Reconceptualizing TBLT:
A Meta-Pedagogy in Second Language Education

Mahdi Ramezani
Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, Canada
(Email: Mahdi.Ramezani@MSVU.CA)

Abstract

In the dynamic landscape of language teaching, the quest for the perfect method has persisted across generations. The advent of communicative approaches in the late 1960s marked a turning point, leading to the rise and fall of various methodologies. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), as a comprehensive realization of Communicative Language Teaching, captivated scholars, educators, and teachers within the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). However, the rigid concept of teaching methods gradually faded, giving rise to the post-method pedagogy, often referred to as the "period of awakening". During the post-method era, teaching methods made way for eclectic approaches, seemingly the only alternative to the traditional methodological constraints. Yet, later scholars such as Stern and Widdowson emphasised the importance of pragmatism in post-method pedagogy, leading to the devaluation of principled eclecticism. This paper explores post-method pedagogy, as conceptualized by Kumaravadivelu, by examining its pedagogical parameters. It elucidates the alignment between TBLT's principles and post-method pedagogy, positioning TBLT as a post-method approach. Drawing on various Second Language Acquisition perspectives, the paper discusses the authenticity of TBLT as a potent Meta-pedagogy. The argument is presented that TBLT is rooted in principled pragmatism, making it a robust Meta-pedagogy.

Keywords

Introduction

Throughout the history of language teaching, it has always been a concern of having and devising the ideal method. By the advent of communicative approaches in the late 1960s, various approaches had fallen in and out of fashion. Consequently, Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT)—as the methodological realisation of Communicative Language Teaching

(Nunan, 2004, 2014)—has received the attention of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers, educators, teacher trainers and teachers. TBLT has been viewed and deemed an approach in which the primary focus is on the meaning and use of language for real-world purposes (Long, 1985; Prabhu, 1987). Consequently, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has garnered extensive research attention across diverse academic disciplines, with notable contributions from prominent scholars such as Long (1985), Prabhu (1987), Ellis (2003), Van den Branden (2006), Van den Branden et al. (2007), Long (2015, 2016), and Ellis et al. (2020). However, later, there was a tendency to declare the end of method—i.e., the total end of method as a valid concept in language teaching. The transition from traditional methods to what is termed post-method pedagogy, often referred to as the "period of awakening" by Kumaravadivelu (2006, P. 53), marked a decline in the favour of specific teaching methods among SLA educators and researchers. Hence, some language teachers have become more eclectically principled perhaps due to the belief that it has been the only way to get rid of the concept of method. However, later, scholars, such as Stern (1983) and Widdowson (1990) devalued principled eclecticism, and then, have emphasised the significance of pragmatism as a basis for post-method pedagogy. This paper aims to explore the concept of post-method pedagogy, as proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2001; 2006), by examining the pedagogic parameters he has identified. It seeks to illuminate the alignment between the principles that underpin TBLT and post-method pedagogy—supporting the idea that TBLT can be viewed as a Meta-pedagogy. To accomplish this objective, the paper draws on a range of perspectives from the field of SLA (Krashen 1985; Long 1985; Schmidt 1990; Stern 1983; Ellis, 2001; Swan 2005) that have been both offered and developed in the existing literature, supporting the idea that TBLT can be viewed as a Meta-pedagogy. It will also clarify the synergies and congruence between post-method pedagogy and the foundational principles of TBLT while addressing misunderstandings that have arisen due to misinterpretations related to various task types and the implementation of appropriate tasks. After defining TBLT as well as various types of tasks, TBLT will be analysed from various perspectives in SLA. By building upon these perspectives, it will be theorised that TBLT is more aligned with principled pragmatism rather than principled eclecticism, and that it is therefore the most potent concept of Meta-pedagogy. By Meta-Pedagogy I refer to a higher-order framework that transcends traditional, method-specific approaches to teaching. It emphasises flexibility, adaptability, and the integration of multiple pedagogical strategies to meet the diverse needs of learners and teaching contexts. Unlike traditional pedagogical methods that prescribe specific techniques and procedures, meta-pedagogy encourages language instructors and educators to draw from a broad repertoire of teaching practices, theories, and experiences to create a dynamic and responsive learning environment. Furthermore, the present study draws not only upon the comprehensive review of influential literature and research pertaining to TBLT described above, but also integrates my extensive 17 years of teaching experience into all those discussions. A significant portion of that time, approximately 9 years, was dedicated to actively implementing TBLT principles. Throughout this period, I meticulously documented my TBLT practice through journal entries, task development, and task design, amassing a valuable repository of practical knowledge. By combining these scholarly resources and personal expertise, this paper presents a robust foundation for examining and analysing TBLT as a Meta pedagogy.

The Root of the Issue

The significance of the topic was highlighted to me during a thought-provoking discussion in a seminar class among a group of Master of Teaching English as a Second Language students at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Canada. The topic was post-method pedagogy, and interestingly almost all of them tended to express their distrust of all traditional and communicative approaches in language teaching. They repeatedly echoed the terms "Post-

method Pedagogy" and "Principled Eclecticism". These terms seemed to be part of the ongoing terminology among ELT teachers and educators. To my surprise I was wondering where all this credit came from. Meanwhile all approaches were doomed to be outdated and TBLT was among. This misunderstanding pointed to a broader issue: the failure to see how TBLT, when reconceptualized as a meta-pedagogy, aligns with and even enhances the principles of post-method teaching.

Post-Method Pedagogy

As mentioned, as a result of the recurring concerns with the constraints of methods, the concept of "method" gradually lost its credibility, prompting scholars to advocate for a transition to a post-method pedagogy (Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Prabhu, 1990). Within the realm of post-method pedagogy, notable scholarly contributions have emerged through the publication of two seminal articles in TESOL Quarterly, authored by Pennycook's (1989) and Prabhu's (1990), which have proven to be profoundly influential in their efficacy. Pennycook persuasively has argued that method decreases teachers' understanding of teaching. Similarly, Prabhu has emphasised that the desired outcome of teaching is shaped by teachers' belief, notions, performance, and self-conceptualisation, rather than the mere implementation of various methods. He meant to terminate the swarm of passion and desire to the concept of method (adapting various method by teachers) by proposing the idea of seeking the best method (1990). Additionally, several researchers (Clarke, 1983; Jarvis, 1991; Nunan, 1989; Richards, 1990; Stern, 1985) have questioned the concept of method and its limited effect on language learning and teaching. Even the death of method has been announced by Allwright (1991) and Brown (2002). Moreover, various studies (Nunan 1989; Legutke et al., 1991; Kumaravadivelu, 1993) have indicated that not only do the language teachers, who are prepared and essentially believe in the miracle of a particular method, apply and make use of various classroom procedures that are not even aligned with their chosen method, but they have also admitted that they do not follow the theoretical principles of their beloved method. Surprisingly, it has even been reported that teachers who claim to have applied various methods usually use the same classroom procedures in different classes. As a result, a great awareness has been encouraged, and then the notion of post-method pedagogy has stolen the limelight and placed itself in the mind of researchers and educators. Attempts were also made to restructure second language teaching and teacher education—i.e., Stern's dimensional framework (1992); Allwright's (2003) exploratory framework; Kumaravadivelu' (2001; 2003) pedagogic parameters. The most prominent one is Kumaravadivelu's proposal, termed as the "pedagogic parameters" (2001, p. 538; 2003, p. 34), which establishes a foundational framework. In the following, after examining his proposal, it will be demonstrated that it is rooted in the fundamental principles of TBLT.

