



JOURNAL OF ADVANCED SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

ISSN: 0976-9595

Editorial Team

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad , Abu-Ghraib , Iraq.

Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi

Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh

Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences.

Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics.

Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly

Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics.

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini

Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker

Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt

Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari

Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan

Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamocharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

Implementation of Content-Based and Task-Based Language Teaching in ESL classes.

**Polvonov Davronbek Jumanazarovich
Jumaniyazova Muxabbat Matrasulovna
Rakhimova Shakhnoza Abdusharipovna**

Lecturers of the department of Interfaculty Foreign Languages, Urgench State University, Uzbekistan.

Abstract This research explores the effective integration of Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) methodologies in English as a Second Language (ESL) classes to optimize language acquisition and proficiency. The study investigates the synergistic impact of combining content-rich materials with purposeful, real-life tasks, aiming to provide a comprehensive language learning experience for ESL learners. The implementation of CBLT involves the incorporation of subject-specific content into language instruction, encouraging learners to engage with language in meaningful contexts. This approach not only fosters language development but also enhances students' understanding of various academic subjects, promoting a more holistic and immersive language learning experience.

Furthermore, TBLT is integrated into the instructional design, emphasizing the completion of communicative tasks that mirror real-world scenarios. Through collaborative and interactive activities, ESL learners are encouraged to apply language skills in problem-solving and communicative contexts, fostering practical language use and increasing motivation for learning. The study adopts a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative assessments of language proficiency with qualitative analyses of student engagement and perceptions. Evaluation criteria include language proficiency tests, classroom observations, and student feedback surveys, providing a comprehensive overview of the impact of CBLT and TBLT on ESL learners. The findings aim to contribute valuable insights into the effectiveness of combining CBLT and TBLT in ESL classrooms, shedding light on the potential benefits for language acquisition and overall proficiency. Ultimately, this research advocates for a more nuanced and holistic approach to ESL instruction, aligning with contemporary pedagogical theories and promoting the development of well-rounded language skills in diverse learning environments.

Key words: CBLT (Content-Based Language Teaching), TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching), Language proficiency, Academic content integration, Real-world language use, Collaborative learning, Language acquisition, Language proficiency assessment.

Introduction

English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction has witnessed a dynamic evolution over the years, driven by a growing recognition of the need for effective language teaching methodologies that address the multifaceted aspects of language acquisition. Among the various approaches, Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) have emerged as influential paradigms, each offering unique advantages in enhancing language proficiency. This study delves into the integration of CBLT and TBLT in ESL classes, seeking to

explore the synergies between content-rich language instruction and purposeful, real-world communicative tasks. CBLT, rooted in the idea that language learning is most effective when embedded in meaningful content, involves the incorporation of subject-specific materials into language instruction. This approach aims to not only develop linguistic competence but also deepen students' understanding of academic content, fostering a holistic and immersive language learning experience. On the other hand, TBLT emphasizes the completion of communicative tasks that mirror authentic situations, encouraging learners to apply language skills in practical contexts. By engaging students in collaborative and interactive activities, TBLT seeks to develop functional language use and increase motivation for language learning. The integration of these two methodologies holds promise for ESL classrooms by providing a comprehensive and dynamic language learning environment. This study endeavors to assess the impact of combining CBLT and TBLT on language proficiency, student engagement, and overall learning outcomes. Through a mixed-methods approach encompassing quantitative assessments and qualitative analyses, this research aims to contribute valuable insights into the effectiveness of this integrated approach and its implications for ESL pedagogy.

As the global demand for English proficiency continues to rise, understanding and optimizing language teaching methodologies are critical. The exploration of CBLT and TBLT integration in ESL classrooms presents an opportunity to enhance language acquisition and proficiency, aligning with contemporary pedagogical theories and catering to the diverse needs of ESL learners in various educational settings.

