หน้าสรุปโครงการ ทุนพัฒนาศักยภาพในการทำงานวิจัยของอาจารย์รุ่นใหม่

1. **ชื่อโครงการ (ภาษาไทย)**   อิทธิพลของวิธีการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแบบทาสท์เบสที่มีต่อความสามารถ
   ทางภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับมหาวิทยาลัย

   (ภาษาอังกฤษ)   The Effects of Task-based Instruction on Thai University Students'
   English Language Proficiency

2. **ชื่อหัวหน้าโครงการ หน่วยงานที่สังกัด ที่อยู่ หมายเลขโทรศัพท์ โทรสาร และ e-mail**

ชื่อและสกุล	ดร. จิราพร แสงอรุณ
	Dr. Jiraporn Sangarun
สถานที่ติดต่อ	สาขาวิชาภาษาอังกฤษ
	สำนักวิชาเทคโนโลยีสังคม
	มหาวิยาลัยเทคโนโลยีสุรนารี
	นครราชสีมา 30000
โทรศัพท์	(044) 22 4363
โทรสาร	(044) 22 4205
e-mail address	sangarun@ccs.sut.ac.th

3. **สาขาวิชาที่ทำการวิจัย**   การสอนภาษาอังกฤษ

4. **งบประมาณทั้งโครงการ**   480,000 บาท

5. **ระยะเวลาดำเนินงาน**   2 ปี

6. **ได้เสนอโครงการนี้ หรือโครงการที่มีส่วนเหมือนกับเรื่องนี้บางส่วนเพื่อขอทุนต่อแหล่งทุนอื่นที่ใดบ้าง**

   เสนอต่อ สำนักงานคณะกรรมการวิจัยแห่งชาติ (ทุนการวิจัยประจำปีงบประมาณ 2547)

   ชื่อโครงการที่เสนอ อิทธิพลของวิธีการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแบบทาสท์เบสที่มีต่อความสามารถ
   ทางภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับมหาวิทยาลัย

   กำหนดทราบผล (หรือสถานภาพที่ทราบ) ประมาณ 30 ตุลาคม 2546 หากได้รับทุนพัฒนาศักยภาพใน
   การทำงานวิจัยของอาจารย์รุ่นใหม่จะขอถอนใบสมัครจากทุน
   ของสำนักงานคณะกรรมการวิจัยแห่งชาติ

7. ปัญหาที่ทำการวิจัย และความสำคัญของปัญหา

Most Thai university students have studied English for eight years before they begin their tertiary education, where they normally take two to five compulsory English courses in their first and second years. Some also take a few elective courses after they have finished the compulsory ones. Even with considerable study of English most of them do not satisfactorily acquire the desired competence. In terms of my teaching experience, I realize that one of the crucial problems facing English instruction in Thai universities is the implementation of traditional teaching methods that do not provide sufficient conditions for learning the target language. This is because the traditional teaching methods are usually organized around words, structures, notions, functions, topics, or situations which are the units of learning that have little support from research as "meaningful acquisition units from a language learner's perspective" (Long & Crookes, 1992, p.27). For a few decades, many researchers, syllabus designers and educational innovators have propounded a task-based approach to instruction as a method to clear up the deficit of using the above-mentioned units of learning and as an approach that has high potential to promote second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learning (Prabhu, 1987; Long & Crookes, 1992; Thomson, 1992; Clayton, 1995; Skehan, 1996; Willis, 1996). To increase the efficiency of English language teaching (ELT) in Thai university English language classrooms, it would be valuable to implement the task-based approach to instruction. However, the task-based approach is still not widely implemented in Thai university classrooms because there is little research demonstrating its potential in the context of English language teaching in Thailand. As a result, there is an urgent need for such research to be carried out.

Although task-based instruction has been proposed for some time, it is still not significantly implemented in the Thai context as attested by the lack of published literature in the field. To fill this gap, this study will replicate and extend previous research that was conducted to test the efficiency of task-based instruction; however, it will extend previous research in significant ways. First, this study will follow a longitudinal approach, while most of the previous research tends to rely on a cross-sectional approach. Second, it will investigate not only the effect of task-based instruction, but also: (1) the effects of learners' proficiency levels; (2) the effects of group participation patterns; (3) the interaction effect between the task-based instruction and group participation patterns and learners' proficiency levels; and (4) the attitude of teachers and learners towards task-based instruction. Third, this study will rely on a triangulation research approach; it will combine both quantitative and qualitative methodology in its process. As a result, it will allow a more confident interpretation of the research data as well as a wider and deeper understanding of efficiency of task-based instruction and its feasibility in a Thai university English teaching context.

8. วัตถุประสงค์

This study aims to examine and describe the efficiency and feasibility of the task-based approach to instruction in the context of English language teaching in a Thai university.

9. ระเบียบวิธีวิจัย

There are three main key concepts in this study: (1) task+based instruction;(2) participation pattern; and (3) teachers' and learners' attitude and beliefs (see their conceptual frameworks in Table 1).

Table 1: The conceptual framework of each of the key concepts related to this study

Key concepts	Assumptions	Focus of the study
1. Task-based instruction	The integration of task and focus on form will best promote L2/FL learning	This study relies on an integration of the task- based instruction frameworks proposed by Skehan (1996, 1998) and Willis (1996). The framework consists of three main stages: 1. Pre-task 2. During-task 3. Post-task (for details see section 5.2)
2. Classroom participation patterns	The combination of task-based instruction with small group patterns is necessary to bring out its potential.	This study compares two group participation patterns: a dyad and a four-person group (for details see section 5.4).
3. Teachers and learners' attitude	- The success of task-based instruction also depends on teachers' and learners' attitude towards it. - An attitude is a relatively enduring organization of interrelated beliefs that describe, evaluate and advocate action with respect to an object or situation, which each belief having cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. (Rokeach, 1968, p.457).	This study investigates teachers' and learners' attitude towards task-based instruction, and group participation patterns (for details see section 5.5).

9.1 Quantitative research design

For the quantitative part of the study a 2 x 3 x 2 research design, set out schematically in Figure 1, will be employed. The first independent variable, teaching method, has two levels: task-based instruction and traditional teaching method, which is a control condition. The second independent variable is learners' English proficiency levels having three levels: high, medium, and low. The last independent variable, classroom participation pattern, has two levels: dyad and four-person group. All the three independent variables are between subject factors.

Figure 1:   Research design

Teaching methods	Proficiency levels	Participation patterns
Task-based instruction (24 participants)	High	dyad
		four-person group
	Medium	dyad
		four-person group
	Low	dyad
		four-person group
Traditional teaching methods (24 participants)	High	Whole class
	Medium	
	Low	

9.2 Qualitative research design

The aim of the qualitative methods used in this study is to investigate the teachers' and students' attitude towards the efficiency of task-based instruction, classroom participation patterns, and the feasibility of task-based instruction in a Thai university English teaching context. To increase the reliability of the qualitative data the following four qualitative methods will be used: (1) video-recorded classroom observations; (2) audio-recording of the participation of each of the dyads and four-person groups while performing class activities; (3) audio-recorded semi-structured interviews; and (4) journals from both the teachers and students.

