English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol.31, No.2 Summer 2025
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2025.31.2.73

The Integration of Form and Meaning in English Language Education in Korea

Seong Man Park[*]
(Dankook University)
Il Suk Lee[**]
(Dankook University)

Park, Seong Man, & Lee, Il Suk. (2025). The integration of form and meaning in English language education in Korea. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 31*(2), 73-94.

This research explores the development of a balanced task-based instruction model for English as a Foreign Language, bridging the gap between purely task-based and structure-focused approaches. The model incorporates real-life tasks that allow learners to focus on grammatical forms while engaging in meaningful language practice. The study proposes a teaching framework that enables educators to create opportunities for learners to learn formal language structures within authentic, practical contexts, emphasizing the achievement of balance between fluency, accuracy, and complexity in language development. This study suggests that a balanced approach, which integrates attention to both form and meaning, can be particularly beneficial for English educators in Korea, as it helps learners develop their target language skills through meaningful, real-world activities. The practical implications of this research extend to both classroom instruction and curriculum design, offering concrete strategies for implementing a more effective and balanced approach to English language teaching in the Korean educational context. This methodology provides educators with a framework to support learners in achieving their language development goals while maintaining engagement with authentic language use, potentially addressing longstanding challenges in Korean EFL education. In doing so, it contributes to the broader discourse on effective language pedagogy in EFL settings.

[form-focused instruction/English as a foreign language in Korea/balanced teaching approach/language acquisition pedagogy]

---

[*] First author [**] Corresponding author

I. INTRODUCTION

This research focuses on designing task-based instruction for English as a foreign language, adopting a balanced approach between the purely task-based approach and the structure-oriented approach (Skehan, 2018). The proposed task enables learners to focus on form while engaging in meaningful language use, closely related to real-life activities.

In the field of second or foreign language education, the most traditional, influential and widespread teaching approach has been the presentation-based approach which consists of presentation, practice, and production (3Ps) (Skehan, 2018). This approach has been widely used in language classrooms around the world, especially for teaching simple language at lower levels (Tan, 2016). Although this approach appears to have given way to current communicative language teaching methods, it remains one of the most common and convenient approaches, primarily due to its established structure in teacher roles and training, clear accountability measures, and effectiveness in preparing students for examinations and textual analysis (Pratista, 2023; Skehan, 2001, 2018). This means that the 3Ps approach is useful for teachers in managing large groups of learners in the classroom and teach them. In addition, this approach provides teachers with clear and tangible objectives and convenient basis for evaluating the effectiveness of learners' language development (White, 1988). The traditional 3Ps approach implicitly assumes that learning occurs during the presentation stage, which is then refined into accuracy and fluency through the subsequent practice and production phases (Skehan, 2018). This approach, however, has been criticized for placing excessive emphasis on the final product while neglecting learners' interlanguage development, thereby hindering meaningful learning (Tan, 2016; White, 1988).

In response to these concerns, contemporary language education has increasingly shifted attention toward task-based language teaching (TBLT), which emphasizes learner engagement in communicative, real-world tasks. Unlike the 3Ps model, which may limit learners' exposure to authentic interaction, TBLT encourages the use of language as a tool for problem-solving, negotiation of meaning, and the achievement of practical goals. However, implementing TBLT in its pure form poses challenges in instructional design and assessment, especially in contexts where curricular goals and teacher training are aligned with more traditional methods (Mudinillah et al., 2024). This tension highlights the need for a hybrid model that integrates the strengths of both approaches while addressing their respective limitations.

In this context, the need for alternative approaches in second language education has been highlighted by several scholars (e.g., Skehan, 2001, 2018; Tan, 2016; White, 1988; Willis & Willis, 1996). As a result, Skehan (2001) advocates for task-based instruction, emphasizing "the viability of task-based teaching as an approach to instruction which is

theoretically defensible and practically feasible" (p. 95).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous scholars have argued that TBLT offers advantages over the traditional 3Ps approach (e.g., Borro, 2021; Pratista, 2023; Shintani, 2011). This instructional methodology fosters authentic communication by placing students at the center of the learning process. It enhances motivation and problem-solving skills through meaningful tasks, promotes the integration of language skills, develops fluency, and creates opportunities for meaning negotiation, ultimately improving real-world performance.

In task-based instruction pedagogy, two opposing approaches to task design have been proposed: the structure-oriented approach and the communication-driven approach. While there is general agreement that an intermediate task balancing form and meaning would be ideal, the debate between these contrasting approaches persists. An intermediate task design that effectively supports second or foreign language development has yet to be established.

Regarding the need for a balanced approach in designing and implementing task-based instruction, Skehan (2001, 2018) emphasizes the importance of finding a middle ground between two contrasting approaches: the structure-oriented task, which lacks naturalness, and the communication-driven task, which lacks control and clear structure. He highlights the necessity of adopting a task-based approach that preserves the naturalness of tasks while incorporating methods and task choices that facilitate a focus on form. Thus, this study seeks to bridge the gap between the two contrasting approaches while maximizing opportunities for learners to acquire the target language through meaningful activities that promote attention to both form and meaning, balancing naturalness with clear structure.

