star sign?</i> <i>Do the characteristics for your star sign describe you? Why or why not?</i></p>	<p>Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students take out a full-size of piece of paper. Giving students two minutes to draw a dog picture. • Then having them work with a partner. Having partners read information on two different pages to interpret their own drawing and their partner's drawing. Having them know that their partner has some additional information on the text they have. 	<p>Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting to the class the findings of their drawings.
<p>Language focus</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students to look through the text again and mark any words whose meanings they cannot guess from context. • Explaining/eliciting the meanings of any words or expressions that students do not understand. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students work in pairs to choose some words describing the personality of each other and then talking about each other's personalities to the class. 	

Appendix 9

Lesson Objectives: 1) to practice the vocabulary related to dreams, 2)

Pre-task (Common Questions About Dreams)

- Asking the pre-reading question as a topic warm-up.

e.g.

Do you dream?, Do you dream everyday?,

Do you remember your dreams?,

Are dreams in color?

- Scanning the text to check the answers

Task cycle		
Task	Planning	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking them to read the text and prepare a survey in groups. Then having students go out of classroom in the break and ask the questions they prepared to the students from other classes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work in groups and prepare the results of survey. • Having students chose spokespersons to report the results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having group members work together to plan their report. Then having spokesperson give their reports in front of the class.
Language focus		
Analysis	Practice	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining/eliciting the meanings of any words or expressions that students do not understand. • Having students to have an understanding of complex sentences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students work in pairs to do the comprehension questions. Taking up the answers with the whole class. 	

Appendix 10

Lesson Objectives: 1) to explore different kinds of meals around the world.
 2) to practice the vocabulary related to cooking a meal,
 3) to practice scanning, skimming, and using dictionary skills

Pre-task (Greg’s Purple Potato Salad)

• Having students look at the pictures and the title of the reading. Then asking the pre-reading question as a topic warm-up.

e.g.

- Do you like to try foods that are new and different? Why or Why not?
- What kind of reading is this? A story or a recipe?
 (Led them look for the meaning of recipe in dictionary)
- How long does it take to make “Purple Potato Salad”?
 (Having them scan the reading for the times. Writing them in the blanks.)

Boil Potatoes	Cool Potatoes	Boil Peas	Total Cooking Time
1) <u>15 minutes</u>	2).....	3).....	4).....

Task cycle		
Task	Planning	Report
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking them to read the text and prepare a list of ingredients for the salad. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having students work in groups and prepare the ingredients which the teacher asked for the previous lesson. (The teacher gave all the students a task to supply the ingredients in the previous lesson. However, the students were not said the reason exactly.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working in groups and preparing the salad in the garden. While preparing the salad having the group members report what they were doing.

Language focus	
Analysis	Practice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explaining / eliciting the meanings of any words or expressions that students do not understand. • Having students to have an understanding of skimming and scanning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asking students work in pairs to do the comprehension questions. e.g. - <i>Complete the sentences. Skim the reading and circle a or b</i> - <i>Read the sentences. Scan the reading. What do the underlined words mean?</i> • Taking up the answers with the whole class.

Appendix 11**Feedback no:****Date:****FEEDBACK FORM**

1. I enjoyed the lesson because...

2. I did not enjoy the lesson because...

3. Through this feedback session, I have learnt...

4. I have not learnt anything new in this feedback session because...

5. The best thing(s) about the task is/are...

6. The most difficult thing(s) about the task is/are...

7. I think the task used was because
.....

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Ayşegül DEMİR
Place and Date of Birth: Adilcevaz- 01. February.1981
E- Mail: ademir_tr@hotmail.com

EDUCATION

2005-2008 : Master of Arts at Çukurova University
Institute of Social Sciences
English Language Teaching
Adana, Türkiye

2002- 2004 : Bachelor of Arts at Çukurova University
English Language Teaching
Adana, Türkiye

1998- 2002 : Bachelor of Arts at Dicle University
English Language Teaching
Diyarbakır, Türkiye

1994- 1998 Sabancı Anadolu Vocational High School
Adana, Türkiye

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2004-... Dicle University, Foreign Languages Teaching
Application and Research Centre
Diyarbakır, Türkiye