10. จำนวนโครงการที่ผู้สมัครกำลังดำเนินการอยู่   1   โครงการ

ชื่อโครงการ   อิทธิพลของการวางแผนก่อนพูดที่มีต่อการพูดภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียนไทย

The Effects of Sources of Pre-task planning on Thai EFL learners' oral performance

ระยะเวลาโครงการ   1   ปี ตั้งแต่   1 กุมภาพันธ์ 2545 ถึง   31 มกราคม 2546

แหล่งทุนที่ให้การสนับสนุน   มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีสุรนารี

งบประมาณที่ได้รับ   50,000   บาท

สถานะผู้สมัคร   หัวหน้าโครงการ (เป็นโครงการวิจัยเดี่ยว)

เวลาที่ใช้ทำวิจัยในโครงการนี้กี่ชั่วโมงต่อสัปดาห์   20   ชั่วโมง

8

<div align="center">

แบบเสนอโครงการวิจัย

ทุนพัฒนาศักยภาพในการทำงานวิจัยของอาจารย์รุ่นใหม่ ประจำปีงบประมาณ 2546

</div>

---

1. **ชื่อโครงการวิจัย**   อิทธิพลของวิธีการสอนภาษาอังกฤษแบบทาสท์เบสที่มีต่อความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับมหาวิทยาลัย
The Effects of Task-based Instruction on Thai University Students' English Language Proficiency

2. **คณะผู้วิจัย**

ชื่อ-สกุล	วุฒิการศึกษา	สถานที่ทำงาน	หน้าที่ในโครงการ	ระยะเวลาการวิจัย
ดร. จิราพร แสงอรุณ	Ph.D.	สำนักวิชาเทคโนโลยีสังคม มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีสุรนารี อำเภอเมือง จังหวัดนครราชสีมา 30000 โทรศัพท์ (044) 22 4205 โทรสาร (044) 22 4205 e-mail: sangarun@ccs.sut.ac.th	หัวหน้าโครงการ และ ผู้ดำเนินการวิจัย	2 ปี
Professor Rod Ellis	Ph.D.	Director The Institute of Language Teaching and Learning University of Auckland New Zealand โทรศัพท์ (044) 22 4205 โทรสาร (044) 22 4205 e-mail: sangarun@ccs.sut.ac.th	นักวิจัยที่ปรึกษา	

3. **สาขาวิชาการและกลุ่มวิชาที่ทำการวิจัย**   การจัดการเรียนการสอนภาษาอังกฤษ

Significance of the study

4. ความสำคัญ และที่มาของปัญหาที่ทำการวิจัย

4.1   Introduction

Most Thai university students have studied English for eight years before they begin their tertiary education, where they normally take two to five compulsory English courses in their first and second years. Some also take a few elective courses after they have finished the compulsory ones. Even with considerable study of English most of them do not satisfactorily acquire the desired competence. In terms of my teaching experience, I realize that one of the crucial problems facing English instruction in Thai universities is the implementation of traditional teaching methods that do not provide sufficient conditions for learning the target language. This is because the traditional teaching methods are usually organized around words, structures, notions, functions, topics, or situations which are the units of learning that have little support from research as "meaningful acquisition units from a language learner's perspective" (Long & Crookes, 1992, p.27). For a few decades, many researchers, syllabus designers and educational innovators have propounded a task-based approach to instruction as a method to clear up the deficit of using the above-mentioned units of learning and as an approach that has high potential to promote second language (L2) and foreign language (FL) learning (Prabhu, 1987; Long & Crookes, 1992; Thomson, 1992; Clayton, 1995; Skehan, 1996; Willis, 1996). To increase the efficiency of English language teaching (ELT) in Thai university English language classrooms, it would be valuable to implement the task-based approach to instruction. However, the task-based approach is still not widely implemented in Thai university classrooms because there is little research demonstrating its potential in the context of English language teaching in Thailand. As a result, there is an urgent need for such research to be carried out.

4.2   Research problem

This study aims to examine and describe the efficiency and feasibility of the task-based approach to instruction in the context of English language teaching in a Thai university.

4.3   Significance of the study

Although task-based instruction has been proposed for some time, it is still not significantly implemented in the Thai context as attested by the lack of published literature in the field. To fill this gap, this study will replicate and extend previous research that was conducted to test the efficiency of task-based instruction; however, it will extend previous research in significant ways. First, this study will follow a longitudinal approach, while most of the previous research tends to rely on a cross-sectional approach. Second, it will investigate not only the effect of task-based instruction, but also: (1) the effects of learners' proficiency levels; (2) the effects of group participation patterns; (3) the interaction effect between the task-based instruction and group participation patterns and learners' proficiency levels; and (4) the attitude of teachers and learners towards task-based instruction. Third, this study will rely on a triangulation research approach; it will combine both quantitative and qualitative methodology in its process. As a result, it will allow a more confident interpretation of the research data as well as a wider and deeper understanding of efficiency of task-based instruction and its feasibility in a Thai university English teaching context.

5. วัตถุประสงค์ของโครงการวิจัย

This study aims to examine and describe the efficiency and feasibility of the task-based approach to instruction in the context of English language teaching in a Thai university. It will answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent does task-based instruction lead to gains in fluency, complexity and accuracy over a 72 hour (6 months) period of instruction?
2. To what extent does task-based instruction result in gains in general language proficiency?
3. What aspects of task-based teaching are related to gains in fluency, complexity and accuracy and to gains in general language proficiency?
4. What is the effect of two participation patterns (specifically, dyads and four-person groups) on the gain in fluency, complexity and accuracy, and on the gain in general language proficiency?
5. What is the effect of learners' proficiency levels (i.e., high, medium, and low) on the gain in fluency, complexity and accuracy, and on the gain in general language proficiency?
6. What is the interaction effect between task-based instruction, group participation patterns, and learners' levels of proficiency on the gain in fluency, complexity and accuracy, and on the gain in general language proficiency?
7. What are the attitude and beliefs of Thai university lecturers of English and Thai university EFL learners towards task-based instruction?

6. ผลงานวิจัยที่เกี่ยวข้อง และเอกสารอ้างอิง

I have organized my literature review into five sections: (1) theoretical base of task-based instruction; (2) task-based implementation; (3) frameworks for task-based instruction; (4) interaction between task-based instruction and classroom participation patterns; and (5) teachers' and students' attitude towards task-based instruction.

6.1 Theoretical base of task-based instruction

The task-based language teaching approach differs from approaches that are more traditional in that it is an approach in which learners' L2 acquisition is promoted through their performance of tasks rather than through specific knowledge about language (Long & Crookes, 1992). Up to now tasks have been defined differently by different researchers:

- *pieces of work undertaken for oneself or for others freely or for some reward* (Long, 1985, p.89)
- *pieces of work or activities usually with specified objectives, undertaken as part of an educational course or a piece of work* (Crookes, 1986, p.1)
- *a sequential and problem-solving social activity, which involves application of existing knowledge to attainment of goals* (Candlin, 1987, p.10)
- *an activity which requires learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allow teachers to control and regulate the process, was regarded as a task* (Prabhu, 1987, p.24)

- *activities that are meaning focused and outcome-evaluated and have some sort of real-world relationship* (Foster & Skehan, 1996, p.300)

- *an activity or action which is carried out as a result of processing or understanding language* (Richard, Piatt & Weber, 1985, p.289).

- *a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form* (Nunan, 1989, p.10).

Though the definitions are different, the consensus among them seems to be that a task is a piece of work or activity that is meaning-focused and outcome-oriented.