Before proceeding further, it is essential to define and clarify the term *task*. In language learning, the concept of a task has evolved through research emphasizing the importance of interactive communication (Moore, 2018). While definitions vary, several scholars (e.g., Breen, 1989; Ellis, 2018; Long, 2014; Samuda & Bygate, 2008; Skehan, 2001, 2018) have identified its key features.

To begin with, tasks function as structured learning plans. Breen (1989) distinguishes between the planned aspect of a task, which includes instructions and materials provided to learners, and the actual process of task completion, which involves interactions among the learner, the task itself, the learning environment, and individual perceptions. While this distinction primarily reflects the perspective of educators or task designers, both the planned and interactive aspects are essential for research and teaching.

Tasks also prioritize meaning-focused communication, often requiring problem-solving

while incorporating elements of form (Ellis, 2018). They also aim to simulate real-world language use, either through authentic activities or pedagogical exercises that encourage realistic communication (Ellis, 2018; Long, 2014). In addition, tasks engage learners in cognitive processes such as reasoning and problem-solving, which influence task complexity and language production (Samuda & Bygate, 2008). Furthermore, tasks yield specific communicative outcomes, resulting in tangible products, such as completed stories or lists (Ellis, 2018).

According to Skehan (2018), tasks in language learning are characterized by several key elements. First, they prioritize meaningful communication over pure form. Second, students must actively use the target language to resolve communicative challenges. Third, the activities closely mirror real-world situations. The focus remains on completing the task, with success measured by the final outcome. This conceptualization emphasizes how task-based language teaching values authentic communication, problem-solving, the use of language in realistic contexts, working toward specific goals, and evaluating based on results. Furthermore, it aligns with cognitive approaches to language learning, stressing tasks that engage learners in balancing accuracy, fluency, and complexity in language production. In this regard, Skehan's definition serves as the foundation for implementing task-based instruction in this research.

In recent years, a growing number of studies in the field of English language education have emphasized the significance of a balanced instructional model that incorporates both form-focused instruction and meaningful, communicative language use. For instance, a 2025 policy brief by the U.S. Department of Education underscores the importance of integrating content knowledge and language competence, rather than teaching grammar and vocabulary in isolation (U.S. Department of Education, 2024). According to the brief, effective instruction should involve authentic, content-rich tasks that necessitate real communication, while simultaneously offering explicit instruction in essential literacy components such as grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension. The recommendation is that explicit focus on form be embedded within broader communicative activities to foster the simultaneous development of fluency and accuracy.

Furthermore, recent discussions in the field advocate for increased attention to fluency within a balanced instructional framework. Conti (2025), for example, acknowledges the ongoing importance of grammar instruction but warns against allowing it to dominate classroom practice at the expense of extended, meaningful language use. He suggests that communicative tasks should incorporate language analysis and form-focused activities not as separate phases, but as integrated elements of task-based instruction. These views reflect a growing consensus in contemporary research: effective language teaching should harmonize structured form-focused instruction with opportunities for spontaneous, communicative engagement, ultimately supporting learners in achieving both linguistic

accuracy and confident language use in authentic contexts (Conti, 2025; U.S. Department of Education, 2024).

III. STATEMENT OF INQUIRY

Despite critiques, the 3Ps approach remains widely used in second language education due to its structured format, ease of application, and alignment with assessment systems (Mugableh & Khreisat, 2019). Teachers often favor it for managing large classrooms and ensuring measurable progress. However, scholars question its effectiveness in fostering communicative competence and deeper interlanguage development.

In response, educators are exploring hybrid models that merge the clarity of the 3Ps with the engagement of communicative and task-based methodologies. These blended strategies aim to support learner autonomy and real-world language use without abandoning instructional control and assessment clarity (Mugableh & Khreisat, 2019).

The context of English education in Korea illustrates these challenges vividly. Since the early 2000s, educational reforms have sought to transition from grammar-translation to Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) (Jeon, 2009, 2010). Despite ongoing curricular reforms and updated textbooks, traditional instructional practices such as exam-focused teaching continue to dominate classrooms in South Korea, largely due to entrenched systemic pressures. As a result, many educators report insufficient training in communicative pedagogy and face challenges in effectively implementing CLT strategies (McGrath, 2001). Although CLT has been promoted at the national policy level to enhance students' communicative competence in English, the grammar-translation method still prevails in both primary and secondary education (Rose, 2023). Given this context, the present study advocates for the integration of TBLT at the tertiary level, where learners are more likely to benefit from exposure to meaningful, real-world communication. This approach is especially pertinent in Korea, where English usage is largely restricted to classroom settings.

Korea is currently working to build an educational system capable of responding swiftly to societal changes (Kim, 2024). As part of this effort, the country continues to revise and enhance its English education framework, gradually shifting instructional approaches to emphasize the development of practical English skills that will benefit students in the future (Im & Son, 2024). The key challenge lies in maintaining a sustainable balance between preparing students for standardized exams and fostering authentic communicative abilities.

