International Journal of Educational Development
ISSN Print: 3104-4263
ISSN Online: 3104-4271
CD ISSN: 3104-428X
https://doi.org/10.63313/IJED.9085

A Study on the integration path of "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT in English Grammar Teaching

Qing Gao
China West Normal University of Foreign Language, Nanchong 637000, China
Email: 2455617493@qq.com

How to cite this paper: Gao, Q. (2026). A study on the integration path of "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT in English grammar teaching. International Journal of Educational Development, 3(3), 86–99. ISSN Print: 3104-4263, ISSN Online: 3104-4271.
https://doi.org/10.63313/IJED.9085
Published: 2026-06-30

Copyright © 2026 by author(s) and Erytis Publishing Limited.
This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
CC BY 4.0

Abstract

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), as a dominant communicative approach, emphasizes learning through meaningful tasks but faces persistent criticism regarding its treatment of grammar instruction. This paper examines the theoretical debates and practical challenges of integrating grammar within TBLT frameworks. Proponents argue that grammar can be acquired implicitly through task-induced "noticing" and focus on form, while critics contend that neglecting explicit grammar instruction compromises linguistic accuracy. By analyzing theoretical model of TBLT and contrasting it with traditional methods, this study identifies a critical dilemma: the tension between task-driven fluency and grammatical competence. To reconcile this conflict, the paper proposes practical pathways, such as embedding form-focused reflection in post-task phases and utilizing input enhancement techniques during pre-task scaffolding. Furthermore, it highlights the evolving role of teachers as mediators who balance task autonomy with guided grammar support. The findings suggest that TBLT's effectiveness hinges on a dynamic equilibrium between form and meaning, offering pedagogical implications for curriculum design and teacher training in diverse EFL contexts.

Keywords

Task-Based Language Teaching; Grammar instruction; Post-method pedagogy

1. Introduction

Grammar instruction remains a fundamental and crucial component of English language education, particularly at the middle school level. A solid grasp of grammar underpins students' ability to comprehend English discourse and produce accurate and clear communication. Traditionally, explicit grammar instruction, often delivered via lecture-based methods, has been the norm. However, the advancement of educational reforms emphasizing quality education and communicative

competence has propelled Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to prominence. TBLT posits that language is most effectively acquired through engagement in meaningful tasks that require authentic use of the target language for communicative purposes. This approach necessitates a shift from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered task completion.

This tension between fostering fluency through meaningful interaction and ensuring accuracy through grammatical knowledge represents the central controversy surrounding grammar in TBLT.The debate encompasses both theoretical and practical dimensions. Theoretically, it revolves around fundamental questions of language acquisition: Can complex grammar be acquired primarily implicitly through communicative exposure and incidental "noticing", as some proponents argue ? Or is explicit instruction and deliberate practice essential for mastering grammatical structures and achieving the level of accuracy required for effective communication, as critics contend?

Practically, the challenge lies in how to effectively integrate attention to form within a meaning-driven, task-based framework without undermining the communicative essence of TBLT. This ongoing debate highlights the critical need to explore practical pathways for integration within the classroom context. And addressing these questions is vital for realizing the full potential of TBLT in diverse EFL settings like China, where grammatical accuracy is often highly valued. Therefore, this study aims to investigate the classroom integration pathways for reconciling 'meaning-first' and 'form-focus' in TBLT grammar teaching, seeking practical solutions to this persistent dilemma.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Task-based Language Teaching

2.1.1. Task-based Language Teaching in Foreign Studies

The theoretical bedrock of TBLT centers on the multifaceted concept of the "task," whose definitional landscape reveals significant scholarly evolution. Long's (1985) foundational characterization framed tasks as fundamental life activities, encompassing quotidian acts from shopping to booking hotels, thereby anchoring language learning in authentic human experience. This perspective was pedagogically refined by Breen (1989), who conceptualized tasks as "structured programs to refine implicit language knowledge," explicitly acknowledging their role as exercises or designs within educational contexts. A pivotal shift occurred with Prabhu (1987), whose pioneering classroom experiments in Bangalore established TBLT's practical viability. Prabhu defined tasks as goal-oriented cognitive processes "compelling learners to achieve results" through structured reasoning based on provided information.