Pedagogic parameters

Regarding the concept of pedagogy, to Kumaravadivilu (2001), pedagogy comprises a combination of sociocultural and historical experiences, classroom strategies, materials, and curricular objectives that influence second language (L2) learning. In light of this, he conceptualises post-method pedagogy as a three-dimensional system—also referred to as three pillars of post-method pedagogy (2001; 2006)—including three pedagogic parameters, namely "particularity, practicality, and possibility" (p, 2).

The parameter of particularity

A pedagogy of particularity has been mentioned to be the most significant parameter of post-method pedagogy which arguably holds considerable attention (Kumaravadivilu, 2001). He has emphasised that language pedagogy "must be sensitive to a particular group of teachers

teaching a particular group of learners pursuing a particular set of goals within a particular institutional context embedded in a particular sociocultural milieu" (p. 538). In fact, the pedagogy of particularity requires a thorough analysis of local needs and situations to fulfil and fit learners and teachers' sociocultural, historical, and political experiences. The example pertinent to applied linguistics is the use of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). Chick (1996) has pointed out and doubted whether CLT had been chosen and expected to work well in the context of KwaZulu, in South Africa, since it would best benefit American and European's L2 education (as cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2001). Additionally, having taught various EAL and EFL classes more than 17 years, I have realised that my Japanese students usually feel more engaged when they are asked to do activities (*tasks*) with explicit explanation of language. Thus, I have investigated the issue by interviewing 18 professional experienced ELT teachers (CELTA and DELTA certified), 6 Japanese EFL teachers and 12 ESL teachers taught in Japan for years. Nearly all of them supported the notion that Japanese students are accustomed to explicit language instruction. They also shared the view that both strong and weak versions of CLT usually do not work for Japanese students. Apparently, CLT might work efficiently for specific contexts, but at the same time it can be a real failure in another context. Emphatically, Kumaravadivelu states that the pedagogy of particularity is both a goal and process which is better activated and achieved through "the awareness of local exigencies" (2001, p. 539). In other words, the pedagogy of particularity can be achieved through continual practice and observation which will result in the growing awareness of a teaching and learning context and circumstance.

The parameter of practicality

Regarding the pedagogy of practicality, the distinction between professional theories and personal theories should be cleared. O'Hanlon (1993), as cited in Kumaravadivelu (2006), has noted that professional theories are proposed by professional educators and theorists. On the contrary, personal theories are mostly generated by teachers who employ and adopt professional theories practically. Obviously, teachers are required to follow a set of procedures, which have been provided in advance, for in-depth analysis and then interpretation. So, teachers' self-exploration and what Kumaravadivelu (2006) calls "self-construction" will be greatly narrowed down (p. 173). It goes without saying that teachers' autonomy will be decreased. So, teachers' personal theory, basically, will be constructed when they attentively observe the effectiveness of their practice of teaching. They, in fact, take control over their teaching process since they identify their problems; they then conduct an analysis and finally propose a practical solution. In other words, the pedagogy of practicality emphasises teachers' insights and perspectives which form their self-reflection and action (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). In a similar vein, Prabhu (1990) mentions that teachers' self-conceptualisation in their teaching will allow them to formulate the most appropriate form of learning.

The parameter of possibility

To clarify the pedagogy of possibility, Kumaravadivelu (2006) has referred to the works of the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire and his advocates (e.g., Giroux, 1988, & Simon, 1988), who emphasise the significant role of teachers and learners' identity. In fact, any social, economic, and political experiences that they transfer and bring to the pedagogical setting, in addition to their classroom experience, will form the parameter of possibility. In terms of language learning, it can be inferred that language converges with sociocultural beliefs. Auerbach (1995) has noted that it merges "learners, teachers, and community activists in mutually beneficial, collaborative projects" (as cited in Kumaravadivelu, 2006, P. 175). Consequently, individual equality will be maintained. Kumaravadivelu (2006) continues with Benesch' (2001) suggestion of linking and embedding sociopolitical contexts within academic and linguistic

contents which might well result in having more effective classroom interaction and in-put. To put it differently, social needs, cultural values and differences, as well as language necessities are mingled, so language teachers are unable to exclude sociocultural practices from their teaching and planning. Objectively, it can be concluded that the pedagogy of possibility is about language teachers' awareness of any new possibilities in their profession, such as teaching and learning (learning process, context, and aims), which should be reflected to the real life, their lives as people. Having established the key principles of post-method pedagogy, the following sections will build the case for TBLT as a Meta-pedagogy.

TBLT: Definition and Types of Tasks

Task-based Language Teaching is, grounded in a procedural syllabus, defined as a process of teaching in which tasks play the focal point in learning and teaching a second language (Ellis, 2003). It is highly significant to mention that TBLT focuses on the tasks as the hub of planning and design in language teaching (Long, 2015). In fact, learners are provided with a variety of functional tasks, which require them to use language for real-world and non-linguistic purposes (Branden, 2006). It has been also mentioned that TBLT is more an approach than a method; Leaver and Willis emphasised TBLT contains more than one methodology which can be implemented smartly and flexibly for various purposes (2004). Above all, not only does TBLT focus on the meaning, but it also addresses concerns for the process rather than product (Feez, 1998). She, additionally, has expressed that the learning process will be formed because of learners' interaction and engagement with the tasks. TBLT has been emphatically differentiated from task-supported language teaching (tblt; lower case) by Michael Long (2015). Hence, TBLT might be mistakenly confused with tblt. The latter aims to help learners to produce and perform correct "use of explicitly taught target language" (TL) while communicative outcomes have been expected (Ellis, 2018, P. 197). It, in fact, increases learners' linguistic awareness through using tasks "as vehicles" for internalising and practicing grammatical structures (Long, 2015, p. 208). The former refers to the use of language naturally (Ellis, 2018) while completing "non-technical" or real-world tasks (Long, 2015, P.108). Long has continued and emphasised that in TBLT syllabus content will be formed by tasks themselves, so lessons will be planned and structured accordingly. In general, through the practice of authentic tasks—that learners face beyond the classroom—TBLT empowers learners to experience language while using it.

Regarding the definition of task, several definitions have been proposed in the literature of Applied Linguistics. Tasks have been defined as activities which are goal-orientated, for example real-world and routine activities done by people in everyday life; and educational activities which might involve language exercises (Van den Branden, 2006). This paper will examine some of the most prominent definitions of TBLT found in the literature, with particular focus on Long's (1985) influential proposal. As for TBLT, Long (1985) has defined tasks (the first category) as everyday tasks or target tasks. In details he has elucidated the concept of task as:

> *a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus, examples of tasks include painting a fence, dressing a child, filling out a form, buying a pair of shoes, making an airline reservation, borrowing a library book, taking a driving test, typing a letter, weighing a patient, sorting letters, making a hotel reservation, writing a cheque, finding a street destination and helping someone across a road. In other words, by "task" is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between. Tasks are the things they will tell you they do if you ask them, and they are not applied linguists. (p. 89)*

Apparently, this definition indeed demands a thorough needs analysis procedure so that appropriate target tasks can be chosen and designed to fit learners' needs (the local needs of the classroom). As a matter of fact, target tasks engage people in a process of obtaining a set of goals that requires the use of language (Van den Branden, 2006). Basically, doing a target task, learners will be engaged in the process of task practically, meaning they know what a real-world task beyond the classroom can propose and push them into, and how it can be dealt with. Additionally, not only could real-world tasks be required for general English (English for general purposes/ GE), but Long (2016) has also mentioned that they might well be required for academic, vocational training, occupational, and social purposes. As these perspectives indicate, while people have goals in mind to achieve, they are able to reflect them to the real-world condition through the comprehension of the language input and output. Similar definitions to Long's (1985) have also been proposed. For example, Crookes (1986) has proposed task is "a piece of work or an activity, usually with a specified objective, undertaken as part of an educational course or at work" (p. 1). Moreover, Skehan's (1998) definition of task also provides support for Long's interpretation of task. He believes that in task "meaning is primary; there is a goal which needs to be worked on; the activity is outcome-evaluated; there is a real-world relationship" (as cited in Long, 2015, P. 109). Last but not least, is a perspective which has been developed by Bachman and Palmer (1996); task has been described as a set of activities that require learners to use language to accomplish certain goals and objectives in a special situation. Obviously, these definitions all emphasise that tasks are activities which are goal- orientated.

