

INTELIGENSIA

JURNAL STUDI KEISLAMAN

Naskah yang dimuat dalam Jurnal Inteligencia meliputi hasil penelitian dan artikel berisi gagasan/ide/pemikiran yang berhubungan dengan masalah dan isu-isu Studi Keislaman. Tanggung jawab isi ada pada penulis sepenuhnya.

Susunan Redaksi:

Penanggungjawab : Dr. Zulkarnain, M.Ag
Penyunting Ahli : Kamaruzzaman Bustamam Ahmad, Ph.D
Redaktur : Dr. Shaumiwaty, M.Hum
Sekretaris : Rahmat Hidayat, MA
Desain Grafis : Afdi Pamila, ST

Penerbit: PPs. STAIN Gajah Putih Takengon Aceh Tengah, Aceh
Gedung Biro Lantai 2 STAIN Gajah Putih Takengon
Telpon: 0643-21088 email: ppsstaingajahputih@yahoo.co.id

INTELIGENSIA

JURNAL STUDI KEISLAMAN

Editorial

Alhamdulillah. Jurnal Inteligencia Vol. 4 No. 1 Maret 2018 telah terbit. Inteligencia adalah jurnal yang diterbitkan Program Pascasarjana STAIN Gajah Putih Takengon Aceh. Inteligencia terbit 2 kali setahun, Maret dan September, memuat kajian dan isu-isu keislaman kontemporer. Edisi Maret 2018 memuat sepuluh artikel sebagai berikut:

Saifuddin menulis kajian tentang Ibnu Rusyd, karya dan pengaruhnya bagi peradaban islam. Ibnu Rusyd merupakan intelektual muslim paripurna, di dalam dirinya terkumpul kemampuan dan bakat dalam berbagai disiplin keilmuan yang barangkali untuk saat ini merupakan sesuatu yang mustahil. Jasanya yang sangat besar adalah usahanya untuk mendamaikan antara filsafat dan syari'at setelah sekian lama. Dan ia menjadi jembatan penghubung dan pemantik kebangkitan dunia Barat modern.

Zulkarnain dan **Irnairi** memaparkan kajiannya tentang kebijakan pembiayaan pendidikan pada satuan pendidikan dasar dalam pemenuhan standar biaya pendidikan dan masalah yang sering terjadi dalam pembiayaan pendidikan antara lain sumber dana yang terbatas, tidak meratanya dana pendidikan yang diterima dari pemerintah, dalam pengelolaan pembiayaan kurang transparan, pembiayaan yang tidak dikelola dengan baik yang bisa disebabkan karena kurang kompetennya pengelola dana di sekolah.

Tulisan **Anis Hidayatul Imtihanah** membahas tentang konsep dan arah pemikiran politik al-Khawarij dalam teologi Islam. merupakan salah satu aliran dalam ilmu tauhid atau teologi Islam. Kelompok tersebut lahir karena adanya pertikaian antara khalifah Ali dan Muawiyah dalam perang Shiffin, yang berakhir dengan adanya tahkim. Para pihak yang pada awalnya adalah pengikut setia Ali kemudian memberontak dan keluar dari barisan Ali, karena tidak sepakat dengan keputusan Ali bin Thalib yang menerima tahkim dari pihak Muawiyah. Dalam perkembangan selanjutnya, Al-Khawarij juga memberi pengaruh –meskipun tidak banyak– terhadap gerakan-gerakan baru/gerakan militan Islam yang muncul setelahnya. Gerakan-gerakan tersebut lebih dikenal sebagai gerakan yang beraliran radikal dan fundamental, atau disebut juga sebagai Neo Khawarij abad ini.

Jusman dan **Maisyarah** menganalisa konsep pendidikan anak dalam kajian Al-Qur'an surat Luqman ayat 12-19 dan surat an-Nahl ayat 78, ditemukan bahwa remaja Islam hari ini kurang mendapatkan pendidikan agama dari orang tua. Banyak para orang tua tidak menggunakan al-Qur'an sebagai referensi atau rujukan dalam mendidik anak, karena itu, terjadinya kemerosotan kualitas dalam hal keimanan anak, karena itu perlu kembali lagi pada ajaran Islam sebagaimana yang dianjurkan dalam al-Qur'an. Sebab al-Qur'an yang sepantasnya dan panduan yang paling efektif dan efisien dalam memberikan pendidikan terhadap anak dalam menjali kehidupan sehari-hari.