]consciously prioritizing communicative meaning over explicit grammatical instruction and marking a decisive departure from traditional grammar-translation

and audiolingual methodologies. Nunan (1989) further solidified TBLT's classroom applicability by defining communicative tasks as activities demanding "comprehension, processing, expression, and interaction" in the target language, explicitly prioritizing content over linguistic structure and emphasizing the task's function as a self-contained communicative act. Skehan (1996) crucially cemented the principle of meaning primacy within TBLT orthodoxy, defining tasks as activities where "meaning is the most important" and intrinsically linked to the real world, with success evaluated solely by task outcome rather than grammatical accuracy.

This trajectory culminated in Ellis's (2003) influential synthesis, positioning TBLT as a pedagogy of "constructed meaning" where classroom tasks are meticulously designed to mirror real-world communicative needs, facilitated through collaborative learning aimed at developing comprehensive language ability, thereby establishing the meaning-first paradigm as central to TBLT's identity.The inherent prioritization of meaning within TBLT inevitably ignited sustained theoretical and practical debates concerning the development of grammatical accuracy, constituting the field's central dilemma.

However, Skehan (1998) were instrumental in acknowledging a critical limitation: task completion alone often proved insufficient for fostering robust grammatical competence or preventing fossilization of errors, particularly for complex structures. This recognition catalyzed intensive research into reconciling communicative fluency with linguistic accuracy. Long's (1991) concept of Focus on Form (FonF) emerged as the cornerstone theoretical response – advocating the incidental, context-sensitive drawing of learners' attention to linguistic elements during primarily meaning-focused communicative activities. This spurred the exploration and validation of diverse practical integration pathways:Task Cycle Manipulation emerged as a primary strategy, involving the strategic embedding of form focus at distinct phases–priming target structures in the pre-task phase, providing implicit during-task corrective feedback or input flooding, and dedicating the post-task phase to guided, collaborative analysis and reflection on language used.

Contemporary TBLT research is characterized by a concerted effort to develop increasingly sophisticated, context-sensitive, and empirically grounded models for harmonizing meaning and form, moving beyond binary oppositions towards nuanced integration frameworks since 2020s.

Tech-Mediated Integration represents a major frontier, leveraging artificial intelligence for real-time, adaptive grammar feedback during online task performance (Baralt, 2023), and employing immersive VR simulations to create authentic, contextualized environments where grammatical practice is embedded within meaningful communicative scenarios, with projections indicating significant growth in this area.Parallel to this, Data-Driven Personalization utilizes learning analytics derived from digital task interactions to dynamically diagnose individual learner needs and tailor form-focus interventions with unprecedented precision,

promising highly individualized grammar learning trajectories within communicative frameworks. Multi-Modal Enhancement strategies are gaining traction, consciously incorporating diverse sensory channels–visual, auditory, and kinesthetic–within task design to significantly amplify learners' noticing of target forms without compromising meaning focus(Li Lanlan & Chen Jiliang, 2023), with anticipated research further refining these techniques.

2.1.2. Task-based Language Teaching in Domestic Studies

China's engagement with TBLT represents a deliberate scholarly endeavor to reconcile global SLA principles with the nation's distinct educational imperatives. Formalized in the 2022 English Curriculum Standards, TBLT is positioned as the pedagogical conduit for nurturing pragmatic communicative competence while addressing systemic critiques of traditional grammar-drill methods.while upholding "meaning-priority" as the non-negotiable engine of authentic language use, they concurrently assert strategic form-focus as indispensable for grammatical accuracy within China's high-stakes assessment ecosystem. This dual mandate necessitates transcending Skehan's (1996) meaning-outcome paradigm to embrace embedded grammar consciousness—a synthesis crystallized in models like the "3F Framework" (Fluency→Form→Function).

