

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
(GRADUATE PROGRAM)



**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK BASED INSTRUCTION IN EFL CLASSROOM:
THE CASE OF WACHEMO UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

BY:

MULUGETA BIRHANU WANNORE

JUNE, 2014

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK BASED INSTRUCTION IN EFL
CLASSROOM: THE CASE OF WACHEMO UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

BY:

MULUGETA BIRHANU WANNORE

**THE THESIS SUBMITTED TO JIMMA UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF
ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE (GRADUATE PROGRAM), IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN TEFL**

DECLARATION

THIS THESIS IS MY ORIGINAL WORK WHICH HAS NOT BEEN PRESENTED FOR A DEGREE IN ANY OTHER UNIVERSITIES AND THAT ALL SOURCES OF MATERIAL USED FOR THE THESIS HAVE BEEN DULY ACKNOWLEDGED.

NAME: MULUGETA BIRHANU WANNORE

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my pleasure to give kindly and respectful gratification to my thesis main advisor Getachew Seyoum (PhD) who walked with me from the beginning to the end of this journey via providing constructive suggestions. Besides, my inestimable acclaim goes to him for his wholehearted hospitality, costly supervision, scholarly criticisms, proposition and dynamic back-up without whom this work would have been futile. I am also incalculably indebted to the sympathy and warm-welcome he has revealed for me in the study interval. Too, I thank my thesis co- advisor Teshome Egere (PhD) for his priceless suggestions throughout the study.

In addition, my praise goes to my father-Birhanu and my mother Zenebech for nurturing me since my early days. Their passion and determined confidence are what have shaped me to be the person I am today. Too, there are epochs when colleagues become heart-breaking cooperators. Thus, my value should go to all my friends without their support I would say as by no means made the study this far.

As well, I would like to acknowledge the instructors and students of WLU, Department of English Language and Literature for their cooperation to fill up the questionnaires during my pilot study. Else, my respect goes to WU, English Language and Literature Department instructors and students for supplying me with required information for the study. As well, I show singular gratitude to Jimma University for financial support in the study.

Finally, I bestow gratification to Hosanna College of Health Sciences and SNNPRG health bureau for sponsoring me in alliance to get done my MA in TEFL program at Jimma University in the preceding couple of years.

ABSTRACT

In this study endeavors were made to assess the implementation of TBI and exploring its underlying constraints in EFL classroom of WU, Department of English language and Literature. To achieve the objective of this study, mixed research design with descriptive and cross-sectional study was employed. In the pilot study, data gathering were carried out immediately after designing questionnaires to prove their reliability. The opinions of experts were also sought on the instruments before disseminating them to test out validity. The necessary data for the study were collected through classroom observation, semi-structured interview, questionnaire, and content analysis. Then, six EFL classes each once were observed with co-observers then four instructors and nine students were interviewed. Moreover, contents of four EFL courses material were analyzed with co-analyzers. These were made to reduce bias which might appear in the study. Besides, the questionnaires were administered and gathered from twenty three instructors and ninety four students who were selected through census method. Afterward, quantitative data analyzed based on descriptive statistics of frequencies, percentage, mean and grand mean where as qualitative data analyzed through narration in the paragraph form. The analysis of the data revealed that Instructors have been convincing knowledge and students have been limited awareness about the benefits of TBI. Accordingly, in this study both instructors and students assured that they have optimistic perceptions. However, they were not observed in implementing various types of tasks consistently in the EFL classroom. Thus, it can be concluded that their optimistic perceptions mismatch with their practical implementation of TBI with in the classroom. To end, the recommendations were forwarded based on the finale of the findings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGE NO
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS-----	IV
ABSTRACT-----	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS -----	IV
LIST OF TABLES -----	X
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	i
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.3.1. General objectives of the Study	6
1.3.2. Specific objectives of the Study.....	6
1.4. Scope of the Study	7
1.5. Limitation of the Study	7
1.6. Significances of the Study	8
1.7. Definitions of Key Terms	8
1.8. Acronyms of the Study	9
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	10
2.1. Historical Background and Overview of TBI.....	10
2.2. Definition of tasks.....	10
2.3. Forms of TBI	11
2.4. Benefits of TBI	11
2.5. Approaches to TBI.....	13
2.6. Types of Tasks.....	15
2.7. Characteristics of TBI.....	16
2.8. Elements of a task.....	18
2.9. Principles of TBI.....	19

2.10.TBI in EFL Materials.....	20
2.11.Implementation of TBI	21
2.11.1.Phases of the task cycle	21
2.12.Error correction.....	22
2.13.Mechanisms of TBI	22
2.14.Assessment in TBI.....	24
2.15.Constraints on the implementation of TBI.....	24
2.15.1..Internal constraints.....	24
2.15.1.1. Instructor related constraints.....	24
2.15.1.2.Instructor and students related constraints.....	26
2.15.1.3.Student related constraints	27
2.15.2.External Constraints.....	29
2.15.2.1. EFL Instructional Materials Related Factors	29
2.15.2.2. Instructional environment related constraints	30
2.16.ELT in Ethiopian education curriculum.....	32
2.16.1.Methods of ELT in Ethiopia education context	32
2.6.2.Harmonized ELT Curriculum and its Rationales.....	32
2.17. Local Researches on the Topic.	34
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	36
3.1.Introduction.....	36
3.1.1.Research Design	36
3.1.2.Research Setting	36
3.1.3.Sources of Data.....	36
3.1.4.Participants of the Study.....	37
3.1.4.1.Instructors	37
3.1.4.2.Students.....	37
3.1.5.Census Method	37

3.1.6.Instruments of Data Collection	38
3.1.6.1.Questionnaires	38
3.1.6.2.Classroom Observation.....	39
3.1.6.3.Semi-Structured-Interview.....	40
3.1.6.4.Content Analysis.....	40
3.1.7.Development of Data Gathering Instruments	41
3.1.8.Procedures for Data Collection.....	41
3.1.9.Data Analysis.....	42
3.1.10.Validity And Reliability Checks.....	42
3.1.11.Pilot Testing.....	43
3.1.12.Ethical Consideration.....	44
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	45
4.1: Analysis of Data obtained from Instructors and Students.....	45
4.1.1: Background Information.....	45
4.1.2: Experiences and Perceptions in TBI.....	46
4.1.3: Theoretical Knowledge of TBI.....	51
4.1.4. Instructors' Implementation and Students' Involvement in TBI	55
4.1.5: The Constraints of the Implementation of TBI.....	60
4.2. Instructors and Students Reply for Open ended Questions.....	68
4.3. Data Obtained by Classroom Observation.....	70
4.3.1. Phases of TBI.....	70
4.4. Analysis of Data Obtained by Interview.....	78
4.4. 1. The Outlook of Instructors.....	78
4.4.2. The Outlook of Students	81
4.5: Data Obtained through Content Analysis of EFL Courses	82
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	86
5.1. Summary	86
5.2. Conclusions.....	89
5.3: Recommendations.....	91
Reference	93

Appendices-----	96
Appendix-I: Instructors Questionnaires	96
Appendix-II: Students Questionnaires	101
Appendix-III: Classroom Observation Check List	105
Appendix-IV: Interview questions for instructors	107
Appendix-V: Instructors’ Responses for Interview Questions	108
Appendix-VI: Interview Questions for Students:	113
Appendix –VII:Students responses for interview uestions	113
Appendix-VIII: Content Analysyis Check List	118
Appendix-IX: Profile of EFL Course Materials	119

LIST OF TABLES

No	Page
Table-A: Instructors' Background Information-----	45
Table-B: Students' Background Information-----	46
Table-C: Instructors' Experiences of TBI -----	46
Table-D: Students' Experiences of TBI -----	47
Table-E: Instructors' Perceptions of TBI -----	48
Table-F.: Students' Perceptions of T TBI -----	50
Table-G: Instructors' Theoretical Knowledge of TBI -----	51
Table-H: Students' Theoretical Knowledge of TBI -----	53
Table-I: Gap Principle Tasks-----	55
Table-J: Reaching a Solution Principle Tasks-----	56
Table-K: Cognitive Principle Tasks-----	58
Table-L: Instructors Related Factors -----	60
Table-M: Student Related Factors -----	62
Table-N: EFL Course Materials/Modules/Related Factors-----	65
Table-O: University/Teaching Environment Related Factors-----	66
Table-P: Pre-Task Phases-----	70
Table-Q: While Task Phases -----	71
Table-R: Language Cycle-----	72
Table-S: Instructional Activities -----	73
Table-T: Classroom Condition -----	74
Table-U: Instructor's Roles -----	75
Table-V: Student's Roles-----	76
Table-W: Instructional Materials Used -----	77
Table-X: Content Analysis of EFL Courses-----	82

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, scope of the study, significance of the study, limitations of the study and definition of the key terms used in the study.

1.1. Background of the Study

Globally, English language has documented itself as a lingua franca. It has become the language of international communication in media, science and technology, business, academia, politics and so on. This calls for the need to produce students who can competitively and effortlessly avail themselves to the world arena (the Institute of International Education, 2012). Too, in the history of ELT plentiful pains have been faced to get fitting methodologies of its instruction. Thus, the revolution in British ELT tradition evolved CLT in the late of 1960s and it has extended to the world since the mid 1970s (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). The advent of CLT, TBI become known in the late of 20th century (Freeman, 1994; Richards, 2006). It involves classroom activities in line with the application of the target language through fostering interaction among learners. Hence, it focuses on meaning than form of language and sees the task itself as heart beat, a new orthodoxy and a complete unit which could be mirrored to execute the independent social activity (Freeman, 1994; Nunan, 2004). It substituted the conventional PPP method of ELT which is restrictive, formalistic and passive in its nature which affords a prospect for instructors to close the eyes to learners' motives (Nahavandi and Makunidani, 2012; Richards and Rodgers, 2001; Wills, D and Wills, J, 2007).

Moreover, its principal goal is to set up learners with language that is equivalent with their needs and is well-matched to their context and familiarity (Ellis, 2003). An instructional activity under it typically involves learners as problem solvers who have to understand particular pedagogic as well as real world task in relation to the instructional objectives or learning outcomes. In using TBI for ELT, learners only have to process and comprehend data in the language skills but also to execute an assigned task via meaningful interaction (Nunan, 2004). Too, learners are also concurrently positioned as the monitors of their own learning by attending to the grammatical forms that are highlighted in the tasks and endeavors the target language through devising language innovation (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Thus, tasks form positive environment for students to put on the knowledge from the cultures and customs of English-speaking countries.

These can be a vehicle to elicit language production, interaction, negotiation, processing and focus on the form when needed to foster SLA (Branden, 2006).

Indeed, scores of countries in the world have integrated TBI in to their ELT curriculum (Nunan, 2006). Similarly, ELT in Ethiopian educational settings can be related with the introduction of modern education during the reign of Menelik-II in 1908 (Heugh and *et al* as cited in Meseret, 2012). ELT has been delivering as a medium of instruction in different levels of education in Ethiopia; however, its curriculum had stressed on the structural aspects of instruction for a long period of time. Evidently, the government of Ethiopia a new education and training policy was published in 1994 (UNESCO, 2001). This policy made a radical overhaul in education. The policy approved active learning owing to that English for New Ethiopia was replaced by English for Ethiopia, which is communicative in its nature. As a result, Ethiopian government has introduced TBI at the tertiary level of education in 1994. The aim of it was generating widespread opportunities in EFL use for Ethiopian students (the Institute of International Education, 2012).

Indeed, a range of and a number of researches have been conducted at global levels in generally and local levels particularly in the topic respectively. Thus, they have revealed that English language proficiency might affect EFL students' academic performance. As well, they exposed that TBI assist students to show remarkable success in their overall performances in ELT (Nunan, 2006). Conversely, Ellen (2005) demonstrated that there had been imperfect, irregular diffusion and support of TBI in EFL classroom.

Additionally, local researchers' like Teshome (1995) did his MA thesis in AAU freshman students' views and preferences with respect to structure-based versus task-based approaches to ELT. The findings of the study confirmed that students were generally optimistic about the recompense of the TBI in ELT. It is pertinent with their views since the new materials and the methodology used to implement the approach were apt. Moreover, Tagesse (2008) carried out his MA thesis in the practicability of task-based EFL instruction in higher institutions of Ethiopia (Kotebe and Commerce colleges of Addis Ababa University). His findings depicted that instructors practice TBI in EFL classroom in little coverage because they cannot follow basic principles of TBI; they have misconceptions about tasks; they use only grouping method as common strategies. Surprisingly, he merely focused on exploring the practice of task based EFL

instruction; however, he did not glimpse its constraint in details. By the same token, Yeshimabet (2009) did her MA thesis on the perception and practice of task based language teaching in EFL classroom in Arbaminch teacher Education College. Her findings demonstrated that instructors and students look like conscious about TBI, even if they lack the proper dedication to pertain it in their classroom. Besides, Meseret (2012) did his PhD desertion on instructors' and students' perceptions and practices of task-based writing in an EFL context in Haramaya University. The data findings illustrated that there was disparity between instructors' perceptions and practices of TBI. Instructors believe that TBI augments students' language performance; however, they tend to instruct ELT through an instructor-centered approach where forms of the language is over accentuated. Thus, instructors were ambivalent in using TBI in their EFL classroom.

Through aforementioned conceptions and the researchers' personal experiences in tertiary level of education in ELT pedagogical setting there subsist issues that entail survey. These are assessing the instructors' and students' implementation of TBI in EFL classroom and signifying the underlying constraints of it comprehensively.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

The implementation of TBI requires the participation of both instructors and students for effectual instructional processes. In Ethiopia EFL instruction is highly valued and is a required subject beginning from pre-school to University level (UNESCO, 2001). Certainly, it has got a number of roles in Ethiopian context. To point out a few of these, it is a medium of instruction in different grade levels, it is a required language in a quantity of working environment, and it is a means of communication in a little instances of the community (Meseret, 2012). Moreover, Ethiopian students' capability to communicate in English is incredibly insufficient. Classroom instructors at the education ladder can witness their existing experiences about the present status of ELT in Ethiopia. At tertiary levels in particular, where English is the language of instruction instructors are experiencing daily that ELT is becoming an obstacle to learners when they learn their fields of specializations. To solve the problem old curriculum of ELT replaced by nationally harmonized curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2012). This related with TBI which aimed in instructing English language through interactive and functional approaches against structural approaches to ELT.

Correspondingly, English language departments have opened and started schooling in various Universities in Ethiopia. One of these Universities is WU. In this University, English language has been used as a medium of instruction for instructional activities based on the nationally harmonized modular curriculum for undergraduate program. Accordingly, instructors and students required to have the knowledge and skills of TBI to attain the intended objectives in didactic processes. This can be digested by implementing meaning based instruction. This reveals the paradigm shift of instructional ideology from instructor to student based method. Hence, as the revolution changed language tradition in British society from grammar based to communicative based the countries in the world in generally and Ethiopia particularly adopted it in the contemporary epoch (Meseret, 2012). Consequently, instructors and students anticipated to implement it effectively for proactive output in the instructional setting. In this regard one of the critical issues is the scope to which instructors and students are wholehearted to embrace the instructional processes through TBI in EFL classroom. Yet, in Ethiopia for a long period of time instructors tend to address English as an object of study rather than promoting the use of the language for communicative activities in the classroom (FDRE, 1994 and UNSECO, 2001). More widely, it is about enthusiasm, having the knowledge and the skill to employ it in EFL

classroom as distinct from customary instructional practices substantiated in instructor-centeredness.

Besides, the design of ELT curricula involves linking theoretical knowledge with real life state of affairs (Wagari, as cited in Meseret, 2012). Even though plenty of researches have been conducted in TBI internationally, very little has been done in Ethiopia. The findings of them depicted that many Ethiopian students lack the vital language skills which could assist them to the demanding abilities in English language (Teshome, 1995). Therefore, to solve the difficulties with its core, TBI has been implementing in Ethiopian higher institutions (Teshome, 1995; Tagesse, 2008, Yeshimabet, 2009; Meseret, 2012). The payback of TBI in students' academic achievement, social interaction and cognitive development can be considered in ELT. Thus, the implementation of TBI at EFL classes of tertiary level of education in Ethiopia found to be too limited. These are due to lack of students' interest, shortage of time, difficulty of test, lack of awareness, lack of confidence, lack of authentic text, lack of modules, and students' background (Yeshemabet, 2009; Tagesse, 2008; Teshome, 1995 and Meseret, 2012).

Furthermore, based on the asset of being an EFL instructor for a half decade in the tertiary level of education in the position of an assistant lecturer, the researcher has experienced a lot about classroom realities associated with the theoretical as well as practical application of the TBI and observed its low implementation in the EFL classroom. The informal observation he had made on the colleagues and students of WU, department of English language and Literature, the literature review he has read in the topic and his personal experiences in ELT setting aggravated the researcher to carry out the study in the topic. Thus, an effective implementation of the TBI requires the instructors' knowledge and positive perception towards it, students' positive perception, appropriately designing of the EFL instructional materials, the prevalence of fitting environment and the like.

Moreover, this research is distinct from other researches in the area of the study by subsequent points. Firstly, the researches of before conducted based on the old curriculum of Ethiopia without focusing on the constraints of TBI; however, this study conducted based on nationally harmonized curriculum through exploring the constraints of TBI in detail. Secondly, geographical location of study setting such as study by Tagesse (2008) on the practicability of task based instruction at the higher institution was limited to the veteran University of Ethiopia

which is found in Capital city where as this study focused on recently established University which is found in Hosanna (Zonal town). Thirdly, its comprehensiveness, for this study data was collected from primary sources (students, Instructors and actual classroom observation) and secondary sources (EFL course materials).

Depending on the aforementioned conceptions this study is attempted to bridge the existing research gap in the implementation of TBI and underlying constraints of it in EFL classroom. Therefore, the following basic research questions were projected to be reacted in the course of this study:

- How do instructors' and students' experience and perceive the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom?
- Do instructors' and students' have theoretical knowledge on the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom?
- How often do instructors' implement and students' involve in the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom?
- What are the constraints that act against the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

The study attempts to answer the following general and specific objectives.

