Comparing the impact of culturally laden Task-based language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-based language Teaching (CBLT) on Iranian intermediate learners' Speaking improvement

Azadeh Rahmani, Dr. Mohammad Alavi

Alborz Non-profit University

ABSTRACT: This research was designed to compare the impact of culturally laden Task-based language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-based language Teaching (CBLT) on Iranian intermediate learners' Speaking improvement. Two groups of participants, i. e. the experimental and control groups, were used in this study. In the experimental group, task-based instruction for 20 intermediate students and in the control group content-based instruction for 20 intermediate students were used as a methods of the class. At the beginning of the course, TOEFL speaking test from TOEFL Test Preparation was used as the pre-test for both groups and then the experimental and control groups received seven sessions of treatment. In each session the experimental group worked on one cultural-laden topic. The focus of a CBI lesson is on the topic or subject matter. After 7 sessions, a post-test speaking test was given to students to compare their improvement of speaking ability. According statistical analysis, it was observed that progress has been seen in both groups. But TBLT class has had better performance than CBLT class.

Key words: TBLT, CBLT, Speaking proficiency, Culture.

Teaching Speaking, for many years, has been just as repetition of drills or memorization of dialogues. But, today world needs that the purpose of teaching speaking should improve learners' communicative skills. Because, only in this manner, learners can express themselves and know how to follow the cultural and social rules suitable in each communicative situation. Sim and Pop (2016) outlines that "Speaking is a highly complex and dynamic skill that involves the use of several simultaneous processes – cognitive, physical and socio-cultural – and a speaker's knowledge and skills have to be activated rapidly in real-time" (p.265). With the advent of communicative era, oral communication considered as a final goal in teaching and learning of second and foreign language.

Choosing the appropriate teaching method that can provide the real- life setting in the classroom for learners and give them the opportunity to practice, can be very effective. TBLT and CBLT are two methods that can partly meet the learners' need in learning and teaching speaking, especially TBLT for its using of real tasks in the classroom. Having adequate vocabulary and syntax knowledge about second or foreign language is necessary if someone wants to speak that language.

Speaking a foreign language requires that learners should have several competences, such as linguistic and communicative competences.

Task-based instruction

Before addressing the Task-based, we require to pay to Communicative language teaching because Task-based language teaching constitutes a strong version of CLT. It aims to develop the ability of learners to use language in real communication (Ellis, 2003). Brown and Yule (as cited in Ellis, 2003) "characterize communication as involving two general purposes –the interactional function, where language is used to establish and maintain contact, and the transactional function, where language is used referentially to exchange information" (p. 27). In TBLT classroom, there is both weak and strong versions. Howatt (1984) distinguishes a "weak" and a "strong" version. The former is based on the assumptions that the components of communicative competence can be identified and systematically taught. In this respect, a weak version of CLT does not involve a radical departure from earlier methods as it still reflects what White (1988) refers to as a Type A approach to language teaching, i.e. an approach that is interventionist and analytic.

A traditional methodology in teaching based on a linguistic content, named PPP (present- practice- produce) was employed in language classes. In this method, first language items were presented to the learners, then these items were practiced in a controlled way that called "exercises". And in the end, the learners had opportunities for applying these items in free language. Plews and Zhao (2010, cited in Mörck Jansson. 2016) point out that TBLT is a flexible whole-language approach and emphasize that it is not a traditional Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) pedagogy (p. 10). Maftoon& Sarem (2015) outline that "PPP is a three-part teaching paradigm: Presentation, Practice and Production; based on behaviorist theory which states that learning a language is just like learning any other skill" (p.31).

Since PPP has been the common method from 1990 onwards, but this method also has shortcomings that it would reduce its popularity in language teaching. According to Ellis (2003) mention that PPP consider language as a set of products that can be obtained constantly as accumulated existence. But researchers in second language acquisition have outlined that learners do not obtain a language in this manner. In the other word, acquisition of second/foreign language is a process that it is opposed to teaching which include language teaching as present-practice and product.

With these criticisms that were raised on PPP, the focus of teaching method changed to communication as the main aspect of language teaching and learning. Maftoon& Sarem (2015) propose that " Early models of Communicative Language Teaching used functional units of organization and practice to replace grammatical ones; more recently, however, the unit of task has been proposed as an alternative to other units of presentation or practice" (p. 34). Nunan (2006) proposes that "while the ESP/LSP movement initially focused on the end product of instructional programs, CLT also forced a re-evaluation of learning processes" (p.8). How do communicative language teaching and Task-based language teaching relate to each other? Ellis (2006) draws a relationship between CLT and TBLT, he outlines that "CLT is a broad, philosophical approach to the language curriculum that draws on theory and research in linguistics, anthropology, psychology and sociology. TBLT represents a realization of this philosophy at the levels of syllabus design and methodology" (p.10).

According to Nunan (2006) TBLT is experiential learning. In this approach the learner's instant personal experience is used for the learning experience. "Intellectual growth occurs when learners engage in and reflect on sequences of tasks. The active involvement of the learner is central to the approach, and a rubric that conveniently captures the active, experiential nature of the process is ' learning by doing' "(Nunan, 2006, p. 12).

Content-based instruction

Krahnke (1987, cited in Richards, 2006) defines CBI as "the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little or no direct or explicit effort to teaching the language itself separately from the content being taught" (page.27).