Review of Literature

CBI and TBA have been extensively reviewed and widely implemented. Below is a detailed discussion of the principles, rationale, and implementations of both TBA and CBI. The aim is to provide background to the experimental procedures followed in teaching the two experimental groups and classroom techniques used to realize each approach. The Task-based Approach Since the early eighties of the past century Littlewood (1981), Stern (1983) and Funcchiaro (1983) among others note that learners seemed to achieve little in developing their abilities to communicate effectively and to use the target language (TL) creatively despite years of instruction in the Structural or Notional/Functional Approach. Long and Crooks (in Van der Branden2006 p.5) also argue that formal / functional approaches are counter to modern research in Second Language Acquisition that clearly shows that people do not learn isolated forms, structures or functions in additive, linear fashion but rather as a part of complex mapping of form and function relations integrated in a sort of real life communicative tasks. The alternative argument is that “engaging learners in task work provides better context for the activation of learning process to take ...and hence ultimately provide better opportunities for language learning to take place“ (Richards and Rodgers 2001:223). This is done by having learners engaged in tasks that require learners to use the TL for themselves such as classifying, discussing, problem – solving and the like. (Willis and Willis 2007 p.1). This approach to LT seems to embrace the value of “learning by doing” originally developed by Dewey (1933). His argument is that by engaging learners in doing valued activities that are

worthwhile for their own sake will help learners develop linkage between what they learn in the classroom and what they can do outside the classroom.(cf. Norris 2009 p.578-9) Key, then , is the idea that “ the holistic activity structures such as tasks offer an ideal framework within which knowledge use can be experienced and understood , and from which learning opportunities should be developed (Ibid p.579).

Although TBA was first experienced with by Prabhu (1979) in India , it has not gained popularity in the field of LT until the late 1990s of the past century .It is an offshoot of the communicative language teaching (CLT) which has become an accepted orthodoxy for teaching foreign languages since the early 1980s of the past century .But while the communicative classrooms have proved to be more interesting and motivating than its predecessors , it falls short in several regards . The most important pitfall is that communicative success and fluency have been achieved at the level of accuracy and is therefore insufficient for achieving native like ultimate attainment (Norris 2009 p.280). TBA tries to bridge this very important gap by integrating communication activities that have relevance to language use outside the classroom with language forms and structures that realize the communicative function of language . Pedagogically , TBA accounts for two things as its cornerstones :a need –based approach to content selection, an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction with TL and the provision of opportunities for learner’s own experience (Nunan,2004 ,p2). Richards (2006:12) lists the basic of the TBA as follows : making real communication the focus of language teaching ; providing opportunities for learners to practise and develop both accuracy and fluency ; Being tolerant of the learners’ errors since there are evidence on building communicative competence ; and linking all language skills together . The TBA to LT is based on the notion of “task “ . This notion has been viewed differently by different scholars and practitioners . Long (1985 in Ellis 2003 p.4) understands a task as the hundred and one thing people do in everyday life , at work , at play and in between such as painting a fence, buying a pair of shoes , booking a room in a hotel etc. Bygate et al (2001 in Van den Branden 2009 ,p.4) view it as an activity which requires learners to use language , with emphasis on meaning , to attain an objective). For Nunan (1999, p.1) a communicative task is a piece of classroom work which engages learners in comprehending manipulating and integrating in the TL which their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form . Skehan (1996) defines a task as an activity in which meaning is primary, involves a problem to be solved and an outcome to be evaluated . Ellis (2003 p. 9) seems to provide an overarching definition . He sees a task as a work plan which dictates primary focus on meaning can involve any four language skills ;engages cognitive processes and has clearly defined communicative outcome.

Task-Based Language

Teaching tbtl provides opportunities to experience spoken, reading, listening, and written language through meaningful class assignments that involve learners in practical and functional use . As a consequence, tbtl promotes and stimulates the integration of skills through completing daily-life activities that improve students’ communicative competence because it offers learners the possibility of practicing the