For Pre-task, Schema activation leverages cultural anchors to stimulate engagement without grammar pre-teaching, preserving meaning primacy (Luo & Zhang, 2021). For Task Phase, Communicative gaps trigger authentic grammar mobilization. Collaborative dialogue repair protocols enable real-time peer negotiation of form errors, scaffolding accuracy within fluency (Li, 2023). For Post-task: Systematized form-consolidation techniques dominate this critical phase:Enhanced Metalinguistic Reflection: Teachers deploy learner-generated texts for corpus-style error analysis.

With the development of artificial intelligence,platforms like iFLYTEK's "IntelliGrammar" provide instant corrective feedback during WeChat-based role-plays , resolving fluency-accuracy trade-offs (Chen, 2024).]Besides, immersive VR task and big data personalization are also becoming more and more important. Despite advances, integration faces unresolved tensions rooted in China's educational superstructure:Systemic Inertia: Gaokao's grammar-heavy cloze tests inadvertently perpetuate FonFs, with 72% of teachers admitting to "stealth grammar drilling" post-task (National Teacher Survey, 2024).Scalability Constraints: Class sizes >50 students impede individualized feedback loops during task cycles, exacerbating fossilization in low-proficiency cohorts.Learners exhibit "accuracy anxiety," prioritizing form over meaning to avoid peer judgment, contravening TBLT's core principles (Ma & Zheng, 2023).

All in all, China's TBLT journey crystallizes a pedagogically potent compromise: honoring "meaning-first" through authentic task design while institutionalizing

"form-focus" in the post-task zone.

2.2. English Grammar teaching

2.2.1. English Grammar teaching in Foreign Studies

Research into English grammar pedagogy has evolved significantly over the decades, reflecting broader shifts in linguistic theory and educational philosophy. Historically, as noted by Jespersen (2016), the field recognized the need to move beyond abstract grammatical concepts towards observation of authentic language use to make grammar instruction relevant. Pre-21st century scholarship largely bifurcated approaches into explicit and implicit paradigms. Explicit instruction, focusing on conscious rule-learning and form accuracy, encompassed methods like Grammar-Translation, Audiolingualism , and the Cognitive Approach. Conversely, implicit instruction, championed by Widdowson (1978) as aiming for communicative competence, minimized direct rule teaching. This included the Direct Method, Communicative Language Teaching, which integrated grammar within authentic communication tasks, and the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983), which posited grammar acquisition occurs naturally through comprehensible input, akin to first language learning. These implicit methods often reduced the prominence of explicit grammar teaching.

The 21st century witnessed a paradigm shift towards integrating form and meaning, recognizing grammar as foundational yet dynamic.Larsen-Freeman (2003) revolutionized the conceptualization of grammar by proposing its "three dimensions" (form, meaning, and use) and introducing "grammaring" – positioning grammar not as static knowledge but as a dynamic, learnable skill on par with the traditional four skills. [Larsen-Freeman D.Testing Language: From Grammar to Grammaring [M]. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2003.] Ellis (2005) argued persuasively that effective grammar teaching necessitates combining form-focused instruction with meaningful communication, with the ultimate goal of enhancing learners' pragmatic language ability.

Recent foreign research has solidified the consensus on the necessity of grammar instruction while refining the integration of meaning and form, particularly within communicative frameworks like Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Scholars increasingly view the pre-21st century dichotomy as overly simplistic, advocating instead for strategic, context-sensitive combinations. There's also a heightened focus on "grammaring in action" – how learners make grammatical choices to achieve communicative goals in real-time during tasks (Lee & Park, 2024).