Richards (2006) has outlined" that Content-based instruction is based on the following assumptions about language learning: People learn a language more successfully when they use the language as a means of acquiring information, rather than as an end in itself; CBI better reflects learners' needs for learning a second language; Content provides a coherent framework that can be used to link and develop all of the language skills" (p. 28). Genesee and Leary (2013) proposes that "CBI also supplies actual cognitive and social bases for learning language" (p. 6).

Meaningful and amusing content, academic or otherwise, supplies learners with cognitive reboots that help them break into a new and complex linguistic system. Eyjólfsdóttir (2001) outlines that "Content-based instruction is also based on the theory that language proficiency derives from integrating the four language skills: reading, writing, speaking and listening" (p.7). In CBI classroom, learners read lessons, communicate, write about their conclusions, listen to other learners, take note, and in this way they improve all four skills together. Ajabshir (2014) concludes that "Content-based teaching is simple and it is the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little or no direct or explicit effort to teach the language itself separately from the content being taught" (p.361). CBI holds that people do not learn language and then use it; rather, they learn language by using it (Genesee & Leary, 2013). The content-based approach called content and language integrated learning (CLIL). Navés (2009) proposes that "Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is an approach to foreign language learning that requires the use of a second language1 to practice content" (p. 11).

The Impact of Culture in Teaching English

Genc& Bada (2005) propose that "The dialectical connection between language and culture has always been a concern of L2 teachers and educators" (p. 73). Kiato (1991) outlines that "Culture was not considered significant in foreign language instruction until the direct method was introduced at the end of the nineteenth century. By the 1970s, language teachers came to realize that language was deeply rooted in culture and could not be separated from it" (p.1)

Marsh & Frigols (2012) outlines that "The development of intercultural knowledge and understanding is closely linked to the capacity for language and use of communication skills" (p.139). Omaggio (1993, cited in Dai, 2011) proposes that teaching culture is considered important

by most teachers but it has remained insubstantial and sporadic in most language classroom. For scholars and laymen alike, cultural competence, i.e., the knowledge of the conventions, customs, beliefs, and systems of meaning of another country, is indisputably an integral part of foreign language learning, and many teachers have seen it as their goal to incorporate the teaching of culture into the foreign language curriculum (Thanasoulas, 2001).

Kramsch (1993) has studied about this subject: Culture in language learning is not an expendable fifth skill, tacked on, so to speak, to the teaching of speaking, listening, reading, and writing and it is always in the background. The impact of culture is indicated well in four language skills. In speaking which is my thesis subject this integration (language and culture) is well recognizable. As Tang (1999) believes that by speaking the language, therefore, one automatically (to a greater or lesser extent) aligns oneself with the culture of the language. To speak a language well, one has to be able to think in that language, and thought is extremely powerful. Language is culture. Language is the soul of the country and people who speak it. Byram & Feng (2004) propose that "The best researched account of culture learning is undoubtedly the search for explanation of relationships between learners' understanding of other cultures and their motivation and achievement in language learning" (p.151). Doganay(2014) proposes that:

> For a long time it has been argued that teaching a foreign language through lingua-cultural approach should be given the importance it deserves. Therefore, many scholars have paid plenty of attention to developing the notion 'intercultural communicative competence' and contribute ideas of implementing cultural based activities into process of foreign language teaching (p.108).

Ibáñez (2012) proposes that "Fostering the connectivity of both language and culture is important since it allows students to radically change their view"(p. 4).

Speaking

English as a foreign language to be taught in Iran, Therefore, teachers will be faced with problems for teaching. Because the sitting outside of the classroom is not English. Among the four skills that are necessary for students to achieve proficiency in English, speaking has greatest effect and also the most difficult skill to teach and learn, because applying of several abilities at the same time is needed for this skill. Usma and García and Gómez (2013) outlines that "Speaking not only means interacting with people about different subjects in different places; speaking is also the resource through which people can reflect on their identity and their culture" (p.20). Oradee (2012) proposes that "In foreign language teaching and learning, ability to speak is the most essential skill since it is the basic for communication and it is the most difficult skill" (p.533).

Finding the most effective methods of teaching for this skill is one of the researcher's permanent concern. Task-based and content-based approaches are new in teaching and learning field. And with this study, we are to find whether they can be effective or not. Farahani and Nejad (2009) outline that "Speaking is so much a part of our daily life that we tend to take it for granted. However, learning speaking whether as a first or second language, involves developing a subtle and detailed knowledge about why, how and when to communicate and to produce complex skills for managing interaction, such as asking a question or taking a turn" (p.24). Perhaps, speaking is

the most dominant skill among the language skills because it includes everything. Thus, if language is a tool of expressing all purposes, the speaking skill is concerned with all these purposes such as expressing feelings, sensations, ideas, and beliefs. This skill is so important that we do many of our actions through it. Hasan (2014) believes that if both the teacher and the learner understand the importance of speaking skills and the practice of this skill in a new and modern way, then they can practice this skill in teaching/learning program.

Aliakbari and Azizifar (2015) propose that "Although all English language skills are very significant to learn English language, it is by speaking that others understand one has learnt a language. If one wants to be understood or express his/her feelings, speaking is the most common way. All English language learners especially those in Foreign Language (FL) settings are at least once asked the question "can you speak English?" But what are their responses? Can they express themselves accurately and fluently?" (p.127).