1.3.1. General objectives of the Study

The general objective of this study was to assess the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom and. investigate the underlying constraints instructors' and students' face in implementing it.

1.3.2. Specific objectives of the Study

The specific objectives of this study were the following:

- To describe instructors' and students' experiences and perceptions in the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.
- To look into instructors' and students' theoretical knowledge on the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.
- To show the extent to which instructors implement and students involve in TBI in EFL classroom.
- To identify the constraints that act against the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.

1.4. Scope of the Study

The researcher believes that the study would have more generalized results had it included other Universities throughout the country. However, it was delimited in to WU, Department of English Language and Literature. Among a few of studies which have been done in this area of study in the national level, none of them has been conducted in new Universities of Ethiopia which has been carrying out instructional activities through nationally harmonized modular curriculum. There are thirty one government Universities in Ethiopia. Among these Universities only one WU was chosen as the area of this study. The researcher has preferred this University firstly, for it is the recently established one and as the result the University might bump into a number of problems in its ELT program. Secondly, due to the University's geographical proximity to the researcher living place and more familiarity of him with the participants of the study to make thoroughly investigation in the issue under the study. Moreover, the focus of this study is confined in to the implementation of theoretical aspects of TBI in the EFL classroom. Besides, it did not see any other approaches to ELT. As well, the participants of the study were encircled purely to single department in the University

1.5. Limitation of the Study

The study was narrowed in terms of its scale. Predominantly, the sample size of the study was limited to twenty five instructors and ninety seven students of WU, Department of English language and Literature. During the data collection, the instructors as well as the students in each class were observed by the researcher and co- observers. Being observed or investigated could be a disturbing situation. In this regard, the existence of the observers in the instructional setting could cause certain amount of constraints to the study. Also, the study was awfully effectual if it was carried out in a specific skill. In addition, the review of related literature of this study explicates assorted variables related to TBI in EFL classroom. However, some of these variables were not gripped in the data gathering instruments by the speculation that they might be fresh conceptions to the participants of the study. Hence, excluding these variables might perimeter the doable information which acquired from them about the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom. Furthermore, upcoming researches could be suggested to fit into place students of different backgrounds in diverse educational settings in order to corroborate the findings of this

study. Thus, taking a broad view in the findings of this study to the whole Universities of Ethiopia could not be pledged.

1.6. Significances of the Study

Investigating the implementation of TBI at the tertiary level of education has invaluable hand-outs to English language instruction from many perspectives. Accordingly, this study is presupposed to have a salient role in contributing to the quality of ELT. Then, it looks forward to have weight in raising awareness on instructors and students about how to work with tasks so as to perk up the didactic process of English language in their classroom. Furthermore, this study might be of help to all those concerned with the instructing EFL such as instructors, curriculum experts, higher education and educational authorities through designing EFL course materials since it explains invaluable nature of TBI to foster linguistic proficiency. Besides, it directs ministry of education and Wachemo University to design tailored trainings in current trend of TBI as part of the instructors' professional development agenda. In addition, it affords a prospect for course instructors, students, Wachemo University officials and ministry of education to dig up constraints that impede the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom. All things considered, the study might be a base for other researchers who are yearning to conduct auxiliary research in the analogous perspective.

1.7. Definitions of Key Terms

According to the milieu of this study the subsequent terms means the ensuing definitions.

- **Task** is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form (Nunan, 2004).
- **CLT** is a set of principles about the goals of language instruction, how learners learn a language, the kinds of classroom activities that best facilitate learning, the roles of instructors and students in ELT (Richards, 2006).
- **TBI** is an approach in which language instruction is organized through different tasks by providing opportunities for learners to perform activities engages in meaningful, goal-oriented communication to solve problems, complete projects and attain decisions (Ismail, 2012).

- **PPP** is an approach to instruct language items which follows a sequence of presentation of the item, practice of the item and then production of the item (Tomlinson, 2011).
- **Implementation** is what instructors and students actually do in relation to their EFL classroom instructional processes (Ellen, 2005).

1.8. Acronyms of the Study

The following are the acronyms used to manage the wordiness in the contents of this study.

These are

TBI - Task Based Instruction

CLT- Communicative Language Teaching

EFL- English as a Foreign Language

ELT-English Language Teaching

MA- Master of Arts

PPP- Presentation of the item, Practice of the item and then Production of the item

SLA- Second Language Acquisition

SNNPRG- Southern Nation and Nationalities and Peoples Regional Government

TEFL- Teaching English as a Foreign Language

WLU- Wolikite University

WU- Wachemo University

SPSS- Statistical Package for Social Sciences

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter reviews selected literatures which are related with the study topic. The discussion is elaborated under topic and sub topics in the subsequent ways. Finally, related studies globally and locally were dyed.

2.1. Historical Background and Overview of TBI

The term 'task' primarily emerged in vocational training in the West and in the US military training in 1950s (Gong & Luo, as cited in Ellen, 2005). Since the beginning of the 1980s, tasks have widely engaged in the field of applied linguistics as language pedagogy. Prabhu (as cited in Ismail, 2012) confirmed that the Bangalore communicative teaching project took place from 1979 to 1984 and was based predominantly on the assertion that language form can be learnt in the classroom exclusively through a spotlight on meaning construction by the learner is a lifeless process. Besides, in the late of twenty century TBI ensued as an advent of CLT. Its validation was cheering learners' to exploit target language through tasks (Dailey, 2009). It hubs on the constructivist theory of learning and has substituted the traditional PPP approach (Ellis, 2003). It endorses communication and social interaction. It underlies on the conception that language learning is process than product oriented approach (Richards and Rodgers (2001). It presents the target language naturally based on the theory of language learning than theory of language structure. Its motto is communicative competence can be developed as a by-product of engaging learners in interactive tasks in the classroom. It considers tasks as the prime unit in scheduling instructional processes (Richards, 2006).

2.2. Definition of tasks

Tasks defined by different scholars. The most proverbial definitions of tasks are the subsequent. These are

- A task is a piece of classroom work that engages learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their concentration is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the objective is to transmit meaning rather than to manipulate form (Nunan, 2004).
- A task is an activity that involves individuals in utilizing language for the rationale of achieving a particular goal or objective in fussy circumstances (Bachman and Palmer, 1996).

➤ A task is a work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to accomplish an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of conveying the correct content (Ellis, 2003).

Therefore, it can be inferred that a task can engage productive or receptive skills and also various cognitive processes, require giving key considerations to the meaning and using linguistic resources accurately by having knowledge of forms in mind.

2.3. Forms of TBI

Certainly, there are three forms of TBI. These are the weak form of TBI which considers tasks as the lone complementary activities before or after the form-focused instruction. They are significant; however, not ample for ELT (Ellis, 2003). In a medium form of TBI; tasks are involved as the main activity, supplemented with some form-focused instructor-controlled activity. Tasks are essential, but not adequate for learning, but are more than supplementary (Tong, Adamson & Che, as cited in Ellen, 2005; Ellis, 2003). Besides, strong form of TBI takes tasks as the merely unit of ELT. Accordingly, they are needed and plenty activities for ELT (Ellis, 2003).

2.4. Benefits of TBI

According to Wang (2010); Willis (1996); Nunan (1989; 2004) the subsequent conceptions are frequently accepted benefits of TBI. These are

- Motivating students' learning with fun, enjoyment and excitement

Language tasks are highly motivating. Enjoyment, excitement and passion are naturally generated from doing tasks. They initiate self-motivation to stimulate learners' awareness and curiosity. They are meaningful and playful activities thus they motivate students to learn, arouse their interest, and develop positive attitudes towards language learning and learn language mechanically.

- Supplying likelihood to use language in authentic contexts

Task itself is inner part of TBI. Thus, learners' savoir faire English language use through performing various activities in the in pedagogical setting as well as in the real world. They expose themselves to the target language milieu in the classroom. They employ whatever language resources available in their mind in order to achieve task goals, for example, solving a problem, sharing or comparing opinion and culture. Therefore, tasks offer learners with probability to employ authentic contexts where they feel as they require utilizing real-life

language to communicate with others meaningfully and purposefully. Meaning, tasks bond students' with real life activities. Thus, all four skills of the target language are integrated into TBI to facilitate student's holistic development of skills in a given language (Nunan 1989, 2004; Willis, 1996).

- Providing a prospect to practice language use and language usage

Tasks designed to offer learners a density of communicative language practice as conventional drill exercises; however, in a moderately meaningful means by working language as living communication to convey information and opinion. By doing so, learners are immersed in using the target language in all four skills, which assists them to better internalize EFL. Therefore, integral parts of communicative lessons and warm up a lesson serve as a substitute for scanty materials, to end a lesson as follow-up activities. According to Nunan (1989) tasks assist students to develop communicative competence such as grammatical, socio-linguistic, discourse and strategic competence. What's more, the task performance (asking and answering questions, dealing with misunderstandings, etc.) reflect the tasks which takes place in real-world communication (Carless, 2003).

- Creating an agreeable and supportive learning milieu

Different from conventional didactic methods through which many students have frustrating experiences of English language learning, tasks present language learners with communicative or problem-solving situations that are enjoyable and relatively stress free. The instructor anticipated to encourage all endeavors at communication in the target language rather than continuous error correction. In such a way, without fear of failure or public correction, students feel emotionally secure and will be more confident to explore and take risks with EFL which further enhances students' active involvement as well as intrinsic motivation, and above all, leads to better learning.

- Promoting interpersonal relations

Tasks involves communicative interaction which afford many prospects for cooperative relationships to come out, both among students and between the instructor and students because the class is often divided into pairs or groups, which make students naturally, interact with others. The partnership and cooperation among students generated while they are carrying out tasks which encourage them to develop social interactions and emotional development, which humanizes the classroom and eases the process of learning and instruction.

- Fostering communicative ability

Facilitate learners' language acquisition. Each specific task stipulates a specific communicative ability for learner through experiencing learners with spontaneous interaction, developing learners' confidence, enhancing language use purposefully and cooperatively, promoting communicative skill (Wills, 1996).

- Increasing the knowledge of four language skills

The task might engage learners in listening to or reading a text; in displaying their understanding; in producing an oral or written text; in employing a combination of receptive and productive skills or in demanding dialogic or monologue language use (Carless, 2003). Too, Richards and Rodgers (2001) stated that TBI spotlight on a holistic didactic approach, which places equal weight on the entire four skills to boost communicative performance more competently.

- Involving cognitive processes

Tasks involve thinking, problem-solving, selecting, reasoning, classifying, negotiating, perceiving differences, sequencing information and transforming information (Nunan, 1989). These draw learners' concentration to accuracy and fluency to facilitate their language acquisition. It helps to bring about the task such as selecting, classifying, ordering, reasoning and evaluating information (Ellis, 2009). This might augment the thinking abilities of students in communication processes.

2.5. Approaches to TBI

Although TBI furnish prime prominence for a theory of learning, theory of language also plays deep-seated role in its implementation.

- a) Theories of language

According to Richards & Rodgers (2001) language is principally a means of meaning making. Thus, multiple models of language inform TBI i.e. structural, functional and interactional models of language. In addition, lexical units are innermost part in language use and language learning where as exchanging of the idea is the focal point of language and heart beat of language acquisition.

b) Theories of language learning

As stated by Richards & Rodgers (2001) and Willis (1996) TBI is believed to be able to effectively facilitate learners' acquisition of the target language. These are interaction hypothesis which engage learners in interacting communicatively and meaning negotiation in the target language. Besides, input and output hypothesis which are tasks that offer the processing that fosters language acquisition. Furthermore, cognitive approaches which are tasks that may influence different aspects of language acquisition and different task variables. As well, motivational principles which are tasks that offer learners with vastly motivating activities including physical activity, partnership, collaboration, experience sharing and varieties of authentic communication experiences. All in all, communication principle which are tasks that uphold learning through involving learners in authentic and meaningful communication which is sturdily related to their real-life circumstances.

c) Theories of language teaching

It capitalizes learners' revelation to the target language use. By drawing the learners' concentrations to the linguistic form implicitly it facilitates students to acquire the target language application (Willis, 1996). This maximizes the prospect to pull off an optimum balance between a focus on form (accuracy) and a focus on communication (fluency).

d) Instructor and student roles

In TBI, the instructor, basically, is a need analyst who evaluates students' communication needs and motivation to design activities at an aptly challenging level. He is also a classroom manager to organize learning settings and activities for effective communication and a counselor and facilitator who is available as a source of guidance and provides feedback on students' performance as well as takes part as an independent participant who monitors the group activities in order to understand the strengths and weaknesses of students for planning future learning activities (Ellen, 2005). Conversely, students' roles are communicators, negotiators, and responsible managers of their own learning in a communicative classroom which puts stress on the process of communication through performing activities and requires learners to negotiate, discuss, interact and communicate with their peers in order to accomplish various communicative purposes desired (Willis, 1996; Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

e) The role of instructional materials

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) it is dependent on adequate deliverance of fitting classroom tasks. They are used in the classroom either as pedagogic tasks which are designed for classroom or authentic/real world tasks. However, authentic tasks are more preferential because they instruct learners with real world activities and skills effortlessly. What's more, they take learners to the real world where language is used naturally and in turn let them experience that what they are learning in the classroom is constructive and pertinent with outside of the classroom.

2.6. Types of Tasks

a. The gap principle

Provides information required to accomplish a task. The three types of gap principle tasks are

- Information gap tasks

Information gap tasks are tasks that desire the transmission of information or message from person to person. Learner receives it through spoken or written communication (Nunan, 1989).

- Reasoning gap tasks

Reasoning gap tasks are tasks which need synthesizing the information provided and deducting new facts in order to perform it lucratively (Prabhu as cited in Ellis, 2003). It involves deriving new information from the given information through processes of inference, deduction and practical reasoning.

- Opinion gap tasks

Opinion gap tasks are tasks which necessitate the participants to exchange opinions on issue i.e. making debate. It involves controversial issues about which the participants exchange ideas through different views (Prabhu as cited in Ellis, 2003.). It engages identifying and articulating a personal preference, feeling, or attitude in response to a given circumstances.

b. Reaching a decision

Reaching a decision tasks are tasks which are carried out through interaction. According to Willis (1996) this includes decision-making tasks, problem-solving tasks, and opinion exchange tasks. These tasks involve learners in exchanging their opinions in order to solve problems or to make decisions.

c. Cognitive process

Cognitive process tasks are tasks which require cognitive operations of learners in the realm of communicative instruction (Wills, 1996, Oxford, 2006, Wills D. and Wills J. 2007, Richards, 2006). i.e.

- Listing tasks

Listing tasks are tasks which necessitate unimaginitive; however, in practice generates a lot of talks when learners explain their ideas. The process involved are brain storming (learners draw their own knowledge and experience in pairs and groups), fact finding (learners find things out by asking each other).

- Ordering and sorting tasks

Ordering and sorting tasks are tasks which involve sequencing items, actions, events in logical and chronological order based on specified criteria. It is also categorizing items in a given group.

- Comparing and contrasting tasks

Comparing and contrasting tasks are tasks which involve relating each other, finding similarities/ differences and things frequently (Nunan, 1989).

- Personal experience sharing tasks

Personal experience sharing tasks are tasks which engage students in sharing the experiences they have in the forgoing settings (Oxford, 2006).

- Creative tasks and projects

Creative tasks and projects are tasks which involve students in doing activities through their own works so as to develop communicative aptitudes (Oxford, 2006).

2.7. Characteristics of TBI

The subsequent section is a description of the characteristics that illustrate TBI

- Real-world Language

Completing tasks that center on day by day language furnish learners occasions where realistic language can be practiced and eventually used outside of the classroom. This does not inevitably mean that students have to recreate authentic dialogues; however, the task is within a real scenario, which in turn would provide realistic language to be spoken. These tasks could supply learners, who do not have opportunities to practice the target language beyond the classroom, a probability to communicate in a realistic setting (Daily, 2009).

- Learner-Centered

Learner-centered approaches focus on tasks that are carried out in the classroom to gain communicative competence based on active learning dogma. Once the task begins, the instructor leaves it up to the students on how and what language they use to complete the task. It has become the orthodoxy of ELT (Nunan, 2004). It stresses on the process of communication, such as using language aptly in diverse situations, and using language for social interaction with other people. Primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as in discourse (Richards and Rodgers 1986). It can aid the individuals to learn the language without obscurity through creating conducive atmosphere to free expression of their needs, opinions and views. Willis (1996) forwarded that tasks remove the instructor domination, and learners get chances to open and close conversations, to interact naturally, to interrupt and challenge, to ask people to do things and to check what they have been done.

- A primary focus on meaning

A task aims at developing English language proficiency through communication. It requires focus on meaning. It incorporates an information, opinion or reasoning gap activities. Thus, students are free to choose the linguistic and non-linguistic means to close the gap and achieve the outcome. However, a task can generate certain semantic space and the need for specific processes linked to linguistic options. Thus, a task may indicate the content but the language used is the learner's choice (Ellis, 2009).

- Outcome-oriented activity

Many ELT materials presented tasks based on the meaning than form with a particular emphasis on outcome (Oxford, 2006). Its focal point is that English language learner is anticipated to produce or attain language skills based on the curriculum (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). In the analogous vein, Tomlinson (2011) stated that tasks are activities in which the learners are requested to use the target language in order to complete a fussy outcome within a meticulous context.

- A complete unit

There must be a finish line in order for the students to know when they have successfully completed the task. This provides a reason to do the task and encourages motivation from students. Alternatively, seeing that there is a finish line could contribute to students rushing

through tasks not necessarily using the target language to accomplish the task. It appears to be so concentrated on completing the task that linguistic forms are treated as a vehicle to minor its significance in ELT (Oxford, 2006).