Tasks are supported by second language acquisition research as a unit of learning that has potential in promoting L2 acquisition (i.e., Long & Crookes, 1992). Foster and Skehan (1996) explain the benefit of tasks as "pushing toward interlanguage development because the demand that tasks make will engage the process that leads to acquisition " (p.300). Long and Crookes (1992) explain the beneficial effect of tasks on learners' L2 development as follows:

...tasks provide a vehicle for the presentation of appropriate target language samples to learners,-- input which they will inevitably reshape via application of general cognitive processing capacities – and for the delivery of comprehension and production opportunities of negotiable difficulty. New form-function relationships are perceived by the learners as a result. The strengthening of the subset of those that are not destabilized by negative input, increased accessibility and incorporation in more complex associations within long term memory, add to the complexity of the grammar and constitutes L2 development (p.43).

Long and Crookes also point out that traditional teaching approaches are inferior to the task-based approach to instruction because "they assume a model of language acquisition unsupported by research findings on language learning in or out of classroom" (p.30). " First, research shows that people do not learn isolated items in the L2 one at a time, in additive, linear fashion, but as parts of complex mappings of groups of form-function relationship. Second, SLA research offers no evidence to suggest that nativelike exemplars of the units of learning such as word, structure, notion, function, topic or situation are meaningful acquisition units, or they are (or even can be) acquired separately, singly, in linear fashion." (Long & Crookes, 1992, pp.33-34). The task-based approach to instruction is seen to have more potential to promote L2 acquisition.

There are two different assumptions on the task-based approach to instruction: the strong form and the weak form. The strong form is based on the assumption that "task should be the unit of language teaching, and that everything else should be subsidiary. The need to transact tasks is seen as adequate to drive forward language development" (Skehan, 1996, p.39). The weak form is based on the assumption that "tasks are a vital part of language instruction, but that they are embedded in a more complex pedagogic context. They are necessary, but may be preceded by focused instruction, and after use, may be followed by focused instruction which is contingent on task performance." (Skehan, 1996, p.39). This weak form of task-based instruction is developed because there has been research showing that form-focused instruction is also necessary for L2 acquisition. The research has supported the view that form-focused instruction provided within the context of communicative programs is more effective in promoting L2 learning than programs that are limited to an exclusive emphasis on explicit linguistic knowledge on the one hand, or an exclusive

emphasis on meaning-focus on the other (Lightbown & Spada, 1993). In order to promote L2 development, it is crucial to maintain an appropriate balance between form-focused instruction and meaning-focused instruction because they complement each other and contribute to learners' L2 development (Celce- Mucia, 1985; Harley, 1989; Long, 1988b; McLaughlin, Rossman, & McLeod, 1983). As a result, Long and Crookes (1992) propose that task-based language teaching in combination with a focus on form is superior in promoting second language acquisition since its basic rationale is highly supported by second language acquisition research. This study will rely on the weak form of the task-based instruction.

6.2   Frameworks for task-based instructions

Skehan (1996, 1998) and Willis (1996) propose frameworks for task-based instruction that rely on the assumption that task-based language teaching in combination with a focus on form has high potential in promoting L2 acquisition (see section 7.2.1). The comparison of the two frameworks is presented in Table 1.

Skehan (1996) makes two suggestions on task-based teaching. First, he proposes that task-based learning can be harmful to learners if implemented without care, because it tends to create pressure for immediate communication rather than interlanguage change and growth. Second, he suggests that the most relevant goals for task-based instruction should be: accuracy, complexity, and fluency. He then proposes a framework for the implementation of task-based instruction based on cognitive psychology and second language acquisition research, and claims that this framework is practical and effective in minimizing the mentioned problems, and in maximizing the probability to reach the goals of accuracy, complexity and fluency.

Skehan's framework consists of three phases: pre-task, during-task, and post-task. The pre-task phase has two main purposes: 1) to teach, or raise students' consciousness of the language need for the task, and 2) to lessen the cognitive load that students may encounter when they actually do the task. The first goal can be achieved in two ways: the teacher may predict what language will be needed for the task and explicitly or implicitly pre-teach it to students, or let the students do a pre-task activity that will provide them the language they need. The second goal may be reached by showing videos, playing tapes, or providing transcripts of similar tasks to students. After that, the students will plan their tasks. In the during-task phase, students do their tasks and the teacher acts as a monitor. At this phase, the teacher should emphasize the appropriate balance between fluency and accuracy. In the post-task phase, the students will re-do their tasks to the class, and their performances may be videotaped so that they can be played back for

Table 1: A comparison of task-based instruction frameworks proposed by Skehan
(1966, 1998) and Willis (1996)

Skehan (1996, 1998)	Willis (1996, p.155)
1. Pre-task <u>The teacher</u> 1. explicitly and implicitly teaches new forms, do consciousness raising activities, or introduce pre-task planning activities <u>The students</u> 1. observe similar tasks, and/or plan linguistically and cognitively	**1. Pre-task** <u>The teacher</u> 1. introduces and defines the topic 2. uses activities to help students recall/learn useful words and phrases. 3. ensures students understand task instructions 4. may play a recording of others doing the same or a similar task <u>The students</u> 1. note down useful words or phrases from the pre- task activities and/or the recording. 2. may spend a few minutes preparing for the task individually
2. During-task <u>The students</u> 1. do the task <u>The teacher</u> 1. emphasizes the appropriate balance between accuracy and fluency	**2. Task cycle** **2.1 Task** <u>The students</u> 1. do the task in pairs or small groups <u>The teacher</u> 1. acts as monitor and encourages students **2.2 Planning** (for public report) <u>The students</u> 1. prepare to report to the class how they did the task and what they have discovered/decide 2. rehearse what they will say or draft a written version for the class to read <u>The teacher</u> 1. ensures the purpose of the report is clear 2. acts as language adviser 3. helps students rehearse oral reports or organize written one **2.3 Report** <u>The students</u> 1. present their spoken reports to the class, or circulate/display their written reports <u>The teacher</u> 1. acts as a chairperson, selecting who will speak next, or ensuring all students read most of the written reports 2. may give brief feedback on content and form 3. may play a recording of others doing the same or similar task (continue)

Skehan (1996, 1998)	Willis (1996, p.155)
3. Post-task The students 1. re-do their tasks to class, and the performance will be videotaped for analysis purposes 2. do parallel tasks to strengthen their accuracy and fluency in doing the tasks The teacher 1. raises students' consciousness for a focus on form	**3. Language focus** **3.1 Analysis** The students 1. do consciousness-raising activities to identify and process specific language features from the task text and/or transcript 2. may ask about other features they have noticed The teacher 1. reviews each analysis activity with the class 2. brings other useful words, phrases and patterns to students' attention 3. may pick up on language items from the report **3.2 Practice** The teacher 1. conducts practice activities after analysis activities, where necessary, to build confidence The students 1. practice words, phrases and patterns from the analysis activities 2. practice other features occurring in the task cycle or report stages 3. enter useful language items in their language notebooks Notes: Some time after this final phase, students may like to repeat the same or similar task with a different partner

analysis purposes. This practice will motivate the students to pay more concern to the goals of restructuring and accuracy. Finally, the students may repeat the tasks or do parallel tasks in order to strengthen their accuracy, complexity and fluency in doing the tasks. analysis purposes. This practice will motivate the students to pay more concern to the goals of restructuring and accuracy. Finally, the students may repeat the tasks or do parallel tasks in order to strengthen their accuracy, complexity and fluency in doing the tasks.