In this regard, this paper proposes a task-based instructional model that integrates the form-focused structure of the 3Ps with the meaningful interaction of TBLT at the college

level. Drawing on Skehan's (2001, 2018) framework, the study aims to provide practical solutions for language educators seeking to optimize learner engagement and linguistic development within real-world contexts.

IV. TASK

1. Overview of the Entire Class Session

The entire class session at the college level will be divided into four sub-sessions: Introduction and Brainstorming, 3 Tasks, Discussion, and Wrap-up. A total of 100 minutes will be allocated for the class, with 75 minutes dedicated to completing the three tasks (25 minutes per task). The session will follow the time frame outlined below (see Table 1):

TABLE 1
Timetable for the One Whole Class

Activity	Time
Introduction and Brainstorming: 1) 10-minute preparatory session 2) Teacher-led task introduction and explanation 3) Role preparation and activity overview 4) Real-life situation presentation	10 minutes
Task 1: Please refer to Table 2	25 minutes
Task 2: Please refer to Table 2	25 minutes
Task 3: Please refer to Table 2	25 minutes
Discussion: 1) Recording review 2) Group feedback exchange 3) Teacher consultation	10 minutes
Wrap-up: 1) Session summary 2) Teacher wrap-up 3) Class conclusion	5 minutes
Total	100 minutes

2. Organization of Three Task Phases

A task that enables learners to effectively balance a focus on both form and meaning is implemented. The following task is designed to teach the use of three verb tenses (i.e., the past tense, past perfect tense, and simple present tense), along with related expressions, in conversations based on real-life situations. This task is intended for beginner-level college

students who aim to improve their proficiency in English conversation and communicate effectively in real-world contexts.

To avoid situations where learners become overly reliant on lexicalized language, vague or unclear communication, and communication strategies, the task topic was chosen based on common real-life situations that involve immediate information (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Robinson, 2001). The topic was selected with consideration of the appropriate task difficulty level for beginner-level college students.

As mentioned above, this task will be carried out in three phases: the pre-task phase, the during-task phase, and the post-task phase. The task group will consist of three members: a husband, his wife, and a plumber, each playing a respective role. While all participants' roles are important, the main focus of the task will be on the husband's performance. To ensure that every group member can participate and practice their role in solving the everyday problem presented in the task, the roles will be rotated.

For the implementation of each task in this study, the three-phase approach (i.e., Pre-task, During-task, & Post-task) will be used. Each task (i.e., Task 1, Task 2, & Task 3) will follow the sub-time frame outlined below, with 25 minutes allocated to each task (see Table 2):

TABLE 2
Timetable for the Three Task Phases

Phase	Time
The pre-task phase: 1) Teaching 2) Consciousness Raising Activity 3) Planning	5 minutes
The during-task phase: 1) Sample discourse provision 2) Three-member task performance 3) Role-based interaction (husband, wife, plumber or task recorder) 4) Performance recording	15 minutes (5 minutes each for 3 members' role playing)
The post-task phase: 1) Transcription review 2) Performance reflection	5 minutes
Total time required for each task	25 minutes

1) The Pre-Task Phase

Pre-task activities will include "Teaching, Consciousness Raising Activity, and Planning" (Skehan, 2001, p. 139).

Teaching: Before the task, grammatical rules specifically related to the use of the past tense, past perfect tense, and simple present tense will be explained to learners who are not familiar with these rules. This will help them formulate their discourse during the actual task according to the provided rules without hindering their meaningful communication.

Consciousness Raising Activity: In this phase, learners will be given pictures, expressions, and vocabulary relevant to the activity. Prior exposure to these materials will

ease their cognitive processing load and activate relevant schemas, helping them engage more effectively when the real task is introduced.

Planning: Learners will be given a real-life situation, but no additional guidance will be provided to encourage stronger accuracy in their task performance.

2) The During-Task Phase

A sample discourse with correct verb tenses will be provided to learners before each task. Three members (i.e., a husband, his wife, and a task recorder) will perform the task together. During the task, one member will be required to record their performance for later analysis. Throughout the task, the teacher's role is to circulate around the class and assist learners in maintaining correct grammar with minimal interference, allowing them to focus on their conversation. After completing the role-playing portion of the task, learners will draft, revise, and practice for the upcoming post-task activities (2001). This activity enables learners to review their performance in terms of form, grammar, and meaning with one another. Since this task is based on a familiar real-life situation, teachers should prioritize fluency and accuracy over complexity during the task.

3) The Post-Task Phase

During this phase, learners will analyze their transcriptions from the previous task phases, focusing on both communicative effectiveness and grammatical form. This phase offers an opportunity for learners to reflect on and consolidate their learning, helping them restructure their understanding in a way that is likely to promote language development.

3. Implementation of The Real Task

Before the real task, a ten-minute preparation time will be allocated for introduction and brainstorming. During this period, the teacher will explain the task and each activity in general, ensuring that learners are prepared for their roles and activities during the task. The following real-life task situation will be provided to help the learners get ready for the task.