2.8. Elements of a task

According to Nunan (1989; 2004) and Willis (1996) tasks are composed of different elements. These are

a. Goals

Willis (1996) stated that goal is what aspect of communicative competence the task is intended to throw in. According to Nunan (1989) goals might relate to a range of general outcomes (communicative, affective or cognitive) or could describe instructor or learner behavior. Moreover; using tasks in ELT might facilitate stake holders to employ integrated language skills.

b. Input

Willis (1996) confirmed that input is the verbal and / or non-verbal information presented by the task materials. This is an experience recounted by the instructor, a written text, a recording, a picture; a map and etc. The use of authentic (real) materials in the classroom could have significance in language development based on the intended purposes.

c. Activities

Nunan (1989) stated that activities specify what learners actually do with the input. Too, Ellis (2003) proposed that activities are procedures which are accomplished by the task participants. The technique how the task is done, the time given for it, the roles played by students and instructors before, during and at the end of the task, the roles of instructors, and whether the task is done in pair, individually or in-group, are evidently specified.

d. Roles

Roles played by both instructors and students' before, during and at the end of the task. In line with this, Nunan (1989) declared that role refers to the part that students and instructors are anticipated to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationships between the participants.

e. Setting

According to Nunan (1989) setting is the place in which learning takes place. Therefore, tasks can be performed inside or outside of the classroom, since it includes both real life tasks and pedagogical tasks.

By and large, the five elements of tasks are two sides of the same coin. If one is overlooked, the task could not be meaningful because one can affect the other directly/indirectly. Therefore, task designers required to bestow equivalent concentration for all components (goal, input, activities, roles and setting).

2.9. Principles of TBI

According to Nunan (2004) the subsequent points are principles of TBI. These are

- Scaffolding

Lessons and materials should deliver supporting frameworks within which the learning takes place. This is particularly imperative to encounter holistic chunks of language that might be beyond learners' current processing capacity. If the scaffolding is impasse prematurely, the learning process will collapse. If it is maintained too long, the learners will not develop the sovereignty required for autonomous language use.

- Task dependency

Task dependency demonstrates how each task exploits and builds on the one that has gone before. In a sense, sequence a step by step point where they are able to carry out the final pedagogical task. In the framework, principles are in operation from receptive-to-productive skills. Later in the cycle, the proportion changes, and learners spend more time in productive work. The reproductive-to-creative-language principle is also used in developing chains of tasks.

- Recycling

Recycling maximizes prospects for learning and activates the organic learning principle. Thus, learning is gradually and inherently unstable. This recycling permits learners to encounter target language items in a range of different environments, linguistic and experiential meaning. It demonstrates how a particular item functions in conjunction with other closely related linguistic items and unusual content area.

- Active learning

Learners learn best by doing /constructing their own knowledge. Most class time should be devoted to opportunities for learners to employ the language. The instructor should facilitate learning input without dominating the class time.

- Integration

Learners should be taught in traditions that make lucid the relationships between linguistic form, communicative function and semantic meaning. This leads to understanding meaning-

based instruction through a mastery of grammar as fundamental for effective communication and thus an overt hub on form is superfluous.

- Reproduction to creation

Learners should be encouraged to move from reproductive to creative language use. In reproductive tasks, learners reproduce language models provided by the instructors and the course materials. These tasks are designed to give learners mastery of form, meaning and function, and are intended to provide a basis for creative tasks.

- Reflection

Learners should be given prospects to mirror on what they have learned and how well they are doing. It reallocates spotlight from language content to learning processes.

2.10. TBI in EFL Materials

Schooling is dynamic in its nature. It is always changing, and ever growing. Materials are too. They are published, and reprinted in huge numbers every year to realize a better quality. Tomlinson (2011) confirmed that materials are whatever thing which is exploited by instructors or students to assist the learning of a language. As stated by Meyers and Jones (1993) materials in the practice of active learning or TBI employed could be cassettes, videos, CD-ROMs, dictionaries, grammar books, readers, workbooks or photocopied exercises. They could also be newspapers, photographs, and live talks by invited native speakers, instructions given by an instructor, tasks written on cards or discussion between learners. In other words, they can be no matter which is deliberately used to amplify the learners' knowledge and/or know-how of the language.

The current trend in materials development is geared towards promoting resources that are more communicatively based than grammar based. In this regard Donough and Shaw (2003) stated that instructional materials following structural approach classically materialized as an ordered list of grammatical items. Such practices evidently force learners to manipulate the language in a vacuum. They go on to elucidate the communicative approach came to the rescue of the traditional approach. Richards (2006) confirmed that TBI related with active learning, autonomous learning and meaning based edification. As well, the ELT materials through TBI are anticipated to encompass various tasks which hearten its implementation in EFL classroom. It assists to gaze at the nature and tasks in EFL teaching course materials.

Therefore, the contents analysis explains the intended goals of EFL course materials prepared to assist learners and instructors to use or decide whether a learning material is rich with apposite tasks. Thus, the course materials will be evaluated based on its title, authors who have written it, the publisher, the level of students, objectives, the tasks, the task types, the purposes of tasks, the skills area the tasks promotes, weakness and strength of the materials (Lazar, 1993). As well, contents to be analyzed through its availability, its objectives, its contents, tasks it has and authenticity. This authenticity should be related to the text sources. As Krippendorff (as cited in Alen, 2012), it can generate both valid and replicable data. The tasks should be understandable and can be done by students based on the meaningful challenge, contain familiar topics, give much chance for students to practice, to be real life English language learning for students, instructions to be clear and easily explicable. Thus, tasks should mirror purposes that ballpark authentic real life, pertinent for students, match and comprehensible to the level of students, active and participatory, prepared based on the needs of the students, identify role of students and instructors, egg on learner activities, every prospect has been taken to involve learners in meaningful and realistic contexts, structures, rules, skills, topics, and situation.

2.11. Implementation of TBI

The phases of TBI implemented in actual classroom can be discussed in the subsequent approaches. These are

2.11.1. Phases of the task cycle

According to Willis (1996) and Richards (2006) the ordinary phases of TBI are the subsequent. These are

- Pre-task: the instructor begins the topic and gives the students clear directions on what they require to do. This may ease the students to recall language that might be handy for the task. The students can take notes and spend time through getting prepared for the task. What's more, they plan the task they are going to do in the classroom.
- Task: the students complete a task by using the language resources as the instructors' monitors and offers support. This includes a lesson that is fundamentally conversational in nature and the unequivocal formulation of messages, performing shared goals and effective in scaffolding the learners' communication.
- Language focus cycle: the consciousness raising activities in order to grab students' contemplation towards the designed language form. It assists learners to pull off greater

level of accuracy. Unambiguous learning helps learners to recognize patterns and to notice them in subsequent input. Richards and Rodgers (2001) sub-divide language focus stage in to two parts:

- **Analysis:** the instructor is anticipated to review each activity with the students, identify significant words, phrases and patterns to click the deliberation of students to notice the language item from the report stage. Alternatively, learners are projected to do consciousness-raising activities to make out and process specific language features from the task they performed.
- **Practice:** the instructor set up a practice activity. Students also anticipated practicing the new language item they get from the analysis activities and learners can enter functional language items in their language notebook.

2.12. Error correction

Instructors require taking notes while monitoring to correct students' errors. They also necessitate being systematic in their correction strategies. They have to hub on diverse kinds of errors in different lessons. This provides a theme to the feedback and aid learners to progress specific aspects of their accuracy (Jones, 2007). In addition, Ellis (2003) stated that while students are performing task in groups, instructors could move from one group to another to listen in and note down the conspicuous errors the students consigned. In the post task phase, the instructor can address the errors with the whole class. A sentence illustrating the error can be written on the board, students can be invited to correct it, the corrected version is written up, and a brief explanation is granted.

2.13. Mechanisms of TBI

According to Ur (1996) and Trualem (2003); Meyers and Jones (1993) the mechanisms of TBI in EFL classroom are the subsequent points. These are

- Role-play

Role play is employed in the entire sorts of activities where learners imagine themselves in a state of affairs outside of the classroom, occasionally playing the role of someone other than themselves, and using language fittingly with the milieu. It helps them to develop the interpersonal skills of learners. It gives learners a prospect to practice skills in a risk-free environment. It is also constructive in an empathy activity where feelings and attitudes are being investigated.

- Pair Work

Pair work is a work performed by the class in pairs in order to give students ceiling occasion to take part in an activity. In it students can practice language together, study a text, research language or be included in information gap activities. They can write dialogues, predict the content of reading texts, or compare notes on what they have listened to or observed.

- Group Work

In large multilevel classes, group work is obviously a key element that enables students to learn from one another. When working in small groups, students have a greater likelihood to practice oral fluency. Students are also far less intimidated in a small group, and once they become familiar with the procedure, they usually enjoy sharing ideas and practicing new language structures in the format.

- Question and Answer

Asking and answering questions is vital to the learning process. Asking questions permit students to clarify points of uncertainty and also indicates the extent to which they are able to use new knowledge and ideas. Responding to questions requires students to recall a new fact or conception and, if the question is phrased aptly, to apply their knowledge to a new circumstances. As they respond to questions, students get pointer on their own learning and the instructor gets feedback on students' understanding.

- Individual work

Students work on their own in class. They complete worksheets or writing tasks by themselves. The worksheets with different tasks which consent to individuals to make their own decisions can be provided. It permits instructors to respond to individual student differences in terms of pace of learning, learning styles, and preferences. Too, it is likely to be less stressful for students than performing in a whole-class setting or talking in pairs or groups. It can develop learner autonomy and promote skills of self-reliance and investigation over instructor-dependence.

- Assignments

Assignment is a task or set of tasks prearranged to students to complete-usually individually; however, occasionally in groups. Typically the students can exercise sizeable autonomy over how, where, when and in what order the tasks are carried out.

2.14. Assessment in TBI

In TBI students assessed to execute specific target language tasks in particular communicative settings. It utilizes the real-world tasks as a means for eliciting the production of particular components of the language system which are evaluated. The assessment tasks should be motivating and authentic which related with what learners are anticipated to be able to do with the target language in real life framework (Jabbarpoor, 2011). Moreover, Bahaman (as cited in Ellen, 2005) stated that the mechanisms instructors draw on to assess their students in EFL classroom can generate wash back effect. Connotatively, what is assessed should be what has been taught in the classroom. If not, the assessments probably have off-putting effect on the instructors ELT. Consequently, the content of assessment should match with the instructional content.

2.15. Constraints on the implementation of TBI

It is palpable that quality of education depends on quality of instruction. As well, the implementation of TBI relies on the line of attack through which constraints of TBI discouraged. These constraints are related with human/internal and non-human/ external/ factors. These are

2.15.1.1. Internal constraints

2.15.1.2. Instructor related constraints

- Instructors tendency to employ the traditional method

Richards (2006) confirmed that instructor's tendency to use traditional methods emerge when they have not been disposed to keep up with scholarly developments of paradigm shifts of instruction. They have not stayed abreast of the knowledge explosion, which would permit them to feel committed to curriculum change and the implementation of new paradigm shifts. Many instructors tend to disregard on the available evidence regarding to new curricular or pedagogical practice if it challenges their current understanding and outlook. Moreover, lack of knowledge on the latest innovative instructional strategies can be another reason for the instructors' resistance towards it. Sometimes they know about the innovation; however, they may snub to utilize them through their guiding actions.

- Instructors' perception

Instructors' perception plays a critical role in determining the implementation of TBI and develops their way of didactic activities. Richards and Rodgers (2001) and Hu (2013) portrayed that instructors might develop their own instructional procedures, informed by a particular view

of language and a particular theory of learning. Thus, they might constantly revise, vary and modify instruction or learning procedures that may not be compatible. Even if the entire instructors share the identical belief about language and language learning, they might implement these principles (beliefs) in different ways; these may upshot in having unusual classroom practice. Moreover, it elucidates instructors' mood and thought about actions which are ill-assorted with innovation (Carless, 2003). They sense as their role is to correct than facilitate students when they make errors, considering themselves as less counselor and friend with students.

- How to organize task stages

One of the most difficult issues that instructors face in implementing TBI in their classes is how to organize task stages. Willis (1996) proposed that the hardest thing for the instructors to do is to stop instruction during the task stage and just monitor. According to him, there are three phases involved in the task based instruction such as a pre-task, task cycle and language focus.

- High demand on the instructors linguistic and pedagogical abilities

The use of TBI also places a high demand on the instructors linguistic and pedagogical abilities (Ellen, 2005). The use of TBI also requires instructions to organize students to communicate and interact with their peers in groups, which was quite a challenge with little training in classroom management (Jha, 2013).

- Lack of preparation on tasks

Preparation refers heavy workloads (i.e. marking) possibly will reduce the time available for lesson preparation and when time is scarce, traditional instruction or following the course materials may be preferred (Carless, 2003). The instructors work load should be consistent with time to prepare course instruction and to arrange significant conditions of instructional approaches.

- Exam-based methods of instruction

There is difficulty to admit as task TBI prepares students sufficiently well for the more traditional form oriented examinations which will determine learners' educational future. Having such a dependency on the outcome of exam could restrain instructors from introducing TBI in their classroom and the instructors pertain it are viewed as unqualified which could eventually put their jobs in jeopardy (Carless, 2003).

2.15.1.3. Instructor and students related constraints

- Lack of motivation

Lack of motivation is the irritability for instructors and students in the instructional setting. They believe that English can never be the language to satisfy their daily needs to survive. They are aware of that English should be used only within the four walls of classroom or in compelling situations (Jha, 2013). It reflects either they are ignorant of the significance of English or they keenly deny the weight of English. In fact, instructors anticipated to initiate and maintain students' motivation if they promote student-centered learning and instruction methods in their class (Jones, 2007). Obviously, motivation would be increased through problem solving tasks, which would engage both the cognitive and the affective resources of the learners. Motivating students take part in groups or pairs in the classroom to facilitate them in communicating efficiently, to enlarge motivation and amplify their level of confidence.

- Lack of knowledge and skills in how to work with tasks

Regardless of its educational profit in language learning perspective, a task in itself does not automatically guarantee its successful implementation unless the instructors and students understand how tasks truly work in the classroom. As an instructional method TBI is more than just giving tasks to learners and evaluating their performance. More importantly, the instructor, who wants to endeavor implementing it fruitfully, is required to have ample knowledge about the instructional framework related to its plan and procedure. TBI is not instructor-centered; instead, it requires individual responsibility and commitment on the part of students. If students are notably lacking in these qualities, TBI might indeed be difficult to implement (Krahne as cited in Meseret, 2012). Instructors and students ability to articulate the principles of TBI and awareness about its implications in the classroom practice can create a problem. Thus, unclear conceptions hinder its implementation (Carless, 2003). Therefore, they are anticipated to carry out tasks based on settings.

- Use of mother language

Learners' and instructors use of mother language eliminates the purpose of the tasks and hinders communication opportunities through target language. Learners not familiarity with being in an environment concentrated on learner centered tasks and instructors' ineffective ability of communication through target language as well as wish of helping students through translating English to Amharic language can make them to use target language during the instructional

processes. For students as well as instructors who do not have enough vocabulary or knowledge of the English language, might force them to complete a task given without target language (Carless, 2004). As evidence, Atkins and *et al* (1995) teaching methodology part one articulates nearly all of the mistakes which second language students make are due to interference from their first language.

- Communicative incompetence

Communicative incompetence implies instructors' and students inability of using the English language correctly/ low English language proficiency/. They lack particularly in areas like word stress, intonation, sentence formation, words choice, stylistic, and cultural nuances of English language. There are moments when, English instructors also hesitate to speak English for fear of making mistakes or being ridiculed (Jha, 2013). Consequently, limited English structures and vocabulary on the part of instructors and students are involved in communicative activities difficulties (Chang, 2011). Therefore, the inexperience, learners' linguistic abilities and the awareness can be a factor (Carless, 2003).

2.15.1.4. Student related constraints

- Background of the student

Nearly the entire of the Ethiopian students reside in rural areas, that the living area has its own disheartening impact in communicating through English language in actual fact. Language acquisition begins from living area and interaction or practice between individuals. According to Atkins and *et al* (1995), English is a more tricky language for rural students to learn than for those students living in urban areas. This is due to scarcity of books and other reading materials in English, and being deficient in the practice opportunities with peers and other communities. Due to this, they cannot express their ideas and opinions aptly.

- Range of English language abilities

While working in groups, the more advanced students could complete the tasks without much or any input from the weaker students. Without participation in the task the weaker students would fall even further behind in their communicative competence. If working alone, the more advanced students would conclude their tasks first. Carless (2002) demonstrated that when the more advanced students complete the task quickly, there is a possibility that these students will become 'off-task'. In other words, because the students have finished the task, they grow to be bored and will eventually begin to raise their noise level. This type of distraction can take away

from the rest of the classes' concentration and can be disturbing for those who are endeavoring to complete the task.

- Students' perception

A lot of factors alter the students understanding about TBA in the classroom. These are students expectations, the need to learn only grammar, and lack of familiarity with the method etc. These factors may pressure their feeling and practice in the classroom. Nunan (1989) stated that students value their own experiences as a source for further learning, and that they learn best when they have a personal investment in the program and when the content is personally relevant. According to Leaver and Kaplan (as cited in Yeshimabet, 2009), obstacles for the implementation of TBA are significant lack of predictability, obstacles related to students' teaching expectations. Even if learners are acquiring new language instinctively, they feel that they are not making progress and lose confidence.

- Fear of making mistakes

Tasks that demand students to employ language in front of the entire class are the most apprehension provoking. Therefore, students get more anxious when called upon to respond individually than voluntarily. Conversely, students found to be more relaxed in the target language use when paired with a classmate or put into small groups. Students know the rules and structure of the language but cannot communicate in that language effectively as the result of fright (Tanveer, 2007).

- Learners lack of confidence in performing tasks

Successfulness or unsuccessfulness of students depends on the confidence they have. Without self-confidence zilch will be achieved. It impedes students unable to express what they want to articulate and they are in predicament during communication in the classroom as well as outside of the classroom. As a result, students cannot express their thoughts, opinions, feelings and ideas as anticipated in ELT process. Therefore, in English classroom they remain silent and depend on the instructor.

- Resistance to class participation

Chang (2011) stated that students are passive through prior experiences in the classroom arrangement in traditionally. Thus, the instructor is supposed to be in the front to lecture and the students sit quietly and follow the instructors' directions.