CONTENT

Richards (2006) outlines that" Content refers to the information or subject matter that we learn or communicate through language rather than the language used to convey it (p.28). Naturally, any language lesson has content, it does not matter that the lesson is a grammar lesson, or a reading lesson, or any other type of lesson. Content of a lesson has to be the means which keeps together the lesson or the exercise together, but in conventional approaches, after other decisions about language teaching, the content have been selected.

Stoller (2002) believed that bringing too much content to language class is wrong and there should be an adequate. We bring too much content in and we don't have enough time to help our learners in reviewing the content for various reasons and investigating language in different methods.

Strategies for Improving Speaking skill

Today English language has a global reputation and then choosing the strategies for learning/teaching speaking skill is very important in the modern educational framework. The main question is that how the learners are going to achieve the speaking skill. In speaking classes teachers can help learners to apply different strategies that they feel easy with them in learning setting.

Navarro Romero (2009) proposes that "part of how to teach, moves away from theory to approach real problems and their solutions. Several authors have stated that when learners face problems in speaking they need practical and concrete solutions to know how to behave and respond in order to overcome those difficulties" (p. 89).

In Task-based approach, that our focus here is more on it, three major types can be used in pre-task activities, as we noted before Task-based approach contains pre-task, during task and post-task, : *teaching* (teaching is clearly concerned with the introduction of new language, and perhaps

with restructuring) ; *consciousness raising* (this sort of activities change the learner's awareness of elements of the task before it is done, with the result that the task is then approached and performed differently (Kumaravadivelu, 1993 and Rose, 1994, P. 59, cited in Torky, 2006) ; and *planning* A task done without planning time is more likely to lead students to choose relatively undemanding language. Hence planning helps to ensure that anything learned through consciousness raising or teaching can be drawn upon during language use and production, and that learners do not rely excessively on lexical based phrases in their speaking. (Torky, 2006).

Torky (2006, p. 92) outlines on during –task stage: The main factor affecting performance during the task is the choice of the task itself. Two general aspects of during-task activity will be covered: Manipulation of attention and the extended task procedure. Within this stage there are the three phases: (1) doing the task, (2) engaging in planning for post-task, and (3) reporting (Willis, 1996 and Rooney, 2000, cited in Torky, 2006). Eventually, after the pre-task and during-task, there is a post-task as the third stage in Task-based approach (The underlying assumption at this stage is that learners have to be reminded that fluency is not the only goal during task completion, and that restructuring and accuracy also have importance. So post- task activities provide another means of inducting effective use of attention during tasks ,and of balancing the various goals that are desirable (Koester, 2000, P. 176, cited in Torky, 2006). And content-based approach is another that we apply it in this research. In content –based instruction, the content plays the central role, and language is used to communicate meaning.

Navarro Romero (2009) outlines that " as teachers can, and should, improve learners' speaking skills and communication strategies, the only thing they need to do is to plan their teaching around two main questions: what they want to teach, which specific speaking features they want to develop in their learners; and how they want to do it" (p. 90).

Purpose of the study

In the current conditions that learning English as an international language is essential for progressing and is necessary for those who are seeking to communicate, finding the most practical way to teach can be helpful. For many years researchers have done extensive research and tested many methods and approaches for this reason. But to find the best and most effective method is dependent on many variables like students' characters, their emotional mood, and their physical conditions and so on. With case studies, appropriate method associated with that condition can be found. In Iran as I noted before, learning English as foreign language in general and speaking skill as a particular skill are not easy. In this study I decided to test two newest approaches (Task-based and content-based instruction) for see whether they can fit with our condition or not. And they are effective in improving speaking skill and finally to see which one is more useful.

Research Questions

The present study will provide best answers to the following questions:
  1. How effective is the employment of culturally laden Task-based Language Teaching in improving speaking skill of university student in Takestan?

2. Whether the content-based instruction is effective in improving of students' speaking ability?
3. Which instruction is more effective in teaching speaking specially for culture issues Task-based or Content-based instruction?
4. What are the attitudes of teacher and learners using task-based and content-based instruction in speaking classes?

Method

The questions that this study tried to answer, are which method works better in improving university students speaking skill, Task-based or Content-based language Teaching? And which instruction is more effective in teaching speaking specially for culture issues Task-based or Content-based instruction? What are the attitudes of teacher and learners using task-based and content-based instruction in speaking classes? In order to answer these questions accurate, comprehensive and effective plan of Task-based and content-based instruction is needed for improving speaking skill of learners in English class.

As it was previously discussed Ellis (2009) noted three phases for task-based instruction: ***Pre-task,*** a) Framing the activity, b) Planning time, c) Doing a similar task are different parts of pre-task as Ellis had pointed that access to a clear framework for a task-based lesson is of obvious advantage to both teachers and learners.; ***the during-task phase,*** two options are available in this phase: Task performance options and Process options; ***the post-task phase,*** Ellis affords a number of options for this phase: repeat performance, reflecting on the task and focusing on forms.

In this study we will have two groups, one group will improve their speaking skill through Task-based instruction and another through content-based. In both instructions, culture is with lessons. Then different treatment will be chosen for each group.