1) Task Situation

Task Title: What Happened to the Kitchen?

> One day, the kitchen tap started dripping, and the drain became clogged. No one noticed the leak at first, so the water kept dripping slowly. By the time you

> discovered it, the situation had already worsened. The sink was overflowing, and water had spread across the entire kitchen floor. Alarmed by the mess, you quickly grabbed some towels to soak up the water, but it was no use. The water kept flowing. To make matters worse, your wife, who was skilled at fixing these kinds of problems, was not at home, and unfortunately, you were not very handy. Still, determined to take control of the situation, you decided to fix the problem yourself. You rushed to the garage, found a wrench and a toolbox, and returned to the kitchen. However, instead of stopping the leak, you mistakenly adjusted the wrong part of the faucet, making things far worse. Suddenly, water started spraying in all directions, drenching the kitchen even more. Now, with the mess growing bigger and no immediate help available, you are faced with a difficult decision. Should you keep trying to fix the problem yourself, risking further damage, or should you admit that you need help and call a professional plumber? At the same time, you also have to figure out how to explain the situation to your wife, who might not be too happy about the disaster in the kitchen. (Jeong, 2002, p. 87)

(* The content of the task described here was referenced the book, TSE PREP by Jeong, 2002, p. 87, but has been reinterpreted and modified by the author.)

Imagine that this situation happened to you in real life.

(1) Task 1: Explaining a Past Event Using the Past Tense

Situation 1: Your wife has just arrived home and discovered the mess in the kitchen. You must explain to her exactly what happened and what you did.

① Pre-Task Activity

The teacher will explain the grammatical elements related to the past tense and provide an example discourse for the learners.

> Use of the past tense: The past tense is used to express actions or situations that occurred at a definite point in the past, even if no specific time expression is given. It can describe a single completed action, repeated actions that happened in the past but no longer occur, or the duration of an activity that was finished in the past (Frank, 1993, p. 72).

② During-Task Activity

Before the task, learners will be given a condensed sample discourse that highlights the correct use of verb tenses, specifically the past tense, to support them in completing the activity.

Example dialogue

> Wife: Oh no! What a disaster! What happened in the kitchen?
> Husband: I'm so sorry, honey. I just wanted to fix it myself. When I walked in, the kitchen was already flooded. So, I tried to stop it. I went to the garage, grabbed my wrench and toolbox, and came back. Using the toolbox, I tried to adjust the valve on the leaky faucet because I thought there was an issue. But it didn't work. So, I attempted to adjust another part of the valve, but that didn't help either. I really thought I could fix it on my own. Anyway, I did my best.
> Wife: I appreciate your effort, but we should have called a plumber right away. Did you at least turn off the water supply?
> Husband: Yes, I did, but only after I realized that my attempts weren't working. By then, the water had already spread across the floor. (Jeong, 2002, p. 87)

Two members will participate in this task, taking on the roles of a husband and his wife, respectively. The third member will be responsible for recording their performance. After completing the role-playing activity, learners will draft and revise their dialogues based on their performance and prepare for the upcoming post-task activity.

③ Post-Task Activity

During this phase, learners will analyze the transcriptions they drafted and revised in the previous task phase. They will then practice them, focusing on both communicative effectiveness and grammatical accuracy.

(2) Task 2: Apologizing to Your Wife Using the Past Perfect Tense

Situation 2: After explaining to your wife what you did to fix the leaky faucet, she becomes upset because this is not the first time you have caused a similar problem. She already knew that you were not very handy and had repeatedly asked you not to attempt these kinds of repairs. Now, you must explain what you had tried to do and ask for her forgiveness.

① Pre-Task Activity

The teacher will explain the grammatical elements related to the past perfect tense and provide an example discourse to guide the learners.

> Use of the past perfect tense: The past perfect tense is used to show that one action happened before another event in the past. It is always related to a particular moment in the past, whether that moment is clearly mentioned or just understood from context. This tense often helps to show the sequence of events in a past narrative. In addition, learners will be introduced to the use of the past perfect tense in past unreal conditional sentences. In these cases, the past perfect tense can appear in if clauses to describe imagined or contrary-to-fact situations. Furthermore, learners will also learn the structure *should have + past participle*, which is used to express advice or obligation related to past actions. This will help the, gain a deeper understanding of how to convey past events and their possible outcomes (Frank, 1993, p. 82).

② During-Task Activity

Before the task, learners will be provided with a condensed sample discourse that demonstrates the correct use of verb tenses, specifically the past perfect tense, to guide them in completing the activity.

Example dialogue

> Wife: If I had been here, I could have stopped this mess from happening.
> Husband: No, actually, by the time I walked into the kitchen, it had already been flooded. I just wanted to take care of it myself.
> Wife: I don't think so. Since you didn't call a plumber right away, you made the situation even worse.
> Husband: I'm really sorry about that. Honestly, I shouldn't have attempted to fix it on my own.
> Wife: Alright. Then what should you have done to avoid this disaster?
> Husband: Well, first of all, I should have contacted a plumber and explained the issue. The plumber could have easily guided me on how to fix the leaky faucet. If I had done that, I wouldn't have flooded the entire kitchen. I shouldn't have acted so hastily. Looking back, that was my biggest mistake, and it's something I should have avoided.

