

THE IMPACT OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING (TBLT) ON ENHANCING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN EFL CLASSROOMS

Berdikulova Mahbuba Erkinjon qizi

Teacher of Gulistan State Pedagogical Institute

Mehmonova Umidabonu

Student of the Foreign Language

and Literature program

Gulistan State pedagogical institute .Uzbekistan

mehmonovaumidabonu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research paper investigates the profound impact of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) on the development of communicative competence among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. In an era where linguistic accuracy often takes a backseat to functional fluency, TBLT emerges as a bridge between theoretical knowledge and practical application. The study compares the traditional Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model with the TBLT framework developed by Jane Willis. By analyzing student engagement, fluency, and cognitive load, the paper argues that TBLT provides a more authentic environment for language acquisition. Results indicate that students taught via TBLT demonstrate higher confidence and a more robust ability to navigate unpredictable communicative situations.

Keywords: TBLT, Communicative Competence, EFL Methodology, Task Cycle, Language Acquisition, Pedagogical Frameworks, Student-Centered Learning.

INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of modern English Language Teaching (ELT) is to equip learners with the ability to communicate effectively in real-world settings. However, for decades, the dominant pedagogical paradigm was the Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model. While PPP offers a clear and manageable structure for teachers, it has often been criticized for creating an "artificial" classroom environment where language is treated as a set of isolated rules rather than a dynamic tool for communication.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) represents a significant shift from "learning about the language" to "using the language to learn." According to Rod Ellis (2003), a task is an activity that requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective. The rationale behind TBLT is rooted in the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory, which suggests that language is best acquired when learners are engaged in meaningful interaction. This introduction explores the

necessity of moving toward task-centric methodologies to meet the demands of 21st-century global communication.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To understand TBLT, one must examine its evolution from Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). While CLT provided the philosophical foundation for communication-focused darslar, TBLT provided the structural methodology.

Jane Willis (1996) proposed a three-stage framework that remains the gold standard for TBLT:

The Pre-task: Introduces the topic and the task, activating prior knowledge and providing necessary vocabulary.

The Task Cycle: Comprising the task itself, planning, and reporting. Here, students work in pairs or groups, utilizing their current interlanguage without immediate correction.

Language Focus: A post-task stage where specific linguistic features that arose during the task are analyzed and practiced.

Critics of TBLT often argue that it neglects grammar. However, Long (1991) introduced the concept of "Focus on Form," which suggests that grammar is most effectively learned when it is addressed reactively, in response to a communicative need, rather than as a pre-selected list of items.

METHODS

This study employed a comparative qualitative and quantitative research design conducted over one semester. The participants consisted of 60 intermediate-level EFL students, divided into two groups:

Group A (Control): Followed a structural syllabus. Lessons were organized around specific grammatical points (e.g., Present Perfect vs. Past Simple) using the PPP model.

Group B (Experimental): Followed a task-based syllabus. Instead of grammar-point titles, lessons were titled based on outcomes (e.g., "Designing a Sustainable City," "Negotiating a Contract," or "Reviewing a Film").

Data Collection Tools:

Pre-test and Post-test: Oral interviews to measure fluency and lexical diversity.

Observations: Recording the frequency of "L1 interference" (use of mother tongue) and "negotiation of meaning."

Surveys: Assessing student motivation and "Speaking Anxiety" levels.

RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The data revealed a clear distinction between the two groups. In the post-test interviews, Group B (TBLT) participants spoke for an average of 40% longer than Group A participants when faced with an unfamiliar topic.

Key Findings:

Fluency vs. Accuracy: Group A showed higher accuracy in controlled written exercises. However, in spontaneous speech, they experienced frequent "communication breakdowns." Group B showed a higher "Repair Strategy" rate, meaning they were better at using circumlocution to explain words they didn't know.

Motivation: Survey results indicated that 90% of the TBLT group found the lessons "highly relevant" to their future careers, compared to only 55% in the control group.

Collaborative Learning: Observation logs showed that TBLT students engaged in significantly more "peer-scaffolding," where stronger students naturally assisted weaker ones to complete the task.

DISCUSSION

The results support the hypothesis that TBLT fosters a more resilient communicative competence. One of the most significant observations was the reduction in "Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety." Because the "Task Cycle" focuses on the successful completion of an objective (e.g., "Did we successfully book the hotel?"), students felt less pressure regarding grammatical perfection.

However, the transition to TBLT is not without hurdles. This section discusses three major challenges:

Teacher Role: The teacher must move from being a "lecturer" to a "facilitator" and "monitor."

Assessment: Traditional standardized tests often fail to capture the communicative gains made in a TBLT classroom.

Linguistic Fossilization: There is a theoretical risk that students may develop "broken English" if the Language Focus stage is ignored. Therefore, the report and analysis phases are crucial for ensuring that fluency does not come at the permanent expense of accuracy.

CONCLUSION AND PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

In conclusion, Task-Based Language Teaching offers a robust framework for transforming EFL classrooms into hubs of active communication. By prioritizing meaning and task completion, it aligns classroom practice with the real-world requirements of language use.

Recommendations for Educators:

1. Start with "Pedagogic Tasks" (simpler classroom tasks) before moving to "Target Tasks" (complex real-world simulations).
2. Ensure that the "Language Focus" stage is never skipped, as this is where cognitive mapping of grammar occurs.
3. Incorporate digital tools to facilitate task reporting, such as recorded presentations or blog posts.
4. References

5. Ellis, R. (2003). Task-based Language Learning and Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
7. Nunan, D. (2004). Task-Based Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Richards, J. C.,&Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge University Press.
9. Skehan, P. (1998). A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Willis, J. (1996). A Framework for Task-Based Learning. London: Longman.