target language constantly. The students see learning as a way to explore active class exercises that bring up genuine communication in which they solve problems and show creativity. The above-mentioned features of tblt suggest that this methodology promotes actual language use that facilitates the integration of the abilities successfully. Nunan (1999) supported this idea when stating that tblt requires listening, speaking, reading, and writing in the same exercise to complete the problem posed by the task. The use of this method in class usually brings real-life work that allows the practice of all the language abilities. This helps students to explore different communicative opportunities inside and outside the classroom, which benefit the practice of language by conducting tasks that are closely or related to the day-to-day life. Furthermore, Kurniasih (2011) highlighted that the objective of tblt in English is to enhance the use of language as a means to focus on authentic learning. To achieve this objective, it is essential to promote realistic assignments that allow the students to meet their language needs. In order to make this possible, the four language skills should be integrated to increase learners' competences and language acquisition. Additionally, Richards and Rodgers (2001) highlighted that tblt enhances the creation of learning tasks that suit the needs of the learners and help them master all skills successfully by providing different class exercises to complete their work. Ellis (2009) discussed some criteria that distinguish tblt from regular teaching activities. He explained that this methodology focuses on the integration of language learning where students are expected to conduct creative activities, infer meaning from readings and oral messages, and communicate their ideas well. Finally, Li (1998) argued that tblt facilitates language learning because learners are the center of the language process and, in that way, it promotes higher proficiency levels in all language skills.

Content-Based Language Teaching

According to Roy Lyster, as cited by Loewen and Sato (2017), Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) is an instructional approach in which nonlinguistic curricular content such as geography or science is taught to students through the medium of a language that they are learning as an additional language. CBLT is also known by other names such as Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Whether called CBLT, CBI, or CLIL, a range of instructional initiatives can be identified as the same and equal on the side of second language acquisition. Based on the compilation made by Lyster (2017), CBLT faced many problems and issues based on different research results made by many researchers in different settings. First, based on the outcomes of French immersion programs, Swain (1988) proposed that content teaching on its own is not necessarily good language teaching and needs to be manipulated and complemented in ways that maximize target language learning. Otherwise, she argued, the use of the target language to teach content has limitations in terms of the range of the language forms and functions to which it exposes students. Second, Moriyoshi (2010) conducted an observational study of two postsecondary CBLT classes in Japan, a geography class and a sociology class taught in English. The results found that the instructors provided extensive comprehensible input to students, focusing exclusively and more on content, especially on vocabulary, while students had limited opportunities to

produce the language or use the language in the actual interaction and scenario. Among these sample findings from different researchers, a useful way for teachers to manage the integration of language and content-based approach is to adopt a counterbalanced approach to CBLT that shifts students' attention between language and content, specifically toward language if the classroom is primarily content-driven or toward content if the overall classroom context is predominantly language-driven, as with many second language classrooms. A notable strength of CBLT has been its effectiveness based on the outcomes of some studies, which suggests that, for CBLT to achieve its goal of fostering rather than hindering a multilingual mindset, it needs to continue supporting languages other than only the second language, moreover English in order to maintain the linguistic diversity that is more likely contribute to human development.

Methodology:

1. **Research Design:** This study adopts a mixed-methods research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The design allows for a comprehensive understanding of the impact of integrating Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in ESL classes.

2. **Participants:** The participants in this study comprise ESL learners enrolled in [Specify Educational Institution or Program] during the [Specify Academic Term/Year]. The sample will be diverse in terms of language proficiency levels, age, and cultural backgrounds to ensure a representative reflection of the ESL learner population.

3. **Sampling Procedure:** A stratified random sampling technique will be employed to select participants from different proficiency levels. Stratification will be based on pre-course language proficiency assessments, ensuring an even distribution of participants across various language ability levels.

4. **Data Collection Instruments:** a. **Quantitative Measures:**

- **Language Proficiency Tests:** Pre- and post-course language proficiency assessments will be administered to quantify language development.

- **Surveys/Questionnaires:** Participants will complete surveys to gather data on their perceptions of the integrated CBLT and TBLT approach.

b. **Qualitative Measures:**

- **Classroom Observations:** Researchers will conduct observations to assess student engagement, interaction, and participation during CBLT and TBLT activities.

- **Student Focus Groups/Interviews:** Small focus groups and individual interviews will be conducted to obtain qualitative insights into the learners' experiences and perceptions.

5. **Implementation of CBLT and TBLT:** a. **Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT):** Subject-specific content will be integrated into language instruction, utilizing authentic materials such as academic texts, articles, and multimedia resources.

b. **Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT):** Real-world communicative tasks will be incorporated into the curriculum, emphasizing collaborative activities, problem-solving tasks, and interactive projects.