Rahmah Fithriani menulis tentang task-based language teaching in grammar instruction: a literature review. Many methods and approaches with their strengths and weaknesses have been proposed in order to get the best learning outcomes in grammar instruction. One which has proven effective to achieve the goal of language learning is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Various methods have emerged as an attempt to make CLT feasible in any classroom contexts and one of them is the task-based language teaching (TBLT). This paper aims to give the review of TBLT frameworks in grammar instruction.

Dalam hasil kajian **Shaumiwaty** dan **Hikma Hidayani** tentang efektifitas strategi learning journal untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis siswa, Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui Apakah strategi Learning Journal efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan menulis pada siswa MTsN Takengon I. Penelitian ini menggunakan quantitative dengan pendekatan experiment.

Ishak menulis tentang konsep inovasi pendidikan Islam Nahdhatul Ulama. Dalam tulisannya disimpulkan bahwa NU menaungi beragam jenis pendidikan dari tingkat dasar sampai perguruan tinggi. Kuantitas pendidikan di bawah naungan NU (Ma'arif) tidak terbantahkan banyaknya.

Hubungan motivasi belajar terhadap prestasi belajar siswa yang ditulis **Rizkia Shaulita** menyimpulkan bahwa motivasi dan prestasi adalah hal yang sangat kuat hubungannya dalam dunia pembelajaran khususnya. Prestasi yang dibahas dalam penelitian ini dikhususkan dalam prestasi mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris untuk mengetahui siswa dalam belajar bahasa asing.

Rahmat Hidayat dan **Nadya L. Pohan** menulis tentang penanaman moral, aqidah, dan akhlak pada anak. Pembentukan pribadi yang berkarakter dengan konsep pendidikan islami lahir dari keluarga, lembaga pendidikan, dan lingkungan. Karakter seorang anak terbentuk sejak dini, bukan sebuah kejadian yang tiba-tiba tetapi membutuhkan proses panjang. Konsep pendidikan islami sangat menekankan pentingnya mengajarkan kepada anak terkait moral, aqidah, dan akhlak.

Di bagian akhir, **Johansyah** menganalisa bagaimana upaya penguatan dimensi psikologis guru. Beliau menyimpulkan bahwa guru adalah pelaku utama dalam proses belajar mengajar. Karena itu mereka harus profesional sehingga mampu menghadapi berbagai persoalan yang muncul di sana. Pada kenyataannya, masih banyak guru yang tidak mampu mengatasi persoalan dalam proses belajar mengajar.

DAFTAR ISI
Jurnal Inteligencia, Volume 4, No. 1 Maret 2018

Susunan Redaksi	i
Editorial	ii
Daftar Isi	v
Saifuddin Ibnu Rusyd, Karya dan Pengaruhnya Bagi Peradaban Islam	1-10
Zulkarnain dan Irnairi Kebijakan Pembiayaan Pendidikan Pada Satuan Pendidikan Dasar Dalam Pemenuhan Standar Biaya Pendidikan	11-29
Anis Hidayatul Imtihanah Konsep dan Arah Pemikiran Politik Al-Khawarij Dalam Teologi Islam ..	30-41
Jusman dan Maisyarah Konsep Pendidikan Anak Dalam Kajian Al-Qur'an Surat Luqman Ayat 12-19 Dan Surat An-Nahl Ayat 78	42-66
Rahmah Fithriani <i>Task-based Language Teaching in Grammar Instruction: A Literature Review.....</i>	67-79
Shaumiwaty dan Hikma Hidayani Efektifitas Strategi Learning Journal Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Menulis Siswa	80-89
Ishak Konsep Inovasi Pendidikan Islam Nahdhatul Ulama	99-100
Rizkia Shaulita Hubungan Motivasi Belajar Terhadap Prestasi Belajar Siswa	101-115
Rahmat Hidayat dan Nadya L. Pohan Penanaman Moral, Aqidah, dan Akhlak Pada Anak	116-124
Johansyah Upaya Penguatan Dimensi Psikologis Guru	125-136
Pedoman Penulisan	137

TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING IN GRAMMAR INSTRUCTION: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Rahmah Fithriani