> Wife: Exactly. If you had asked for help earlier, we wouldn't have had to deal with this huge mess now.
> Husband: I know. By the time I realized my mistake, the damage had already been done. Next time, I'll make sure to call a professional right away. (Jeong, 2002, p. 87)

Two members will participate in this task, assuming the roles of a wife and her husband, respectively. The third member will be responsible for recording their performance. After completing the role-playing, learners will draft and revise their dialogues based on what they did during the task and then practice for the upcoming post-task activity.

③ Post-Task Activity

During this phase, learners will analyze the transcriptions they drafted and revised in the previous task phase. They will then practice these transcriptions, focusing on both communicative effectiveness and grammatical accuracy.

(3) Task 3: Calling a Plumber and Persuading Him to Come Today Using the Simple Present Tense

Situation 3: Finally, you decide to call a plumber. After making the call, you learn that he doesn't have time at the moment and cannot repair the faucet until tomorrow. In this situation, you need to call the plumber again and try to persuade him to come to your house immediately.

① Pre-Task Activity

The teacher will explain the grammatical elements related to the simple present tense and provide an example discourse for learners. In this task, the learners will need to persuade the plumber to come to the house over the phone, using the simple present tense in an urgent and courteous tone.

> Use of the simple present tense: The simple present tense is used to describe actions that happen routinely or facts that are generally true. It is often used with non-action verbs, particularly those that express states or conditions. These verbs typically refer to continuous situations that do not have a clear starting or ending point (Frank, 1993, p. 67).

② During-Task Activity

Before the task, learners will be provided with a condensed, desirable sample discourse that demonstrates the correct use of the simple present tense in this task.

Example dialogue

> Plumber: Hello, how can I help you, sir?
> Husband: Hi, I'm one of your customers, and I'm having a problem. I'm calling about my leaky faucet. Would you be able to come over and fix it now if it's not too much trouble?
> Plumber: I'm sorry, sir. I can't come right now. I have other work to finish by tomorrow.
> Husband: I understand you're busy, but I really need you to come and fix this issue as soon as possible. I can't wait until tomorrow because I need to use my kitchen tap. I've invited all my friends for my son's birthday party tomorrow, so it's urgent that this gets fixed today. Please consider my situation. I'm in desperate need of your help. Look, I'm willing to pay extra or cover overtime to get you here now. Besides, I'm sure this is a quick and simple job for you. Please don't make me call someone else. I'd rather have you do it. So, please come as soon as you can. I'd really appreciate it.
> Plumber: I understand your urgency, sir. Let me check my schedule and see if I can rearrange some appointments. If I find a way to come earlier, I'll call you back within the next hour.
> Husband: That sounds great. I really appreciate your help. I'll be waiting for your call. (Jeong, 2002, p. 87)

Two members will participate in this task, taking on the roles of a plumber and a husband, respectively. The third member will record their performance. After completing the role-playing, learners will draft and revise their dialogues based on the task and then practice for the upcoming post-task activity.

③ Post-Task Activity

During this phase, learners will analyze the transcriptions they have drafted and revised in the previous task phase. They will then practice these transcriptions, focusing on both communicative effectiveness and grammatical accuracy.

4. Wrap-up

After completing all three tasks, a ten-minute discussion period will be assigned. During this time, learners will share their drafts and recordings with other groups to receive feedback from their peers, as well as from the teacher. Following the discussion, a five-minute period will be allocated for the teacher to wrap up the entire class session.

V. DISCUSSIONS

1. The Role of Task Repetition in Language Learning

After completing the tasks, learners will be encouraged to regularly repeat the same tasks, such as once a week or twice a month, under the teacher's guidance. The purpose of this repetition is to reduce the cognitive load and help achieve a balance between complexity, fluency, and accuracy. By engaging in repeated tasks, learners will benefit from a cyclical approach to task-based activities, as proposed by Bygate (1996). He argues that redoing a task contributes to greater organization and purposefulness, with repeated performances encouraging a more syntactic mode of thinking. This allows learners to self-correct and refine their language use over time.

It is essential that the teacher carefully organizes these repeated activities to monitor progress effectively. The teacher should assess both what has been accomplished and what areas still need attention. This process can be facilitated through a "monitoring cycle," (Skehan, 2001, p. 151) which should be a collaborative effort between the teacher and the learners. The monitoring cycle should be a joint construction, where both the teacher and the learner engage in ongoing reflection and feedback.

Furthermore, learners should be encouraged to evaluate their own progress in language learning. By participating in this ongoing evaluation, students develop the analytical skills necessary to recognize their own strengths and weaknesses. This self-reflection is important for fostering learner autonomy and establishing sustainable language development practices that extend beyond the classroom environment. It helps them identify areas where they struggled previously and recognize what they still need to focus on for future learning. By fostering this kind of self-assessment, learners become more autonomous in their language development, taking an active role in shaping their learning path.