Research Design
Participants

A class of 20 university students majoring accounting was selected in task-based instruction and another class of 20 students majoring in architecture was assigned in content-based instruction. Both women and men participated in this study. They aged between 19 to 21 years old. Persian is their first and English is their second language.

Procedures

We consider the first group who receive task-based instruction as an experimental group, and another group who are in content-based instruction class as a control group. TOEFL speaking test from TOEFL Test Preparation was used as the pre-test for both groups and then the experimental and control groups received seven session of treatment. In experimental group, the students receive the Task-based instruction. In each session, the **control group** worked on one cultural-laden topic.

The focus of a CBI lesson is on the topic or subject matter. During the lesson students are focused on learning about something. The aim is when students learn language, they also learn about the culture of language. In a fact, they learn about the culture using the language they are trying to learn. In other words, they don't use their native language as a tool for developing

language. We can go through two stages in content-based classes: *Preparation* and *During the lesson*. **In preparation stage**, the appropriate topics that learners were interested in, were chosen. Some suitable sources such as: websites, reference books, audio or video of lectures or even real people) with different aspect of the subject were available to the learners. **In during lesson**, dividing the class into small groups, assigning each group a small task and a source of information to use to help them fulfil the task , after doing the task they form new groups with students that used other information sources and share and compare their information. There should then be some product as the end result of this sharing of information which could take the form of a group report or presentation of some kind. After 7 sessions, a post-test speaking test was given to students to compare their improvement of speaking ability.

Instrumentation

In this research, 7 culturally laden topics are selected from IELTS Speaking Test. They will be taught in each class but by two different methods.
In Task-based class, time is divided in three pre-task, during-task and past task and time in content-based class is in two preparation and during the lesson.

Task number	*Topics & Language Focus*	*Task Skill in Task-based class*	*Skills in content-based class*
Task 1	**Introduction** *simple time and simple continuous*	Interviews	Playing video
Task 2	**Culture** *Simple past and past continuous*	Picture describing Information gap	Using Website
Task 3	**Celebration & Festivals** *Present perfect & present perfect continuous*	Picture narrating story telling	Using book
Task 4	**Travel** *Future time*	Simulation	Playing video

Task 5	**Food (Food & culture)** *Past perfect*	Information-gap	Using website
Task 6	**Jobs & Occupation** *Passive (present time)*	Role play	Real people
Task 7	**Family** *Passive (past time)*	Story completion	Using website & play videos of families from all over the world

In content-based class, time divided in two phases: *preparation* and *during the lesson*.

Preparation phase includes:

- Preparation

o Choose a subject of interest to students.
o Find three or four suitable sources that deal with different aspects of the subject. These could be websites, reference books, audio or video of lectures or even real people.

- During the lesson

o Divide the class into small groups and assign each group a small research task and a source of information to use to help them fulfil the task.
o Then once they have done their research they form new groups with students that used other information sources and share and compare their information.
o There should then be some product as the end result of this sharing of information which could take the form of a group report or presentation of some kind.

In Task-based approach, three types of tasks has identified in Larsen-free man book. An *information-gap activity* that involves the exchange of information among participants in order to complete a task. The second is *opinion-gap activity* requires that students give their personal preferences, feelings, or attitudes in order to complete a task (giving a social problem and finding a series of possible solutions). And the third is *reasoning-gap activity* requires students to derive some new information by inferring it from information they have been given.

Results

For this study, two groups of students who taken general language test were assigned in two task-based as an experimental (G1) and content-based as control (G2) groups. Also in this study, a pre-test before the treatment and a post-test after the treatment were applied. There is a summary of participants in two groups as following table (Table 1):

Table 1. The distribution of participants in two groups

Groups	N	Methodology
G1: Experimental Group	20	Task-based language Teaching
G2: Control Group	20	Content-based language Teaching

In this study, two groups in the same size were selected. The first group (G1) as the experimental group received seven treatment in Task-based instruction and second group (G2) as the control group received seven treatment in Content-based instruction for teaching speaking skill to intermediate students in Takestan University. The following table show the performances of both groups on pre-test:

Table 2. *Paired Samples on the pre-test*

Groups	Methodology	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
G1	TBLT	20	6.90	3.55	.79
G2	CBLT	20	7.35	3.78	.84

An independent t-test also was used for both G1 and G2 groups through SPSS to find if there is any significant differences between two groups on pre-test.

Table 3. *Independent Samples t-Test for the performance of G1 and G2 on the pre-test*

Groups	Mean	t	sig.
G1 (TBLT)	6.90	.388	.850
G2 (CBLT)	7.35		

Note: $p < .05$

As a result, t value in above table at p< .5 is .388 (sig. 850). Therefore according to the t-table, the null hypothesis is correct and we cannot reject it. According to the obtained values, we can say that there is not any significant difference between the performances of the two groups at the beginning. In the other words, they were from the same population.