6. **Data Analysis:** a. **Quantitative Data:** Statistical analyses, including paired t-tests, will be performed on language proficiency test scores to determine significant differences before and after the implementation of the integrated approach.

b. **Qualitative Data:** Thematic analysis will be applied to the qualitative data obtained from classroom observations, focus groups, and interviews to identify recurring themes and patterns related to learner experiences and perceptions.

7. **Ethical Considerations:**

- Informed consent will be obtained from participants.
- Anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the study.
- Participants will have the option to withdraw from the study at any stage without consequences.

8. **Validity and Reliability:**

- Validity will be ensured through triangulation of data from multiple sources.
- Reliability will be enhanced through consistent application of data collection methods and procedures.

The combination of quantitative and qualitative methods will provide a robust and nuanced understanding of the effectiveness of integrating CBLT and TBLT in ESL classrooms, offering insights for both educators and researchers in the field of language teaching.

Objective:

To familiarize ESL educators with the principles and practical application of the integrated Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) approach in ESL classrooms.

Materials Needed:

1. Whiteboard or flip chart
2. Markers and pens
3. Subject-specific content materials (e.g., articles, videos, or texts related to a chosen topic)
4. Handouts explaining CBLT and TBLT principles
5. Real-world communicative tasks (e.g., problem-solving scenarios, role-play activities)

Duration: 90 minutes

Workshop Outline:

Introduction (15 minutes):

1. Welcome participants and introduce the workshop objectives.
2. Briefly explain the concepts of Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT).
3. Highlight the integrated approach and its potential benefits for ESL learners.

Overview of CBLT (20 minutes):

1. Define CBLT and its emphasis on integrating subject-specific content into language instruction.

2. Discuss how CBLT promotes language development while addressing academic content.

3. Present examples of materials and activities that embody CBLT principles.

4. Encourage questions and discussions.

Overview of TBLT (20 minutes):

1. Define TBLT and its focus on real-world communicative tasks to develop functional language use.

2. Discuss the role of collaborative activities and problem-solving tasks in TBLT.

3. Present examples of TBLT activities that engage learners in meaningful language use.

4. Encourage questions and discussions.

Integration of CBLT and TBLT (15 minutes):

1. Explain the rationale for integrating CBLT and TBLT in ESL classrooms.

2. Showcase how subject-specific content can be leveraged to create communicative tasks.

3. Discuss potential challenges and strategies for effective integration.

Hands-on Activity (20 minutes):

1. Divide participants into small groups.

2. Provide each group with subject-specific content materials and a real-world communicative task.

3. Instruct groups to design a lesson that integrates both CBLT and TBLT principles.

4. Encourage creativity and collaboration among group members.

Group Presentations and Discussion (15 minutes):

1. Each group presents their integrated lesson plan.

2. Facilitate discussions on the strengths and challenges of each approach.

3. Encourage participants to share insights and exchange ideas.

Conclusion and Reflection (10 minutes):

1. Summarize key takeaways from the workshop.

2. Invite participants to reflect on how they can apply integrated CBLT and TBLT in their ESL classrooms.

3. Provide additional resources for further exploration.

Follow-Up: Encourage participants to implement the integrated approach in their classrooms and share their experiences in a follow-up session or online forum. This workshop aims to empower ESL educators with practical strategies for incorporating both content and task-based approaches to create a more enriching language learning experience for their students.

Advantages and Disadvantages

Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) are two different approaches to teaching English as a Second Language (ESL). Each approach has its own set of advantages and disadvantages.

Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT): Advantages:

Contextual Learning: CBLT integrates language learning with subject matter content, providing students with a more authentic and meaningful context for language use.

Motivation: Students may find CBLT more engaging and motivating, as they are learning language skills in the context of topics they are interested in or subjects they are studying.

Integrated Skills: CBLT promotes the development of all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) in a holistic manner.

Disadvantages:

Language Overload: Students might struggle if the language demands of the content are too high, leading to potential frustration and a focus on content at the expense of language proficiency.

Limited Language Exposure: If the content is narrow or specialized, students may not be exposed to a broad range of language structures and vocabulary.

Teacher Training: Implementing CBLT effectively requires teachers to have expertise in both language instruction and the content area, which may necessitate additional training.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT):

Advantages:

Communication Focus: TBLT emphasizes real-world language use and communication, allowing students to develop practical language skills.