Dosen Fakultas Ilmu Tarbiyah dan Keguruan UIN SU Medan
Email: rahmahfithriani@uinsu.ac.id

Abstract

The role of grammar instruction for EFL/ESL learners has been a major debate among the stakeholders; the English language teachers and students, researchers and practitioners. Some believe that language teaching should focus on meaning and fluency to reach the goal of language as a means of communication, while some others argue that the focus on language form and accuracy is more important in language acquisition. Despite this long controversy, grammar gains its prominence in English language teaching, particularly in Asian context. Many methods and approaches with their strengths and weaknesses have been proposed in order to get the best learning outcomes in grammar instruction. One which has proven effective to achieve the goal of language learning is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Various methods have emerged as an attempt to make CLT feasible in any classroom contexts and one of them is the task-based language teaching (TBLT). This paper aims to give the review of TBLT frameworks in grammar instruction.

Keywords: Grammar instruction, communicative language teaching, and task-based language teaching

Introduction

The teaching of grammar for language learners has been a long debate among researchers and practitioners. Some argue that grammar is not necessary to be given a special focus on language learning as children learn their first languages without learning the rules of how the words are combined yet they are able to communicate with others. Lewis (1993) asserted that 'grammar is not the basis of language acquisition, and the balance of linguistic research clearly invalidates any view to the contrary'. However, Celce-Murcia (1985) argued that evidences show that no-grammar

teaching will lead to the product of clumsy and inappropriate foreign languages, which means that grammar plays a very important role in language learning. Furthermore, Corder (1988) emphasized the importance of grammar in acquiring the capability of producing grammatically acceptable utterances in language. Learning grammar will help to furnish the basis of the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing.

Regardless of the problem, the role of grammar instruction has been regarded as crucial to the ability to use language. Unfortunately, most English learners find grammar difficult and boring to learn. Al-Mekhlafi and Nagaratnam (2011) stated that learners have generally looked upon grammar instruction as the moments of discomfort and sometimes even terror. Class activities are usually dominated by teachers explaining the grammar rules followed with the instruction for the students to do the exercises in accordance with grammar rules explained. Thus Baron (1982) said that most learners portrayed English teachers as unattractive grammar mongers whose only pleasure in life is to point out the faults of others. In order to change this negative stigma of grammar instruction, English teachers should be aware the strengths and weaknesses of various teaching approaches and methods. Furthermore, they must be able to apply and adapt them in such a way that they can work best for accommodating their learners' diversities, but also creating an enjoyable class with interactive and meaningful activities at the same time.

Methods and Approaches in Grammar Instruction

Methodology is the key aspect in language teaching. There are two terms within methodology which are used to refer to the type of instruction used in classrooms; method and approach. Walia (2012) differed the two terms as follows: "methods are the fixed teaching systems with prescribed techniques and practices, and approaches are language teaching philosophies that can be interpreted and applied in a variety of different ways in the classroom." There have been many methods and approaches offered by the experts and each claim to give the most effective outcomes. Savage, Bitterlin and Price (2010) summarized six methods and approaches that have a big influence in the evolution of grammar instruction, namely: grammar translation method, direct method, audio-lingual method, cognitive approach, natural approach and communicative approach. This evolution can be illustrated as a pendulum swinging back and forth between explicit and implicit grammar instruction.

Grammar-Translation Method

The grammar-translation method is developed on the basis that different kinds of knowledge are located in separate sections of the brain. Thus, the main goal of learning a language is not for communication, but to give mental exercise necessary to develop the part of brain responsible to linguistic competence. The name of the method represents the main emphases of this method through which teachers teach classes using the students' native languages with Grammar study as the focus of the lessons. The advantage of this method is explicit teaching of grammar rules that describe the language functions. However, because of the lack of communicative practice, students taught with this method can barely speak in the language learnt, which actually is the main reason why one learns a new language.

Direct Method

This method can be said as the opposite of grammar-translation method. Native languages are not allowed to use in classrooms to encourage students to speak in the target one. This method is claimed as the natural method through which students learn the direct association between words and meanings. Aspects of grammar are taught by using inductive presentation through which learners understand grammar rules from the examples. This is regarded as one of its weaknesses, besides the minimum focus it gives on reading and writing, which are needed by students with work or academic goals.