Pre-test /post-test results for the two groups

The descriptive statistics for task-based group's performance is given in Table 4. According to the mean score and standard deviation of the pretest/posttest of TBLT group, significant differences in the group's performance before and after the treatment was seen in this group**.**

Table 4. *Paired Samples Statistics. TBLT pre-test/post-test results*

	Tests	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean
TBLT (G1)	pre-test	6.90	20	3.55	.79
	post-test	17.65	20	1.87	.41

To find out if such obtained scores on pre and post tests were significant, the matched T-test was conducted in Table 5. The obtained value for T, at P<.05 is 12.85. Because this value for T is greater than the critical value for T (t = 2.00), therefore, the performance of TBLT group on the pre and posttests is statistically significant. So this result is achieved that teaching the speaking skill through Task-based instruction has been successful to intermediate learners and they have had progress.

Table 5. *Paired Samples t-test for TBLT group*

	Tests	Mean	t	sig.
TBLT	pre-test	6.90	12.85	.000
	Post-test	17.65		

Note: p<.05

The performances of CBLT on pre-test and post-test is given in Table 6. According to this table the mean scores and standard deviation for the pre and posttests, significant difference was seen between the performances of G2 on the post and pretests.

Table 6. *Paired Samples Statistics. CBLT pre-test/post-test results*

	Tests	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error mean
CBLT	pre-test	7.35	20	3.78	.84
(G2)	post-test	8.55	20	3.92	.87

According to Table 4.7, the obtained T value (sig. . .00) is 7.71. As a result, we can say that CBLT method has had a positive effect in teaching of speaking skill on intermediate Iranians' learners.

Table 7. *Paired Samples t-test for CBLT group*

	Tests	Mean	t	sig.
CBLT	pre-test	7.35	7.71	.000
	Post-test	8.55		

Note: p<.05

So according to these results, we can reject the null hypothesis and say that both TBLT and CBLT have been effective in teaching speaking skill to Iranian intermediate learners.

Post-test results for the two groups

The main purpose of this study is to see which method is more effective in teaching speaking skill for Iranian intermediate learners, TBLT or CBLT (as we saw that both are effective, but which one is more effective). To answer this question, an independent T-test was used for comparing the post-test scores of these methods. Table 8**.**

Table 8. *Paired Samples on the post-test*

Groups	Methodology	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
G1	TBLT	20	17.65	1.87	.41
G2	CBLT	20	8.55	3.92	.87

According to above table, the mean score for TBLT is 17.65 and for CBLT is 8.55. We can notice that there is a difference between performances of these two groups on post-test. But to see such this difference is significant or not, an independent T-test was used. Table 9 shows this result**.**

Table 9. *Independent Samples t-Test for the performance of TBLT and CBLT on the post-test*

Groups	Mean	t	sig.
G1 (TBLT)	17.65	9.35	.002
G2 (CBLT)	8.55		

Note: p<.05

According above tables, this result is obtained that TBLT class performance is better than the performance of CBLT class.

Discussion

Wei (2005, cited in Choudhury, 2014) outlines that "language has a dual character: both as a means of communication and a carrier of culture. Language without culture is unthinkable, so is human culture without language. A particular language is a mirror of a particular culture" (p.3). Brown (1994, cited in Choudhury, 2014) explains the relation between language and culture as follows: "A language is a part of a culture and a culture is a part of a language; the two are intricately interwoven so that one cannot separate the two without losing the significance of either language or culture" (p.3)

Richards (2008) outlines in his book about teaching speaking from 1970s till now. He believes that "speaking in traditional methodologies usually meant repeating after the teacher, memorizing a dialog, or responding to drills, reflecting the sentence-based view of proficiency prevailing in the audio-lingual and other drill-based or repetition based methodologies of the 1970s"(p.2).

In 1980s with advent of communicative language teaching, there was a But there was an alter in syllabuses and methodology and therefore the views to teaching speaking language changed too. Communicative syllabuses built around notion, functions, skills, tasks or other non-grammatical units of organization. The goal for speaking classes was and this goal could be

attained through the apply of information-gap and other tasks that needed learners to try real communication.

There are four research questions in this study. The first question whether the employment of culturally laden Task-based language teaching is effective in improving speaking skill of intermediate students in Takestan University? There were two groups in this study, the experimental group (Task-based instruction), and control group (content-based instruction). During seven sessions of treatment, learners in experimental group received task-based instruction for learning speaking skill. Interviews, picture describing, information gap, picture narrating, storytelling, simulation, role play and story completion were tasks that learners in TBLT class have done them. By using independent sample t-test and matched t-test, we came to the conclusion that learners in experimental group which had received task-bask instruction have had improvement in their   speaking   ability.   Then   the   answer   to   first   question   is   yes.

The second question is content-based instruction effective in improving of students' speaking ability? To answer this question, learners in control group received seven sessions treatment through content-based instruction. Playing video, using website, using book and real people were techniques which used in this class. By using independent sample t-test and matched t-test, this result was found that learners in CBLT class have had improvement in speaking ability too. The third question is which instruction is more effective in teaching speaking specially for culture issues Task-based or Content-based instruction? The data obtained from statistic descriptive of Paired Samples on the post-test and Independent Samples t-Test for the performance of TBLT and CBLT on the post-test, we came to this conclusion that TBLT has outperformed better than of TBLT in teaching speaking skill.

The final question is about what are the attitudes of teacher and learners using task-based and content-based instruction in speaking classes? To answer to this question, both learners and teacher answered some questions about their attitudes of TBLT and CBLT when they were used in classes. The end result was that both learners and teacher has positive attitudes towards TBLT rather than CBLT.