Regarding the definition of task as an educational activity, it has been suggested that there should be a link between the tasks that language learners perform in the classroom and their counterparts in the real world outside (Van den Branden, 2006). In other words, through the implementation of these tasks, learners are given this opportunity to rehearse the language they might need to use outside the classroom. Meaning also becomes the hub of the attention and departure point of any tasks. The most prominent definition, in this regard, has been proposed by Ellis (2003); he has stated that a task is:

> *a workplan 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 the meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes. (p. 16)*

Similarly, Nunan (1989) has defined task as "a piece of classroom work which involve[s] learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is primarily focused on meaning rather than form." (p. 10). He has also added that tasks should be able to stand alone and be completed by nature. The definition of task proposed by Richards and Rodgers (1986) is akin to aforementioned definitions:

> *an activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e. as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and performing a command may be referred to as tasks. Tasks may or may not involve the production of language. A task usually requires the teacher to specify what will be regarded as successful completion of the task. The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language*

teaching more communicative . . . since it provides a purpose for a classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake. (p. 289)

These definitions have shown that there is a pedagogical perspective which seeks non-linguistic outcomes. In fact, while processing the input and then producing output, learners will be constructively engaged with meaningful interactions; they will be engaged mainly as language users not language learners (Van den Branden, 2006). However, it does not mean that form is divorced from meaning in TBLT. It has been strongly advised that tasks should be designed in a way as if language learners might need to attend to specific aspects of the language since it benefits second language acquisition (Ellis, 2003; Long, 1998; Skehan, 1998).

Task types and practical examples

Implementing various types of tasks is of great importance since it can impact and promote L2 acquisition and learning. Although there are various task classifications, here, some aspects of task typology will be explored. To begin with, Prabhu's (1987) description of various types of tasks has been provided in *table 1*.

Table 1
Prabhu's classification of Task

Type of task	Definition
Information gap	This type involves 'a transfer of given information from one person to another – or from one form to another, or from one place to another'.
Reasoning gap	This type involves deriving some new information from given information through the processes of inference, deduction, practical reasoning, or a perception of relationships or patterns.
Opinion gap	This type involves identifying and articulating a personal preference, feeling, or attitude in response to a given situation.

Note. Adapted from Prabhu (1987).

Regarding *information gap* tasks, they normally require participants to go through the process of coding and decoding (Prabhu, 1987). One example of *information gap* tasks—which I normally plan for my classes—is that a video clip of around 15 or 20 minutes, or even more, depending on learners' proficiency, can be divided into two equal parts (by time), part 1 and 2. After grouping students into groups A and B, members of group A will exclusively watch part 1 of the clip, while students in group B will watch part 2. Afterwards, learners in group A and B will be asked to form new pairs and explain their section to each other. They are expected to combine two pieces of information to grasp the whole storyline of the clip. In fact, learners are expected to use their own linguistic resources to elaborate their parts. The teacher will be acting as scaffolder and a better knower, so comprehensible input is expected to appear by the negotiation of meaning and form—among learners and teacher—which is aligned with Long's (1996) proposal of interaction hypothesis (modified output) that will be discussed later. A probable example of reasoning gap task, which also includes sociocultural communication, is when the teacher asks students to read real reviews of various international restaurants on their websites and then decide on the best three restaurants. Obviously, not only do they learn about various food cuisines (cultural values), but they will also practice and boost their ability in expressing one-self. As they read through the websites, they will be exposed to meaningful and comprehensible information which finally modifies the prospective output. As for opinion gap tasks, Prabhu (1987) mentioned that this type of task could require learners to use their background knowledge (schematic knowledge), factual information, and reasoning abilities to

support and justify their standpoint. In fact, there are no right or wrong answers to these activities. For instance, the teacher can provide learners with various news headlines and ask students to choose one or two, and then let the others know about how they feel about them. Obviously, these types of tasks are not primarily focused on linguistic objectives.

Moreover, pedagogical and target tasks have been proposed which can be categorised into discrepant language function. The former has been defined as those tasks that happen in the classroom and have more academic function; in fact, they tend to promote and boost learners' knowledge of the world, jargons, and terminologies (Long, 2016). The latter has been noted as real-world communication activities which, by their authentic nature, tend to provide learners with authentic situations outside the classroom (Long, 2016). They are, obviously, aligned with sociocultural, historical and political beliefs—for instance, filling out application forms for a library card, residence or visitor visa, driving license, bank account and many others. Similarly, Nunan (1989) has also mentioned that pedagogical tasks have more psycholinguistic basis in SLA theories. They are not necessarily designed in accordance with learners' needs—since they might not be identifiable—and not chosen based on real-world tasks. He has also noted that real-world tasks are designed to rehearse those tasks that can be found beyond the classroom, which requires a thorough needs analysis to identify learners' needs (1989). However, for the case of TBLT—not task-based syllabus (tbl, lower case)—Long has believed that Pedagogical tasks are both "more tangible" and "simpler versions" of target tasks (2015, p. 110).

TBLT from various perspectives

As a sufficiently prestigious approach in the realm of L2 teaching and learning with its focus on the theories of learning rather than the theories of language, TBLT has been introduced for over 37 years. This pleasant surprise has turned into the hub the research for numerous researchers, educators, curriculum designers, material writers, and language teachers. Thus, it has been found significant to be analysed through discrepant theoretical perspectives of SLA. In the following, key TBLT perspectives and their supporting rationales will be reviewed, setting the stage for its introduction as a Meta-pedagogy.

The Output Hypothesis Perspective and TBLT

Regarding the notion of the Output Hypothesis, Swain (1995) has emphasised the significant role of output in the SLA; it helps learners become more responsible and act more autonomously, so they process and track their language more carefully and deeply compared to what input can do for the learners (1995). Moreover, regarding the development of learners' L2, Lambert (2019) has mentioned the significance and effectiveness of the Output Hypothesis in particular when tasks are designed to motivate and encourage L2 learners' output. To analyse and support the role of Task-Based Instruction in learners' learning or acquisition, and what different teachers can do to fulfil learners' needs based on their local circumstance, Swain's (1995) three functions of output accuracy, 1) the Noticing Hypothesis, 2) hypothesis-testing function, and 3) metalinguistic (reflective) function, will be expounded.