Audio-Lingual Method (ALM)

The ALM was very popular in the US schools in the 1960s as the response to the failure of grammar-translation method in producing people who were able to speak foreign languages they learnt. Inspired by behaviorism, this method emphasizes on oral production, which is drilled through the memorization of a series of dialogues and the rote of practice of language structures. During the era of this method, language laboratories began to surge as students were required to listen to audio tapes and dialogues on the topics of daily life. Grammar is not taught through explicit rules, but practice drills to help them memorize the structures of sentences in the target language. The belief is that through much practice, students will develop fluency. However, in reality, students taught with this method tend to memorize the dialogues, but cannot produce their own sentences in the target language when they need it.

Cognitive Approach

This approach represents a shift back to the explicit grammar instruction. Inspired by Chomsky's theory of Universal Grammar, cognitive approach deals with mental processes like memory and problem solving with the emphasis on syntactic aspect of language. Placing itself in opposition to behaviorism that emphasizes habit formation as process of language learning, cognitive approach considers the conscious study of language rules as central to the learning of a foreign language and practice will be meaningful if learners understand the rules involved in practice. They are encouraged and helped to first have a clear understanding of a grammatical rule before practicing and using it in meaningful contexts. The limitation of this approach is its emphasis on analyzing structure at the expense of communicative practice but the pronunciation is the emphasized.

Natural Approach

The natural approach is based on the idea of enabling naturalistic language acquisition in the language classroom with less emphasis on practice and more on exposure to language input. The aim of the natural approach is to develop communicative competence. Thus, lessons in the natural approach focus on understanding messages in the foreign language, and place little importance on conscious learning of grammar rules. It is also claimed that this approach enables teachers to motivate their learners by emphasizing interesting, comprehensible input and low-anxiety situations. The flaw of this approach is placed on the little attention given on grammar. Since the focus is on communication, how will learners discern the grammatical structures of the language without direct instruction? As the result, learners never attaining correct grammar of the language.

Communicative Approach

The communicative approach, also known as communicative language teaching (CLT) focuses on the communicative functions of language rather than on mere mastering of structures. It aims to make communicative competence the goal of language teaching through activities that involve real communication and carry out meaningful tasks. In CLT, grammar is taught as a means to help learners convey their intended meaning appropriately. Based on the assumption that some learners learn better by being given the context and then are presented with the grammar rules afterwards while others need the rule in order to understand the rationale for the new grammatical structure, the teaching of grammar can be

managed either deductively or inductively depending on the kinds of grammatical points. Learners are encouraged to be actively involved in communication activities while the teacher plays the role as a facilitator without giving much correction or intervention during the activities. However, since CLT was developed mainly in the context of English Second Language (ESL) teaching, the feasibility of this approach to be applied in EFL context is still questioned.

CLT and Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT)

Language classrooms in 1950s were dominated by traditional methods which focused mainly on the learning of grammar rules and vocabulary and as the result; many language learners knew grammar rules but could not use the target language to communicate. In the 1970s, CLT was first introduced to solve this problem and since its emergence, CLT has become the most popular approach used in English language teaching all over the world (Kumaravadivelu: 1993). However, since CLT was developed in the context of ESL teaching, EFL teachers usually feel reluctant to apply this approach in their classrooms for some reasons. One of them as diagnosed by Al-Mekhlafi and Nagaratnam in their paper *Difficulties in Teaching and Learning Grammar in an EFL Context* (2011), “the hard fact that most teachers face is that learners often find it difficult to make flexible use of the rules of grammar taught in the classroom. They may know the rules perfectly, but are incapable of applying them in their own use of the language.” Chung (2005) argued that communicative approach will be easier to apply only when learners have the fundamental knowledge of language. He further argued “for societies whose first (and second) language is not English, there is still a need for structural practices so that the foundation of linguistics knowledge can be built up before further communicative task are given.”

To solve the problems addressed above, CLT has been interpreted in some contexts through various manifestations. Task-based language teaching (TBLT) could be considered the most popular manifestation of CLT. In recent years, many researchers (e.g. Ellis, 2000, 2003; Skehan; 2003 and Littlewood, 2004) have attempted to explore TBLT, which indicated an enormous growth of interest in this particular approach. According to Willis (1996), one of the advantages of this approach is the possibility of combining ‘the best insights from communicative language teaching with an organized focus on language form’ and thus avoiding the drawbacks of more narrowly form-centered or communication-centered approaches. Another advantage of this approach is its flexibility. TBLT is not a monolithic teaching method, but an adaptable approach to language teaching. As Ellis (2009) notes,

'there is no single way of doing TBLT', so teachers can adapt this approach and design their own classroom activities which work best for their students.