Willis (1996) also proposes a framework for task-based instruction. Her framework consists of three phases: pre-task, task cycle, and language focus. The pre-task phase aims to make students familiar with the topic of the task and understand task instructions, and to provide the students the language needed for doing the task. At this pre-task phase, teachers will introduce and define the topic of task, elicit language need for doing the task from students, explain task instructions, and may play a record of others doing the same or similar task. Then the students will plan their tasks. The task cycle phase consists of three stages: task, planning (for public report), and report. The task stage aims to make students gain fluency and confidence in using the target language. At this task stage, students do the task and the teacher acts only as a monitor. The planning stage aims to " gives students the time and support they need to prepare for the linguistic

15

challenge of going public" (Willis, 1996, p.64). At this planning stage, students will prepare to report to class how they did the task and what they discovered, and the teacher will act as an adviser. The report stage aims to "give students a natural stimulus to upgrade and improve their language" (Willis, 1996, p. 64). At this report stage, the teacher may give feedback on content and form. The language focus phase consists of two stages: analysis and practice. The two stages aim " not to perfect students' production of the target language and make it automatic, but to draw their attention to the surface forms realizing the meanings they have already become familiar with during the task cycle, and so help students to systematize their knowledge and broaden their understanding " (Willis, 1996, p.64). At this language focus phase, the teacher will guide students to analyze and practice language form. After the analysis and the practice, students may re-do the task or do parallel tasks.

It is evident that Skehan's framework and Willis's framework share several similarities. In their first stages, both suggest that students may be exposed to examples of similar tasks done by others, and students should be given time to plan before they do the task, since the preparing time will promote accuracy, fluency, and complexity of language use. Second, both of them seem to agree that the report stage is important because it encourages students to balance the three learning goals: accuracy, complexity, and fluency. In the last stage, both recommend language analysis activities and parallel tasks. However, the frameworks also have three differences. First, Willis suggests only implicit teaching of language in the first stage, while Skehan suggests both explicit and implicit teaching of language in the first stage. Second, while Skehan suggests that a teacher may predict what language will be needed in the task and what should be explicitly or implicitly taught to students, Willis argues that "although it may be possible, with experience, to predict some of the forms that may occur in closed tasks, in more open tasks, it is virtually impossible to do so." (Willis, 1996, p.33). Third, while Skehan puts the public report and the language analysis activities in the post-task phase, Willis places the public report in the second phase of her framework, and places language analysis in the third phase of it. Furthermore, she adds the practice stage in the language focus phase. This study will rely on a combination of the task-based instruction frameworks proposed by Skehan (1996, 1998) and Willis (1996).

6.3   Task-based implementation

The first study that investigated the efficiency of the task-based approach to instruction is the Bangalore/Madras Communicational Teaching Project that was proposed and implemented in South India between 1979-1983 in response to dissatisfaction with existing methods. The project was based on the assumption that "form is best learnt when the learner's attention is on meaning" (Prabhu, 1982, p.2). This assumption resulted from the following beliefs: learners develop a grammar of L2 in an organic process rather than an additive one, and observer generalization about language structures based on fully formed language competence does not necessarily correspond to those the learners make for themselves and may distort the learners' own generalizations. As a result the project rejected any explicitly language-focused activities, and its designers developed "materials to enable learners to develop English without overtly learning English" (Brumfit, 1984, p.233). Four primary and secondary schools in Bangalor and Madras each with one experimental and control class participated in the project. The students in the experiment groups learned English through materials designed by the project designers, while the control groups learned English in normal English classes. The materials aimed to promote: " (1) the learner's natural desire to meet a

challenge (i.e. to solve a problem to prove that he can do so; (2) the preoccupation with meaning or thinking which such problem solving necessarily bring about; (3) the incidental struggle with language-use which such activity engenders" (Prabhu,1982, p.3). The teaching and learning activities consisted of three steps: first, a task similar to the one that the students would do was done by the teacher and the whole class to provide a guided demonstration of the procedure and some language needed for doing the task; then the students did the task themselves; and finally students evaluated their own performance to discover whether they had successfully solved the problem; however, success was the only criterion not the correctness of language. After four years of the experiment a battery of tests were administered to assess achievement of the experimental and control groups. The test results were overall positive, while not entirely conclusive, and do support the superiority of task-based instruction over the traditional approach.

Thomson (1992) implemented task-based instruction in a beginning level Japanese language course at the National University of Singapore. She focused her study on a task that aimed to promote students' skill in exchanging personal information. Two hundred and twenty Singaporean first year students did the task of asking about the sleeping habits of students in other classes. The teaching and learning process consisted of five stages: (1) preparing: students worked as a whole class to brainstorm Japanese adjectives needed for the task; (2) creating a questionnaire: students worked as a whole class to make a questionnaire on sleeping habits; (3) pre-interview practice: students practiced interviewing with three peers; (4) interview: the students worked in groups to interview students from other classes; (5) discussion and report: students worked as a whole class to discuss the collected information and write a report for the whole class. The researcher found that students could make coherent reports of the interview result, and students reported that they enjoyed the learning experience. She then concluded that task-based instruction was superior to traditional approaches and suggested that the following five components are essential for the success of the implementation of task-based instruction: (1) learners' familiarity with the concept of communicative language teaching and self-directed learning, and opportunities to experience both of them; (2) task objectives focusing on both language skill objectives and learning skill objectives; (3) teachers' awareness of their new roles in task development; (4) greater emphasis on task process than task product; and (5) incorporation of learner input into the task.

Clayton (1995) implemented a task-based, learner-centered business English program for eighteen Thai adult learners of English who were employees of a multinational company and had various educational and English language backgrounds. The study consisted of three sessions, each three weeks in length. In the first session, learners worked in small groups to execute an oral presentation task. In the second session, each group worked on a field-problem solution task during which they identified a work-related problem, described possible solutions, and prepared and presented a tape-slide production of the problem and solution. At the end of the second session, the researcher was convinced that the learners had successfully developed English language competence through the task-based learning activities; the learners did not concur. They therefore requested a more conventional form of instruction for the next session; however, they found the focus on language form was boring and not motivating. Clayton concluded that a task-based, learner-centered approach, in which students take responsibility for defining their own tasks, planning and evaluating their work, and reporting their results successfully, is effective despite severe constraints of variable times, resources and learners' various levels of language ability and motivation.

Prabhu's Bangalor/Madras project (1982) and Clayton's study (1995) rely on the strong form of the task-based approach to instruction (see section 7.2.1), as a result there are no explicit language-focused activities in either study. Thomson's study (1992) relies on the weak form of the task-based approach to instruction (see section 7.2.1), since there is focused instruction in the preparation phrase. Though Prabhu's study does not report a need for focused instruction, Clayton's study seems to imply that students want focused instruction, and furthermore, they need familiarity with and understanding of the concept of task-based instruction as suggested by Thomson (1992). Thomson and Clayton's studies seem to support the weak form of the task-based approach to instruction and confirm Long and Crookes's claim that task-based language teaching in combination with a focus on form has high potential in promoting L2 acquisition. As a result, this study will rely on the weak form of the task-based instruction.