Conclusions

The focus of this study was improving learner's ability in speaking proficiency through two different TBLT and CBLT methods. Speaking ability is that allows learners to have efficient communication.

Liao (2009) proposes that "Speaking is the skill that the students will be judged upon most in real-life situation. It is an important part of everyday interaction and most often the first impression of a person is based on his/her ability to speak fluently and comprehensibly (p.11).

According to Brown (1994), speaking is the most challenging skill for learners because it has a   set   of   features   that   characterize   oral   discourse. Curso (2012) outlines about the most difficult aspect of Spoken English "is that it is always accomplished via interaction with at least one other speaker and this is one reason why many of us were shocked and disappointed when we use our second or foreign language for the first time in the real interaction: we had not been prepared for spontaneous communication and

could not cope with all of its simultaneous demands (p.21). As we noticed in previous chapter, Iranian learners' performance in TBLT class was better than in CBLT class. Here are some points on strengths of TBLT: TBLT is designed to develop learners' abilities to engage in meaningful and fluent communication (Ellis, 2003).

TBLT therefore, lies on the belief that language is more than a system of rules, it is a 'dynamic resource for the creation of meaning' (Nunan, 2006, p. 6). Task-based approaches recognize that learning is controlled by internal processes (Skehan 1996a, cited in Townsend-Cartwright, 2014), and that learners do not move from being unable to use a syntactic form to mastery in one step, but pass through developmental stages of non-target like use (Long & Crookes 1992, cited in Townsend-Cartwright, 2014). As it mentioned in previous chapters, TBLT has three important phases: pre-task, task cycle and post task.

References

A Hasan .Ali Alsagheer. (2014). The effect of using task-based learning in Teaching English on the oral performance of the secondary school students. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, *3*(2), 250-264.
    Academic Affairs, Huainan Normal University, Huainan, China.
AdAms, R., & NewToN, J. (2009). TBLT in Asia: Constraints and opportunities. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *19*(1), 1-17.
Addison, N. M., & Walker, R. J. (2012). Contending with Content: Notes on Introducing a Content-based Instruction (CBI) Approach in a Media English Course for Third/Fourth Year Elective Students in a Japanese University. 文京学院大学外国語学部文京学院短期大学紀要, (11), 241-257.
Ahmed, M. I. (2013). Is Task-based Language Teaching'The Answer'?. *Language in India*, *13*(3).
Ajabshir, Z. F.(2014). *Content-Based Second Language Instruction.* International Journal of
Aliakbari, M., & Azizifar, A.(2015). The role of classroom interaction on improvement of speaking among Iranian EFL learners.
    and the Case for its Implementation. http://www.birmingham.ac.uk.
Azimi, F., Rahmani, R., & Sadeghi, B.(2014). The effect of Task-based Instruction and Content-based Intruction on the Comprehension and Production of Existential Constructios By Iranaians EFL Learners.
BANCIU, V., & Jireghie, A. (2012). Communicative language teaching. *Revista de Administratie Publica si Politici Sociale*, *8*.
Barnard, R., & Viet, N. G. (2010). Task-based language teaching (TBLT): A Vietnamese case study using narrative frames to elicit teachers' beliefs. *Language Education in Asia*, *1*(1), 77-86.
Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*.
Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Longman

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York, NY : Pearson Education.

Busse, V., & Krause, U. M. (2015). Addressing cultural diversity: effects of a problem-based intercultural learning unit. *Learning Environments Research*, *18*(3), 425.

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (2004). Culture and language learning: Teaching, research and scholarship. *Language teaching*, *37*(03), 149-168.

Cartwright, L. T,(2014). Analysis of the Task-Based Syllabus: Strengths, Weaknesses,

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied linguistics, 6(2), 5-35.

Choudhury, R. U. (2014). The role of culture in teaching and learning of English as a foreign language. *Jazan University: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Retrieved on 17th November*.

Chuange Ying.Y. (2010).*Task-based Language Approach to Teach EFL Speaking*. Chenge

Comer, W. (2007). Implementing Task-Based Teaching from the ground up: considerations for lesson planning and classroom practice. *Russian Language Journal/Русский язык*, *57*, 181-203.

Curso, T. F.(2011-2012). *The importance of teaching of listening and speaking skills.* Dpto.

Dai, L. (2011). Practical Techniques for Cultural-based Language Teaching in the EFL Classroom. Journal of Language Teaching & Research, 2(5).

Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content-and-language integrated learning: From practice to principles?. *Annual Review of applied linguistics*, *31*, 182-204.

Davies, S. (2003). Content based instruction in EFL contexts. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *9*(2), 24-28.

Dema, O., & Moeller, A. K. (2012). Teaching culture in the 21st century language classroom. didáctica de la lengua y la literatura.

Doganay, Y. (2014). The Impact of Cultural Based Activities in Foreign Language Teaching at Upper-Intermediate (B2) Level. SüleymanDemirel University: Kazakhstan. Retrieved on 14th June.

Dorathy, A. A., & Mahalakshmi, S. N. (2011). Second language acquisition through task-based approach–role-play in English language teaching. *English for Specific Purposes World*, *11*, 33.

Douglas, S. R., & Kim, M. (2015). Task-based language teaching and English for academic purposes: An investigation into instructor perceptions and practice in the Canadian context. *TESL Canada Journal*, *31*, 1.