2.15.2. External Constraints

2.15.2.1. EFL Instructional Materials Related Factors

- Organization of instructional materials

The adequacy of equipment and instructional resources are a significant variable in the classroom. The pedagogical alternatives are unblock to an instructor whose only aid is the blackboard, and whose students can rely only on the notes they make during class time and perhaps from a course materials, are plainly different from those pleasant environments by an instructors and students who have access to video and audio equipment in every classroom, good recording facilities, well- resourced self- access center or computer laboratory. Thus, the organization of curricular materials such as authentic materials may have an impact on the institutionalizing of TBA. The roles of instructional materials are to progress the balance between concrete and abstract learning experience, assist students to integrate prior experience with the present varying from abstract to concrete, ensure longer retention of the information gained, motivate the students to pay attention to the lesson, give opportunity to learn through engagement and immediate action use of all senses and muscles (Jha, 2013).

- Role of course materials and topics

Role of course materials and topics refers endeavoring to conclude the course materials with little regard to the capability of the students against the permissible time due to external pressure (Carless, 2003). The course materials should incorporate tasks as core contents of language instruction and provide awareness raising issues in its stages of tasks to make learning effective and efficient as well as to attain the goals of instruction and learning in the classroom or outside of the classroom.

- Wash-back effect of the exam

The form-focused tests and examinations are mismatched with TBI ideology. In order to ensure that students could get high marks in local tests and examinations, instructors adopted instructors dominated, form-focused, and grammar-based methods of instruction. Such a negative wash back effect also subdued instructors' utilization of more tasks in their ELT (Bachaman, as cited in Ellen, 2005).

- Lack of availability of ELT materials

The dearth of ELT materials for each student in the classroom might affect instructional processes. Therefore, instruction processes might depend on the materials in the instructors' hand which they have adapted from various sources (Krippendorff as cited in Alen, 2012).

- Lack of authentic texts

Authentic texts are texts which create the natural like situation in the classroom. The quandary is that there might be scarcity of authentic texts in the course materials. Leaver and Kaplan (as cited in Yeshimabet, 2009) confirmed that instructors anticipated to employ apposite authentic texts. Instructors who desired to add tasks to their classrooms projected to find fitting authentic materials and then develop their own tasks. Even if they accomplish the materials, it may be beyond the level of learners and take time to modify or adapt it.

- Lack of adequate tasks in the content of course materials

The course materials should incorporate tasks adequately in their contents and offer awareness raising issues in its stages of tasks to make learning effective and efficient as well as to arrive at the goals of instruction in or outside of the classroom (Carless, 2003).

2.15.2.2. Instructional environment related constraints

- Lack of exposure

Students would merely employ English in class and rarely utilize it to communicate with others outside of the classroom. Due to this problem, there might be difficulty in communicating effectively through interacting with group members in English classroom. Therefore, limited exposure has a great impact on students' communication performance. It is principally in the classroom that they can learn, when and how to articulate what to whom in English. Classrooms in general expose learners to theoretical knowledge whereas outside of the classroom atmosphere exposes learners to the performance or actual usage of the language (Meseret, 2012). Although instructors paid much attention to students' English learning, there were no prospect for students to practice English language during recess or after classes. Accordingly, the entire of the classroom learning was form-focused which paying attention principally on mastering and memorizing the words, sentences, dialogues and grammar instead of providing students with prospect to pertain English.

- Time

Time in learning is classified into two: allocated and engaged time. The allocated time refers to the time during which students have the prospect to learn. Engaged time is the part of allocated time when students are exhibiting a task (Ellen, 2005). Employing TBI reduces the amount of available time that is devoted to content coverage. Time constraint is one of the issues that instructors frequently raise in implementing TBI. Incidentally, the suggested things are avoiding interruption, handling routine procedures smoothly and quickly, and minimizing time spent on description. Insufficient time in ELT results in focusing mainly on instructing words, sentences and grammar and gave students little time to make use of what they learned freely. The instruction might hinge on knowledge-transmitting and form-focused activities. As Leaver and Kaplan (as cited in Yeshimabet, 2009) point out the amount of time required for preparing lessons plays a fundamental role in TBI. To solve this problem increasing experience in TBI and providing direct assistance from administrators and other scholars have value.

- Class size and Classroom condition

Class size, including the overall classroom situation affects the implementation of TBI. In this aspect Tudor (as cited in Trualem, 2003) proposed that instructional procedures which are perfectly feasible with 10-12 students might need creative adaptation with a group of 30; however, become problematic with groups of 80, 150 or more. This does not unavoidably mean that the educational goals which are being pursued with groups of 10-12 call for to be dropped or even revised with large classes. Thus, class sizes inevitably have an influence on the form of interaction between instructors and learners upon which TBI is based. In a class of 10-12, the instructor can interact directly with each learner to get to know their specific background and learning preferences. This is hardly feasible with a class of 120 or more. Moreover, the physical environment of the class (classroom arrangement, furniture arrangement, classroom appearance and layout etc), may affect the implementation of TBI unconstructively.

- Cultural difference

TBI is a Western method of instructing English languages. Thus, learners who come from a different culture and whose strategies of learning and studying are different from Western cultures might have difficulty in accepting it. Thus, students rely on the instructor to get information directly (Carless, 2003).

- Lack of training on TBI

Lack of the essential orientation and adequate training or support in TBI might foster the negative attitudes towards it. As instructors and students trained in TBI methods, were required to use it. This requirement led them to develop their sense of control and to give task materials to students with sense of how to use them (Feryok as cited in Meseret, 2012).

2.16. ELT in Ethiopian education curriculum

English language instruction started in Ethiopia during the reign of Menelik II in 1908(Heugh and et al as cited in Meseret, 2012). Beginning from that time English language is taught as subject in each level of education in Ethiopia and used as medium of instruction (FDRE, 1994; UNESCO, 2001). The design of English language curricula comprises of connecting theoretical knowledge with practical real life situation and using the problem solving approach. The mechanism of selection and organization of content areas should be based on the rational assumption behind goals of general education at each levels of education.

2.16.1. Methods of ELT in Ethiopia education context

The methodology of English language instruction in Ethiopia faced similar situation of other countries in the world in its history in terms of instructional approaches, methods and techniques. For a long period of time instructor centered and structural approach was the dominant ideology (Institute of International Education, 2012) Though the recent education and training policy of Ethiopia claims to be communicatively oriented, most instructors in Ethiopian tertiary level of education still seem to employ the instructor-centered approach. As a result, ministry of education designed different projects in which instructors have been introduced to recent instruction methods (Wagari as cited in Meseret, 2012).

2.6.2. Harmonized ELT Curriculum and its Rationales

According to Ministry of education (2012) modularized curriculum for undergraduate program, English Language is among the few languages used globally as a medium of communication and all forms of interaction (economic, political, etc) between nations across countries and continents. Its instruction at undergraduate level in countries like Ethiopia becomes inevitable to produce students capable of working at global level to aid the development of the country in every affair. Providing training in English Language and Literature has also an incontestable concern in Ethiopia.

Thus, producing qualified individuals with the required competence is the foremost agenda. This curriculum offers competence based training. It is whispered that students should have ample training and practice in the subject matter to thrive in the modern employment market. Among others, students should know about how human language functions. They also necessitate knowing about the principles that guide the scientific study of language. In addition, they need to practice different levels of writing, reading, listening, and speaking in English. The students must have also the prospect to engage in oral communication in a variety of situations and develop the oral communication skills indispensable to be able to transfer the same skills to their job. They also require analysing literary texts and conducting research to solve problems, full mastery of the target language so that they have the competence and confidence to use the language for their purposes. The curriculum is designed focusing on the competencies which graduates need to attain by integrating English Language knowledge and skills, and aspires to effectively prepare professionals for diverse job opportunities in the areas where the country needs skilled professionals. There is a great need for English Language specialists in various areas such as public relations, communications, interpretations, etc.

Moreover, its rationales are to present students and/or trainees with a profound understanding of the English Language, Literature and Communication from various perspectives, with the aim of preparing them for the era of globalization and human communication matters. The courses offered are designed principally for the development of trainees' language skills with the general aim of preparing them as excellent communicators in various professional areas.

Obviously, in the old curriculum courses are scattered and not designed based on the core competencies that the students should acquire. In other words, it is knowledge based and not competence based. Besides, the curriculum does not give credit to students' study time. Accordingly, it has become inevitable to revise the curriculum to make it competence based to match the graduates' competence with the demand of the market. Modularizing the delivery of the courses at undergraduate level would enable in clustering scattered courses together and offering them based on the competence they build. To enable students have adequate training and practice in the subject matter, it is mandatory to leave the traditional knowledge based and scattered approach and embrace the methodology that focus on the unity of idea which is the core value of the modularization approach.

As a result, courses are clustered into modules based on the similarity of the core competencies they develop and based on the vertical and horizontal relations between the different bodies of knowledge working towards the achievement of the core competencies. Based on the theoretical knowledge of task based instruction the aim, goals and objectives of modularised curriculum would be achieved through task based instruction.

2.7. Local Researches on the Topic.

A number of researches have been conducted locally in Ethiopia. For instance, Teshome (1995) did his MA thesis in AAU freshman students' views and preferences with respect to structure-based versus task-based approaches to ELT. Study findings showed that students were generally optimistic about the advantages of the TBI. Thus, the respondents favored its learning activities and disposed towards it and the methodology used to implement the approach in particular.

Besides, Tagesse (2008) carried out his MA thesis in the practicability of task-based EFL instruction in higher institutes (Kotebe and Commerce colleges of Addis Ababa University). He investigated that task-based instruction is being practiced to some extent though the basic principles of the approach are not followed. ELT materials include different types of tasks to some extent. The most commonly used tasks are opinion exchange, comparing and contrasting, decision making, and problem solving tasks. Instructors also, most of the time, use opinion exchange and personal experience sharing tasks out of their course materials. They sometimes use reordering and sorting, and comparing and contrasting tasks from different sources. Some tasks have pre-task and task phases; others include only task phase. The post-task phase is not included in the tasks which are found in the materials.

Uniformly, Yeshimabet (2009) did her MA thesis on the perception and practice of task based language teaching in EFL classroom in Arbaminch teacher Education College. The findings demonstrated that the instructors and students seem to be aware of the relevance of TBI, even if they lack the proper dedication to pertain it in their classroom. Tasks are used infrequently in the EFL classes. Even if tasks are being used, it's found out that they were not being implemented according to the main principles. The task lacks the language focus cycle that comprises language analysis and practice stage. Almost all of English language instructors do not play their roles as expected. However, the post task cycle is not implemented totally. The instructors as well as material developers had misconceptions about task based instruction. This is particularly

manifested by ignoring the post task cycle and the principles of it while developing the modules respectively.

Besides, Meseret (2012) did his PhD dissertation on instructors' and students' perceptions and practices of task-based writing in an EFL context in Haramaya University. The data findings illustrated that there was mismatch between instructors' perceptions and practices of TBI. Lack of awareness about TBI resulted in the students' wrong perceptions and practices of tasks. Similarly, in spite of the many challenges in implementing TBI in EFL contexts, instructors should confidently put effort to raise the students' awareness in it. It is theorized that students in typical classroom settings can engage in self-directed learning which provided as they are supported and encouraged to develop self confidence. It was challenging, not impractical to make the ELT through tasks. He stated that instructors deem that tasks based instruction enhances students' language performance; however, they tend to shift to instruct English language through an instructor-centered approach where forms of the language is over emphasized. This shows that the instructors were ambivalent in using TBI. Therefore, instructor's perceptions of TBI did not inform their classroom practice.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology of the study. Therefore, it aims to describe the research design, research setting, source of data, participants of the study, census method, instruments of data collection, procedures for data collection and data analysis.

3.1.1. Research Design

A mixed research design with descriptive and cross-sectional study was employed. According to Tayie (2005) descriptive survey is sympathetic to explain current circumstances. Besides, it illustrates immediate status of an observable fact. As stated by Creswell (2012) mixed methods research approaches afford an enhanced understanding of the research problem. Thus, the study intended to respond to the research questions through qualitative instruments (i.e. semi-structured interview, open ended questionnaires) and quantitative nature (i.e. closed ended questionnaires, observation, and content analysis of EFL courses). Afterward, the data analyses of both methodologies were applied.

3.1.2. Research Setting

Ethiopia has thirty one government Universities. Among these Universities of Ethiopia, WU located in SNNPRG at Hosanna town, Hadiya Zone about 235 kms from Ethiopian capital city. It started academic work before two years. Thus, the researcher has chosen the University based on the dogma of convenience sampling due its proximity and researchers acquaintance with respondents to make a thorough assessment. In line with this Ross (2005) stated that convenience sampling is employed when the backbone of the research is situated spatially close to the researcher.

3.1.3. Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used in this study. The primary sources were instructors and students. They were taken to acquire noteworthy information about research through various data gathering instruments. Another primary source was the EFL classroom. At this juncture, the actual instructional processes were observed in order to get the first hand information. As a secondary source EFL course materials contents were analyzed to glimpse how they have been designed in the means they promote the implementation of TBI.

3.1.4. Participants of the Study

The participants of the study were English language courses instructors and students in Wachemo University, Department of English language and Literature in the 2013/14 Academic year.

3.1.4.1. Instructors

The respondents of the study were twenty five English language courses instructors in Wachemo University, Department of English language and Literature. The entire of the instructors were participants for the questionnaire. However, the researcher selected six instructors for classroom observation and four instructors for interview by using purposeful sampling techniques.

3.1.4.2. Students

The respondents of the study were ninety seven students in Wachemo University, Department of English language and Literature. They were from Year-I to Year-III levels. Thus, there figure is year-I-43, Year-II-38 and year-III-16 students. The entire students were participants of the questionnaire. Yet, the researcher selected nine students (three students from each respective year) for the interview based on purposeful sampling techniques i.e. their achievement results. Therefore, the researcher managed the way of classifying students into the three groups of high, medium, and low achievers from each respective year based on the results of students which were documented in the department.

3.1.5. Census Method

The University has the entire number of twenty-five instructors and ninety seven students in the department of English language and literature in the academic year of 2013/2014 G.C. Hence their number was below two hundred and controllable in its scope it is feasible to apply comprehensive sampling/ census/method. According to Israel (1992) a census method is applied for small populations whose quantity is below two hundred and most likely existing. In it developing the sampling frame is permanent. Consequently, it grants overall proof. Also, Dawson (2002) confirmed that this method provides the researcher an opportunity to contact everyone in the target area. Besides, it can be presumed that the entire participants were covered the reliable findings in the research to be acquired (Kothari, 2004). Thus, the researcher incorporated the entire population in the target area as the participants of the study hoping that it helps him in obtaining the valid and reliable data hence their size were manageable to get in touch with each of them. As a result, the researcher administered questionnaires for the entire

participants of the study. Besides, classroom room observation and interview were conducted through purposively selected participants in the setting.

3.1.6. Instruments of Data Collection

An amalgamation of close-ended and open-ended items in the questionnaire, classroom observation, semi -structured interview and content analysis were applied for data collection. The bases for the tools were the concept in the review of related literature.

3.1.6.1. Questionnaires

According to Kothari (2004) questionnaires are any written tools that present a series of items. They facilitate the researcher to attain large amount of data swiftly. Thus, the questionnaire was designed based on literature review in chapter two and partly adapted from Horwitz (as cited in Meseret, 2012). Thus, two sets of questionnaires (one for students and another for instructors) were designed and administered as a focal data collecting tools (please refer to appendixes-I and II). The instructors' and students' questionnaire encompasses both close -ended and open -ended questions and they were divided into seven parts. Part one aimed at gathering the instructors' and students' personal biography. The number and conceptions of question were different; however, they were equipped based on multiple choose items. Thus, the total numbers of questions were three (from item 1.1 to 1.2) for instructors and one item for students. Part two of the questionnaires were intended to find out the instructors' and students' experiences of TBI in EFL classroom. Basically, the questions were quite different because participants of the study have different backgrounds. Thus, the questions were three for instructors (from item 2.1 to 2.3) and four for students (from item 2.1 to 2.4). They were geared up based on the "Yes" or "No" alternatives. Part-three questionnaires projected to know instructors' and students' practice of theoretical knowledge of TBI in EFL classroom. The questions have similar concepts. Therefore, their number was five for each participants of the study (from item 3.1 to 3.5). They were organized based on five point Likert scales i.e. always (5), usually (4), sometimes (3), rarely (2), never (1). Part-four questionnaires designed to identify instructors' and students' perceptions of TBI in EFL classroom. The questionnaires were similar notionally; however, the numbers of the questions were four for both instructors' and students (4.1-4.4). They were arranged based on five point Likert Scales i.e. strongly agree (5), 4= Agree (4), Undecided (3), Disagree (2), strongly disagree (1).

Similarly, Part-five of the questionnaires were designed to know about instructors' and students' implementation of different types of tasks such as gap principle (5.1.1-5.1.3), decision making principle (5.2.1-5.2.3) and cognitive principle tasks (5.3.1-5.3.5) in EFL classroom. The questions have the same wordings for instructors and students. The numbers of the items were twelve. They were primed based on five point Likert scale like always (5), usually (4), sometimes (3), rarely (2), never (1). Part-six questionnaires were set out to find out the factors affecting the implementation of TBI in EFL classrooms. The questions were factors related with instructors (6.1.1.-6.1.3), students (6.2.1-6.2.6), EFL course materials (6.3.1-6.3.3) and instructional environment (6.4.1-6.4.3). The ideas of questions were entirely equivalent for instructors and students in their size and wordings. The numbers of the questionnaires were fifteen for each groups of the study. They were equipped based on four point Likert scale such as most serious (4), serious (3), undecided (2) and not serious (1). Finally, part-seven questionnaires were open ended questions. They were geared up to find out subjective notions of instructors' and students' about the implementation of TBI in EFL classrooms. The questions were three for each participants of the study. The instructors and students' were asked to respond questions through narration in a paragraph form.