6.4 Interaction between task-based instruction and classroom participation patterns

Second language research informs us that the amount and quality of language practice can sometimes depend not simply on the teaching methods or format employed but upon the interaction of teaching methods and classroom participation patterns (Long, 1990). Long, Adams, Mclean, and Castanos (1976) compared language use in two classroom participation patterns: teacher-led whole class and dyads doing the same problem-solving task. They found that the task produced more student talk in pairs than in a teacher-led whole group where the teacher continued to use most of the teaching and learning time to ask questions, correct errors, and drill language forms. Pica and Doughty (1985, 1986) also compared language use in three participation patterns: teacher-led whole class, four-person group, and dyads. Students in the three groups did two similar tasks: one-way and two-way tasks. The findings were: (1) more negotiation work was found in small groups than in the whole group; (2) negotiations of dyad and four-person group were not significantly different. These findings suggest that the combination of task-based instruction with small group participation is necessary to bring out its potential. However, little research has investigated the interaction between these two variables, as a result this study will investigate the interaction between task-based instruction and two group participation patterns: dyads and four-person groups.

6.5 Teachers' and students' attitude towards task-based instruction.

Success in implementing of a new teaching method depends crucially on the attitude and beliefs of both teachers and students. Though research shows that teachers' and students' attitude and beliefs influence them to accept or reject a new method, there has been little research on the task-based approach to instruction that investigates the attitudes of teachers and students towards it. One is the study by Murphy (1993), who investigated the attitude of a group of high school students in Malaysia towards tasks in term of interest and usefulness. For six weeks, the students were asked to answer a questionnaire after they finished doing each task. Teachers then analyzed the students' answers and discussed the responses in classes. The findings were: (1) students rejected too difficult tasks; (2) they preferred choosing their own tasks; (3) they preferred tasks that promoted active involvement and tasks that were new; (4) they liked to work in groups; (5) they wanted their English teachers to use some L1.

18

The other two studies, though they do not directly investigate teachers and learners' attitude and beliefs towards task-based instruction, report some information on the two variables. First, Thomson (1992), who implemented task-based instruction in a beginning level Japanese course at the National University of Singapore, reported that the students in her study enjoyed doing learning tasks. Second, Clayton (1995), who implemented task-based instruction in a business English course for Thai adult learners of English, reported that his students initially rejected the task-based instruction before they finally accepted that it was more interesting than traditional teaching methods. Thomson, as the teacher of the course, also reported his attitude and beliefs toward task-based instruction that it effectively promoted the English language learning of Thai adult learners of English.

Although the above-mentioned research results show that both teachers and students have good attitudes towards task-based instruction, Clayton's (1995) study also shows the constraints that need to be managed before the method is accepted by students. Since " teachers and learners, as experienced members of the classroom community in a particular society, bring with them their own perceptions of what constitutes language teaching, language learning and language outcomes, and their own prescriptions about what their classroom roles ought to be." (Kumaravadivelu, 1991,p.99), to understand the whole picture of task-based instruction, it is necessary to investigate both its effects on students' target language learning, and teachers' and students' attitude towards and beliefs about it. To gain a thorough understanding of the efficiency and feasibility of task-based instruction in a Thai university English teaching context, this study will investigate both the effects of the task-based instruction on the students' English language learning, and the teachers' and students' attitude towards it.

6.6   References

Anderson, G. (1990). *Fundamentals of educational research.* Flamer: London. Bickerton, D. & Odo,C. (1976). Chance and variation in Hawaiian English, vol.1: General Phonology and Pidgin Syntax. Final Report on NSF Project GS-38748, 1976. In J. Schumann, (1980). The acquisition of English relative clause by second lanuage learners. In R. Scarcella & S. Krashen, *Researchin second language acquisition.* Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (1989) *Educational research: an introduction.* Longman, New York.

Brindley, G. (1987). Factors affecting task difficulty. In D. Nunan,(1989). *Design tasks for communicative classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, C.J. (1984b). The Bangalore procedural syllabus. *ELT Journal,38,* 233-241.

Candlin, C. (1987). Toward task-based language learning. In C.Candlin & D.Murphy (eds.) 1987: *Language Learning tasks.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Celce-Mucia, M. (1985). Making informed decisions about the role of grammar in language teaching. *TESOL Newsletter, 19,* 4-5. Clayton, T. (1995). A task-based approach to in-house business English program. *Prospect, 10,* 32-40.

Crookes, D. (1986). Task classification: A cross-disciplinary review (Tech. Rep. No. 4) Honolulu: Center for Second Language Classroom Research, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa. In Long, MH. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan, *Language teaching methodology for the nineties.* SEAMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

Crookes, D., & Rulon, KA. (1985). Incorporation of corrective feedbacks in native speakers/non-native speaker conversation. (Tech. Rep. No.3) Honolulu: Center for Second Language Classroom Research, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa. In Long, MH. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan, *Language teaching methodology for the nineties.* SAEMEO Regional Language Center, Singapore.

Crookes, D., & Rulon, K.A. (1988). Topic and feedback in native-speaker/non-native speaker conversation. *TESOL Quarterly, 22,* 675-681.

Denzin, N.K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods.* 2nd edn. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Duff, P. (1986). Another look at interlanguage talk: talking task to task. In R. Day (ed.)(1986). *Talking to learn.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1977). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Foster, P. & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning and task type on second language performance. *SSLA, 18,* 299-323.

Gass, S. & Crookes, G. (1993a). *Tasks in pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Gass, S. & Crookes, G. (1993b). *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics, 10,* 331-359.

Harley, B. (1993). Instructional strategies and SLA in early French immersion. *SSLA, 15,* 245-259.Horwitz, E. (1987). Surveying student beliefs about language learning. In A.Wenden and J. Rubin (eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning.* London: Prentice-Hall.In J. Richards & C. Lockhart, *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hyltenstam, K. (1984). The use of typological markedness conditions as a predictor in second language acquisition. In R. Anderson (Ed.), *Second languages: A crosslinguistic perspective* (pp. 39-60). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Karavas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal, 50/3,*187-198.

Keenan, E. & Comrie, B. (1979). Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry, 8,* 63-99.

Kenedy, C. (1988). Evaluation of the management of change in ELT projects. *Applied Linguistics, 9,*329-342.

Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, MH. (1980). Input, interaction and second language acquisition. Ph.D. Dissertation. Los Angeles. UCLA. In M.H.,Long (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan, *Language teaching methodology for the nineties.* SAEMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

Long, MH. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstan and M. Pienemann, Clevedon, *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition.* Avon: Multilinguai Matters.

Long, MH. (1988b). Instructed interlanguage development. In L.M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: multiple perspective* (pp. 115-141). New York: Harper & Row.

Long, MH. (1990). Task, group, and task-group interactions. In S. Anivan, *Language teaching methodology for the nineties.* SAEMEO Regional Language Centre, Singapore.

Long, MH., Adams, L., McLean, M., & Castanos, F. (1976). Doing thing with words: Verbal interaction in lockstep and small group classroom situations. In J. Fanselow, & R. Crymes. *On TESOL 76.* Washington, DC: TESOL.

Long, MH. & Crookes, G. (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly, 26,* 27-56.

McLaughhlin, B., Rossman, T., & McLeod, B. (1983). Second language learning: An information-processing perspective. *Language Learning, 33,*135-158.

Nunan, D. (1985a). *Language teaching course design: Trends and issues.* Adelaide: National Curriculum Resource Centre.

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

Pavesi, M. (1986). Markedness, discoursal modes, and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8,* 38-55.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1985). Input and interaction in the communicative classroom: A comparison of teacher-fronted and group activities. In S. Gass, & C. Madden, (1985). *Input and second language acquisition.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pica, T. & Doughty, C. (1986). Information gap tasks: Do they facilitate second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 20,* 305-325.