The Noticing Hypothesis

Considering the Noticing Hypothesis, Schmidt (1994) posits that noticing paves the path for acquisition of new items, particularly those that are not readily apparent: "more noticing leads to more learning" (Schmidt, P. 18). This viewpoint is supported by approximately two decades of research, ranging from Schmidt and Frota (1986) to Mackey (2006), as referenced in Long (2015). Schmidt, (1990) has proposed that input cannot become intake unless it is noticed consciously. Similarly, Swain (1995) explained that "the activity of producing the target

language may [well] prompt the second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may make them aware of something they need to find out about their L2 [process of learning]" (p. 129). She believes output substantially fosters noticing, heightening learners' awareness of their knowledge gaps and deficiencies. Additionally, she has hypothesised that the language items that learners are able to notice and recognise themselves pertain to their capability of acquiring of those linguistic items (1995)—which are very likely at their level of learning. It has also been believed that what learners themselves experience and discover about their own learning and language tends to be more practical and useful to them (1995). Thus, regarding the Output Hypothesis, in a TBLT lesson what learners are asked to accomplish—in form of tasks, for example, a gap information task—directly requires them to think of their output and calculate what language items (Lexis, syntax, and function) they need to fulfil the task meaningfully. While planning the task, L2 learners will notice the language in-use, so they are able to shape a better understanding of the language.

The Hypothesis Testing
As for the hypothesis testing, Swain (1995) has expounded on the process of trial and error done by language learners, and how learners hypothesise the function of target language. Swain has noted that learners' production (output) provides them with a cognitive condition in which they are able to raise awareness of their interlanguage system and notice the differences and gaps between what they have been expected to produce and what they are currently capable of. In other words, not only do they modify their output to meet the communicative needs, but they also expand their interlanguage and monitor "what works and what does not" (p. 132). Learners are provided with "opportunities for contextualized, meaningful use, to test out hypotheses about the target language, and to move the learner from a purely semantic analysis of the language to a syntactic analysis of it" (Swain, 1985, p. 252). She (1995) has also stated that learners selectively apply hypothesis testing on some part of the input not the whole of it. Having said that, it can be extrapolated that TBLT is more about output rather than input. Learners are provided with a variety of tasks in which they produce various products which are the offspring of considerable amount of negotiation of meaning and form.

Example of Task design and my consistent findings over years
Considering the previous information gap task (*refer to task type section, Table 1*)—designed by myself and practiced and tested with more than 360 EAL, ESL, and EFL learners with discrepant levels of proficiency from B1 to C1 CEFR—after watching their assigned sections (Clip 1 or Clip 2), students A, who viewed Clip 1, gathered together to discuss and summarize its content. Similarly, students B, who watched Clip 2, did the same. Subsequently, they were asked to reconvene with their assigned partner to share their understanding of the different clips. They, in general, needed to combine two pieces of information to understand the whole clip. I then realised when they were negotiating their understanding they aimed and strived to come up with appropriate language and function to be ready to explain their parts to their partners, who watched the other clip. I understood that a great variety of language (grammar, vocabulary, function), and some pronunciation issues, were demanded since most of the learners felt less confident or incompetent. Not only did I appear as a scaffolder, facilitator, and source of knowledge, but there was plenty of peer-assistance or -scaffolding. After each task, I, normally, set up friendly interviews with my learners and ask them to reflect on their process. Learners reported that there were moments that they sometimes needed some specific language knowledge which they already knew how to use it in their mother tongue but not in the TL (English). They strive to extend it by pushing themselves to generate new forms. Importantly, it was reported that they noticed gaps in their language knowledge as they were engaged in the process of production. It was emphasised—by most of my students at various levels of

proficiency—they needed feedback on their attempts which was fulfilled by peer and teacher assistance. Later, Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis, which emphasises the role of interaction, as part of the Output Hypothesis, in the creation of comprehensible input as a result of the practice of TBLT in the classroom, will be taken up.

Metalinguistic function
Her third functional description of the Output Hypothesis is related to the use of metalinguistic function or "conscious reflection" (1995, P. 132). Swain has noted that when "test hypothesis" is one of the aspects of the Output Hypothesis, then the output (production) is a hypothesis as well (p. 132). In other words, learners' productions are their best speculations about the best way of saying things in L2. Emphatically, she has echoed the significant role of tasks which help learners to reflect on their production, and then negotiate form and meaning. Teachers also become aware of learners' hypotheses (what they have produced) while they are doing a task. Hence, at this level of output, which is the "metalinguistic function of using language", learners are able to reflect on their own language and internalise it (p. 132). It is crucial to mention that the negotiation of meaning is for the sake of form clarification, which means meaning is tried to be conveyed using various forms, and learners reflect on them explicitly (Swain, 1995). Accordingly, the amalgamation of the noticing hypothesis and hypothesis testing results in the formation of metalinguistic function since learners will discuss their problematic linguistic forms and try to propose solutions for meaningful productions. In the study undertaken by Swain and Lapkin (1998) it has been confirmed that while completing a communicative task, students will negotiate the target language forms to make sure which forms need to be used to convey the message accurately and coherently; therefore, linguistic items will be internalised.

The Sociocultural Perspective
Sociocultural theory has been derived from the work of Vygotsky who emphasised the role of social context in learning (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). The most fundamental concept developed by Vygotsky is that learners are best understood in their social, cultural, and historical mindsets (Brooks & Swain, 2014). Vygotsky (1978) has theorised the notion of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which emphasises the distance between learners' current knowledge and their potential progression. In other words, ZPD accounts for the knowledge that learners have not yet built upon and learnt although they are capable of learning through scaffolding (as cited in Brown, 2014). Additionally, Ellis et al. have expounded in detail that appropriate language learning takes place as learners are provided with the opportunities to interact and be engaged with cultural artefacts (2020) or even intercultural communications. In fact, intercultural communication works as a mediator. Brown has also explained that "Vygotsky maintained that social interaction was foundational in cognitive development and rejected the notion of predetermined stages" (2014, P. 13). On the other hand, scaffolding— the interaction among experts (knower) and novice speakers—positively affects learners' success in performing tasks (Ellis, 2018 & Ellis et al., 2020) in which a kind of constructive interactional phenomenon will take place; as a matter of fact, a better knower cooperatively provides input for the novice learner. Although novice learners at first depend on more experienced knowers, they gradually take more responsibility for their learning. Obviously, autonomous language learning will be formed as well. By looking at the nature of TBLT, it can be viewed that learners provide comprehensible input for each other while conducting a communicative task. To support this, a study was conducted on groups of university students by Donato (1994). In this study it was shown how students were able to produce a type of linguistic structure, orally, as a group; however, none of them individually had known it (as cited in Ellis, 2018). Thus, language acquisition was evidenced and reported.

Example of Task design and my consistent findings over years

Practicing, implementing, and developing TBLT over years, I have observed and been convinced that while doing a task, learners build and share an imaginary space where not only do they collect and pick up each other's language knowledge to build their competency, but they also experience and improve new cultural perspectives and real-world experiences. Through this process they later reflect on their recent gained knowledge provided by their counterparts. In a recent action research project conducted across six various coeducational EAP (B1+, B2+, B2+/C1 CEFR) classes, in different semesters, at a university in Canada, I designed and implemented an authentic academic task for my students. The task involved pairs of students assuming the roles of admission officers and directors of a specific university program. Then, they were asked to create a university application form through the elements of which the admission office can decide whether to invite the applicants to the second step of admission (interview) or not. They also needed to generate some interview questions—in accordance with the field of study that the pairs had decided on—using which the admission officer and programme director can make a final decision upon the applicants. Finally, two emails were asked to be generated using which they can inform applicants whether they were rejected or accepted. They first created their own outline, and were then sent to visit relevant offices, for example, admission office to interview university staff or what I rather call informants—an individual who provides information based on their personal experiences, knowledge, or perspectives—on the university campus to get more comprehensive information and insight about their design. Subsequently, while presenting their final product, they regularly and alternatively were using the words and structures picked up from their interviews with the informants and the discussion they had prior to their presentations with their peers. Interestingly, regarding cultural specification, they reported that the application forms in their home countries are a little bit different (i.e., what information should be included in a portfolio is different from universities in Korea, Japan and Ivry Coast, Iraq, China, Peru, Mali, Jordan, and Ukraine). After each presentation in each class (levels), during Q&A sessions, as they were sharing their experiences with their classmates, I keenly observed their language usage as well as patterns and, once again, discerned a tendency among them to employ the language they previously recorded while interacting with or interviewing others. Notably, peer correction and scaffolding occurred with individuals explicitly recommending specific language (e.g., vocabulary), highlighting its superiority. Moreover, they actively engaged in providing reflection and feedback on one another's cultural disparities. It, in fact, sparked other educational differences (cultural discrepancies) leading to ongoing discussions that I never stopped since new language forms were used and implicitly practiced. At the end of the discussions, I drew their attention to the forms that were used.