3.1.6.2. Classroom Observation

Observation bestows the direct account of situations under the study. Thus, the researcher applied non-participant observation with co-observers to study circumstances in its natural setting without altering the state of affairs and with a detached representativeness. According to Kothari (2004) non-participant observation demonstrates the episode in the classroom and it is independent of respondents' willingness to respond. To this end, the researcher equipped classroom observation checklist which has six main questions (please refer to appendix-III) in order to collect data. The checklist has six parts which focus on the phases of tasks such as pre-task phase, while task phase and post task phase, instructional activities, classroom conditions, instructor's and students' roles and instructional materials used during the implementation of TBI. The checklist was geared up based on the review of related literature made in Chapter Two and partly adapted from Horwitz (as cited in Meseret, 2012). Therefore, six English language course instructors (two instructors from each year) at Wachemo University, Department of English language and Literature were observed once each with co-observers. They were selected based on purposeful sampling technique (i.e. the course type they have been instructing in EFL

classroom). Thus, the researcher and co-observers made twelve observations totally using prepared checklist without disturbing the instructional processes in EFL classroom. Then, the data obtained from classroom observation were analyzed through SPSS version.16 based on the four point Likert scales such as major emphasis (4), some emphasis (3), limited emphasis (2) and not at all (1) to see whether activities crop up in the classroom or not. The observations were carried out before making interview and administrating questionnaires as well as analyzing content of EFL courses.

3.1.6.3. Semi-Structured-Interview

The semi-structured interview assists the researcher to get actual information from the respondents. According to Dawson (2009) semi-structured interview is extremely handy for seeking opinions, attitudes, views and perceptions. Therefore, the researcher employed purposive sampling technique to opt participants of the study for it. In light of this view, Tayie (2005) stated that purposive sampling technique employed to select participants of the study based on their knowledge and professional judgments. Thus, the data were gathered from four EFL course instructors and nine students. To trim down bias in the selection of EFL course instructors and students for the study the researcher used criteria such as the type of courses they instruct for instructors as well as the academic achievement results (high, medium and low) for students in each respective year. The academic profiles of participants of the study were taken from the department of English Language and Literature. Moreover, semi-structured interview questions were primed twelve for instructors and seven for students (Please see appendix- V and VI). Afterward, they were interviewed after observing their classroom. Then, the interview responses were audio-recorded, saved as text, coded; transcribed, taken notes and then analyzed (Please see appendix VI and VII). The interview was conducted through English language with instructors.

3.1.6.4. Content Analysis

Content analyses are imperative sources of data for qualitative research. Consequently, it is critical to examine the EFL courses materials contents to identify to what extent they promote the implementation of TBI in their contents. In here, the TBI sections of the four English course materials were analyzed by researcher and co- analyzers through Likert scales i.e. Very great (5), great (4), some (3), limited (2), not at all (1). The check list was organized based on the model which adapted from Lazar (1993) and Krippendorff (as cited in Allen, 2012). (Please see appendix-VIII). The EFL course materials for content analysis were chosen through purposeful

sampling techniques i.e. their weight given to skills of language. Entirely eight analysis were made with co- analyzers. This was done to wither subjective bias which might leak out by researcher. The analyses of the data were carried out through SPSS version.16.

3.1.7. Development of Data Gathering Instruments

The data collecting instruments (the questionnaires, the observation checklist and semi-structured interview and content analyses) were designed based on the objectives of the study and the research questions from the review of related literature made in Chapter Two and partly adapted from Horwitz (as cited in Meseret, 2012). The instruments were commented by the researcher's advisor, co-advisor and two colleagues' instructors of English language courses before application. Through captivating the constructive comments and suggestions given by these individuals, the researcher made the necessary changes in the tools to validate the content validity, logical flow and clarity of items in the instructors' and students' questionnaires. Moreover, to check the internal consistency of the questionnaires, the researcher pilot tested the items in WLU, Department of English language and Literature which is a government University at SNNPRG where the instructional process was started in similar period with WU (please see Table 1 and 2).The insights gained from the pilot study assisted the researcher to modify ambiguous items and to avoid and delete needless items.

3.1.8. Procedures for Data Collection

Before the administration of instruments of the study students and instructors in each group were informed about the objectives and significance of the research. They were requested to state real and honest responses. In addition, they were acknowledged for the time they were spending in filling up the questionnaires. Moreover, the participants were permitted to ask for any clarifications they might require. Afterward, the questionnaires were distributed. Once they finished answering the questionnaire, they were requested to check their responses for incompleteness or missing answers. The researcher observed classroom with co-observers. Then, thoroughly semi-structured interview were conducted with the instructors and students whose classes were observed. Subsequently, the content analyses of EFL course materials through developed models were analyzed with co-analyzers, then questionnaires dissemination were made. After tabulating and analyzing the data culled through the questionnaires, interview, observation and content analysis of EFL materials the data were explained and interpreted based on SPSS version16.00.

3.1.9. Data Analysis

Primarily, the questions were made lucid to the respondents not to cause perplexity. The researcher gave brief description on questionnaires for students and instructors before distributing them. The collected data were analyzed by using quantitative methods through frequency, percentages, mean and grand mean of the items to find reliable data and discussed accordingly. The percentages were used to show the proportion of the responses; whereas the weighted means were computed to describe the characteristics of given items. Grand mean was applied to see the overall notions of instructors and students. The data obtained through open ended questions and semi-structured interview were analyzed qualitatively in paragraph form in separate sections. Finally, based on the findings of the study conclusions and recommendations were drawn-out.

3.1.10. Validity And Reliability Checks

a. Validity Checks

To get done the validity in the instruments of data collection, the instruments were plaid by experts in the field. It was primed through English language because the respondents were from tertiary level of education. The entire items were developed in addressing the research questions under the investigation. The content validation was established by cross-referencing the content of items construct in line with research questions. It tackled to what extent the apt content symbolized in the instruments of data collection. Indeed, validity gazed at whether the instrument dealings what it is planned to gauge (Golafshani, 2003). The researcher tainted the construction of a number of items in the questionnaires; observation, interview guide and content analysis models based on the feedback received from experts in the field.

b. Reliability Checks

The issue of reliability addressed based on the pre-testing instruments. To ensure this, a pilot test of questionnaire took place in WLU. The main concern of reliability was checking the consistency of the instruments in relation to what they intended to measure. The reliability of the responses is inferred through test re-test methods (Golafshani, 2003). Based on this the researcher modified as well as omitted the items that have discriminative power.

3.1.11. Pilot Testing

The purpose of pilot test is to check the clarity of each item of data collection the researcher assesses. Therefore, the researcher carried out pilot test in WLU, Department of English language and literature. The University selected by using purposeful sampling i.e. the University has started work with Wachemo University at the identical period. On the basis of the feedback obtained from the pilot test the final versions were prepared. The reliability statistics of instructors and students data of the results of pilot study were 0.743 and 0.771 respectively. The pilot study was conducted to notice whether the intended instruments could work as planned through test re-tests method. The tools were disseminated to instructors and students at the Department of English language and Literature in WLU. The pilot test revealed that certain items need to be modified. Thus, in the students' questionnaire the item 3.1 (I give much time for grammatical rules discussions) modified to (I give time for grammatical rules discussions). Also, item 3.4 (I participate in pair and group works through correcting mistakes and errors of my partners) modified to (I correct errors of my partners). Moreover, from the instructors questionnaires the item 3.4 (I correct students' mistakes and errors) modified to (I correct students errors). Furthermore, item 4.1(Tasks are communication oriented through enhancing students' knowledge of integrated language skills) modified to (Tasks are communication oriented). Besides, item 4.2 (Tasks engage students in putting a primary focus on meaning) modified to (Tasks engage putting a primary focus on meaning). Accordingly, some inconsistent items were avoided and the ambiguous questions were deleted. For example, from the students' questionnaires "I need to know well about the language rules before I deal with tasks in the classroom" and "Instructors' tendency to use traditional method" were avoided. According to Muijs (2004) the internal consistency of the instrument is measured through the Crobach Alpha (α) which is an index of reliability. It ranges between zero and one. Thus, the way to describe it is through using Crobach alpha based on (0.7- 0.8 acceptable, 0.8- 0.9 good and above 0.9 excellent). Therefore, the internal consistency of the participants' responses for the items were found to be quite reliable as shown in Table-1 above, the Crobach Alpha coefficient items were more than .70 which are in the acceptable reliability range. Then, after making pilot test the arranged and corrected items were administered and collected in a set of interval.

3.1.12. Ethical Consideration

Ethical consideration plays an imperative role in the data collecting time in the research studies. Thus, the researcher anticipated to be attentive of it. Therefore, in order to collect pilot test from WLU and the actual data from WU, the researcher had gone after a series of data gathering procedures. Having received the authorized official letters from Jimma University the researcher had gone to WLU and WU to gather trustworthy information. Furthermore, each instrument displayed an opening introductory letter that requested the respondents' cooperation for the study. They informed that the information they provide kept confidential. All potential study participants informed about the procedures used in the study. Then, the researcher explained to the respondents' objectives and significance of the study. To augment confidentiality the researcher removed information that requires naming of respondent.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter explains the analysis, interpretation and findings of data in the study. The data obtained through the close ended questionnaire, the classroom observation and content analysis were tabulated and presented quantitatively. Moreover, open ended questionnaire, information gathered through the semi-structured interview are presented and interpreted qualitatively under the same themes through narration in paragraph form. Then, overall data categorized under six sections such as background information, experiences, perceptions, knowledge, implementation of various types of tasks and constraints of the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom are presented as follows.

4.1: Analysis of Data obtained from Instructors and Students

4.1.1: Background Information

The study involved twenty five instructors and ninety seven students of English language and Literature department from WU, in the academic year 2013/2014 G.C. However, two instructors and three students were absent during the interval of questionnaire disseminations and collection because they were left out the University for their PhD program and missed the classes due to anonymous rationales respectively. Thus, the questionnaires administered and collected from twenty three instructors and ninety four students. Based on the data obtained, the researcher made analyses through SPSS version16.00 depending on frequency, percentage, mean, and grand mean of the items.

Table-A. Instructors' Background Information.

N= 23

No	Alternatives		Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	Qualification	MA degree	23	100
2	Experience	0-5 years	15	65.2
		5- 11 years	8	34.8
		11 – above years	1	4.3

Key: N= Number

In relation to item-1(qualification) 100% of instructors' responses implied that the entire instructors in the department of English language and literature were MA holders. It can be deduced that instructors might have basic knowledge of TBI due to their pre-service training in their undergraduate and post graduate programs.

Respecting to item-3(Work experiences) responses of 65.2%, 34.8% and 4.3% of instructors' responses lay bared that they have 0-5 years, 5-10 years, 11 and above year's experiences of

instructing English language courses respectively. This implies that most instructors in the University, department of English language and literature are inexperienced. Though they are MA holders, their inexperience might influence their implementation of TBI in EFL classroom pessimistically.

Table-B. Students' Background Information **N=94**

No	Alternatives			
	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)	
1	Year level	I	41	43.60
		II	38	40.40
		III	15	16.00

Key: N= Number f= Frequency

With respect to item -3 (Year-level) 43.6%, 40.4% and 16.0% of students responses implied that they are categorized under year-I, Year-II and year-III levels respectively. This might reveal that the enrollment prospects of students in WU, the field of English language and literature has been escalating from year to year. Therefore, instructors' knowledge and instruction of ELT should go hand in hand with the current trend of TBI in EFL classroom.

4.1.2: Experiences and Perceptions in TBI

Table-C. Instructors' Experiences of TBI **N=23**

No	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
1	-	-	23	100
2	-	-	23	100
3	17	73.9	6	26.1

Key: N= Number f= Frequency

Concerning item -1 (Did you thought English language courses through tasks before you join tertiary level of education as an instructor?) 100% of instructors responded that they have no experience of instructing English language courses through tasks before they join tertiary level of education. As it can be deduced they have on the track of instructing English language through tasks in tertiary level of education. As signified in the Table-4.1 most instructors' have been employed in WU directly from Ministry of Education without having in-service experience in instructing English language courses through tasks.

About the item-2 (Have you got in-service training about teaching English language courses through tasks in the classroom?) 100% of instructors' responses revealed that they have-not got

in-service training on the implementation of TBI. They instruct English language courses through tasks based on the pre-service training they have got before. Thus, it can be inferred that this might pressurized instructors implementation of TBI based on the current trend grimly. Lack of the essential orientation and adequate training or support in TBI might foster the negative attitudes towards it (Feryok as cited in Meseret, 2012).

Item-3 (Have you been informing students about the benefits of learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom?) 73.9% of instructors responses depicted that they inform students about benefits of TBI in the classroom. The rationale of it might be to generate awareness and augment their participations in the instructional processes. However, 26.1% of instructors could not inform students about its significance. Therefore, this might be due to heedlessness about their professionalism. It can be deduced that the experiences and knowledge of most instructors on the implementation of TBI have been going in parallel with generating alertness among the students about merits of TBI in ELT pedagogic setting even though certain group of instructors have been hesitating about it. According to Carless (2003);Richards and Rodgers (2001); Willis (1996) benefits of TBI are promoting interpersonal relations , fostering communicative ability , increasing the knowledge of four language skills, supplying likelihood to use language in authentic contexts, motivating students’ learning with fun, enjoyment and excitement in ELT setting.

Table-D: Students’ Experiences of TBI

N=94

No	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
1	34	36.2	60	63.80
2	56	59.6	38	40.40
3	-	-	94	94.00
4	49	52.1	45	47.90

Key: N= Number

f= Frequency

About the item -1(Did you hear about learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom when you were in high school?) 63.8% of students did not hear about learning English language courses through tasks before they join Wachemo University. Contrary to this 36.2% of students responded that they have information about learning English language courses through tasks before. Thus, it can be deduced that there are information variation among students about learning English language through tasks.

that instructors have strongly agreed in the scheme. According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) language learning is process than product oriented approach.

Pertaining to item 2 (Tasks engage students in putting a primary focus on meaning) 65.2% of instructors demonstrated that they agreed on the notion whereas 34.8% of them strongly agreed that tasks are totally meaning based. However, there are agreements among the instructors on the conceptions, differences also observed since their responses are different. The inclination of the mean value ($m=4.35$) of the item to four demonstrated that ELT instructors believe that tasks foster meaning than form based ELT. In light of this view Ellis (2009) confirmed that a task can generate certain semantic space and the need for specific processes linked to linguistic options. Thus, a task may indicate the content but the language used is the learner's choice.

With regard to Item -3 (Tasks have different solutions which encourage students to see different perspectives) 60.9% of instructors agreed on the inspiration due to their optimistic attitude about it although they have no high awareness of it whereas 39.1% of them imply that they strongly agreed on the notion. Thus, it can be inferred that there is insight difference among instructors on the conception. The inclination of the mean value ($M=4.39$) of the item to four displayed that instructors confirmed their agreement on the notion which articulates that tasks have different solutions which hearten students to glimpse different perspectives.

Regarding to item-4 (Tasks promote students self-confidence and autonomous learning) 60.9% of instructors implies that they agreed on the concept which assert that tasks promote students self confidence and independent learning. Correspondingly, 39.1% of instructors viewed their strong agreement on the notion. The inclination of the mean value ($m=4.43$) of the item to four portrays that instructors have exemplified harmony on the notion. According to Tomlinson (2011) stated that tasks are activities in which the learners are requested to use the target language in order to complete a fussy outcome within a meticulous context.

The grand mean ($m=4.54$) of the item in Table-5 inclines to the figure five. This divulged that the instructors' have well-built orthodoxy in the issues rose about perceptions of TBI.

Table-F: Students' Perceptions of TBI**N=94**

No	SA		A		U		D		SD		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1	9	9.6	22	23.4	63	67	-	-	-	-	3.43
2	24	25.5	70	74.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.26
3	19	20.2	69	73.4	6	6.4	-	-	-	-	4.14
4	25	26.6	32	34	37	39.4	-	-	-	-	3.87
GRAND MEAN											3.93

*Key: SA- Strongly agree (5), A= Agree (4), Un= Undecided (3), D= disagree (2), SD= strongly disagree (1)
N= Number f= Frequency*

Concerning Item-1 (Tasks are appropriate to develop integrated language skills) 67% of students have been in dilemma to articulate their opinion about the view. Twenty three point four percent of students' responses imply that they have awareness about the benefits of learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom whereas 9.6% of students response replied strongly agreed view hence they consider that it is decisive for fostering language skills. The inclination of the mean value (m=3.43) of the item to three indicates that students have dilemmatic scheme about the view which utter tasks are right to develop integrated language skills. It can be inferred that students require awareness creation training and orientation on the merits of task based instruction in EFL pedagogic setting in addition to what they have been learning in the actual classroom. Richards and Rodgers (2001) stated that TBI spotlight on a holistic didactic approach, which places equal weight on the entire four skills to boost communicative performance more competently.

With respect to item-2 (Tasks engage me to put a primary focus on meaning) 74.5% of responses demonstrated that students believe as tasks engage them on meaning than form based activities even if they have a bit dilemma in it. Twenty five point five percent of instructors implied that they have ample consciousness about the outlook. The inclination of the mean value (m=4.14) of the item to four pointed up that students have proved their agreement on the scheme which pronounce that tasks engage them to put a primary focus on meaning.

Respecting to item-3 (Tasks have different solutions; I believe this can help me to see different perspectives.) 73.4% of students response implied that tasks assist them to make out diverse views in the world scenario whereas 20.2% of students prop up the view hence their response is

strongly agree. What's more, 6.4% of students snubbed to declare whatever thing to it. This is might be due to the nature of subjects they have been instructing in the classroom. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=4.26) to four designated that they have demonstrated agreement on the opinion. These verified that tasks offer a room for them to settle on how to arrive at the outcomes hence it hubs on the serviceable scenery of tasks.

Relating to item-4-(Tasks promote my self-confidence and independent learning) 39.4% of students have been hesitant about the notion. Thirty four percent of students approximately practicing tasks in the classroom to assist themselves in developing self confidence and independent learning where as 26.6% of students put themselves in the analogous position. Thus, the inclinations of the mean value (m=3.87) of the item to four entail that they concur on the conception. It helps to bring about the task such as selecting, classifying, ordering, reasoning and evaluating information (Ellis, 2009). This might augment the thinking abilities of students in communication processes.