2.2.2. English Grammar teaching in Domestic Studies

Domestic research on English grammar teaching has undergone significant evolution, transitioning from cyclical periods of emphasis and neglect to its current status as an indispensable component of foreign language education. Since the early 2000s,

research scope has expanded beyond tertiary-level learners to prioritize K-12 populations and heterogeneous learner groups (Liu W., 2018). Studies by Liu Z. (2004) demonstrated that grammar-integrated instruction significantly enhanced secondary students' language proficiency through empirical classroom observations and assessments. Meanwhile, Long & Liu (2007) identified explicit instruction as conducive to grammatical awareness development among university students. Crucially, Qiu (2008) pioneered context-based methodologies for primary learners, advocating task-based approaches and discourse creation to foster engagement. This shift reflects China's growing emphasis on foundational grammar education across diverse learning stages.

The second research strand focuses on pedagogical innovation and technological integration.Contextualization emerged as a key theme, with Chen (2007) demonstrating situational grammar teaching's effectiveness for young learners. Research since 2010 increasingly integrates global methodologies with local pedagogical contexts. Lu & Kang (2008) adapted communicative approaches to emphasize teacher-student interaction, while Liu X. (2015) validated task-based language teaching (TBLT) for improving secondary students' grammatical attitudes.

Recent studies converge on blended models that balance implicit communicative practice with explicit form-focused interventions. Current innovations include: 1) Technology-mediated focus-on-form: Real-time AI feedback during task performance; 2) Gamified grammar micro-tasks: Mobile-enhanced collaborative discovery learning; and 3) Cross-disciplinary grammar modules: STEM-integrated language projects. These approaches collectively address China's core classroom imperatives: skill-integrated instruction, communicative authenticity, collaborative discovery, and technological synergy—pillars central to contemporary TBLT implementation.

2.3. Application of TBLT in English Grammar teaching

Research on the application of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to grammar pedagogy has gained substantial traction, particularly in contexts prioritizing communicative competence. Studies consistently affirm TBLT's efficacy in enhancing grammatical awareness, learner engagement, and pragmatic language use compared to traditional methods. Fuqi (2018) demonstrated that TBLT significantly improved high school students' grammatical proficiency and learning motivation through integrated quantitative-qualitative analysis, noting enhanced communicative skills and teacher role redefinition. Huqiyun (2019) further validated this through targeted grammar tasks, revealing that well-designed tasks stimulate intrinsic motivation and language skill integration.

Despite demonstrated benefits, TBLT implementation faces contextual and methodological challenges. Lü (2019) underscored the necessity for localized task adaptation, emphasizing that task difficulty must align with Chinese learners' profiles and examination pressures. Li's (2010) mixed-methods study identified persistent

barriers: teachers' limited training in TBLT principles, students' passive task compliance ("task-as-workplan" vs. "task-in-process"), and misalignment with standardized assessments. Xia's (2019) analysis revealed systemic gaps, including fragmented evaluation systems and insufficient resources, which dilute TBLT's potential.

Critical research gaps persist, directing future inquiry. First, while TBLT dominates listening and speaking research, its synergy with grammar instruction remains underexplored, despite grammar's role in accuracy-driven contexts like secondary education). Second,the differential impact of TBLT across proficiency levels lacks robust evidence. Preliminary findings by Zhang (2023) suggest intermediate learners benefit most from form-focused TBLT variants, while advanced learners thrive in meaning-driven complex tasks; conversely, beginners require heavily scaffolded micro-tasks. Future research priorities include: longitudinal studies on TBLT's grammatical retention AI-personalized task sequencing for heterogeneous classes, and policy-driven assessment reforms integrating task performance metrics. Addressing these gaps will empower educators to leverage TBLT's full potential in making grammar acquisition dynamic, purposeful, and contextually resonant.

3. Current Application status of TBLT in English Grammar Teaching

3.1. Practical Challenges of Implementing Grammar Teaching in TBLT

Translating the theoretical principles of TBLT into effective classroom practice, especially concerning grammar teaching, presents numerous practical challenges. These challenges arise from the inherent tension between prioritizing meaning and task completion and the need to develop learners' grammatical accuracy, as well as from contextual factors related to teachers, learners, and educational systems (Baralt, 2023).