Dueñas, M. (2009). The whats, whys, hows and whos of content-based instruction in second/foreign language education. *International journal of English studies*, *4*(1), 73-96.

Dupuy, B. C. (2000). Content-Based Instruction: Can it Help Ease the Transition from Beginning to Advanced Foreign Language Classes?. *Foreign language annals*, *33*(2), 205-223.

Ellis, R. (2002). The methodology of task-based teaching.

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

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 221-246.

Elmahdi, O. E. H. (2016). The Impact of Task-Based Approach on EFL Learner's Performance. *World Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(2), 301.

Elmes. D. (2013). *The Relationship between Language and Culture.* National Institute of

Eskey, D. (1992). Syllabus design in content-based instruction. *The CATESOL Journal*, *5*(1), 11-23.

Eyjólfsdóttir, T. (2011). Content-based instruction. A closer look at CBI in Iceland.

Farahani, A. A. K., & Nejad, M. S. K. (2009). A Study of Task-based Approach: The Effects of Task-based Techniques, Gender, and Different Levels of Language Proficiency on Speaking Development. *Pazhuhesh-e-Zabanha-ye Khareji*, *49*(4), 23-41.

Feryok, A. (2008). An Armenian English language teacher's practical theory of communicative language teaching. *System*, *36*(2), 227-240.
Fitness and Sports in Kanoya International Exchange and Language Education Center.

Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 Speaking Problems: Implications for ESL Curriculum Development in a Teacher Training Institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37*(1), 43-59.

Genc, B., & Bada, E. (2005). Culture in language learning and teaching. *The Reading Matrix*, *5*(1).

Genesee, F., & Lindholm-Leary, K. (2013). Two case studies of content-based language education. *Journal of Immersion and Content-Based Language Education*, *1*(1), 3-33.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (1997). Content-based instruction: Research foundations. *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content*, 5-21.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English (2nd ed.)*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

Heidari, A., Ketabi, S., & Zonoobi, R. (2014). The role of culture through the eyes of different approaches to and methods of foreign language teaching. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, (34).

Helen, Fs. (2012). *Speaking Your Mind. Bilingual Language, Culture, and Emotion*. Observer Vol.25, No.5 May/June, 2012.

Holmes, D. (2004). Speaking activities for the classroom. Chulalongkorn University Press.

Hommel, B., Colzato, L. S., & Van Den Wildenberg, W. P. (2009). How social are task representations?. *Psychological Science*, *20*(7), 794-798.
Humanities. Year49 No.198.

IBÁÑEZ, J. I. (2012). Teaching English As A Foreign Language and Culture of the English-Speaking Countries Through ICT In and Out Of Classroom Contexts.

Jack, R., & Richards, M. (2008). Teaching listening and speaking from theory to practice. *Cambridge University. Printed in The United States of America*.

Jacobs, G. M., & Farrell, T. S. (2003). Understanding and implementtng the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) paradigm. *RELC journal*, *34*(1), 5-30.

Juan-Garau, M., & Jacob, K. (2015). Developing English learners' transcultural skills through content-and task-based lessons. *System*, *54*, 55-68.

Kasap, B. (2005). *The effectiveness of task-based instruction in the improvement of learners' speaking skills* (Doctoral dissertation, Bilkent University).

Kay, P., & Kempton, W. (1984). What is the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis?. *American anthropologist*, *86*(1), 65-79.

Kayi, H. (2012). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *Новейшие научные достижения*, *12*(2012).

Kayi, H. (2012). Teaching speaking: Activities to promote speaking in a second language. *Новейшие научные достижения*, *12*(2012).

Khamkhien, A. (2010). Teaching English speaking and English speaking tests in the Thai context: A reflection from Thai perspective. *English Language Teaching*, *3*(1), 184.

Khan, I. (2013). Speaking skills and teaching strategies: The case of an EFL classroom. *Elixir International Journal*, *58*(10), 14557-14560.

Kitao, K. (1991). Teaching Culture in Foreign Language Instruction in the United States. *Doshisha studies in English*, *52*(53), 285-306.

Knight, B. (1992). Assessing speaking skills: a workshop for teacher development. *ELT Journal*, *46*(3), 294-302.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Kumagai, Y. (1994). The Effects of Culture on Language Learning and Ways of Communication: The Japanese Case.

Lazear, E. P. (1999). Culture and language. *Journal of political Economy*, *107*(S6), S95-S126.

Liao, G. (2009). Improvement of speaking ability through interrelated skills. *English language teaching*, *2*(3), 11.

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Littlewood, W. (2013). Developing a context-sensitive pedagogy for communication-oriented language teaching. *English Teaching*, *68*(3), 3-25.

Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. *Language policy and pedagogy: Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton*, 179-192.

Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL quarterly*, *26*(1), 27-56.

Maftoon, P., & Sarem, S. N. (2015). A critical look at the presentation, practice, production (ppp) approach: challenges and promises for ELT. *BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience*, *3*(4), 31-36.

Mahadi, T. S. T., & Jafari, S. M. (2012). Language and culture. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*.

Marsh, D., & Frigols Martín, M. J. (2012). Content and language integrated learning. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*.

Mayo, M. D. P. G. (2015). The interface between task-based language teaching and content-based instruction. *System*, (54), 1-3.