The inclination of the grand mean value (m=3.93) of the item to four disclosed that students have sanguine perceptions on learning English language courses through tasks hence they prove their concurrence.

4.1.3: Theoretical Knowledge of TBI

Table-G: Instructors' Theoretical Knowledge of TBI

N=23

No	Al		Us		Sm		Ra		Nev		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	5	21.7	14	60.9	3	13	1	4.3	3.00
2	-	-	8	34.8	13	56.5	2	8.7	-	-	3.26
3	-	-	19	82.6	4	17.4	-	-	-	-	3.82
4	-	-	21	91.3	2	8.7	-	-	-	-	3.91
5	3	13	4	17.4	14	60.9	2	8.7	-	-	3.35
GRAND MEAN											3.47

Key: A= always (5), U= usually (4), sm= Sometimes (3), R=Rarely (2), N=Never (1)
 N= Number, M= mean
 f= Frequency

About an item-1 (I explain grammatical forms and patterns) 60.9%, 21.7%, 4.3% of instructors have been implementing instructing grammatical forms and patterns in the classroom sometimes, usually, rarely in the classroom respectively. The inclination of the mean value (m=3.00) of the item to three implies that instructors explain grammatical forms and patterns sometimes in the classroom. Thus, it can be inferred that functional approaches of ELT highly implemented than

structural approaches in EFL classroom. According to Ellis (2003) in a medium form of task based instruction; tasks are involved as the main activity, supplemented with some form-focused instructor-controlled activity. Thus, tasks are indispensable but not adequate for learning; however, they are more than ancillary. Thus, it can be concluded that instructors have been applying medium form task based instruction in the classroom.

As regards to the item-2 (I involve students in planning the task they are going to do through phases in the classroom) 56.5%, 34.8%, and 8.7% of instructors involve students in it sometimes, usually and rarely. This demonstrates that they instruct students through instructor derived tasks. The inclination of the mean value ($m=3.26$) of the item to three confirms that instructors involve students in planning the task they are going to do in the classroom based on phases of tasks occasionally. Thus, it can be inferred that students' participations in the didactic processes through tasks are too limited. Richards (2006) stated that in the Pre-task phase the instructor helps students to plan the task they are going to do in the classroom.

With regard to item-3 (I involve students in group or pair work in the classroom) 82.6% and 17.4% of instructors employ it usually and sometimes respectively. This proves that instructors' employ group or pair work as ordinary mechanisms of task based instruction. The inclination of the mean value ($m=3.82$) of the item to four implies that instructors involve students in group or pair work usually in the classroom. It can be deduced that group and pair work are regularly used mechanisms of task based instruction in the classroom. According to Ur (1996) and Meyers and Jones (1993) TBI involve group work and pair works as well as other cooperative learning mechanisms in its implementation.

With respect to item-4 (I correct students' errors) 91.3% and 8.7% of instructors responses revealed as they have been correcting students' errors in the classroom usually and sometimes respectively. The tendency of the mean value of the item ($m=3.91$) to four demonstrated that instructors corrects students' errors usually in the classroom. This depicts that most instructors could not propose probability to students for peer to peer learning as well as self correction while doing tasks in the classroom cooperatively or collaboratively. In line with this Ellis (2003) stated that while students are performing task in groups, instructors could move from one group to another to listen in and note down the conspicuous errors the students consigned.

With reference to item-5 (I assess students' progress on the basis of their day to day communicative performance) 17.4% of instructors employ it usually. Thus, it can be believed that there is provision of practical tasks to students to foster their communicative performance. Sixty point nine percent of instructors practice it sometimes. Thus, this might illustrate that certain instructors assess students' progress through paper and pencil tests. Too, 13% of instructors revealed that they practice it always. These demonstrate that they assess students' progress based on continuous assessment. In contrary, 8.7% of instructors portrayed that they practice it in the classroom rarely. This explains that some instructors use it infrequently due to their exam based methodology of instruction. The tendency of the mean value ($m=3.35$) of the item to three exemplify that instructors' assess students' progress on the basis of their day to day communicative performance sometimes in the classroom.

All in all, the inclinations of the grand mean value ($m=3.47$) of the items to four demonstrates that instructors' have knowledge of instructing English language courses through tasks. Thus, the data depicted that they require awareness creation training such as workshop, conferences and seminars for better understanding of current trends of it.

Table-H: Students' Theoretical Knowledge of TBI **N=94**

No	Al		Us		Sm		Ra		Nev		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	-	-	54	57.4	40	42.5	-	-	2.57
2					50	53.2	44	46.8	-	-	2.53
3			54	57.4	37	39.4	3	3.2	-	-	3.54
4	-	-	35	37.2	59	62.8	-		-	-	3.37
5					65	69.1	29	30.9	-	-	2.69
GRAND MEAN											2.94

Key: SA- Strongly agree (5), A= Agree (4), Un= Undecided (3), D= disagree (2), SD= strongly disagree (1)
N= Number
f= Frequency

About item-1 (I give time for grammatical rules discussions) 57.4% of students practice structural approaches to language learning as a dictum of instructional processes occasionally. Conversely, 42.5% of students response depict that they practice form based leaning in the classroom infrequently. Therefore, the tendency of the mean value ($m=2.57$) of the item to three demonstrates that students' practice grammar based instruction sometimes in the classroom. This can be categorized under medium form of task based instruction (Ellis, 2003)

Respecting to item-2 (I plan for the task I am going to do in the classroom) 53.2% of students make a brainstorming on the task they are going to learn in the classroom sometimes. On the other hand, 46.8% of students implied that they carryout it infrequently. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=2.53$) to three indicates that they plan the task they are going to do in the classroom occasionally. It can be deduce that students learn in the classroom through instructor derived tasks.

With regard to item-3 (I learn through instructor based discussion) 57.4% of students' responses implied that they have been learning in the classroom through spoon feeding frequently. Thirty nine point four percent of students' responses imply that it is practiced in the classroom sometimes. Besides, 3.2% of students depict that instructor based instruction practiced in the classroom rarely. Therefore, the inclination of the mean value ($m=3.54$) of the item to four indicates that they learn English language courses through tasks in the classroom room through instructor based discussion habitually.

With respect to item-4 (I correct errors of my partners) 62.8% of students' responses signify that they provide and receive comments from their partners about errors they committed seldom. Thirty seven point two percent of students' responses demonstrated that they correct errors of their partners in the classroom usually. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=3.37$) of the item to three indicates that students correct errors of their partners in the classroom sometimes. This demonstrates that their errors corrected by instructors in the classroom typically.

About an item-5-(I asses my progress on the basis of my day to day performance) 69.1% of students assess their progress on the basis of their day to day performance sometimes. Thirty point five percent of students' responses implied that students asses their progress on the basis of their day to day performance occasionally. The inclination of the mean value ($m=2.69$) of the item to three indicates that they have been assessing themselves in the classroom based on their day to day performances sometimes. This might reveal that students assessed in the classroom through paper and pencil tests.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m= 2.94$) of the item to three indicates that students' practice their theoretical knowledge of task based instruction sometimes in the ELT instructional

setting. This implies that even if students are amateur about task based instructions, instructors themselves are timid on activating students' knowledge of EFL in meaning based instruction.

4.1.4. Instructors' Implementation and Students' Involvement in TBI

Table-I: Gap Principle Tasks.

N=117

No		A		U		Som		Rarely		Never		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	%	%	f	%	
1	I	-	-	4	17.4	19	82.6	-	-	-	-	3.17
	S	-	-	28	29.8	41	43.6	25	26.6	-	-	3.03
2	I	-	-	3	13	17	73.9	3	13	-	-	3.00
	S	-	-	26	27.7	52	55.3	16	17	-	-	3.10
3	I	-	-	-	-	20	87	3	13	-	-	2.87
	S	-	-	15	16	56	59.6	23	24.5	-	-	2.91
GRAND MEAN												3.01

Key: A= always (5), U= usually (4), sm= Sometimes (3), R=Rarely (2), N=Never (1)
I= instructor and S= student N=Number f= Frequency

Concerning item-1 (reasoning gap tasks) 82.6% of instructors responses revealed that they put into operation tasks which require explanations and engagement through synthesizing and deducting the information occasionally. Conversely, 17.4% of instructors execute reasoning gap tasks in the classroom usually. Equally, 43.6% of students' responses imply that they carryout tasks which call for reasoning from them in the classroom occasionally. As well, 29.8% and 26.6% of students' response demonstrated that they perform tasks which entail explanation frequently and infrequently respectively in the classroom. Therefore, the inclination of the average mean value of item of instructors and students (m=3.10) to three pointed up that reasoning gap tasks are implemented in the classroom sometimes. According to Ellis (2003) reasoning gap tasks are tasks which engage the processes of inference, deduction and practical reasoning.

With regard to item-2(information gap tasks) 73.9% of instructors' implement information gap tasks in the classroom usually. Moreover, 13% and 13% of instructors execute it in the classroom usually and rarely respectively. Fifty five percent of students' responses imply that tasks which necessitate idea transfer from person to person put into service in the classroom sometimes. Besides, 27.7% and 17% of students put into action it in the classroom frequently and seldom. The inclination of the average mean value (m=3.05) of the item of instructors and students to three implies the implementation of information gap tasks in the classroom sometimes. According to Nunan (1989) information gap tasks are tasks which require transmission of

information or message from person to person. Thus, learner receives it through spoken or written communication.

Item-3 (opinion gap tasks) 87% instructors employ opinion gap tasks in the classroom hardly ever. Moreover, thirteen percent instructors' responses indicated as they realize it in the classroom rarely. Fifty nine point six percent of students' response indicates that tasks which require explaining outlook used in the classroom infrequently. What's more, 24.5% and 16% of students' response demonstrated that tasks which necessitate view of them executed in the classroom rarely and frequently respectively. Thus, the inclination of the average mean value (m=2.94) of instructors and students items to three reveals the implementation of opinion gap tasks sometimes in the classroom. Therefore, it can be believed that this is a task that requires the participants to exchange opinions on the issue based on the controversial issues. Ellis (2003) explained as opinion-gap tasks involve identifying and articulating a personal preference, feeling, or attitude in response to a given situation.

Therefore, based on the mean value of the items it can be inferred that reasoning gap tasks (m= 3.10), information gap tasks (m=3.05), and opinion gap tasks (m=2.94) implemented in the classroom respectively. The inclinations of the grand mean of the item (m= 3.01) to three pointed up that the instructors and students execute the gap principle tasks sometimes in the classroom.

Table-J: Reaching a Solution Principle Tasks. N=117

No		A		U		Som		Rarely		Never		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	
1	I			5	21.7	13	56.5	5	21.5	-	-	3.00
	S	-	-	52	55.3	22	23.4	20	21.3	-	-	3.34
2	I	-	-	5	21.7	6	26.1	12	52.2	-	-	2.70
	S	-	-	16	17	38	40.4	40	42.6			2.74
3	I	-	-	18	78.3	3	13	2	8.7	-	-	3.70
	S	-	-	57	60.6	35	37.2	2	2.2	-	-	3.59
GRAND MEAN											3.06	

Key: A= always (5), U= usually (4), sm= Sometimes (3), R=Rarely (2), N=Never (1)

I= instructor S= student, N= Number m= mean f= Frequency

With regard to item -1(decision-making tasks) 56.5% of instructors apply reasoning tasks in the classroom sometimes, 21.7% and 21.7% of instructors execute it in the classroom usually and rarely in the classroom. Too, 55.3% of students execute it usually, 23.4% of students carry out it sometimes, and 21.3% of students accomplish it rarely in the classroom. Correspondingly, the

inclination of the average mean value ($m=3.17$) of instructors and students' item to three revealed that it is implemented in the classroom sometimes.

About an Item -2 (problem-solving tasks) 52.2% of instructors implies that problem-solving tasks realized in the classroom rarely, twenty six point one percent of instructors executed it sometimes and twenty one point seven percent of instructors applied it usually in the classroom. Likewise, 42.6% of students' response showed that it is put into service in the classroom uncommonly. In addition, 40.4% and 17% of students implied that it is employed in the classroom sometimes and usually respectively. According to Nunan (2004) problem-solving tasks demands students' intellectual reasoning powers, through challenging, engaging and pleasing to solve the trouble. These includes puzzle i.e. logic problems, real life problems, describing experiences, comparing alternatives, evaluating and agreeing in a solution. The inclination of the mean value of instructors ($m=2.70$) and students ($m=2.74$) item to three implies that the implementation of problem-solving tasks in the classroom occasionally in the classroom.

With respect to Item-3 (Opinion exchange tasks) 78.3% of instructors implies opinion exchange tasks applied in the classroom usually, 13% and 8.7% of instructors demonstrated that they implemented it in the classroom sometimes and rarely respectively in the classroom. Accordingly, 60.6%, 37.2% and 2.2% of students executed it in the classroom usually, sometimes, and rarely. The inclination of the mean value of the instructors ($m=3.70$) and students ($m= 3.59$) item to four implies as it is implemented in the classroom frequently.

Thus, the inclination of the grand mean value of the items ($m=3.06$) to three reveals that reaching a solution principle tasks can be implemented in the classroom sometimes. Therefore, based on the average data obtained from instructors and students opinion exchange tasks ($m=3.65$), decision-making tasks ($m= 2.82$), and problem-solving tasks ($m= 2.72$) realized in the classroom respectively.

Table-K: Cognitive Principle Tasks**N=117**

No		A		U		Som		rarely		Never		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	
1	I	-	-	6	26.1	13	56.5	4	17.4	-	-	3.09
	S	-	-	42	44.7	31	33	21	22.3	-	-	3.22
2	I	-	-	13	56.6	7	30.4	3	13	-	-	3.43
	S	-	-	15	16	44	46.8	35	37.2			3.05
3	I	-	-	12	52.2	7	30.4	4	17.4	-	-	3.35
	S	-	-	19	20.2	35	37.2	40	42.6	-	-	2.78
4	I	-	-	2	8.7	12	52.2	9	39.1	-	-	2.70
	S	-	-	16	17	29	30.9	49	52.1	-	-	2.65
5	I	-	-	3	13	19	82.6	1	4.3	-	-	3.09
	S	-	-	15	16	45	47.9	34	36.2	-	-	2.80
GRAND MEAN												3.02

Key: A= always (5), U= usually (4), sm= Sometimes (3), R=Rarely (2), N=Never (1)
 I= instructor and S= student N= Number f= Frequency

With regard to item-1 (listing tasks) 56.5% of instructors revealed that they implement listing tasks in the classroom sometimes. As well, 26.1% and 17.4% of instructors imply that they execute it in the classroom usually and sometimes respectively. In contrast, 44.7% of students' responses depict that listing tasks practiced in the classroom usually. Moreover, 33% and 22.3% of students practiced it in the classroom rarely and sometimes respectively. The inclination of the average mean value of the item of the instructors and students (m=3.12) to three demonstrated that listing tasks implemented in the classroom sometimes. According to Wills (1996) listing tasks are unimaginative; however, in practice generates a lot of talks that learners explain their ideas based on the brainstorming processes.

About an item-2 (ordering and sorting tasks) 56.2% of instructors apply ordering and sorting tasks usually in the classroom. In the same way, 30.4% and 13.4% of instructors realize them sometimes and rarely in the classroom respectively. Correspondingly, 46.8% of students' apply ordering and sorting task sometimes. Moreover, 37.2% and 16% of students' employ them sometimes and usually in the classroom respectively. The inclination of the average mean value of instructors and students (m=3.24) to three implies its implementation in the classroom sometimes. Richards (2006) stated that these types of tasks involve sequencing items, actions, events in logical and chronological order based on specified criteria through categorizing items in a given group

In response to Item-3 (comparing and contrasting tasks) 52.2% of instructors put into practice comparing and contrasting tasks in the classroom usually. Moreover, 30.4% and 17.4% of instructors employ them sometimes and rarely in the classroom. Besides, 42.6% of students put into operation it rarely in the classroom. Moreover, 37.2% and 20.2% of students set up it sometimes and usually in the classroom. The inclination of the average mean value of the item of instructors and students ($m=3.07$) participants to three proved the discharge of comparing and contrasting tasks in the classroom takes place sometimes in the classroom. Nunan (1989) stated that comparing and contrasting tasks involve relating each other, finding similarities or differences and things in common.

Concerning Item-4 (personal experience sharing tasks) 52.2% of instructors implement personal experience sharing tasks sometimes in the classroom. Also, 39.1% and 8.7% of instructors put into service them rarely and sometimes in the classroom respectively. Moreover, 52.1 % of student response indicates that personal experience sharing tasks practiced in the classroom rarely. Similarly, 30.9% and 17% of students' response indicated that they implemented in the classroom sometime and usually respectively. Thus, the inclination of the average of mean value of the item of instructors and students ($m=2.78$) to three reveals that the accomplishment of personal experience sharing tasks in the classroom takes place sometimes. In light with this view Oxford (2006) confirmed that it is presumed to encourage learners to talk more freely about themselves and share their experiences with others hoping that they foster the interaction in the classroom through closer and causal social conversation that's why they are open tasks.

In relation to Item-5 (creative and projects tasks) 82.6% of instructors put into action creative and projects tasks sometimes. Also, 13% and 4.3% of instructors' responses imply that it is implemented in the classroom usually and rarely respectively. Furthermore, 47.9% of students' response demonstrates that creative tasks and projects executed in the classroom sometimes. Moreover, 36.2% and 16% of students' response explains that creative and projects tasks put into operation in the classroom rarely and usually in the classroom respectively. The inclination of the average mean value of instructors and students ($m=2.95$) to three implies its execution in the classroom is sometimes. Oxford (2006) confirmed that creative and projects tasks involve pairs or groups of learners and combinations of task types in the classroom hence students compare the real life version with their own script.

The inclination of the grand mean of the item (m=3.02) to three demonstrated that the execution of cognitive principle tasks sometimes in the classroom. However, instructors apply ordering and sorting tasks (m=3.24), listing tasks (m=3.12), comparing and contrasting tasks (m=3.07), creative and projects tasks (m=2.95), personal experience sharing tasks (m=2.78) in the classroom respectively.