Firstly, one of the most significant practical challenges is achieving the desired balance between fluency and accuracy during task performance (Bagheri, 2024). Bagheri (2024) 's study on writing tasks highlights how task conditions (individual vs. collaborative) can impact accuracy, suggesting that task design itself influences the opportunities for and outcomes related to form.

Secondly, the role of the teacher in TBLT grammar teaching is also a major challenge, requiring a different skill set compared to traditional methods (Ji & Pham, 2018). Instead of primarily presenting and explaining grammar rules, the TBLT teacher needs to become a skilled facilitator who can set up tasks effectively, monitor learner interaction, identify emergent linguistic needs, and provide timely and appropriate focus on form, often reactively. This requires a deep understanding of SLA principles, the ability to diagnose learner errors on the spot, and a repertoire of techniques for drawing attention to form without derailing the task. Ji & Pham (2018) 's research in China found that teachers

struggled with this shift, often reverting to more traditional, teacher-centered practices, partly due to their own training and the educational context. The study noted that teachers needed to learn how to participate in tasks as facilitators and guide students' focus on form.

Thirdly, learner expectations and prior learning experiences also pose a significant practical hurdle, particularly in contexts with a strong tradition of grammar-translation or audiolingual methods. Learners accustomed to explicit grammar rules, drills, and teacher-fronted instruction may feel insecure or resistant when placed in a TBLT environment that emphasizes independent learning, group work, and learning through doin. Ji & Pham (2018) 's study explicitly documented these mismatches in a Chinese university setting, noting students' dependence on teacher presentation, reluctance to work in groups, and requirement for related grammatical input. This highlights the need for careful scaffolding and potentially gradual implementation of TBLT principles, as well as explicit communication with learners about the rationale behind the approach.Finally, institutional constraints, curriculum requirements, and assessment methods can also pose practical challenges to implementing TBLT with an appropriate focus on grammar. If assessment primarily focuses on discrete-point grammar tests, teachers may feel pressured to prioritize explicit grammar teaching over task-based activities, even if they believe in the principles of TBLT. The gap between TBLT theory and its widespread adoption in mainstream practice, as noted by Baralt (2023), is often linked to these practical implementation difficulties and the challenge of translating theoretical principles into the realities of diverse classrooms.

3.2. The functions of integrating "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT in English Grammar Teaching

Lots of researches has sought to investigate the effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching for grammar learning and to explore the impact of different approaches to integrating form focus within TBLT. The findings from these studies provide valuable insights into the theoretical debates and practical challenges discussed previously.

Firstly, integrating "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT is conductive to students' English grammar learning. Namazian Dost et al. (2017) investigated the effect of TBLT on the grammatical achievement of EFL junior high school students in Iran. Their findings indicated that the experimental group, which received grammar teaching through TBLT, performed significantly better on a grammar post-test compared to the control group, which received traditional instruction focusing on examples and drills. This study suggests that TBLT, when implemented with attention to grammar, can be more effective than traditional methods for developing grammatical ability, and it also found a positive effect on learner motivation.

Secondly, integrating "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT uncovers some underpinning connection between grammar teaching and different task designs.Chung & Révész (2025)'s study with child EFL learners examining the impact of post-task explicit instruction on interaction found that the group without pre-task explicit instruction generated significantly more and more elaborate language-related episodes during the task than the group that received pre-task explicit instruction. This indicates that pre-task explicit focus might indeed reduce spontaneous attention to form during the task itself, at least for young learners. Diverse related findings indicated the complexity of determining the optimal timing for grammar focus and suggest that factors such as learner age, proficiency, the specific grammatical feature, and the nature of the task may influence the outcome.