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

Prideaux, G. & Baker, W. (1986). *Strategies and structures: The processing of relative clauses* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 46.) Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Reid, J. (1987). The learning style preferences of ESL students. TESOL Quarterly, 21, 87-103. In J. Richards & C. Lockhart, *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1986). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics.* London: Longman.

Rokeach, M.(1968). *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol.1.* The Macmillian Company & Free Press, USA.

Romaine, S. (1984). Relative clauses in child language, pidgins and creoles. *Australia Journal of Linguistics, 4,* 257-281.

Sheen, R. (1994) A critical analysis of the advocacy of the task-based syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly, 28,* 127-151.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 17,* 38-62.

Samuda, V., & Round , P.L. (1993).Critical episodes: reference points for analyzing a task in action. In S. Gass, & G. Crookes, (1993a). *Tasks in pedagogical context: Integrating theory and practice.* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Thomson, C.K. (1992). Learner-centered tasks in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 25,* 523-531.

Trend M.G. (1978). On the reconciliation of qualitative and quantitative analysis: A case study. *Human Organization, 37,* 345-354.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning.* Longman, England.

7. การเชื่อมโยงกับนักวิจัยที่เป็นผู้เชียวชาญในสาขาที่ทำการวิจัย

ผู้เชี่ยวชาญในสาขาวิชาการศึกษาภาษาที่ 2 (Second Language Education) ที่ข้าพเจ้าขอความร่วมมือในการทำวิจัยโครงการนี้ มีดังนี้ คือ

1.	Professor Rod Ellis	Head of the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, University of Auckland, New Zealand	รับเป็นนักวิจัยที่ปรึกษา ให้คำแนะนำในการเขียนเค้าโครงการวิจัยจะให้คำแนะนำในทุกขั้นตอนของงานวิจัยนี้
2.	Professor Andrew Lian	University of Canberra, Australia	ให้คำแนะนำในการเขียนเค้าโครงการวิจัยจะให้คำแนะนำในการจัดทำอุปกรณ์การวิจัย และการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล และจะเป็นผู้อ่านต้นฉบับของรายงานวิจัย
3.	Dr. Deborah Healey	Director of the English Language Institute, Oregon State University, USA.	ให้คำแนะนำทางด้านการจัดทำอุปกรณ์การวิจัย และการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล
4.	Professor Merill Swain	University of Toronto, Canada	จะเป็นผู้อ่านต้นฉบับของรายงานวิจัย
5.	Professor Alister Cumming	Head of the Department of Second language Education, University of Toronto, Canada	จะเป็นผู้อ่านต้นฉบับของรายงานวิจัย

8. ระเบียบวิธีวิจัย

8.1 Key concepts

There are three main key concepts in this study: (1) task-based instruction;(2) participation pattern; and (3) teachers' and learners' attitude and beliefs (see their conceptual frameworks in Table 2).

Table 2: The conceptual framework of each of the key concepts related to this study

Key concepts	Assumptions	Focus of the study
1. Task-based instruction	The integration of task and focus on form will best promote L2/FL learning	This study relies on an integration of the task- based instruction frameworks proposed by Skehan (1996, 1998) and Willis (1996). The framework consists of three main stages: 1. Pre-task 2. During-task 3. Post-task (for details see section 5.2)
2. Classroom participation patterns	The combination of task-based instruction with small group patterns is necessary to bring out its potential.	This study compares two group participation patterns: a dyad and a four-person group (for details see section 5.4).
3. Teachers and learners' attitude	- The success of task-based instruction also depends on teachers' and learners' attitude towards it. - An attitude is a relatively enduring organization of interrelated beliefs that describe, evaluate and advocate action with respect to an object or situation, which each belief having cognitive, affective; and behavioral components. (Rokeach, 1968, p.457).	This study investigates teachers' and learners' attitude towards task-based instruction, and group participation patterns (for details see section 5.5).

8.2 Quantitative research design

For the quantitative part of the study a 2 x 3 x 2 research design, set out schematically in Figure 1, will be employed. The first independent variable, teaching method, has two levels: task-based instruction and traditional teaching method, which is a control condition. The second independent variable is learners' English proficiency levels having three levels: high, medium, and low. The last independent variable, classroom participation pattern, has two levels: dyad and four-person group. All the three independent variables are between subject factors.

Figure 1:   Research design

Teaching methods	Proficiency levels	Participation pattern
Task-based instruction (24 participants)	High	dyad
		four-person group
	Medium	dyad
		four-person group
	Low	dyad
		four-person group
Traditional teaching methods (24 participants)	High	Whole class
	Medium	
	Low	

8.3   Qualitative research design

The aim of the qualitative methods used in this study is to investigate the teachers' and students' attitude towards the efficiency of task-based instruction, classroom participation patterns, and the feasibility of task-based instruction in a Thai university English teaching context. To increase the reliability of the qualitative data the following four qualitative methods will be used: (1) video-recorded classroom observations; (2) audio-recording of the participation of each of the dyads and four-person groups while performing class activities; (3) audio-recorded semi-structured interviews; and (4) journals from both the teachers and students.

8.4   Participants

Two lecturers of English and forty-eight first year students at Suranaree University of Technology (SUT), Thailand will volunteer to participate in this study. The students will be selected to join this study according to the following four criteria: (1) they will be required by the university to take two compulsory English courses (i.e., English 1, and English 2) in the second and third trimester of the 2003 academic year; (2) their willingness to participate in the study; (3) their levels of English proficiency (i.e., high, medium, and low) which are determined by the scores from the English placement test administered by the SUT School of English; (4) undertake not to receive any additional English instruction during the period of the experiment (i.e., from the time they are selected to participate in the study until the time they take the follow-up English proficiency test); and (5) in the case that they are randomly assigned into the experimental condition, agree to be taught with the task-based approach, and to get the assigned grades for the two required English

courses based on a combination of the assessment of their abilities to do the learned tasks and the mid-term and final examinations. (i.e., The participants under the control condition will get their final grades for both courses based on the mid-term and final examinations.) The participant will consist of students with high, medium, or low level of English proficiency, 16 participants in each level of proficiency. The participants in each proficiency level will be first randomly assigned into the experimental and control groups. Then, they will be randomly assigned into the two participation patterns (i.e., dyads and four-person groups).

8.5 Research tools

The following nine research tools will be used in this study: (1) a letter to solicit participants; (2) a personal and academic questionnaire; (3) an attitude questionnaire aiming to investigate participants' attitude towards the efficiency and feasibility of the task-based instruction, and the two group participation patterns; (4) journals from both the lecturers and students; (5) English proficiency tests; (6) tasks, task-based lessons, and task-based lesson plans. In the following sections, each research tool is briefly described; (7) recorded classroom observation; and (8) semi-structured interview.

8.5.1 A letter to solicit participants

A soliciting letter will be developed to invite students to participate in the study.

8.5.2 A personal and academic questionnaire

The researcher will develop a questionnaire for gathering personal and academic information on each student who volunteer to participate in the study. This questionnaire will be tried out and revised until it is able to provide the expected information in a satisfactory manner. Based on this information, I will then select participants for the study.

8.5.3 An attitude questionnaire aiming to investigate participants' attitudes towards the efficiency and feasibility of task-based instruction, and the group participation patterns

The researcher will construct a questionnaire for investigating teachers' and students' attitude towards (1): the efficiency and feasibility of task-based instruction; and (2) the two group participation patterns (i.e., dyads and four-people groups). The questionnaire will be pilot-tested with a small sample group and revised. To increase the efficiency of the questionnaire, the researcher will present in the session when participants do the questionnaire, so that rapport can be built and there will be opportunities for clarifying the respondents' queries on it.