4.1.5: The Constraints of the Implementation of TBI

Table-L: Instructors Related Factors N=117

No		Ms		S		Un		Ns		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1	I	-	-	9	39.1	-	-	14	60.9	1.79
	S	10	10.6	21	22.3	2	2.1	61	64.9	1.79
2	I	-	-	4	17.4	-	-	19	82.6	1.35
	S	-	-	10	10.6	14	14.9	84	89.4	1.21
3	I	-	-	21	91.3	-	-	2	8.7	2.83
	S	18	19.1	67	71.3	9	9.6	-	-	3.10
Grand mean										2.01

Key: Ms= Most serious (4), S= Serious (3), Undecided= (2), Not serious (1) f= Frequency

With regard to item-1 (negative wash-back effect of the exam) 69.6% of instructors have been seeing it as not serious factors in the classroom because they have prepared exam from the content which they have thought. The response of 39.1% of the instructors revealed as they see it as serious factor that is might be due to students' background and with the nature of the course where a. Conversely, 64.9% of students' responses demonstrated that it is not serious factor because they might have been taking the exam from the content they have learnt in the classroom. As well, 22.3% of students implied that it is serious factor. This might be ensued due to the nature of courses in which instructors' haven not been vulnerable to prepare exam effortlessly from the contents they have thought. The inclination of the average mean value (m=1.79) of instructors and students item to two illustrated that there are divergence of notion among the participants of the study in considering negative wash-back effect of the exam as a factor in the EFL classroom. Negative wash back effect also subdued instructors' utilization of more tasks in their ELT (Bachaman, as cited in Ellen, 2005).

With respect to Item-2 (instructors' perception) 82.6% of instructors notice their perception as not serious factor about the notion. Seventeen point four percent of instructors implied that it is a serious factor. In addition 89.4% of students' responses implied that it is not serious factor. Moreover, 19.1% of students' response depicts that it is serious factor. Besides, 14.9% of students' responses depict that it is undecided factor due to their dilemmatic view in the notion. Also, 10.6% of students believe that it is serious factor. The inclination of the average mean value ($m=1.28$) of the item of the participants to one illustrated that instructors' perceptions are not serious factor in the classroom. Therefore, instructors' perception might create incongruity between theoretical understanding of task based instruction and classroom practices (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

With respect to the item-3 (lack of motivation) 91.3% of instructors see lack of motivation as a serious factor while 8.7% spot that it is not serious factor. Moreover, 71.3% of students' responses designate that lack of motivation to teach English language courses through tasks are serious factor in the classroom. These might be related with the interest of instructors and their leaning to instructor centered methodology of teaching. Nineteen point one percent of students responses portrays that it is the most serious factor in the classroom because of instructors lack of incentive about their duty due to strangeness of the University. Furthermore, 9.6% of students' responses indicated that it is undecided factor because students might not know about the problem with respect to instructors. The inclination of the average mean value ($m=2.97$) of participants of the study to three proved that lack of motivation among EFL instructors are serious factor.

Finally, the inclination of the grand mean value ($m=2.01$) of the items to two implies as instructor related factors are ambivalent factor in the University. Thus, instructor need awareness creation scenarios concerning to TBI.

Table-M: Student Related Factors**N=117**

No		Ms		S		Un		Ns		Mean
		f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	
1	I	9	39.1	10	43.5	3	13	1	4.3	3.17
	S	21	22.3	50	53.2	23	24.5	-	-	2.97
2	I	-	-	-	-	-	30.4	16	69.6	1.12
	S	-	-	-	-	11	11.5	83	88.3	1.30
3	I	11	47.8	10	43.5	-	-	2	8.7	3.30
	S	14	14.9	80	85.1	-	-	-	-	3.15
4	I	10	43.5	7	30.4	2	8.7	4	17.4	3.00
	S	71	75.5	23	24.5	-	-	--		3.19
5	I	14	69.9	6	26.1	-	-	3	13	3.35
	S	49	52.1	27	28.7	5	5.3	13	13.8	3.19
6	I	18	78.3	4	17.4	-	-	1	4.3	3.70
	S	84	89.4	10	10.6	-	-	-	-	3.90
GRAND MEAN										2.90

Key: Ms= Most serious (4), S= Serious (3), Undecided= (2), Not serious (1)f= Frequency

Concerning item-1 (Students' lack of interest) 43.5% of instructors' glimpses that students' lack of interest is serious factor since they deem most students have been joined in English department devoid of their interest. Moreover, 39.1% of instructors consider it as the most serious factor. Conversely, 13% of instructors snubbed to utter anything about the issue rose because they are not considering the problem as their business. Moreover, 4.3% instructors' view that it is not serious factor due to their consideration of instructional processes has been going in good manners. Fifty three point three percent of students' responses demonstrated that students' lack of interest is serious factor. Also, 21% of students' responses illustrated that it is the most serious factor. Besides, 24.5% of students' responses pointed up that it is undecided factor. The inclination of the average mean value (m=3.00) of the item to three shows that students' lack of interest to learn English language courses through tasks are the serious factor in the University.

With regard to the item-2(Students' perception) 69. 6% of instructors believe that students' awareness about TBI has no problem on them as they feel might be the entertaining nature of tasks creates opportunities to them to use tasks suitably. Also, 30.4% of instructors observe it as undecided factor. In contrary, 88.3% of students' response indicates that students' perceptions are not serious factor. Thus, students' perception related with students expectations, the need to learn only grammar, and lack of familiarity with the task based instruction in the classroom, etc.

These factors may influence their feeling and practice in the classroom (Nunan 1989). The inclination of the average mean value ($m=1.21$) of the item to one illustrated that students' perception to learn English language courses through tasks are the not a serious factor.

With respect to an item-3 (range of language skills among students) 47.8% of instructors believe that range of language skills among students are the most serious factor because most of the time high achievers might overlook the discussion in cooperative tasks where as 43.5% of instructors' view that it is serious factor due to analogous beliefs. Similarly, 37.2% of instructors consider it as serious factor influence in the instructional processes. Moreover, 85.1% students' response indicates that the differences in English language skills exploitation among students are serious factor because students came from different backgrounds. Besides, 14.9 % of students' responses demonstrated that it is the most serious factor due to bearing in mind the disparity in language abilities among the students are significant. The inclination of the average mean value ($m=3.23$) of participants of the study to three implies that range of language skills among students are the serious factor in the EFL classroom.

Concerning the item-4 (lack of exposure to practice language skills) 43.5% of instructors believes that lack of exposure to practice English language skills out of the classroom are the most serious factors in ELT where as 30.4% of instructors perceive it as serious factor due to students living setting. As well, 17.4% of instructors witness that it is not serious factor because language is learnt through time. Conversely, 8.7% of instructors glimpse that it is undecided factor due their ambivalent view on it. Moreover, 75.5% of students' responses point towards the most serious factor. Furthermore, 24.5% of students' responses prove that it is serious factor. The inclinations of the average mean value ($m=3.01$) of the item of participants to three revealed that lack of exposure to practice English language skills are serious factor. This pointed up that students lack of exposure (ideal environment) in which students practice and develop their language through communication with their friends and family. Therefore, students do not practice integrated skills when they are out of the classroom. Consequently, this has brought its own impact on students' active involvement in the class and in the implementation of task based instruction in EFL classroom (Carless, 2003). As well, this is might be due unfamiliarity with the methodology hence the cultural difference of the language observed in the didactic processes.

As regards to item-5 (learners' use of Amharic language) 69.9% of instructors believe that students' use of Amharic language against the target language in the classroom is the most serious factor. Also, 26.1% of instructors responded as it is the serious factor when students are organized to carryout tasks in cooperative way. Contrary, 13% of instructors supposed that learners' use of Amharic language is not serious factor in the classroom due to the nature of the courses and level of students they instruct. Additionally, 52.1% of students' response demonstrated that students' use of Amharic language in the classroom is the most serious factor. Along with 28.7% of students responses depict that students' use of Amharic language in the classroom is serious factor. Also, 13.8% of students' responses imply it is not serious factor. Five point three percent of students show as it is undecided factor. The inclination of the average mean value ($m=3.27$) of participants' item to three shows as learners' use of Amharic language is the serious factor in the classroom. This happens when students' like to speak in Amharic while doing tasks in the classroom and students' deficiency in vocabulary when they speak English language. This pessimistically affects communicative performance of learners through target language (Carless, 2004).

Relating to the item-6 (fear of making mistakes) 78.3% of instructors responded as fear of making mistakes while doing tasks are the most serious factor. Moreover, 17.4% of instructors believe that it is serious factor because of the students' low ability in EFL setting. Four point three percent of instructors demonstrated that it is undecided factor due to variation of courses nature. On the other hand, 89.4% students' responses described that it is the most serious factor. Also, 10.6% of students' responses represented that it is serious factor. This is due to socio-cultural factors in which the society encourages shyness and they under estimate themselves. Thus, the inclinations of the average mean value ($m=3.80$) of the item to four proved that it is the most serious factor in the classroom. According to Tanveer (2007) truly the students know the rules and structure of the language; however, they cannot communicate in that language as the result of fright.

Finally, the inclination of the grand mean value of the items ($m=2.90$) to three demonstrated that student related factors are serious factor. This might be occurred due to poor background of students in ELT setting.

Table-N: EFL Course Materials Related Factors**N=117**

No		Ms		S		Un		Ns		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	I	11	47.8	6	26.1	2	8.7	4	17.4	3.04
	S	11	11.7	62	66	21	22.3	-	-	2.89
2	I	-	-	10	43.8	9	39.1	4	17.4	2.78
	S	13	13.8	55	58.5	12	12.8	14	14.9	2.71
3	I	17	73.9	6	26.1	-	-	-	-	3.74
	S	69	73.4	25	26.6	-	-	-	-	3.73
GRAND MEAN										3.15

Key: Ms= Most serious (4), S= Serious (3), Undecided= (2), Not serious (1) f= Frequency

With regard to item-1 (Lack of authentic texts) 47.8% of instructors think that be deficient in authentic texts in the course materials are the most serious factor in ELT setting. This is because of cultural difference of the language as well as texts where as 26.1% of instructors also believe it as serious factor. Contrary, 17.4% of instructors glimpse that it is not serious factor because they adapt tasks from extra sources like newspapers, magazines and etc. Eight point seven percent of instructors are not voluntary to supply responses for the item due to their dilemma in the issue. Sixty six percent of students' view that it is serious factor where as 22.3% and 11.7% of students glimpse that it is undecided factor and serious factor in classroom. The inclination of the average mean value (m= 2.97) of the item to three indicates as lack of authentic texts in the EFL course materials are serious factor in the classroom. According to Leaver and Kaplan (as cited in Yeshimabet, 2009) to create the natural like situation in the classroom, practitioners are advised to use authentic texts.

With respect to item -2 (Lack of adequate tasks in the content of EFL course materials) 45.8% of instructors responded that it is serious factor due to its dearth of tasks. Thirty nine point one percent of instructors refused to respond the item due to their dilemmatic view in the thought. Similarly, 17.4% of instructors consider that it is not serious factor due their experiences of adapting suitable tasks. Fifty eight point five percent, 14.9%, 13.8% and 12.8% of students' responses demonstrated that it is serious factor, not serious factor, most serious factor, and undecided factor respectively. The inclination of the average mean value (m=2.75) of the item to three portrays that lack of adequate tasks in the content of EFL course materials are serious factor. This disclosed that there is paucity of tasks in the EFL materials contents. This is occurred due to lack of formally written EFL course materials in the University.

Item-3 (Unavailability of EFL teaching materials for each student) 73.9% of instructors responded as unavailability of EFL teaching materials for each student are the most serious factor whereas 26.1% of instructors consider it as serious factor. These demonstrate as there is scarcity of EFL teaching materials in the University. It can be inferred that instructors have been teaching English language courses through the tasks which they adapted from various sources. Seventy three points for percent of students' responses illustrate that it is the most serious factor. In addition, 26.6% of students' responses confirm that it is serious factor. The inclination of the average mean value (m= 3.735) of the item to four illustrates that the unavailability of EFL teaching materials for each student is the most serious factor in the University.

The inclination of the grand mean value (m=3.15) of the item to three indicates that EFL course materials related factors are serious factor in the classroom. Based on the mean value of Table-4.14 unavailability of EFL teaching materials for each student (m= 3.74), lack of authentic texts (m= 2.97), lack of adequate tasks in the content of modules (m=2.75) are respective EFL course materials related factors.

Table-O:Instructional Environment Related Factors N=117

No		Ms		S		Un		Ns		Mean
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	I	16	69.6	7	30.4	-	-	-	-	3.70
	S	42	44.7	52	55.3	-	-	-	-	3.55
2	I	2	8.7	4	17.4	3	13	14	60.9	1.74
	S	-	-	29	30.9	16	17	49	52.1	1.79
3	I	-	-	-	-	4	17.4	19	82.6	1.17
	S	-	-	6	6.4	15	16	73	77.7	1.29
GRAND MEAN										2.21

Key: Ms= Most serious (4), S= Serious (3), Undecided= (2), Not serious (1) f= Frequency

Concerning to item -1 (lack of resources i.e. audio/ language lab) 69.6% and 30.4% of instructors responded that lack of resources i.e. audio/ language lab is the most serious and serious factor respectively. Moreover, 55.3% of students' responses imply that it is serious factor. What's more, 44.7% of students' response shows that it is the most serious factor. The inclination of the average mean value (m=3.62) of the item to four demonstrate as lack of resources i.e. audio/ language lab is the most serious factor in the classroom. It is believed the ELT are not equipped with audio-visual materials and reference books as well as necessary teaching aids which assist the implementation of task based instruction in EFL classroom.

About item -2 (large class size) 60.9% of instructors responded as large class size is not serious factor. This depicts that the classes have the number of students fitting with its size to implement task based instruction. Seventeen point four percent of instructors notice it as the serious factor due to high number of students in the classroom where as 8.3% of instructors glimpses it as the most serious factor. Thirteen percent of instructors refused to respond to the item because of their class differences in teaching EFL in the setting. Eight point seven percent of instructors showed that it is the most serious factor. On the other hand, 52.1% of students' responses reveal that it is not serious factor. Moreover, 30.9% of students' responses reveal that it is serious factor. Moreover, 17% of students' responses reveal that it is undecided factor. Also, the inclination of the average mean value ($m=1.65$) of the item to two illustrate that they have undecided idea which indicates as there is class size difference among the classroom in which the instructors have been teaching and students learning. It can be believed that large number of students is a big challenge to implement task based instruction in the classroom because it is difficult to engage all students at the same instance (Richards, 2006)

With respect to the item -3 (limited periods for ELT schedule) 82.6% and 17.4% of instructors responded that limited periods for ELT schedule as not serious and undecided factor in the classroom respectively. This shows that 62.5% of instructor spot that it is not serious factor. As well, 77.7% of students' responses proved that limited periods of time for ELT schedule is not serious factor. Twenty four point three percent of students' responses illustrated that limited periods of time for ELT schedule is serious factor. Eight point five percent of students' responses exemplify that limited periods of time for ELT schedule is the most serious factor. Moreover, 6.4% of students' responses demonstrated that limited periods of time for ELT schedule is undecided factor. The inclination of the average mean value ($m=1.23$) of the item to two explained that they have undecided notion on the idea which utter as limited periods of time for ELT schedule is a factor in the classroom. This might be due to teaching English language courses through tasks might take a lot of time and instructors cannot cover the course materials based on the schedule. Leaver and Kaplan (as cited in Yeshimabet, 2009) stated that task based instruction required time to prepare lessons. Thus, providing ample time through providing direct assistance from administrators can play paramount in its implementation.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m=2.21$) of the item to two indicates as instructional environment related factors are undecided factor in the classroom. Based on the mean of the item for Table-22 lack of resources ($m=3.62$), limited periods of time for ELT schedule ($m=1.65$) and large class size ($m=1.23$) are instructional environment related factors in their respective orders.

4.2. Instructors and Students Reply for Open ended Questions

a. Item allied with the benefits of TBI

The majority of instructors deem that instructing English language courses through tasks assist students to build up integrated language skills through offering them a prospect to carry out communication effectively. As well, it can generate horizontal relationship between instructors and students as well as vertical relationship among students in the classroom. Moreover, it can cultivate a dynamic, autonomous and creative language use. Instructors know benefits of task based instruction; however, they did not implement task based instruction in the classroom based on the principles and phases. Thus, it can be deduced that instructors are hesitant in the implementation of task based instruction in the classroom. Alternatively, students' responses depicted that learning English language courses through tasks supply them a prospect to develop communicative skills. What's more, it unlocks a wide exposure for them to practice language skills in the classroom hence they have no setting in the real world to carry out it. Even though they accept as true in this means they are reluctant in its implementation due to their poor background (Please see appendix-4.6).

b. Item Related with the Mechanisms of TBI

Approximately the entire of instructors frequently utilize group work, pair work and individual work in the classroom. In contrary, they rarely apply asking and answering, project work and panel discussion in the classroom based on the nature of the courses they have been instructing. These portray that instructors have been stick to selected methods of task based instructions. It can be deduced that cooperative and collaborative instructional processes applied in the classroom to in a restricted manners. The data of interview session supported this view (please see appendix-V). Correspondingly, nearly all students' response revealed that they learn English language courses through tasks based on the mechanisms such as group work, pair work, individual work and project work regularly. They depicted that based on the course type they learn course through debating, answering and questioning, drama and panel discussion in the classroom. It can be inferred that students have been learning English language courses through

tasks based on the limited methods of cooperative and collaborative schooling dogma (please see appendix-VII).

c. Item Related with Role Of Instructors and Students in TBI

Nearly everyone instructors responded that their roles in EFL classroom is offering notes on the lesson they were going to instruct, giving instruction on the tasks, introducing the lesson of the day, organizing students, advising students and monitoring students' activities. Evenly, as they replied the roles of students are listening what the instructor utters, taking notes, asking and answering question, and working cooperatively and collaboratively in the classroom. This depicts that instructors know their roles as well as students roles; however; they are faithful for instructor centered ideology of schooling hence they afford instructor derived tasks to students frequently. This idea supported by the data findings of observation and interview session (please see appendix- V and 4.6). The majority students implied that their role in the classroom while instructional processes in the classroom following the presentation of instructor attentively, taking notes, asking and answering questions, obeying the rules and regulations of the classroom. What's more, the role of instructors in the classroom are organizing students, providing lecture notes, advising students'. This implied that students have been learning English language courses through tasks without active involvement in the deductive processes. (Please see appendix-VII and Part 4.6).