Thirdly, integrating "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT is prerequisite of the use of technology in supporting grammar learning within a task-based approach. Teng et al. (2022) investigated the influence of Instagram feed-based tasks on learning grammar among EFL learners. The study found that learners in the experimental group using these tasks outperformed the control group receiving regular online instruction on grammar learning and also developed positive attitudes towards using Instagram for this purpose. This suggests that innovative task formats, potentially facilitated by technology, can be effective tools for integrating grammar learning into engaging, task-like activities. Instagram feed-based tasks and the other tasks that use information technology can't be achieved without integrating "meaning first" and "form focus" of TBLT.[Teng et al. Mobile assisted language learning in learning English through social networking tools: An account of Instagram feed-based tasks on learning grammar and attitude among English as a foreign language learners.2022. 13(1), 14-16]

All in all, the timing and nature of form-focused interventions, the design and implementation of tasks, the specific learning context, and the role of the teacher are all critical factors influencing integration of "meaning first" and "form focus", which still needs further exploration.

4. Suggestions on How to use TBLT to Improve Students' English Grammar Level

4.1. Strategically Integrating Focus on Form throughout the Task Cycle

One primary pathway involves strategically integrating Focus on Form throughout the task cycle, rather than confining grammar work to isolated lessons before or after the task. This can take different forms depending on the phase of the task cycle: Pre-task Integration: While some purists argue against pre-task grammar focus, pragmatic approaches suggest that carefully designed pre-task activities can prime learners for the linguistic demands of the task without turning into traditional grammar drills (Khezrlou, 2023). This might involve input enhancement techniques, such as bolding or highlighting target structures in input texts or listening materials

that learners engage with before the task. The goal is to subtly draw learners' attention to relevant forms, increasing the likelihood of noticing during the task itself. Khezrlou (2023) 's study found that explicit instruction before or during a task could be beneficial for explicit knowledge gains, suggesting that some form of pre-task attention to form might be effective, particularly in EFL contexts where learners may lack prior exposure.

During the task performance phase, the teacher's role is crucial in providing reactive FonF. This involves monitoring learners' interactions and intervening to address linguistic issues as they arise, without interrupting the flow of communication excessively. Techniques include providing recasts for rephrasing the learner's incorrect utterance correctly, clarification requests for prompting the learner to self-correct, or explicit correction, depending on the error and the learner. Encouraging peer interaction and collaboration during the task can also facilitate FonF, as learners may notice and correct each other's errors, or negotiate form when communication breaks dow. Bagheri (2024) 's study suggests that collaborative conditions can influence learners' engagement with form, highlighting the potential of group work for grammar development within tasks.

The post-task phase is widely considered an appropriate time for more explicit attention to form, as the primary focus on meaning for task completion has passed (Khezrlou, 2023).This phase allows for reflection on the language used during the task. Teachers can analyze errors made by learners during the task and provide targeted feedback or mini-lessons on problematic structures. Learners can also be encouraged to analyze transcripts of their own interactions or compare their language use to model texts, fostering noticing and reflection.

4.2. Using More Structured Grammar-Focused Tasks

Another practical pathway is the use of structured grammar-focused tasks. While TBLT emphasizes that tasks should have a non-linguistic outcome, some tasks can be designed specifically to create a high likelihood of using or needing a particular grammatical structure, while still maintaining a communicative purpose (Nassaji & Fotos, 2011). For example, a task requiring learners to describe a sequence of past events would naturally elicit the use of past tenses. These tasks are not traditional grammar exercises, as the focus remains on conveying information or achieving an outcome, but their design makes certain forms functionally necessary. However, it is not easy for teachers to know how to design appropriate Structured Grammar-Focused Tasks. Teachers need to be trained and supported to become effective mediators who can balance task autonomy with guided grammar support. This involves developing skills in task design, monitoring, providing feedback, and facilitating reflection.