Generally, in my teaching, I emphatically encourage my learners to reflect on their process of learning by maintaining journals of their linguistic achievements. Additionally, following each task, I regularly conduct friendly interview sessions with my students to revise their achievements and concerns. Conducting individual interviews, I was informed that they used and imitated the language they picked up during the interviews and interaction with others (e.g., informants). In other words, my learners were able to recognize and use certain language elements effectively, even if they were initially unfamiliar with them; this emphasises the main principle of TBLT, learning through authentic tasks. For the lower level, B1+, my learners emphasised that most of the time they tended to be listeners and followed what was being said (in the interviews and interactions with others) to generate their output accordingly whereas my B2+ and C1 students were actively involved in the discussions. Amazingly, my lower-level students were using new language forms while planning for their final product; however, they sought my assistance at that stage. In a nutshell, my students—from various proficiency—

agreed that they completed their tasks through the interaction with real-life resources (staff or informants, classmates, etc.), and significantly they emphasised the significance of intercultural discrepancies in educational contexts.

After careful consideration, it is apparent that the parameters of possibility, practicality, and particularity, indeed, existed during the process of undertaking the task:

- Possibility: my learners brought their own schema (mental templates and frameworks) of political, social, and contextual knowledge with themselves into the task. They were also provided with this opportunity to foster their creativity and critical thinking.
- Practicality: my learners used their own personal method to approach in conducting the task, and I played the role of a facilitator and scaffolder. They carried out an authentic academic task which they agreed upon its vitality in their real-life.
- Particularity: where the context was shared and discussed with my learners, so they were able to excavate their individual strategies and styles. So, each group was able to deal with their context through peer collaboration, teacher's guidance and informants' input.

The Interaction Hypothesis Perspective
The Interaction Hypothesis is one the most vital conditions for second language acquisition (Long, 1996). Having built upon Krashen's (1985) notion of comprehensible input, Long (1996) was mostly concerned with modified output. Through modified interaction learners are able to negotiate the meaning, which is also a source for comprehensible input. Modified interaction could include confirmation checks, elaboration, clarification and repetition request, slower speech rate, gesture. While completing a task, learners interactively provide each other with a type of implicit comprehensible input in form of negotiation of meaning and form to express meaning. Accordingly, Lee (2005) has recorded that tasks can effectively stimulate negotiation of meaning. Long has also noted that the Interaction Hypothesis can draw learners' attention to the selective linguistic codes during the negotiation of meaning (2015). Therefore, as a result of undertaking a task, learners' attention will be captured to the form as well, so they can convey the meaning. He, elsewhere, has emphasised that SLA will be promoted by the negotiation of meaning through interaction and communication which happens when learners, interlocutors, try to convey their messages by sufficient feedback and more comprehensible input (1983). To this end, Long (1996) has mentioned that L2 learning will be impacted by the negotiation of meaning; in fact, learners with equal proficiency level provide comprehensible feedback for each other.

Example of Task design and my consistent findings over years
An example of which, among a considerable amount of pertinent recorded data of my action research, is when I asked two groups of my (B1+ and B2+/ C1 CEFR) EAP learners to imagine themselves as Template Designers or Template/ Document Specialists. After explaining the role and asking learners to research the responsibilities of this role, they were tasked to generate some specific templates by their own choice (a list of templates had also been provided). Then they were asked to help each other to formulate an appropriate language (vocabulary, grammar, and function) for each template. While observing them, I used display and referential questions to scaffold, synergise, and facilitate the process. They unintentionally had to discuss the language to come up with the appropriate formats. In other words, the product (output) was negotiated and interacted. Meanwhile, they reported (after the feedback session), through the interaction with one another, they were able to examine various incidental language forms which engaged them in meaningful negotiations to determine the most effective linguistic expressions. It was not me as the instructor who provided the language; in fact, it was them

who formed their learning process by doing a task. They acknowledged that the entire process (completing the task) relied upon the interaction among them.

Responding to Misconceptions

Although TBLT is considerably well-known among all language researchers, educators, trainers, and instructors, it has been criticised unfairly from time to time. However, its guidelines and pedagogical instructions have been being used regardless of being advocates or critics. The following will delve into some significant instances of misunderstandings along with their responses. Considering one the most widespread criticisms, the critics of TBLT have insisted that it disregards grammar (Sheen, 2003; Swan, 2005). As it has been elaborated, TBLT makes the use of tasks as basic units for planning and teaching; it contrasts starkly with structural approaches which are defined and applied based on grammatical structures (Thornbury, 2006) and mostly follow a hierarchical order in teaching language. Seemingly, it has been unbelievable—for the advocates of structural linguistics—that those structural approaches, for instance presentation, practice, production (PPP) approach, contradict research findings on interlanguage development and teachability (Long, 2016). So, to refute their allegation, the PPP approach will be analysed in detail. Regarding the most prominent structural syllabus approach, PPP, Richards mentioned that in a typical lesson there is a three-phase approach, which is known by "many teachers who have completed certificate-level training courses" (2015, P. 66). In his book, Richards (2015) defined them as:

> *Presentation*: the new grammar structure [language] is presented, often by means of conversation or a short text. The teacher explains the new structure and checks students' comprehension of it. Alternatively, the students may be asked to infer a grammar rule from its use in a text or conversation.
> *Practice*: students practise using the new structure in a controlled context, through drills or substitution exercises.
> *Production*: students practise using the new structure in different contexts, often using their own content or information in order to develop fluency with the new pattern. (p. 66)

Obviously, at first the language is expounded explicitly by the teacher (East, 2017). In this stage it is tried to provide input through which learners will be able to produce the language (so-called hope). Then learners will be invited to practice the rules in a more controlled way in forms of exercise (East, 2017). Thus, input is highly prioritised and attached considerable significance. Finally, when it comes to the last phase, production of the lesson, learners are expected to produce the target language—the language was taught earlier (East, 2017). Wills (1996) points out that the objectives of this phase, production, are often not attained. Wills (1996) has also added that many teacher trainers, teacher educators, and experienced teachers have realised that students perform in two ways in terms of production. They either follow the teacher's instructions and concentrate on the language they have already been taught in the second phase, or they complete the activity by focusing on the meaning without paying attention to the language. The latter is more about learners' background and existing knowledge, bridging from known to unknown. As it is clear the former requires learners to receive and practice the input attentively and seriously, in a teacher–centred way, which makes the production phony, formulaic and conventional (Focus on Forms not Focus on Form). And importantly it won't last long. Throughout the years, I have documented various action research projects involving my EAL, ESL, and EFL classes with discrepant proficiency levels; a great majority of my students reported that in this stage (production) they either experienced confusion as they had to memorise and then repeat what was taught earlier, or they felt so

limited with the use of language which left their minds blocked from production of meaningful output.