During its development, there are two points of debate in applying TBLT in English teaching. The first is related to the focus of attention; whether on linguistic form and accuracy or on meaning and fluency. The second is about the grammar teaching; some suggest the explicit knowledge of grammar while some others believe grammar knowledge should be taught implicitly. These controversies, along with the fact that TBLT is an adaptable approach to language teaching, have contributed to the emergence of TBLT conceptualization in classrooms. Various designs of TBLT have been proposed by the experts (Prabhu 1987; Skehan 1996; Willis 1996; Ellis 2003). Despite the strengths and weaknesses of each design (as claimed by the designer), all of them show one common characteristic, three principal phases showing the chronology of a task-based lesson. Pre-task phase contains various activities to introduce learners to the topic and the task. Task phase centers around the task itself, in which learners are encouraged to use their communicative skill to carry out the task and given the guidance to improve the skill. Post-task phase involves procedures for following-up on the task performance.

TBLT Frameworks in Grammar Instruction

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) has become a dominant approach to language teaching worldwide. However, despite its popularity, TBLT has been unable to displace more traditional pedagogies in many EFL contexts. This is especially true in Indonesia, where conventional form-focused approaches are preferable. Widodo (2006) said that in reality, teaching grammar in the context of EFL has traditionally been dominated by grammar-translation method where the use of mother tongue is clearly important to elicit the meaning of target language by translating the target language into native languages. The main reason behind EFL teachers' reluctance to use TBLT is because they continue to struggle with successful implementation of this approach in their classrooms. They remain skeptical of TBLT due to the lack of a solid teaching structure and lack of knowledge on how to manage tasks in the classroom.

Related to this practical problem, some studies have been conducted to find out the effectiveness of proposed TBLT frameworks in one particular skill of language teaching. This paper will review four frameworks whose effectiveness in grammar instruction has been analyzed through previous studies. Each is claimed to give teachers the best practical guide for

conducting tasks in the classroom. To make them simple and more structural, all frameworks will be presented in tables.

Jiuhan Huang’s Framework (2010)

Huang’s Task-Based Learning Framework is claimed to offer a promising grammar-teaching approach to adult learners. Furthermore, Huang stated that this framework, which was based on Willis’ (1996) provides learners with opportunities and practices that fulfill many of the 10 principles of instructed learning proposed by Ellis (2005).

Preparation: The teacher prepares a short text containing some examples of the grammatical feature to discuss.	
Pre-task	Brainstorming: The teacher asks the students questions related to the topic of the text and pre-teaches vocabulary that students might be unfamiliar.
Task Cycle	Task: Students working in a small group choose a more specific topic related to the topic of the text and discuss some important points of their chosen topic.
	Planning: Each group summarizes their discussion to report to the whole class.
	Report: Each group sends their representative to report the group’s summary to the whole class. After all groups report their summaries, the teacher reports his/her own summary of the text.
Language Focus	Analysis: The teacher chooses some sentences from the text with the target forms and explains the grammatical rules of the forms.
	Practice: Each group is asked to write their summary of the text using the target forms explained. The teacher asks a few students to report back to the class and correct language mistakes using the target forms.

C. J. Thompson & N. T. Millington’s Framework (2012)

Thomson and Millington also developed their framework based on Willis’ (1996). However, they modified the pre-task phase by providing useful vocabulary and grammar use which they believed would help the learners successfully complete the task cycle. They claimed their framework as adaptable within limited resources and implementable with a large class to promote language interaction and grammar use. They also said that this framework can help to facilitate language use across different groups and

minimize some of the classroom management issues for teaching speaking in large classes.

Pre-task	Introduction: The teacher gives the class instructions of the task and provides some vocabulary and target form to use in the task.
	Preparation: The teacher prepares a different story for each group of students to prevent them from using their L1 to complete the task and present the story.
Task Cycle	Task: Students describe their pictures and sequence them in the correct order. This activity allows them to engage in free L2 communication to agree on the sequence of the photos.
	Report: A representative from each group narrates the story to the rest of the class.
Language Focus	Analysis: Students write a summary of their story and work in pairs; examining their texts and editing any errors noticed. The teacher provides feedback about the correct use of the grammar forms.
	Practice: Students orally practice their narration in pairs before rewriting an improved version of their text.