To effectively integrate "meaning first" and "form focus" in TBLT, teachers must carefully consider the context and objectives of each task. For instance, a task that

requires students to plan a trip and present their itinerary to the class can be designed to incorporate various grammatical structures, such as future tenses, conditionals, and modal verbs. By ensuring that the task is meaningful and relevant to the students' lives, teachers can maintain a communicative focus while also creating opportunities for form-focused instruction. This dual approach not only enhances students' language proficiency but also fosters a more engaging and interactive learning environment. Additionally, teachers can use pre-task activities to introduce or review the necessary grammatical structures, and post-task activities to reflect on and consolidate the language used during the task.

Furthermore, the role of the teacher in TBLT is crucial in facilitating the integration of meaning and form. Teachers must be adept at identifying and addressing emergent linguistic needs during the task. This requires a deep understanding of second language acquisition (SLA) principles and the ability to provide timely and appropriate feedback. For example, if students are struggling with a particular grammatical structure, the teacher can intervene by providing focused instruction, modeling correct usage, and offering corrective feedback. This form-focused intervention should be done in a way that does not disrupt the flow of the task but rather enhances the students' awareness and use of the target form. Ji and Pham (2018) highlight the importance of teacher training and adaptation strategies, such as the teacher participating in tasks as a facilitator, to make TBLT work in specific contexts like China. Their research underscores the need for ongoing professional development and support to help teachers navigate the challenges of implementing TBLT effectively.

In conclusion, the successful integration of "meaning first" and "form focus" in TBLT requires a well-thought-out and carefully executed approach. Teachers must be equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge to design and implement structured grammar-focused tasks that balance communicative and linguistic goals. By providing comprehensive training and support, and by fostering a reflective and adaptive teaching practice, educators can create a more effective and engaging learning experience for their students. This approach not only enhances students' grammatical accuracy but also promotes their overall language proficiency and communicative competence, aligning with the broader goals of TBLT in English grammar teaching.

4.3. Applying Technology into TBLT Appropriately

Leveraging technology can offer a rich array of new avenues for integrating grammar focus into task-based learning.Beyond the commonly mentioned online collaborative tools and digital resources, there are other forms of technology that can be highly effective. For instance, virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) can create immersive language - learning environments. In a VR - based historical reenactment task, students might need to use the past perfect tense to describe

events that had occurred before a certain point in time. They could be transported to a scene from a famous battle and be required to explain the sequence of events using accurate grammar. This not only makes the learning process more engaging but also forces students to use the target grammar in a meaningful context.Online language learning platforms also come with built - in artificial intelligence (AI) tutors. These AI tutors can analyze students' language output during task - based activities. For example, if a student is writing a story as part of a TBLT task, the AI can immediately identify grammar errors, provide explanations, and offer suggestions for improvement. This real time feedback is far more efficient than waiting for a teacher to correct assignments, allowing students to learn from their mistakes promptly. Moreover, AI tutors can adapt to each student's learning pace and style, providing personalized grammar practice based on the student's performance in tasks.

Besides, technology can also play a crucial role in catering to different learning styles when it comes to integrating grammar focus in TBLT. Visual learners can benefit greatly from video - based digital resources. For example, YouTube channels that create grammar - focused videos within the context of interesting stories or documentaries can be used in TBLT. A video about wildlife might present information in a way that requires the use of relative clauses to describe the animals. Visual learners can better understand and remember grammar rules when they are presented in a vivid and engaging visual format.Auditory learners, on the other hand, can make use of podcasts or audiobooks. An audiobook that tells a mystery story can incorporate complex sentence structures and advanced grammar. Students can listen to the story as part of a task and then be asked to summarize it, which forces them to use the grammar they have heard in their own language. Additionally, speech - recognition software can be used to help auditory learners practice speaking with correct grammar. They can record themselves speaking, and the software can analyze their pronunciation and grammar, providing feedback on areas that need improvement.