Additionally, in various interviews over the years, I interviewed 23 colleagues of mine, who have been professional and certified ELT instructors (being CELTA or DELTA certified and have related master's degree i.e., TEFL or TESOL), with over 10 years of teaching experience. They unanimously agreed that whenever they employed the PPP approach, the learners were, to some extent, able to generate and use the instructed language that session, but they were unable to apply it into their future sessions. Additionally, they mentioned that students liked and tended to employ their own personal versions of language, including using different grammar, semantics, function, lexis, circumlocutory strategies, idiomatic expressions, etc. Conversely, it was pointed out that when TBLT or tbl predominated their teaching, they realised learners showed significantly greater understanding and control over the language being produced (meaningful output). Finally, to end this dispute, Long (2016) has recorded that second language learners' syntactical development does not improve in accordance with the order imposed by instructors or textbooks. If the linguistic items are not developed in a way that textbooks and teachers require, they can be improved through the focus on meaning (negotiation of meaning and form). Long (2015) believes it results in comprehensive output. Regarding teaching grammar, TBLT draws upon the notion of focus on form (FOF) – not focus on forms (FOFs) (Long, 2015 & 2016). Focus on form draws learners' attention to language items (words, grammatical structure, semantic patterns, discourse markers, etc.) in a context. East (2017) has expounded that learners notice or attend the language items while they are using language to accomplish a task. Basically, when learners notice a language item, they consciously make use of it. Notably, in an authentic TBLT lesson learners are inclined to be involved in the process of negotiation of form and meaning. East (2012) has also notified that "unlike strong CLT, grammar is not ignored, and learners are not left entirely to their own devices to work out the rules" (p. 23). The aim of TBLT is to overcome the drawbacks of established teaching methods and approaches that follow CLT. He emphatically mentions that through the use of focus on form, TBLT questions the grammatically orientated teacher-centered approaches, weak CLT, as well as the limitations of strong CLT, purely focusing on meaning (Eats, 2017).

Example of Task design and my consistent findings over years
As for FOF, in four of my ESL classes (during various semesters) at a university, in Canada in 2021, I designed an authentic task for my A2 learners. It involved executing a set of instructions based on their own chosen topic, referred to as a process task. To showcase their understanding, they were required to create a poster and present it to the rest of the class. Prior to the task, I formed groups, activated their background knowledge on process tasks (giving awareness), and instructed them to select a real-world process. Examples included cooking a special dish, making tea or coffee, filling out an application form, opening an online bank account, applying for a credit card, assembling furniture, changing a flat tire, setting up a wireless home network, planning a birthday party, conducting a scientific experiment, creating a personal budget, writing a research paper, gardening, performing basic first aid, or installing software on a computer. The topic selection was twofold: it boosted learners' confidence in executing the task and presenting it, while also granting them autonomy. The learners reported feeling less stressed since they had control over the process, and appreciated the support from both their peers and myself. Throughout the group work, I closely monitored their progress, providing scaffolding and facilitation as needed. Additionally, I supplied them with the necessary language to accomplish the task and encouraged them to seek assistance from peers in other groups, fostering social interaction. Notably, I prompted the learners to consider the appropriate

language forms and tenses for presenting their processes or instructions. Interestingly, many learners predominantly used the present simple tense, while a few ventured into using "*should"* despite being at an A2 level. To address this, I periodically joined their groups and reassured them that there are alternative ways to discuss a process. Consequently, during the task, the groups actively engaged in the process of negotiation of meaning and forms.

Moreover, Ellis (2003) has categorised tasks as focused and unfocused tasks; the latter allows learners to employ their linguistic and background knowledge freely to complete a task. The former, which leads learners to process a particular target feature, has two objectives: motivating communicative language use and employing a particular linguistic feature. Based on the definition of TBLT proposed by Ellis (2003), Swain and Lapkin (2001) have reported that while learners perform a focused task, not only do linguistic items occur repeatedly, but also language learning will be boosted as a result. In sum, language is not ignored by TBLT. It is not just treated as a separate activity, but it is taught during a task process in which the teachers reactively take on the roles of scaffolders and facilitators by providing the language items; peer-learning will be focused as well.

Furthermore, Ellis et al. have emphasised that "SLA literature is replete with studies that demonstrate that incidental acquisition does take place when learners perform tasks" (2020, p. 338). On the other hand, the critics of TBLT have claimed that it focuses on incidental learning which does not last. Swan (2005) has emphasised that due to incidental learning, in the implementation of TBLT, almost hardly do any linguistic items retain long. However, Long (2016) has noted that incidental learning, implicit learning, tends to increase and expand over time; incidentally-learnt knowledge of L2 is more durable since incidental learning requires in-depth processing to obtain the knowledge. Li has also found that the effect and durability of incidental corrective feedback, which is maintained overtime (in longer period), is more than short-term effect of explicit feedback (2010). In 2000 Norris and Ortega published a highly influential paper which reports that both implicit and explicit instruction have similar results and effects on L2 language learners. Finally, 15 years later Goo and his colleagues in a meta-analysis report reemphasised the positive effect of incidental acquisition (Goo et al., 2015).

Another criticism against TBLT is that although it might possibly help learners with their oral proficiency, new language items would not be developed. L2 learners do not learn new language items and they, in fact, become proficient users of the knowledge and language that they have already been taught (Swan, 2005). On the contrary, studies, particularly the ones based on input-based tasks, have shown that L2 learners will learn and acquire new language such as vocabulary and grammar while they are actively engaged in performing tasks (Ellis, 2001; Shintani, 2016). Considering corrective feedback, Ellis et al. (2006) have also reported that learners' grammatical structure and accuracy will be improved as they perform tasks and receive feedback on their productions. Finally, regarding various SLA perspectives on TBLT, previously discussed, in particular the output hypothesis and social interaction hypothesis, it reveals language learners indeed advance their proficiency through the intricate process of negotiating meaning and form. This dynamic process leads to a transformation in their interlanguage system, as new language elements are generated, interacted with, heard, and internalized while undertaking tasks. Swan (2005) has also criticised TBLT as it heavily relied on the notion of the Noticing Hypothesis. He noted that there are so many language items that both native and nonnative speakers acquire without conscious awareness. Obviously, he dramatically rejects his own criticism regarding incidental learning (mentioned above). It has been emphasised that in some cases learning might draw upon innate linguistic knowledge; however, extensive amount of language learning depends on the Noticing hypothesis (Ellis et

al., 2020). Long (2016) has mentioned that Schmidt has never rejected the occurrence of incidental learning which leads to this point that the Noticing Hypothesis focuses on the ideas of attention and awareness not intention and understanding. In other words, "understanding is facilitative, but not required" (p. 16). In their personal communication, Michael Long and Richard Schmidt (July 26, 2015) emphasised that "more noticing means more acquisition," and "more attention and more awareness, means more acquisition" (as cited in Long, 2016). Since TBLT draws upon focus on form—not focus on forms—approach in language teaching, Swan (2005) has concerned in a TBLT session learners are not often provided with enough input to be noticed by them, which is a problem for TBLT. In other words, capturing learners' attention is the psycholinguistical justification for focus on form. Long (2016) has responded back and mentioned that TBLT has never assumed that conscious awareness is required for acquisition; it has been built upon students' ability of incidental and intentional learning. Thus, noticing can accelerate the process of learning (N. Ellis, 2005). The aim of TBLT is to provide various circumstances for learners to experience and learn the target language.