8.5.4 Journals from both the lecturers and students

The purposes of using students' and lecturers' journals in this study are: to trigger their insight about learning and/or teaching and to use the record for their later reflection and the interview. After each class, the participants under the experimental and control conditions, and the lecturers will be asked to record

26

their personal reflection to things that happen in the classroom, questions or observation about the problems that occur in learning or teaching, descriptions of significant aspects of the lessons, ideas for future analysis or reminders of things to take action on.

8.5.5   English proficiency test

For practicality, a tryout version of the IELTS will be used for the participants' proficiency test, since the cost for the real test (5,000 bath per testee) for all 48 participants is unaffordable for this research project.

8.5.6   Tasks, task-based lessons and task-based lesson plans

The researcher will develop tasks around the same topics and genres as those used in the traditional classes. In addition, she will develop task-based lessons and task-based lesson plans based on the integration of the task-based instruction frameworks proposed by Skehan (1996, 1998) and Willis (1996) (see section 5.2).

8.5.7   Video-recorded classroom observation

Classroom observation will be used in his study to gain rich pictures for the whole teaching and learning activities that will be going on in the experimental class (i.e. this class will be taught by the task-based instruction). To increase the efficiency of the method, the following five steps will be taken. First, two observers will rate classroom sessions to reduce the possible subjectivity of the observers. In addition, the two observers will be trained until they reach reliable rating. Second, each classroom session will be videotaped so that observers will not have to be in the classroom since their presence may influence the teaching and learning activities. The videotape will not only allow the observers to study the behaviors carefully before rating, it will also allow checking on the reliability of their ratings. Furthermore, unanticipated data may be observed. Third, a guided category for observing and rating will be developed to provide neutral observational language and to increase consistency between raters. Fourth, there will be continual feedback between the observers and the participants Finally, the observation method will be pilot tested with a small sample.

8.5.8   Audio-recorded group interaction

The oral interaction of each of the dyads and four-person groups while performing class activities will be audio-recorded.

8.5.9   Semi-structured interview

A week after the final teaching session, semi-structured interviews will be administered. The purpose of the interviews is twofold: (1) to ensure that the students and the teachers understand the questionnaire items and the researcher understands their responses correctly; (2) to further probe the students' and the teachers' attitude towards the task-based instruction and the group participation patterns.

Each participant under the task-based instruction will be interviewed for approximately 30 minutes. The first part of the interview will deal with questionnaire items, the participant will be asked to clarify any responses that seem vague to the researcher. In the second part of the interview, will deal with her/his journal, open-ended and exploratory questions related to her/his journal will be asked. The participants under the control condition will also be interviewed, for approximately 30 minutes, regarding their journals. The lecturers will be interviewed three times in three days, for approximately two hours per day. The first interview will deal with questionnaire items; while the second and third interviews will deal with their written journals.

All interviews will be audio-recorded. To increase the efficiency of the method, the following four steps will be followed. First, in developing the protocol of the interview, open-ended questions will be asked, and exploratory questions will follow. Second, the interviews will be done in the Thai language. Third, a conversational mode will be used in the interview because it is the mode that will promote empathy, encouragement and understanding, and produce trust and a relaxed atmosphere (Borg & Gai, 1989). Finally, the interview will be pilot-tested with a small sample.

8.6 Procedure for data collection

This study will proceed along the following 10 steps:

8.6.1 Step 1: Research tools constructing and field testing

All research tools (see section 6.5) will be adapted or constructed. All of them will then be field-tested and revised. In addition, the classroom observation and semi-structured interview will also be trialed.

8.6.2 Step 2: Selecting participants

A soliciting letter and a personal and academic questionnaire will be distributed to the target students. The students who volunteer to participate in the study are required to fill in the personal and academic questionnaire, and return it with their consent form. After that, based on the criteria described in section 6.4, the researcher will select participants.

8.6.3 Step 3: Teacher training

A month before the task-based teaching, one of the two lecturers will be introduced to task-based instruction, its rationale, purposes and procedures. Then, she/he will practice teaching according to a few task-based lesson plans to make sure that she/he is familiar with the teaching procedures before the real teaching begins. She/he will be asked to follow without any changes the teaching procedures in the given lesson plans provided. However, after teaching she/he can comment and express her/his opinions on them in her/his journals and the interview.

8.6.4 Step 4: Orientation to the experiment

Two weeks before the experiment, the researcher will implement two fifty-minute orientation

sessions (i.e., one for the participants under the experimental condition, the other for the participants under the control condition) during which I will explain the purpose of the study, the kinds of activities the participants will be involved in, the amount of time they will be required to give to the study, and the benefits they will derive from participating. In return for their involvement, all participants will be paid.

8.6.5 Step 5: English proficiency pre-test and attitudinal questionnaire

A week before the experiment all participants will do a proficiency test (i.e., a try out version of the IELTS) (for details see section 6.5.5) to assess their general language proficiency. In addition, the participants in the experimental group will complete an attitudinal questionnaire (for details see section 6.5.3) that aims to investigate their attitude towards task-based instruction and the two participation patterns. The two teachers will also answer a questionnaire (for details see section 6.5.3) that aims to investigate their attitude towards and beliefs about task-based instruction opinion and the two participation patterns.

8.6.6 Step 6: Experiment

8.5.6.1 Experimental procedure for participants in the task-based instruction group (the experimental condition)

All participants in the task-based instruction group will study in the same class. They will work in two different group participation patterns: six dyads and three four-person groups. The participants will undertake the first course of task-based lessons (English 1) for 12 weeks (three hours per week). They will be asked to write a journal regarding teaching and learning activities of each class (for details see section 6.5.4). In the 13th week, they will be tested for their ability to do the learned tasks and they will answer the questionnaire investigating their attitude towards the task-based instruction and their group participation patterns. In addition to the test, they will do the midterm and final examinations that are developed for the students who take the required English 1 course in that trimester. They will receive the assigned grades for the English 1 course based on a combination of the assessment of their abilities to do the learned tasks and the mid-term and final examinations. After the first course, they will have a two-week break, which is the university's second trimester break. After that they will take the second course of task-based instruction (English 2) with the second lecturer. The procedure for this second course will be the same as that of the first course.

8.5.6.2 Experimental procedure for participants under the traditional teaching method (the control condition)

All participants under the control condition will be randomly assigned into four classes of their first required English course (English 1), six participants in each class (i.e., 2 students from each of the high, medium, and low proficiency levels). They will study English 1 in the traditional classes for 12 weeks (three hours per week). They will be asked to write a journal regarding teaching and learning activities of each class (for details see section 6.5.4). They will take the midterm and final examinations that are developed for the students who take the required English 1 course in that trimester, and they will be assigned grades for the course based on their scores from the midterm and final examinations. After the first course, they will have a

two-week break, which is the university's second trimester break. After that they will take their second required English course (English 2). The procedure for this second course will be the same as that of the first course.

To control possible Hawthorn effects, the participants under the experimental and control conditions will not be told about the real objectives of the present study. They will be told that the researchers are interested in their attitudes towards the teaching and learning activities in their English class. In addition, the participants under the control condition will be asked keep secret their participation in the present study. Furthermore, the teachers whose classes these participants enroll in will not be informed about the presence of these participants.