M. B. Crivos & P. L. Luchini's Framework (2012)

Crivos & Luchini offer a different approach to TBLT in grammar instruction. They believe that the best method to teach grammar is by developing learners' awareness of a certain grammatical forms. Learners are provided with data about how a particular grammar structure works in context, and are then prompted to work out the rule by themselves. This framework, which is based on Willis and Willis's (1996) taxonomy of consciousness-raising tasks (CRT), consists of a series of tasks focusing on specific grammar points.

A. Identification/Consolidation Task

Pre-language Focus	Planning: Working in groups, students are provided with a text and asked to make an outline of the story in it.
	Report: Each group gives oral presentation reporting what they see in the text.

Language Focus	Comparison: The teacher plays a recording of the narration. Based on what they listen, students compare their version with the original one.
	Feedback: Students comment on their findings and the teacher precast the introduction of the new form moves the focus into the target feature without explicit explanation.
Post-language Focus	Reflection: Each group is asked to write up the story to give students opportunity to reflect on the task done.

B. Hypothesis Building/Checking Task

Pre-Task	Introduction: Each group is given a copy of the task sheet. The teacher introduces the topic and involves the class to discuss it.
	Elicitation: The teacher elicits from the students what they know about the topic to predict what the text is about.
	Confirmation: Students read the text on their own to confirm their expectations.
Task	Error Analysis: Students are asked to find six errors of form in the text
	Modification: Students are asked to give the modified edition of each mistake.
Post-task	Reflection: Students complete a substitution table in which they are prompted to reflect on the target feature by filling in a gapped text.

C. Reconstruction-Deconstruction Task

Pre-task	Students are given a glossary with some key words to help them understand the text.
Task	Grouping the class: Students are put into two groups: A and B. Each student in group A receives part A of the task while those in group B get part B.
	Reading task: Each student reads the story in silence and orders the pictures following the sequence in which the events are described in their copies.
	Comparison: Students compare their results with those from another member of the same group. Later, they are asked to answer some <i>True/False</i> questions. They

	are again asked to compare their results with those coming from another partner.
Post-task	Finding Differences: Students are paired with partners from different group and asked to compare their answers with the ones given in the <i>True/False</i> exercise previously done. They are also challenged to find six differences in the two versions of the story.
	Discussion: The teacher leads a whole class discussion to find agreement on common responses.

William Littlewood’s Framework (2000)

As an TBLT expert whose works have been cited by numerous researchers, William Littlewood proposed a more general framework without specific step-by-step activities to follow in grammar instruction. He set the guideline to follow and gave the teachers themselves discretion to create the tasks which can work best with their students of different levels of proficiency. Littlewood developed his framework based on a five-part continuum of varying degrees of focus on form and/ or meaning which, he believed is related to the goal of language teaching, namely, communication.

Focus on form ←		→ Focus on meaning		
Exercises	Exercise - Tasks			Tasks
Non-communicative learning	Pre-communicative language practice	Communicative language practice	Structured communication	Authentic communication
Focusing on the structures of language, how they are formed and what they mean, e.g. through exercises, “discovery” and awareness-	Practising language with some attention to meaning but not communicating new messages to others, e.g. in “question-and-	Practising language in a context where it communicates new information, e.g. in information gap activities or	Using language to communicate in situations which elicit pre-learnt language but with some unpredictability, e.g. in	Using language to communicate in situations where the meanings are unpredictable, e.g. in creative role-play,

raising activities.	answer” practice.	“personalised” questions.	structured role-play and simple problem-solving.	more complex problem-solving and discussion.
Focus on discrete items and/or skills ←			→ Purposefulness and contextualisation	

Discussion

In the above review of four TBLT frameworks in grammar instruction, there are some similarities and differences that can be observed. The first two by Huang and Thompson & Millington were developed based on Willis’s (1996) framework. They also share one common characteristic of explicit grammar teaching. However, there are also some differences between the two. Huang adapted Willis’s framework without making much modification meanwhile Thompson & Millington admitted that they gave additional aspect in the pre-task phase, ‘Although Willis (1996) does not advocate the pre-instruction for vocabulary and grammar use, the authors felt that in this context, providing useful vocabulary would help the learners successfully complete the task cycle (Thompson & Millington, 2012: 162). Another difference is placed in the language focus phase. Huang gave the responsibility to explain the grammar points solely on the teacher while Thompson & Millington gave students the opportunity to explore the grammar points themselves before the teacher gives explanation.