Moreover, Swan (2005) has criticised TBLT for being learner-centred and teachers almost have no more control over the process. However, according to Leaver and Willis (2004), TBLT "is a multifaced approach, which can be used creatively with different syllabus types and for different purposes" (p. 3). Having stated that, it can be claimed that TBLT is not just about the learners, as just a learner-centred approach with no teacher's control; on the contrary, teachers are able to act autonomously and set their plans according to the local needs of the class and learners. Moreover, let us imagine that TBLT is only learner-centred, and teachers have no control over the learning process. So, learners are actively engaged in the process of their language learning which is a pillar of eclectic pragmatism. Additionally, Ellis et al. (2020) have emphasised that depending on various types of tasks the lesson can be teacher-led. They have emphasised that tasks can be carried out and accomplished "in a whole-class participatory structure" which testifies the role of teacher as a "co-performer of the task" (p. 335), and to me, as a co-moderator. Furthermore, the study by Samuda (2001) has illustrated after providing learners with the condition in which learners are scaffolded both implicitly and explicitly, they could use a new language feature (e.g., grammar) in their production while doing a communicative task. Apparently, in TBLT, both teachers and learners actively engage in the learning process, fostering high levels of involvement and engagement during task-based lessons.

Principled Pragmatism and Eclecticism
Since the advent of post-method pedagogy, principled pragmatism and eclecticism have stolen the limelight. Therefore, most experienced ELT teachers proudly mention that they do not favour or endorse any methods in particular; they, in fact, tend to be more selective. Widdowson emphasises that the latter refers to the belief that teachers do not advocate and show commitment to any methods or approaches; in other words, they tend to make arbitrary selection of techniques, strategies, and procedure for their teaching process which according to this definition has no advantages and value (1990), and, indeed, it has been rejected by Stern (1983). He has believed that "eclecticism is still based on the notion of a conceptual distinctiveness of different methods. However, it is the distinctiveness of the methods as complete entities that can be called into question" (p. 482). In contrast, the former concentrates on how teachers' reflective thinking, "self-observation, self-analysis, and self-evaluation", can help them to form and reform their classes as well as the learning process (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, p. 33). To act and move according to principled pragmatism, Prabhu (1990) has noted that teachers need to increase their understanding (and to me need to develop metacognitive awareness) of the process of teaching and learning. He has also asserted that teachers'

"subjective understanding" means that their teaching "is active, alive, or operational enough to create a sense of involvement for both the teacher and the student" (pp. 172 - 173). Intriguingly, this can be used as a support for TBLT where the teacher wisely provides learners with the circumstances in which they are actively in control and charge of their actions and learning to accomplish a task (various types of tasks), which is an important parameter of post method pedagogy. Regarding teachers' active engagement in a Task-Based lesson, Samuda has emphasised that depending on the task design the role of teachers will vary in different phases, "pre-task preparation, post-task debriefing, and monitoring of task performance" (p. 121).

Considering the definition of task by Long (1985), "hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between" (p. 89), I have realised that, normally, as long as the learners have the concept of that (real-world) task (i.e. how it works; how it should be done) in their background knowledge, they know how to proceed and execute it. Whenever I tasked my students, no matter their age (young and adult learners) or level of proficiency (A2 to C1 levels), only by providing appropriate instruction and pertinent information to activate their prior knowledge on that context, they automatically started to brainstorm and think about the language they needed to accomplish the task. In fact, they knew about the process and how to complete it, but they might well need assistance with the language while undertaking it. According to my practical experience, implementing and recording my TBLT teaching for 9 years, I have been convinced that learners, depending on different tasks and task difficulty, have their own way to accomplish tasks. Obviously, various language needs will arise. I also have been convinced that language will be automatized, since, mentioned by Brown (2015), output will be interacted and negotiated. In other words, produced language may require the teacher's intervention as a scaffolder, facilitator, and resource. They provide essential and contextually needed knowledge for the learners. So, they will be able to use that knowledge to complete the task. Finally, it can be concluded that teachers and learners are autonomously engaged with the process of teaching and learning in the classroom—and to me—beyond it.

TBLT as a Meta-Pedagogy

Informed by educational theory, pedagogy as an umbrella term covers curriculum, instruction, and evaluation (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). In this respect, Long (2015) has emphatically noted that TBLT uses tasks as the unit for "design, implementation and evaluation" (p. 6). In fact, TBLT "requires an investment of resources in needs analysis and production of materials appropriate for a particular population of learners" (p. 7). It can be interpreted that one of the most fundamental and essential requirements in the implementation of TBLT is a careful needs analysis based on learners' sociocultural, historical, and sociopolitical circumstances, which accounts learners' local needs and context; and then, the design, implementation and evaluations will be done accordingly. Moreover, by a meticulous consideration, it can be seen that the theoretical and practical perspectives of TBLT are aligned with Kumaravadivelu's (2001) definition of pedagogy which emphasises that not only does pedagogy include issues related to "classroom strategies, instructional materials, curricular objectives, and evaluation measures", but it also covers various "historical, political, and sociocultural experiences" that might affect L2 learning (P. 538). In this regard, Long has stated that "a genuine task syllabus does not attempt to impose the same program on all learners" (2015, P. 222) which clearly refers to the pedagogies of particularity and possibility. According to my 3-year recent teaching experience in Canada, I have instructed various ESL classes with different focuses on General (GE) and Academic purposes (EAP). As mentioned earlier, I have been recording my TBLT sessions. I am firmly convinced that the same tasks have never been able to be applied and instructed in one way in different classes and for diverse groups of learners; and, for sure, their outcomes have always been discrepant. I practically and technically have been experiencing

Kumaravadivilu's (2001) pedagogies of particularity and practicality since TBLT has shown a great sensitivity to particular group of teachers and learners. Regarding the pedagogy of possibility, it should be mentioned that the flexibility of TBLT in designing various tasks (task types) makes it possible for teachers and learners to reflect real-life facts, matters and topics in the process of teaching and learning. TBLT is highly capable of fitting learners' goals within various contexts—using discrepant authentic tasks. So, contextual situation forms the foundation of teaching and learning, In terms of different typology of task, it has been expounded that not only can various types of tasks be applied to fulfil learners' sociocultural and local needs, but they also provide numerous opportunities for negotiation of meaning and form while learners use the language to accomplish tasks, pedagogic or target tasks (*refer to my teaching experience mentioned above*). Also, TBLT has been discussed from various theoretical perspectives of SLA, such as output hypothesis (including noticing, hypothesis, testing function, and metalinguistic function), interaction hypothesis, and sociocultural perspective, which noticeably and evidently prove that TBLT is more than a simple approach. Importantly, it should be emphasised that TBLT contains more than one methodology which can be implemented smartly and flexibly for various purposes (Leaver & Willis, 2004). As a result, by a careful consideration of all provided evidence above (as well as different sections of the study), it can be concluded that it is highly evident that TBLT has been formed on Kumaravadivelu's three parameters of post-method pedagogy, namely as possibility, practicality and particularity; or, conversely, as a thought-provoking perspective, his premise might have been—or to me is—established on the foundation of TBLT. In other words, TBLT potentially works as a Meta-pedagogy. Moreover, the realisation and incarnation of principled pragmatic (pragmatism)—where "the relationship between theory and practice, ideas and their actualization, can only be realized … through the immediate activity of teaching" (Widdowson, 1990, P. 30)—can be seen within TBLT. All mentioned theoretical perspectives exist and are able to be observed within the practice of TBLT. So, could it be assumed that TBLT goes beyond the definition of method and syllabus since task is the unit and structure of learning? I prefer to refer to Task-Based Pedagogy as Meta-Pedagogy which views language holistically as a sociopolitical and sociocultural process towards language learning. Meta-pedagogy indicates an advanced pedagogical framework that expands upon the principles of post-method pedagogy, offering a higher-level perspective in educational approaches. In fact, it is more about learners and teachers who oversee the circumstance and process than the materials which are pre-tailored. Finally, it emphasises that language learning and production do not necessarily depend on what have been taught by the teacher or even prescribed by the textbooks or material writers, who might be unaware and ignorant about learners' sociocultural, sociopolitical, and historical situations, or not even know about learners' feelings and needs during a session.