8.6.7   Step 7:   English proficiency post-test and attitudinal questionnaire

A week after the end of the second class, all participants will again take a parallel try-out version of the IELTS to assess their general language proficiency. In addition, the participants in the experimental group will again complete the same attitudinal questionnaire that aims to investigate their attitudes towards task-based instruction and the two participation patterns. The two teachers will also answer the same questionnaire that aims to investigate their attitudes towards and beliefs about task-based instruction opinion and the two participation patterns.

8.5.8   Step 8:   Semi-structure interview

Two weeks after the English proficiency post test, each participant in the experimental and control groups, and the teachers will be interviewed (for details see section 6.5.9).

8.5.9   Step 9:   English proficiency follow-up test

Two months after the English proficiency post test, all participants, in both the experimental and control groups will again take a parallel version of the IELTS to assess their general language proficiency.

8.6.10   Step 10:   Data analyze

8.6.10.1   Quantitative data

The data from the proficiency tests will be treated in two ways: (1) as a holistic proficiency score; and (2) specifically in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency as reflected in their speech and written texts in their proficiency test. After that the two sets of the data will be analyzed with a three-way ANOVA. Where significance is reached, this will be followed by Tukey HSD post hoc multiple tests.

8.6.10.2   Qualitative data

The qualitative data regarding: (1) lecturers' and students' attitudes towards the task-based instruction and the two-group participation patterns; (2) students' (under the control condition) attitudes

towards the traditional instruction; (3) classroom observation; (4) students' and lecturers' journal; (5) audio-recorded group participation; and (6) semi-structured interviews will be transcribed, coded, grouped and interpreted.

9. ขอบเขตการวิจัย

งานวิจัยนี้จะครอบคลุมตัวแปรอิสระ (Independent variables) 3 ตัวคือ (1) วิธีการสอนแบบทาสท์เบส (2) รูปแบบการปฏิสัมพันธ์ (เป็นคู่ และ กลุ่มละ 4 คน) (3) ระดับความสามารถทางภาษาอังกฤษของผู้เรียน (สูง ปานกลาง และ ต่ำ) นอกจากนี้กลุ่มตัวอย่างของงานวิจัยนี้เป็นนักศึกษาระดับปริญญาตรีชั้นปีที่ 1 โดยไม่รวมนักศึกษาชั้นปีที่ 2, 3 หรือ 4

10. อุปกรณ์การวิจัย

10.1 อุปกรณ์การวิจัยที่มีอยู่แล้วคือ คอมพิวเตอร์จำนวน 1 เครื่อง

10. 2 อุปกรณ์การวิจัยที่มีต้องการเพิ่มเติมคือ เทปบันทึกเสียงขนาดเล็กจำนวน 6 เครื่อง

11. แผนการดำเนินงานตลอดโครงการ

Activities	1st year												2nd year											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Develop and test research tools	▬	▬	▬	▬																				
2. Select participants					▬	▬																		
3. Train the teacher for the first course							▬																	
5. Orientation to the experiment								▬																
6. Pre-test English language proficiency, and administer the attitude questionnaire								▬																
7. Implement the first course									▬	▬	▬													
8. Train the teacher for the second course												▬												
9. Implement the second course													▬	▬	▬									
10. Post-test English language proficiency, and administer the attitude questionnaire																▬								
11. Semi-structured interview																▬								
12. Follow-up English language proficiency test																			▬					
13. Analyze the data																	▬	▬	▬	▬	▬			
14. Write the research report																						▬	▬	▬

12. ประโยชน์ที่คาดว่าจะได้รับ

12.1 ผลการวิจัยที่ได้จะนำไปสู่การเพิ่มประสิทธิภาพการจัดการเรียนการสอน เพื่อพัฒนา ความสามารถทางด้านภาษาอังกฤษของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับปริญญาตรี และจะเป็น พื้นฐานในการดำเนินการวิจัยที่เกี่ยวข้องกับการพัฒนาความสามารถทางด้านภาษาอังกฤษ ของนักศึกษาไทยในระดับปริญญาตรี

12.2 ได้บทเรียนภาษาอังกฤษแบบทาสท์เบสสำหรับนักศึกษาไทยในระดับปริญญาตรี จำนวน 2 รายวิชา

12.2 บทความทางวิชาการ 3 บทความ ดังนี้คือ

ชื่อบทความ	ปีที่จะตีพิมพ์	รายชื่อวารสารที่คาดว่าจะตีพิมพ์
1. The Effects of Task-based Instruction on Thai university Students' English Proficiency 2. Task-based Instruction and Group Participation Patterns 3. Task-based Instruction and Learners' Participation Patterns	2549 หรือ 2550	1. Language Learning 2. Second Language Acquisition Research 3. TESOL Quarterly: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc., USA

33

13. รายละเอียดงบประมาณ

รายการ	ปีที่1	ปีที่2
1. ค่าจ้างชั่วคราว ค่าจ้างผู้ช่วยวิจัยระดับปริญญาตรี 1 คนเป็นเวลา 12 เดือน (ต.ค. 46- ก.ย. 47) เดือนละ 8,400 บาท (ตามอัตราของมหาวิทยาลัย เทคโนโลยีสุรนารี)	100,800	—
2. ค่าตอบแทน		
2.1 ค่าตอบแทนนักศึกษาผู้เข้าร่วมการวิจัยจำนวน 50 คนๆละ 500 บาท (2 คนเข้าร่วมการทดลองเพื่อทดลองเครื่องมือการวิจัย 48 คนเข้า ร่วมการทดลองจริง)	25,000	25,000
2.2 ค่าตอบแทนครูผู้สอนจำนวน 2 คน (คนละ 30 ชั่วโมง ชั่วโมงละ 600 บาท / ตามอัตราของ เทคโนธานี มหาวิทยาลัยเทคโนโลยีสุรนารี)	30,000	30,000
2.3 ค่าตอบแทนผู้ควบคุมการสอบ Pre, Post, Follow up test, ค่าตรวจข้อมูล	7,000	20,000
3. ค่าใช้สอย		
1.1 ค่าถ่ายเอกสาร ค่าโทรสาร	5,000	10,000
1.2 ค่าจ้างเหมาการพิมพ์	5,000	10,000
1.3 ค่าจ้างถ่ายทำวีดีโอเทปการสอน	20,000	20,000
1.4 ค่าอาหารเลี้ยงและอาหารว่างสำหรับการจัดปฐมนิเทศ, การสัมภาษณ์, ฯลฯ		
1.5 ค่าจ้างวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล	-	50,000
1.6 ค่าจ้างถอดข้อมูล	-	50,000
1.7 ค่าจ้างจัดทำรูปเล่มรายงานวิจัยฉบับสมบูรณ์ 50 เล่ม	-	10,000
4. ค่าวัสดุ		
4.1 ม้วนเทปเปล่าเพื่ออัดเสียงการทำกิจกรรมของผู้ร่วมการทดลอง ม้วนVDOเพื่ออัดกิจกรรมการเรียนการสอน, แผ่นดิสเกต, กระดาษ, หมึกพิมพ์ และ ค่าวัสดุสำนักงาน	5,000	10,000
4.2 ค่าน้ำมันเชื้อเพลิง และน้ำมันหล่อลื่น	2,200	5,000
5. ค่าครุภัณฑ์ จัดซื้อเทปบันทึกเสียงความเร็วสูงจำนวน 8 เครื่อง	40,000	-
รวมงบประมาณที่เสนอขอ	240,000	240,000

หมายเหตุ: ขอถัวเฉลี่ยทุกรายการ