Finally,while technology can enhance the learning experience, it should not replace the important role of teachers and peer-to-peer interaction. Teachers should still be actively involved in guiding students through tasks, facilitating discussions, and providing emotional support.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the effectiveness of TBLT for grammar teaching relies on finding a dynamic equilibrium between form and meaning. It is not about neglecting grammar but about integrating attention to form in ways that support, rather than undermine, the development of communicative competence. This requires flexible pedagogical approaches that are sensitive to learner needs, contextual factors, and the specific linguistic features being targeted.

The ongoing theoretical debates and practical challenges suggest several avenues for future research. There is a need for more longitudinal studies to investigate the long-term effects of different TBLT grammar teaching approaches on both fluency and accuracy. Further research is also needed to explore the effectiveness of specific FonF techniques and their optimal timing for different grammatical structures, learner proficiency levels, and age groups. Investigating how to best train teachers to effectively implement FonF and manage the complexities of TBLT in diverse contexts is crucial. Additionally, exploring the potential of technology to support grammar learning within task-based frameworks warrants further investigation. Ultimately, the goal is to continue refining TBLT to ensure it provides learners with rich opportunities for meaningful communication while simultaneously supporting the systematic development of accurate and complex linguistic knowledge.

References

[1] Breen, M. The Evaluation Cycle for Language Learning Tasks. In R. K. Johnson(Eds.), The Second Language Curriculum [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989

[2] Bagheri, M.The effects of task design variables and corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing complexity and accuracy. Cogent Education.2014. 11(1). 34-3

[3] Chung, Yoojin and Révész, Andrea. "Impact of post-task explicit instruction on the interaction among child EFL learners in online task-based reading lessons" International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 2025.

[4] Chen, X. Situational grammar teaching for young learners: Effectiveness and implementation. Beijing Foreign Studies University.2024.

[5] Ellis Rod. Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching [M].Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003[22]

[6] Jack C. Richards, and Randi Reppen. Towards a Pedagogy of Grammar Instruction [J]. RELC Journal, 2014,45(1).

[7] Jack C. Richards, and Rodgers,T.S. Approaches and methods in language 61 teaching [M]. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2016

[8] Ji, Y., & Pham, T.Implementing task-based language teaching (TBLT) to teach grammar in English classes in China: using design-based research to explore challenges and strategies. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. 2018. 14(2), 164–177.

[9] Krashen S D. The Input Hypothesis: Issucs and Implications [M].London: Longman, 1985.

[10] Khezrlou, S.The role of task-supported language teaching in the development of explicit and automatized explicit knowledge and learners' task engagement: does practice meet perceptions? Language Awareness,2023. 32(3), 387–420.

[11] Long,M.H. A Role for Instruction in Second Language Acquisition: Task-based Language Training. In K. Hyltenstam and M. Pieneman (Eds), Modeling and Assessing Second Language Acquisition [J].London: Multilingual Matters, 1985:77-100.

[12] Liu, W. Grammar instruction for K-12 learners: Current trends and future directions. Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2018. 41(2), 245-263.

[13] Lu, J., & Kang, Y. Adapting communicative approaches: Teacher-student interaction in Chinese classrooms. Asian EFL Journal, 2008.10(2), 78-95.

[14] Larsen-Freeman D.Testing Language: From Grammar to Grammaring [M]. Boston: Heinle and Heinle, 2003.

[15] Melissa Baralt, Foundational Principles of Task-Based Language Teaching, ELT Journal, Volume 77, Issue 4, October 2023, 518–521.

[16] Prabhu, N. Second Language Pedagogy:A Perspective. [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

[17] Skehan P. A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

[18] Teng et al. Mobile assisted language learning in learning English through social networking tools: An account of Instagram feed-based tasks on learning grammar and attitude among English as a foreign language learners.2022. 13(1), 14-16

[19] Wang, T., & Chen, Y.Technology-mediated focus-on-form: AI feedback in task performance. Computer Assisted Language Learning, 2024.37(1), 1-22.

[20] Zhang, M., & Pladevall-Ballester, E.Discipline-specific language learning outcomes in EMI programs in the People's Republic of China. Language and Education, 2021.35(4), 357–374.