Conclusion

As has been mentioned, the implementation and adaptation of an effective method and approach have long been a concern of all second language teachers, teacher trainers, educators, and material writers. As a result, the field of Second Language Acquisition has experienced and seen a great number of proposals in this regard until the time that the death of method was declared. Instead, the novel notion of post-method pedagogy has spread among teachers and researchers. Then, professional language teachers have not been proud of being communicative or structuralist; in fact, principled eclecticism and then principled pragmatism have fallen into fashion and stolen the limelight. Inevitably, the advocates of post-method pedagogy have been lost with new terms and principles and become forgetful about the magic and potentiality of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)—as a Meta-pedagogy concept. Additionally, regarding the definition of pedagogy—in educational and language context—this paper was structured upon the three pillars of post method pedagogy—possibility, practicality and

particularity—proposed by Kumaravadivelu (2006) to document TBLT as a Meta-pedagogy. Considering the nature of TBLT and the aim of teaching English—General English (GE), English as a Second Language (ESL), English as an Additional Language (EAL), English as a Foreign Language (EFL), and English for Academic Purposes (EAP)—it can be concluded that since task has been defined and able to be used efficiently for different purposes, TBLT allows teachers and students to practice teaching and learning through various procedures and principles. Expressly, tasks, in accordance with their definitions, have potential to be fit into various circumstances and conditions to fulfil local needs of the learners. In fact, TBLT allows teachers and students to act as policymakers of their contexts. Then, various SLA perspectives towards TBLT were expounded upon, which provided straightforward and convincing responses to the critics of TBLT.

In conclusion, Task-based learning is more complex than just a method for teaching language and is a broader philosophy that takes account every possibility of learning, needs and circumstances. It seems appropriate to call TBLT a "Meta-pedagogy" which goes beyond post-method pedagogy. Meta-pedagogy could potentially convey the idea of a higher-level pedagogical framework that builds upon or extends the principles of post-method pedagogy. As for further studies, it is vital to mention that this paper is an opening for more in-depth analysis and research on TBLT through a novel perspective which is Second Language Socialisation (SLS).

References

Allwright, R. L. (1991). *The death of the method* (Working Paper No. 10). The University of Lancaster, The Exploratory Practice Centre.

Allwright, R. L. (2003). Exploratory practice: Rethinking practitioner research in language teaching. *Language Teaching Research, 7*(2), 113–141. https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168803lr118oa.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford University Press.

Brooks, L., & Swain, M. (2014). Contextualizing performances: Comparing performances during TOEFL iBT™ and real-life academic speaking activities. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 11*(4), 353–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2014.947532

Brown, H. D. (2002). English language teaching in the "post-method" era: Towards better diagnosis, treatment, and assessment. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 9–18). Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. D. (2014). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (6th ed.). Pearson.

Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (4th ed.). Pearson.

Clarke, M. A. (1983). The scope of approach, the importance of method, and the nature of technique. In J. E. Alatis, H. H. Stern, & P. Strevens (Eds.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics: Applied linguistics and the preparation of second language teachers* (pp. 106–115). Georgetown University Press.

Crookes, G. (1986). *Task classification: A cross-disciplinary review* (Tech. Rep. No. 4). University of Hawaii, Center for Second Language Classroom Research.

East, M. (2012). *Task-based language teaching from the teachers' perspective*: *Insights from New Zealand.* John Benjamins.

East, M. (2017). Task-based teaching and learning: Pedagogical implications. In N. Van Deusen-Scholl & S. May (Eds.), *Second and foreign language education* (3rd ed., pp. 85-95). In *Encyclopedia of language and education*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02246-8_8

Ellis, N. (2005). At the interface: Dynamic interactions of explicit and implicit language knowledge. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 27*(2), 305–352. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310505014X

Ellis, R. (2001). Non-reciprocal tasks, comprehension and second language acquisition. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching, and testing* (pp. 49–74). Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2018). *Reflections on Task-Based Language Teaching*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788920148

Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert., C. (2020). *Task-Based Language Teaching: Theory and Practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Feez, S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Goo, J., Granena, G., Novella, M., & Yilmaz, Y. (2015). Implicit and explicit instruction in L2 learning: Norris & Ortega (2000) revisited and updated. In P. Rebuschat (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 443–482). John Benjamins.

Jarvis, G. A. (1991). Research on teaching methodology: Its evolution and prospects. In B. Freed (Ed.), *Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 295–306). D. C. Heath.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. Longman.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a postmethod pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(4), 537–560.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410615725

Lambert, C. (2019). *Referent similarity and nominal syntax in task-based language teaching*. Springer.

Leaver, B. L., & Willis, J. R. (Eds.). (2004). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education*. Georgetown University Press.

Lee, L. (2005). Using web-based instruction to promote active learning: Learners' perspectives. *CALICO Journal, 23*(1), 139–156.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309–365.

Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 126–141.

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

Long, M. H. (1989). Task, group, and task-group interaction. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in English as a Second Language, 8*(2), 1–26.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (1998). Focus on forms in task-based language teaching. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 16*(2), 35–49.

Long, M. H. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Long, M. H. (2016). In defense of tasks and TBLT: Nonissues and real issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*, 5–33. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000057

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1993). Units of analysis in syllabus design: The case for task. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks in a pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice* (pp. 9–54). Multilingual Matters.

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417–528.

Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2014). Task-based teaching and learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed., pp. 455–470). National Geographic Learning/Cengage Learning.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism.* Routledge.

Prabhu, N. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

Prabhu, N. (1990). There is no best method—why? *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(2), 161–176.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Richards, J. C. (2015). *Key issues in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Samuda, V. (2001). Guiding relationships between form and meaning during task performance: The role of the teacher. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 119–140). Pearson Education.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129–158.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. *AILA Review, 11*, 11–26.

Sheen, R. (2003). Focus on form—a myth in the making? *ELT Journal, 57*(3), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/57.3.225.

Shintani, N. (2016). *Input-based tasks in foreign language instruction for young learners*. John Benjamins.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1999). Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 83*(1), 1–22.

Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Stern, H. H. (1985). [Review of the book *Methods that work: A smorgasbord of ideas for language teachers*, by J. W. Oller & P. A. Richard-Amato]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*(2), 249–251.

Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: The case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 376–401. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami013

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125–144). Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal, 82*(3), 320–337.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Focus on form through collaborative dialogue: Exploring task effects. In M. Bygate, P. Skehan, & M. Swain (Eds.), *Researching pedagogic tasks: Second language learning, teaching and testing* (pp. 99–118). Pearson Education.

Thornbury, S. (2006). *An A-Z of ELT: A dictionary of terms and concepts used in English language teaching*. Macmillan Education.

Van den Branden, K. (2006). *Task-based language education: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Van den Branden, K., Van Gorp, K., & Verhelst, M. (2007). *Tasks in action: Task-based language education from a classroom-based perspective*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Willis, D. (1996). Accuracy, fluency and conformity. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 44–51). Heinemann.