Overall, the iterative nature of task repetition can make progressive learning possible, where each repetition builds upon previous performances, reinforcing acquired knowledge while introducing opportunities for expansion and refinement.

2. Assessment Challenges in Task-Based Instruction Approaches

Task-based language teaching has emerged as a significant approach in English language education, emphasizing authentic communication over isolated language components (e.g., Borro, 2021; Pratista, 2023; Skehan, 2018). However, a critical misalignment exists between this teaching methodology and current assessment practices (e.g., Mudinillah et al., 2024; Youn, 2024).

Mudinillah et al. (2024) highlight several key assessment challenges in this approach. First, traditional assessment methods continue to prioritize discrete language elements, such as grammar and vocabulary. As a result, they often fail to evaluate students' ability to use language in real-world contexts. This fundamental disconnect undermines the core principles of task-based instruction, which aim to develop practical communicative competence. As this methodology gains traction globally, the need for appropriate evaluation tools becomes increasingly urgent.

Second, the implementation of task-based approaches varies considerably across cultural contexts. Educational settings that emphasize student-centered approaches typically align well with task-based principles, encouraging autonomy and active participation. In contrast, more traditional educational environments often struggle to integrate these communicative methods with established teacher-centered methodologies. These differences underscore the need for contextually sensitive implementation and assessment approaches.

Finally, the lack of standardized evaluation frameworks for task-based language instruction has led to inconsistent measurement practices. This lack of uniformity makes meaningful comparisons between studies challenging and complicates efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of these approaches comprehensively. Without reliable assessment tools, the true impact of task-oriented teaching remains difficult to quantify.

Thus, in upcoming research, scholars should prioritize developing assessment strategies that authentically reflect the communicative objectives of task-based methodologies while remaining adaptable to diverse educational environments. By creating comprehensive evaluation frameworks that balance linguistic competence with practical language application, educators can gather valuable insights to enhance curriculum design and teaching practices both in Korean EFL contexts and throughout the global language education community.

3. Application of Technology in Online Technology-mediated Task-Based Language Teaching

Future research should investigate the possibilities of incorporating online technology into task-based English teaching. The integration of online technology into TBLT offers

valuable opportunities to enhance language learning by making tasks more interactive, authentic, and learner-centered. Online technologies such as virtual reality environments, collaborative documents, and gamified applications allow learners to engage in problem-solving and communication activities that closely resemble real-world language use beyond the classroom (González-Lloret & Ortega, 2017; Vellanki & Bandu, 2021). These technologies not only create immersive environments but also foster collaboration, sometimes even facilitating interactions with native speakers or international peers. Research shows that technology-mediated tasks can increase learners' motivation, lower anxiety, and foster creativity by providing a safe space to experiment with language, thus extending learning opportunities beyond what is possible in traditional classroom settings (Chong & Reinders, 2020).

Moreover, online technologies support personalized and adaptive learning by offering instant feedback and allowing tasks to be tailored to individual learners' needs and proficiency levels (Chong & Reinders, 2020; Vellanki & Bandu, 2021). Digital tools such as language learning apps, virtual reality simulations, and collaborative tools can provide adaptive learning experiences, automatic corrections, and opportunities for peer collaboration, promoting learner autonomy and engagement. Successful implementation, however, requires clear task design, adequate scaffolding, and teacher support to ensure that learners are not overwhelmed by technological challenges and can fully benefit from the interactive and communicative potential of online TBLT (Chong & Reinders, 2020; Vellanki & Bandu, 2021). The thoughtful integration of online technology into TBLT can transform language classrooms into dynamic and immersive learning environments.

According to González-Lloret and Ortega (2014), technology can be integrated into education using any task-based model, but achieving full integration requires three essential elements. First, it is crucial to differentiate between tasks and conventional exercises or activities. In digital learning environments, tasks should prioritize meaning over form, center on the learner, and reflect learners' needs, interests, and digital skills. These tasks should promote higher order thinking through authentic language use and reflective learning. Second, technology should be recognized as a non-neutral tool that introduces real-world tasks that should become core components of curriculum design. Educators should employ technology thoughtfully and intentionally to enhance, rather than merely supplement, education. Third, technology needs to be integrated throughout the entire TBLT process, from needs analysis to evaluation.

When these principles are applied, a collaborative, technology-mediated approach can effectively enhance learners' language abilities and maximize the benefits of technology-enriched language learning.

VI. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study presents a practical English language task based on Skehan's (2001, 2018) principles, aiming to balance form and meaning in task-based instruction. The task aims to incorporate attention to form without disrupting meaningful communication among learners. By doing so, it provides a realistic and practical framework for learners to apply target language structures, particularly verb tenses, in authentic situations.

The task emphasizes learner familiarity with real-life language use, encouraging negotiation of meaning as suggested by Plough and Gass (1993). This approach aligns with Skehan's (2001) assertion that balancing fluency, accuracy, and complexity maximizes the chances of effectively focusing on both form and meaning. To address the challenge of achieving this balance, the study incorporates a repetition strategy (Bygate, 1996), aiming to harmonize accuracy, fluency, and complexity.