Mojavezi, A. (2013). The relationship between task repetition and language proficiency. *Applied Research on English Language*, *3*(1), 29-40.

Mörck Jansson, C. (2016). Teaching EFL to Newly Arrived Adolescents: A Literature Review on EFL Teaching in Multilingual Classrooms.

Navarro Romero, B. (2009). Improving speaking skills.

Navés, T. (2009). Effective content and language integrated learning (CLIL) programmes. *Content and language integrated learning: Evidence from research in Europe*, 22-40. New York: Newbury House.

Nemat Tabrizi.A.R& Nasiri. M. (2001). *The Effect of Using Task-Based Activities on Speaking Proficiency of EFL Learners*. The Asian Conference on Education.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology* (Vol. 192). New York: Prentice Hall.

Nunan, D. (2006). *Task-based language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Oradee, T. (2012). Developing speaking skills using three communicative activities (discussion, problem-solving, and role-playing). *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *2*(6), 533.

Oura, G. K. (2001). Authentic task-based materials: Bringing the real world into the classroom. *Sophia Junior College Faculty Bulletin*, *21*, 65-84.

ÖZÜORÇUN, F. (2014). Teaching culture as a fifth language skill. *Journal of International Social Research*, *7*(29).

Pessoa, S., Hendry, H., Donato, R., Tucker, G. R., & Lee, H. (2007). Content-based instruction in the foreign language classroom: A discourse perspective. *Foreign Language Annals*, *40*(1), 102-121.

Plews, J. L., & Zhao, K. (2010). Tinkering with tasks knows no bounds: ESL teachers' adaptations of task-based language-teaching. *TESL Canada Journal*, *28*(1), 41.

Powers, D. (2008). Task-Based Instruction: From Concepts to the Classroom. *Retrieved November 2 nd, 2012 from the web*.

Richards, J. C. (1984). The secret life of methods. *TESOL quarterly*, 7-23.

Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.

Richards, J. C., Rodgers, T. S., & 王才仁. (2000). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 外语教学与研究出版社.

Robinson, P. (2011). Task-based language learning: A review of issues. *Language Learning*, *61*(s1), 1-36.

Sabet, M. K., & Tahriri, A. (2014). The Impact of Task-based Approach on Iranian EFL Learners' Motivation in Writing Research Abstracts. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, *5*(4).

Saleng, M. (2014). The Implementation Of Video Learning to Improve Speaking Ability. *ELTS JOURNAL*, *2*(3).

Sárdi, C. (2002). On the relationship between culture and ELT. Studies about languages, 3, 101-107.

Seelye, H. N. (1974). *Teaching culture: Strategies for foreign language educators*. National Textbook Company.

Shabani, M. B. (2013). The effect of background knowledge on speaking ability of Iranian EFL learners. *language*, *1*(1), 25-33.

Shiu University.

Sim, M. A., & Pop, A. M. (2016). TEACHING SPEAKING SKILLS. THE ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ORADEA, 264.

Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genesee, F. (1989). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content in second/foreign language instruction. *Tesol Quarterly*, *23*(2), 201-217.

Stoller, F. L. (2002). Content-based instruction: A shell for language teaching or a framework for strategic language and content learning. *Retrieved June*, *16*, 2006.

Stoller, F. L. (2002). Content-based instruction: A shell for language teaching or a framework for strategic language and content learning. *Retrieved June*, *16*, 2006.

Stoller, F. L., & Grabe, W. (1997). A six-T's approach to content-based instruction. *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content*, 78-94.

Tang, R. (1999). The place of "culture" in the foreign language classroom: A reflection. *The Internet TESL Journal*, *5*(8), 1-2.

Thanasoulas, D. (2001). The importance of teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. *Radical pedagogy*, *3*(3), 1-25.

Thanghun, K. (2014). *Using of taks-based learning to development English speaking ability of prathom 6 students at Piboonprachasan School* (Doctoral dissertation).

Tinge, J. (2016). A Lesson Plan of TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching*)*. Office of

Torky, S. A. E. (2006). The Effectiveness of a Task-Based Instruction Program in Developing the English Language Speaking Skills of Secondary Stage Students. *Online Submission*.

Tsai, Y. L., & Shang, H. F. (2010). The impact of content-based language instruction on EFL students' reading performance. *Asian Social Science*, *6*(3), 77.

Tsiplakides, I., & Keramida, A. (2009). Helping students overcome foreign language speaking anxiety in the English classroom: Theoretical issues and practical recommendations. *International Education Studies*, *2*(4), 39.

Wang, Z. (2014). Developing accuracy and fluency in spoken English of Chinese EFL learners. English language teaching, 7(2), 110.

Willis, A. I. (2000). Critical Issue: Addressing Literacy Needs in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). Doing task-based teaching: A practical guide to task-based teaching for ELT training courses and practising teachers.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Some questions and answers. *The Language Teacher*, *33*(3), 3-8.

Willis, J. (1996). A flexible framework for task-based learning. *Challenge and change in* language teaching, 52-62.

Woods, D., & Çakır, H. (2011). Two dimensions of teacher knowledge: The case of communicative language teaching. *System*, *39*(3), 381-390.

Zohrabi. M., (2006). *Task-based language acquisition.* Journal Of Faculty of Letters and