Crivos and Luchini’s had a different perspective from the first two researchers in terms of teacher’s explanation on grammatical features. They argue that grammar instruction should not aim at achieving immediate production but helping students become aware of how grammatical features work. Thus, all activities developed in their framework involve students’ active participation without teacher’s explanation on grammatical features. Another feature of Crivos and Luchini’s framework, which is also different from Huang’s and Thompson & Millington’s ones is their framework underpins a meaning-form-meaning progression while the other two a meaning-meaning-form progression.

The last framework by William Littlewood stands in a more neutral position by addressing both explicit and implicit grammar instruction and offering the possibility of focusing on form only, meaning only or both. This framework is aimed to give grammar teachers the flexible guideline on how to implement TBLT for different levels of learners. Thus, Littlewood did not

provide detailed activities to follow like the other three but an example to each category to show how it is implemented in grammar activities.

Conclusion

TBLT in grammar instruction can be implemented through various activities focusing on form, meaning or both with either explicit or implicit grammar teaching. Through the four TBLT frameworks reviewed in this article, it can be concluded that the best strategy to apply by a grammar instructor is not to limit himself/herself to one type of activity, but to draw on all the resources and techniques available by combining both explicit and implicit grammar teaching and focusing on both meaning and form in one's teaching practice. This is in accordance with what Bygate (2001) suggested that 'only by integrating form- and meaning-centered approaches, can teachers maximize their chances of successfully teaching all those aspects of language that learners most need to master, and thus meeting the central challenge for language teaching...to develop learners' communicative language ability through pedagogic intervention.'

References

- Al-Mekhlafi, A. M., & Nagaratnam, R. P., (2011). *Difficulties in teaching and learning grammar in an EFL context. International Journal of Instruction, 4(2), 69-92.*
- Baron. (1982). *Grammar and good taste: Reforming the American language.* New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press.
- Bygate, M. (2001). Effects of task repetition on the structure and control of oral language, In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 23-48). Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- Chung, S. F. (2005). A communicative approach to teaching grammar: theory and practice. *The English teacher, XXXIV, 33-50.*
- Corder, S. (1988). Pedagogic grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood-Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching* (pp. 123-145). New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Crivos, M. B. and Luchini, P. L. (2012) A pedagogical proposal for teaching grammar using consciousness-raising tasks. *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4(3), 141-153.*
- Ellis, R., (2000), Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 4(3), 139-220.*
- Ellis, R. (2003) *Task-based language learning and teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. In P. Robertson, P. Dash, & J. Jung (Eds.), *English language learning in the Asian context* (pp. 12-26). Pusan: The Asian EFL Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009) Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.
- Huang, J. (2010). Grammar instruction for adult English language learners: a task-based learning framework. *Information Series*, 39(1), 29-37.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1993). Maximising learning potential in the communicative classroom. *ELT Journal*, 47(1), 12-21.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The lexical approach: The state of ELT and the way forward*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Littlewood, W. (2000). Task-based learning of grammar. *Teaching and Learning Update*, 1, 40-57.
- Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319-326.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1985). Making informed decisions about the role of grammar in language teaching. *TESOL Newsletter*, 19(1), 4-5.
- Prabhu, N. 1987. *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Savage, K. L., Bitterlin, G., & Price, D. (2010). *Grammar matters: Teaching grammar in adults ESL programs*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A Framework for the implementation of task-based instruction, *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (2003). Task-based instruction, *Language Teaching*, 36, 1-34.
- Thompson, C. J., & Millington, N. T. (2012). Task-based learning for communication and grammar use. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(2), 159-167.
- Walia, D. N. (2012). Traditional teaching methods vs. CLT: A study. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 3, 125-131.
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (1996). *Challenge and change in language teaching*. London, UK: Heineman.
- Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow, U.K.: Addison Wesley.
- Widodo, H. P. (2006). Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 5(1), 122-141. <http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/2006v5n1nar1.pdf>