However, achieving perfect equilibrium among these three factors remains challenging. The task appears to prioritize accuracy and fluency, with complexity addressed through repeated task performance and the monitoring cycle concept (Skehan, 2001). This study proposes that successful implementation of the monitoring cycle requires balanced collaboration between teachers and learners, as well as active and voluntary learner engagement.

While the task offers several benefits, it is important to consider potential difficulties, limitations, and constraints when applying it to English language classes in Korea.

A significant challenge in TBLT is the assessment process, including the continued reliance on traditional methods that prioritize discrete language elements over real-world communication skills, thereby undermining the core principles of TBLT approaches. In addition, cultural differences also affect TBLT implementation, with student-centered approaches aligning well with its principles, while teacher-centered systems face difficulties in adaptation (Mudinillah et al., 2024). The absence of standardized evaluation frameworks further complicates efforts to measure the effectiveness of TBLT approaches consistently. To address these issues, researchers must develop assessment strategies that authentically reflect the communicative goals of TBLT approaches while remaining adaptable across diverse educational contexts, ultimately enhancing curriculum design and teaching practices worldwide.

Another primary challenge lies in achieving and maintaining the perfect balance between attention to grammatical forms and meaningful communication throughout the task. The study suggests that the task focuses more on accuracy and fluency, potentially neglecting complexity. Developing all three aspects (i.e., accuracy, fluency, and complexity) simultaneously may prove difficult, especially within the constraints of a single task. In addition, the study emphasizes that perfect balance can only be achieved through balanced

collaboration between teachers and learners, which might be challenging to establish and maintain in some classroom contexts.

The effectiveness of the task may vary depending on learners' proficiency levels, with lower-level learners potentially struggling with the demands of focusing on both form and meaning simultaneously. Time constraints could also pose a significant challenge, as implementing the repetition strategy and monitoring cycle may require substantial class time, which could be difficult to accommodate in curriculum-driven educational settings. Furthermore, while the task aims to balance various language aspects, assessing learners' progress across all these dimensions may be complex and time-consuming for teachers.

Implementing this balanced approach effectively may require specialized training for educators, which could be a constraint in some educational contexts. The effectiveness of the task might also be limited in large classes, where individual monitoring and feedback become more challenging. Lastly, the real-life focus of the task may need adaptation to ensure cultural relevance and appropriateness in different EFL contexts, particularly in Korea.

Another limitation of this study is the limited exploration of the role of technology in task-based language teaching within the instructional design of the task. While some research has addressed the use of technology in task-based learning, more in-depth studies are needed to understand how digital tools can be effectively integrated (Mudinillah et al., 2024). Given the increasing prevalence of digital platforms in language education, it is crucial to explore how technology can enhance task-based activities. Digital tools present unique opportunities to facilitate authentic language tasks, deliver immediate feedback, and foster immersive learning environments that traditional task-based methodologies may not fully provide. Developing frameworks for technology-enhanced task-based language instruction is not only advantageous but also essential for practical application. Therefore, future research should investigate the impact of various technologies on key aspects of task-based approaches in language education, such as task design, implementation approaches, assessment techniques, and learner engagement.

Finally, the primary limitation of this study lies in its focus on instructional design without providing empirical evidence from actual classroom implementation, such as through a pilot study. As the proposed task-based instruction has not yet been tested in practice, its effectiveness remains theoretical. Therefore, follow-up research is necessary to evaluate the outcomes of this instructional model in real educational settings. Specifically, further studies should be conducted involving Korean university students to empirically verify the applicability, effectiveness, and pedagogical impact of the proposed approach. Such research will help determine how well the designed tasks support learners' communicative competence and engagement with both form and meaning in authentic contexts.

By acknowledging and addressing these potential difficulties and constraints, educators can better prepare for implementing this balanced task-based approach in their English language classes within the Korean EFL context. This awareness allows teachers to maximize the benefits of the task while mitigating potential challenges, ultimately leading to more effective language instruction and learning outcomes.

In conclusion, this task-based approach offers a valuable framework for English language instruction in Korea, potentially bridging the gap between form-focused and meaning-focused learning. By addressing the identified challenges and continuing to refine the balance between linguistic components, this method can contribute to more effective and engaging English language education in Korea. The integration of authentic, goal-oriented tasks provides students with meaningful contexts to develop their communicative competence while still maintaining attention to grammatical accuracy. Furthermore, when properly adapted to the Korean educational context, TBLT can help learners develop the confidence and skills needed for real-world language use while respecting cultural expectations and institutional requirements. With thoughtful implementation, ongoing professional development for educators, and appropriate modifications to evaluation practices, this approach has the potential to transform the landscape of English language education in Korea, preparing learners more effectively for both academic success and global communication needs.

REFERENCES

Borro, I. (2021). Comparing the effectiveness of task-based language teaching and presentation-practice-production on second language grammar learning. In M. J. Ahmadian & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of task-based language teaching* (pp. 549-565). Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R. K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum*. Cambridge University Press.