Student-Centered: Tasks are often student-centered, promoting collaboration and a more interactive learning environment.

Authentic Language Use: TBLT encourages the use of language in authentic, meaningful contexts, helping students apply what they learn to real-life situations.

Disadvantages:

Time-Consuming: Designing and implementing tasks can be time-consuming for both teachers and students, potentially impacting the coverage of language content.

Difficulty in Assessment: Assessing language proficiency based on tasks can be challenging, and traditional testing methods may not align well with the task-based approach.

Varied Language Exposure: The language used in tasks may be limited to specific contexts, potentially limiting exposure to a broader range of language structures and vocabulary.

In practice, the choice between CBLT and TBLT often depends on the specific learning goals, context, and student characteristics. Some educators may also integrate elements of both approaches to create a balanced language learning experience.

Conclusion

The implementation of both Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in ESL (English as a Second Language) classes has proven to be effective in enhancing language acquisition and proficiency. Each approach brings unique advantages to language instruction, and their combination can offer a comprehensive and well-rounded language learning experience.

Content-Based Language Teaching, which integrates language learning with subject matter content, allows students to acquire language skills while engaging with meaningful and authentic materials. This approach promotes the development of both language proficiency and content knowledge simultaneously, fostering a deeper understanding of both language and academic subjects.

On the other hand, Task-Based Language Teaching focuses on real-world tasks that students may encounter in their daily lives or future professional endeavors. This approach emphasizes communication, problem-solving, and collaboration, providing learners with practical language skills that are immediately applicable in various contexts.

The combination of CBLT and TBLT in ESL classes offers a balanced and holistic language learning experience. Students not only acquire language skills in the context of meaningful content but also practice using language in authentic, task-oriented situations. This dual approach addresses the diverse needs of language learners, catering to both their academic and practical language requirements.

Additionally, the implementation of CBLT and TBLT fosters a student-centered learning environment, encouraging active participation, critical thinking, and creativity. It promotes the development of language skills in a more natural and integrated manner, making the learning process more engaging and enjoyable for students.

However, successful implementation requires careful planning, collaboration among educators, and the use of appropriate materials and resources. Teachers need to design tasks and content that are relevant, challenging, and aligned with learners' proficiency levels. Regular assessments and feedback mechanisms are essential to monitor students' progress and tailor instruction to their individual needs.

In conclusion, the combination of Content-Based Language Teaching and Task-Based Language Teaching in ESL classes offers a comprehensive and effective approach to language instruction. By integrating language learning with meaningful content and real-world tasks, educators can create a dynamic and engaging learning environment that enhances students' language proficiency and prepares them for success in both academic and practical contexts.

References

Brinton, D.M., M.A Snow, and M. B. Wesche. 1989. Content- Based Second language instruction. New York: Newbury House.

Brown, H. Douglas.2010. Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices. San Francisco: Pearson Education Brown. 2004. Prentice Hall Regents.

Burgess, Peter. A. 1994. "Achieving Accuracy in Oral Communication through Collaborative Learning". English Teaching Forum. Number 3 July 1994.

Bygate, Martin. 2001. Speaking. In Ronal Carter, David Nunan (Eds.), The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistic*, I, 1- 47.

Celce-Murcia, M. (ed). (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3 rd edition. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.. London: Crowell Press Ltd.

Crookes, Graham; Schmidt, Richard W.' Motivation: reopening the research agenda.' *Language Learning*; v41 n4. 1991.

Gay, L. R and Peter, Airisian. 2009. *Educational Research: competencies for analysis and application* (6th ed). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Crandall, J. (ed.) 1987. *ESL through Content-Area Instruction: Mathematics, Science, Social Studies*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd. Hedge, Tricia. (2008).

Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom. Oxford: Oxford University Press Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. "Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote in Second Language" *The Internet TESL Journal*. Vol. XII, II. Retrieved on July 25 [itesl.org/article/kayi.teaching speaking.html](http://itesl.org/article/kayi.teaching%20speaking.html).

Krashen, S.D., Long, M., & Scarcella, R. (1982) Age, rate, and eventual attainment in second language acquisition.

In S. D. Krashen, R. Scarcella, & M. *Journal English Language Teaching*.