Bygate, M. (1996). Effects of task repetition: Appraising the developing language of learners. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language tea*ching (pp. 136-146). Heinemann.

Chong, S. W., & Reinders, H. (2020). Technology-mediated task-based language teaching: A qualitative research synthesis. *Language Learning and Technology*, *24*(3), 70-86. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/44739

Conti, G. (2025, March 16). Grammar is essential, but fluency should take priority: A research-based perspective. *The Language Gym*. https://gianfrancoconti.com/

2025/03/16/grammar-is-essential-but-fluency-should-take-priority-a-research-based-perspective/

Ellis, R. (2018). *Reflections on task-based language learning and teaching*. Multilingual Matters.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning on performance in task-based learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*(3), 299-324.

Frank, M. (1993). *Modern English: A practical reference guide*. Prentice Hall.

González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (2014). Towards technology-mediated TBLT: An introduction. In M. González-Lloret & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Technology-mediated TBLT: researching technology and tasks* (pp. 1-22). John Benjamins.

González-Lloret, M., & Ortega, L. (2017). Technology for task-based language teaching. In C. Chapelle & S. Sauro (Eds.), *The handbook of technology and second language teaching and learning* (pp. 237-254). Wiley. https://www.lrc.columbia.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2017-Technology-for-TBLT-In-Chapelle-Sauro.pdf

Im, H. J., & Son, H. J. (2024). A study on the effectiveness of PBL for English presentation in general English classes. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 30*(3), 109-127. https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2024.30.3.109

Jeon, J. (2009). Key issues in applying the communicative approach in Korea: Follow up after 12 years of implementation. *English Teaching, 64*(4), 123-150.

Jeon, J. (2010). Issues for English tests and assessments: A view from Korea. *Language Assessment in Asia: Local, Regional or Global, 4*, 53-77.

Jeong, C. (2002). *TSE PREP*. Nexus.

Kim, J. E. (2024). Development and application of the HC-TPACK model: A focus on integrating English education with technology utilization and human competency development. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 30*(1), 25-39. https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2024.30.1.25

Long, M. (2014). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.

McGrath, S. (2001). Communicative language teaching in Korean public schools. *The Korea TESOL Journal, 5*(2), 1-6.

Moore, P. J. (2018). Task-based language teaching (TBLT). In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-7). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0175

Mudinillah, A., Rahmi, S. N., & Taro, N. (2024). Task-based language teaching: A systematic review of research and applications. *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies, 3*(2), 102-115. https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i2.1352

Mugableh, A. I., & Khreisat, M. N. (2019). Employing TBL and 3PS learning approaches to improve writing skill among Saudi EFL students in Jouf University. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 2(1), 217-229.

Plough, L., & Gass, S. M. (1993). Interlocutor and task familiarity: Effects on interactional structure. In G. Crookes & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning* (pp. 35-56). Multilingual Matters.

Pratista, G. Y. (2023). Presentation practice production vs task-based language teaching: A comparison of two teaching templates. *EDUPEDIA, 7*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.24269/ed.v7i1.1726

Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task productions: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics, 22*(1), 27-57.

Rose, R. S. (2023). *English Communication in Korean Education* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Johns Hopkins University.

Samuda, V., & Bygate, M. (2008). *Tasks in second language learning*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Shintani, N. (2011). Task-based language teaching versus traditional production-based instruction: Do they result in different classroom processes? *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 6*, 97-120.

Skehan, P. (2001). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Skehan, P. (2018). *Second language task-based performance: Theory, research, assessment*. Routledge.

Tan, Z. X. (2016). Cultural resistance to imported pedagogy: The case of task-based language teaching in English class in China. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research, 4*(2), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.31686/ijier.vol4.iss2.510

U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. (2024). *Implementing evidence-based instructional practices for English learners*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learners-brief.pdf

Vellanki, S. S., & Bandu, S. (2021). Engaging students online with technology-mediated task-based language teaching. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid 19 Challenges,* (1)*,* 107-126. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid.8

White, R. (1988). *The ELT curriculum*. Blackwell.

Willis, D., & Willis, J. (1996). Consciousness-raising activities. In D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching*. Macmillan Heinemann.

Youn, S. J. (2024). Language assessment ecology of a localized task-based classroom: The case of Korean EFL pre-service teachers. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 24*, 460-482. https://doi.org/ 10.15738/kjell.24..202405.460

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Seong Man Park (professor)
Dept. of English Language, College of Foreign Languages
Dankook University
118, Dandae-ro, Dongnam-gu, Cheonan-si, Chungnam, 31116, Korea
Email: seongmanpark@dankook.ac.kr

Il Suk Lee (professor)
Dept. of English Language, College of Foreign Languages
Dankook University
118, Dandae-ro, Dongnam-gu, Cheonan-si, Chungnam, 31116, Korea
Email: lis213@dankook.ac.kr

Received : April 10, 2025
Reviewed : June 2, 2025
Revised version received : June 25, 2025