4.3. Data Obtained by Classroom Observation

In this study the researcher and co-observer observed six EFL lessons of wittingly selected instructors (one times each instructor). In this way, the activities which were executed by instructors in various stages of classroom instruction were tabulated and analyzed below.

4.3.1. Phases of TBI

Table-P : Pre-Task Phases

N=12

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	
1	5	41.7	3	25.0	4	33.3	-	-	3.08
2	3	25	4	33.3	5	41.7	-	-	2.83
3	4	33.3	5	41.7	3	25	-	-	3.08
4	-	-	4	33.3	5	41.7	3	25	2.08
GRAND MEAN									2.77

*Key: ME: most emphasis=4, some emphasis (SE) =3, Limited emphasis (LE) =2, Not at all (NE) =1 N= Number
M= mean f= Frequency*

Item-1 (instructors presented familiar tasks to students in the classroom) 41.7% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data demonstrated that it is experienced in the classroom with little emphasis. Furthermore, 25% of data revealed that it is adept in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclination of the mean value (m=3.08) to three displayed that instructors present familiar tasks to students in the classroom with some emphasis. This implies that tasks which are proverbial to students applied in the classroom; however, there are differences among instructors in its practices.

Item-2 (Students plan the task they are going to do in the classroom) 41.7% of data pointed up that it is carried out in the classroom with little emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data demonstrated that it is performed in the classroom with some emphasis. Moreover, 25% of data showed that it is done in the classroom with major emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value to three reveals that students plan the task they are going to do in the classroom with some emphasis. It can be deduced that students perform tasks that are derived from their instructors.

Item-3 (Instructor gives introduction about the topic) 41.7% of data proved that it is accomplished in the classroom with some emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data illustrated that it is succeeded in the classroom with major emphasis. Furthermore, 25% of data showed that it is adept in the classroom with little emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean

value to three portrays instructor gives introduction about the topic with some emphasis. Thus, students learn the topic without being introduced in the classroom.

Item-4 (Instructor gives clear directions on the tasks) 41.7 of data proved that it is performed in the classroom with little emphasis. What's more, thirty three point three percent of data illustrated that it is done in the classroom with some emphasis. Twenty five percent of data demonstrated that they are implemented in the classroom with no emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value to two portrays that instructors offer clear directions on the tasks with little emphasis. As a result, students could learn tasks through unambiguous directions.

Therefore, the inclination of the grand mean ($m=2.77$) of the item to three indicates as pre-task phases have been practiced in the classroom through some emphasis.

Table-Q: While Task Phases N=12

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	3	25	4	33.3	5	41.7	-	-	2.83
2	4	33.3	6	50	5	16.7			3.17
GRAND MEAN									3.00

*Key: ME: most emphasis=4, some emphasis (SE) =3, Limited emphasis (LE) =2, Not at all (NE) =1 N= Number
M= mean f= frequency*

Item-1 (Instructors give advice to students to assist each other) 41.7% of data illustrated that it is practiced in the classroom with little emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. Twenty five percent of data revealed that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. The inclination of the mean value to three illustrates that instructor's give advice to students to assist each other with some emphasis.

Item-2 (instructor moves around the class to assist students) 50% of data showed that it is carried out in the classroom with some emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data exemplified that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Additionally, 16.7% of observation results pointed up that it is practiced in the classroom with little emphasis. The inclination of the mean value to three explains that instructor moves around the class to assist students with some emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m=3.00$) of the item to three indicates that while task phases have been implemented in the classroom through some emphasis in the classroom.

Table-R: Language Cycle **N=12**

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	-	-	5	41.7	7	58.3	1.42
2	-	-	-	-	8	66.7	4	33.3	1.67
3	-	-	-	-	3	25	9	75	1.25
GRAND MEAN									1.45

Key: ME: most emphasis=4 , some emphasis (SE)=3, Limited emphasis (LE)=2, Not at all (NE)=1

N= Number M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (Students comment on each other's work) 58.3% of data proved that it is practiced in the classroom with no emphasis. Along with 41.7% of data showed that it is accomplished in the classroom with limited emphasis. The inclination of the mean value ($m=1.42$) to three demonstrates that students' comments on each other's work in the classroom with no emphasis.

Item-2 (Students rewrite tasks by using the corrections and comments they get from heir instructor and peers). Sixty six point seven percent of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with limited emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data confirm that it is done in the classroom with no emphasis. The inclination of the mean value ($m=1.67$) to three illustrates that students rewrite tasks by using the corrections and comments they get from heir instructors and peers in the classroom with limited emphasis.

Item-3 (Instructor give general comments on students work) 75% of data illustrate that it is implemented in the classroom with no emphasis. Twenty five percent of data demonstrated that it is practiced in the classroom with limited emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=1.25$) to three portrays that instructors give general comments on students work with no emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m=1.45$) of the item to two indicates that language cycle phases i.e. practice and analysis has been practiced in the classroom through limited emphasis in the classroom. According to Willis (1996) and Richards (2006) the ordinary phases of TBI are pre-task, task, and language focus cycles.

Table-S.: Instructional Activities**N=12**

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	3	25	9	75	-	-	-	-	3.25
2	4	33.3	6	50	2	16.7	-	-	3.17
3	4	33.3	3	25	5	41.7	-	-	2.92
GRAND MEAN									3.11

Key: ME: most emphasis=4 , some emphasis (SE)=3, Limited emphasis (LE)=2, Not at all (NE)=1

N= Number M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (Classroom activities capitalize communication opportunities through interactions and negotiation of meanings) 75% of data demonstrated that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. Furthermore, 25% of data showed that it is carried out in the classroom with major emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=3.25) of the item to three explains that classroom activities capitalize communication opportunities through interactions and negotiation of meanings in the classroom with some emphasis.

Item-2 (Language forms are addressed within a communicative context.) 50% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data confirmed that it is experienced in the classroom with major emphasis. Along with 16.7% of data exemplified that it is practiced in the classroom with little emphasis. Thus, the inclinations of the mean value (m=3.17) to three proved that language forms are addressed within a communicative context in the classroom with some emphasis. It can be deduced that instructors have been applying medium form of task based instruction (Ellis, 2003).

Item-3 (Student-centered) 41.7% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with little emphasis. Thirty three point three percent of data demonstrated that it is done in the classroom with major emphasis. Moreover, 25% of data explained that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclination of the mean value (m=2.92) of the item to three shows as student-centered approach implemented in the classroom with some emphasis. This clarified that instructors have been tended to traditional methodology of teaching. Willis (1996) forwarded that tasks remove the instructor domination, and learners get chances to open and close conversations, to interact naturally, to interrupt and challenge, to ask people to do things and to check what they have been done. The inclination of the grand mean value (m=3.11) of the item

to three indicates that instructional activities have been practiced in the classroom through some practice in the classroom.

Table-T: Classroom Condition

N=12

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	12	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.00
2	12	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.00
3	7	58.3	5	41.7	-	-	-	-	1.42
4	10	83.3	2	16.7	-	-	-	-	3.83
GRAND MEAN									3.31

Key: ME: most emphasis=4, some emphasis (SE)=3, Limited emphasis (LE)=2, Not at all (NE)=1 N= Number
M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (presence of enough sitting space for students) results of 100% of data demonstrated that there are presences of enough sitting space for all students in the classroom which are established with major emphasis. The mean value (m=4.00) of the item exhibit the identical data.

Item-2 (presence of movable seats) results of 100% of data underline the presence of movable seats for the entire students in the classroom with major emphasis. The mean value (m=4.00) of the item depicted the matching data.

Item-3 (presence of classroom layout arranged to facilitate TBI) 58.3% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Along with 41.7% of data exemplified that it is implemented in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclination of the mean value (m=1.42) to two reveals that the presence of classroom layout arranged to facilitate task based instruction in the classroom with some emphasis.

Item-4 (appropriateness of class size for TBI) 83.3% of data demonstrated that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Along with 16.7% of data depicted that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=3.83) to four portrays that there are appropriateness of class size for TBI with major emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value (m=3.31) of the item to three indicates that classroom condition has been arranged for TBI through some emphasis. Thus, it needs improvement numerically, qualitatively and it should be detached from the office.

Table-U: Instructor's Roles**N=12**

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	11	91.7	1	8.3	-	-	2.92
.2			8	66.7	4	33.3	-	-	2.67
3			5	41.5	7	58.3	-	-	2.42
4	9	75	3	25	5	5	-	-	3.75
GRAND MEAN									2.94

Key: ME: most emphasis=4, some emphasis (SE) =3, Limited emphasis (LE) =2, Not at all (NE)=1 N= Number
M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (organizing students to carry out tasks in group or pair) 91.7% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. In addition 8.3% of data proved that it is performed in the classroom with limited emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=2.92) to three depicted that organizing students to carry out tasks in group or pair practiced in the classroom with some emphasis.

Item-2 (clarifying the learning objective.) 66.7% of data showed that it is experienced in the classroom with some emphasis. Moreover, 33.3% of data reveals that it is practiced in the classroom with limited emphasis. The inclinations of the mean value (m=2.92) to three depicts that instructors clarify the learning objective in the classroom with some emphasis.

Item-3 (Giving clear instruction for doing tasks) 41.5% of data demonstrated that it is implemented in the classroom with some emphasis. Furthermore, 58.3% % of data illustrated that it is carried out in the classroom with limited emphasis. The inclinations of the mean value (m=2.92) to three proved that instructors' give clear instruction for doing tasks in the classroom with some emphasis.

Item-4 (Authoritative and dominant during the class discussions.) 75% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Besides, 25 % of data demonstrated that it is experienced in the classroom with some emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=3.75) to four portrays that instructors are authoritative and dominant during the class discussions with major emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m=2.94$) of the item to three indicates that instructor's roles have been practiced TBI through some practice in the classroom. Thus, instructors should be helped by stake holders.

Table-V: Students' Roles

N=12

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	7	58.3	5	41.7	-	-	-	-	3.58
2	-	-	4	33.3	8	66.7	-	-	2.33
3			3	25	9	75		-	2.25
GRAND MEAN									2.72

Key: ME: most emphasis=4, some emphasis (SE)=3, Limited emphasis (LE)=2, Not at all (NE)=1 N= Number M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (Listening to instructor's explanation) 58.3% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with major emphasis. Moreover, 41.7% of data explained that it is done in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclination of the mean value ($m=3.58$) to four shows as listening to instructor's explanation practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. This demonstrates as students are inactive listeners most of the time.

Item-2 (actively participating) 66.7% of data showed that it is performed in the classroom with limited emphasis. Besides, 33.3% of data confirmed that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. Thus, the inclinations of the mean value ($m=2.33$) of the item to two implies as students actively participating in the classroom with limited emphasis.

Item-3 (Giving comments.) 75% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with limited emphasis. Twenty five percent of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclinations of the mean value ($m=2.25$) to two illustrate that students give comments in the classroom with limited emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m=2.72$) of the item to three indicates that students' roles have been practiced the task based instruction through some emphasis in the classroom.

Table-W. Instructional Materials Used

N=12

No	ME		SE		LE		NE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	100	1.00
2	7	58.3	5	41.7	-	-	-	-	3.58
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	100	1.00
4	-	-	-	-	3	25	9	75	1.25
GRAND MEAN									1.71

Key: ME: most emphasis=4 , some emphasis (SE)=3, Limited emphasis (LE)=2, Not at all (NE)=1 N= Number M= mean f= frequency

Item-1 (Module) 100% of data showed that it is used in the classroom with no emphasis. The mean value (m=1.00) of the item pointed up the identical data

Item-2 (Duplicated materials) 58.3% of data illustrates that it is employed in the classroom with major emphasis. Besides, 41.7% of data proved that it is adept in the classroom with some emphasis. The inclination of the mean value (m=3.58) of the item to three implies that the duplicated materials used in the classroom with major emphasis.

Item-3 (audio-visual material) 100% of data showed that it is practiced in the classroom with no emphasis. The inclination of the mean value (m=1.00) of the item to one implies that audio-visuals employed in the classroom with no emphasis.

Item-4(Pictures, maps, charts, posters, diagrams) 75% of data proved that it is practiced in the classroom with no emphasis. Along with 25% of data demonstrated that it is used in the classroom with limited emphasis. Thus, the inclination of the mean value (m=1.25) to one represent that pictures, maps, charts, posters, diagrams employed with no emphasis.

The inclination of the grand mean value (m=1.71) of the item to two indicates that instructional materials have been employed in the classroom to implement in task based instruction through limited practice. Hence, instructors have been inclined to in using duplicated materials due to lack of formally designed modules in the University.

4.4. Analysis of Data Obtained by Interview

In this study, semi-structured interview was utilized as a data gathering instrument. The rationale of it was to acquire supplementary information from both instructors and students about the study. Accordingly, the respondents' ideas on the matching themes are analyzed qualitatively underneath.

4.4. 1. The Outlook of Instructors

- **The perceptions and experiences of TBI**

In order to obtain information on the experiences of TBI instructors were asked to mirror their classroom observation variations when they were in secondary level of education and at their current EFL classroom (see items 4 and 5 in appendix-IV). The entire interviewees guaranteed that there are disparities between instructional methods engaged at secondary and tertiary level of schooling. In validating this conception, Instructor₁ forwarded that typically instruction was instructor reliant in secondary level of education whereas in tertiary level students are a tad matured that they can do things autonomously.

Concerning the students' sentiment during the implementation of TBI; the entire interviewees reflected identical views. For example, Instructor ₁ (please see appendix-IV, Item-7) stated the subsequent view:

“Yehea.....Students reveal struggling. The struggling as I imagine has two rationales: The primary thing is, normally they deem as learning grammar is constructive as they were taught towards that for the justification of intention when they were in high schools. And second is lack of awareness on the payback of TBI.”

Along with evenly instructor₄ (please see appendix-IV, Item-7) communal approximately the equivalent view by uttering the subsequent:

“Ha-ha....To the scope that my knowledge is concerned, there is partiality among students regarding TBI in the classroom. Certain groups of students like learning English language courses through tasks; however, other students not like it. It can be concluded that students have pessimistic sensation about TBI. “

Consequently, it can be inferred from the instructors' outlook is that the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom impinged by the students' preceding experiences of didactic activities.

- **Knowledge of TBI mechanisms**

To point out the instructors' knowledge on TBI, the researcher of this study forwarded the subsequent question: "What does task mean to you?" (See appendix-IV, Item-2) the entire of the instructors elucidated the term task and revealed their impression. As observed under in their definitions the responses are not compressively explained the notion. For example,

"Well. To me task means an activity where target language is employed by the learner for communicative purposes in order to achieve certain outcome" (Instructor, 1).

"Hi...hi...hi...I believe that task is a means of enabling learners to learn a language by practicing how it is used in communication" (Instructor, 2).

Concerning the knowledge of the methodology the researcher invited the item which articulates "What is a TBI to you?" (See appendix-IV, Item-3). Therefore, all of the interviewees reflected their understanding on the notion as follows:

"Well. TBI to me is, method of teaching in which students receive scheme for learning through using target language in meaningful communication." (Instructor 1)

"K...kkk.kkk....TBI means to me is when students are learning through discussion, taking responsibility, touching their view, exploring their sentiment, and communication; however, they are not motionless in the classroom". (instructor₃).

The supplementary phase to which instructors were asked to mirror on is, concerning their feeling towards the implementation of TBI and its value (see item 6 in appendix IV). Incidentally, three of the respondents secured that they have optimistic perceptions in employing TBI in EFL classroom. Moreover, they added that TBI endorses learners' coolness in using the language in real life situation for auxiliary communication. In wide-ranging it is apt to deduce that instructors have required knowledge on the TBI and its weight in the course of didactic activities through various professional trainings in the area through time.

- **Instructors' implementation and students' involvement in TBI**

To the range that practicing diverse TBI mechanisms in the classroom is concerned, the subsequent conceptions are revealed by the entire interviewees: (See Item-8, appendix-IV).

Assignment, pair work, group work and individual work, assignment, asking and answering question.

However, a number of mechanisms of TBI were declared, apart from group work, pair work and individual work instructors were not glimpse employing other mechanisms during the actual classroom observation sessions (Please see Part-4.6).

- **Constraints on the implementation of TBI**

During the interview with the instructors a number of the questions (items 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, see Appendix IV], were forwarded to point out the expected factors which affect the implementation of TBI. As the instructors reflected, the approach they were taught has influenced their current practices in EFL classroom. For example, instructor₁ (see Appendix F-1) said the following:

“Yeah, I would utter all right. Since most of my instructors were my role models and it is obvious that most of them in particular in instructing English language courses were usually based on grammar approach, teaching the language structure and explaining everything, normally memorizing and learning rules. In one way or another that has influenced me and I am trying to detach myself from it.” (Instructor1)

“Why not! Teaching is very complex in high school. Students require a lot from the teachers and the teaching is based on the textbook. Here in University, instruction highly inclined to autonomous learning and helping learners in the way they are carrying out instructional activities. Thus, instructors have not been anticipated to utilize passive approach; however, it depends on his knowledge of methodology of ELT.” (Instructor4)

Concerning evading students’ unwillingness during implementation of TBI, instructors recommended that awareness should be created on the application and benefits of TBI. In line with this, instructor₁ (see appendix IV, item-9) forwarded his view as follows:

“Yehea....The main thing is to generate the awareness initially. For example, ahead of starting any activity I designed for them just I endeavor to explicate what benefit that does to them in improving their language, why we are doing that principally. If they suitably understand that besides the language fence they have, they are disposed to participate. However, there is a kind of confrontation in employing it”

“Indeed students’ unwillingness is prime problem. Thus, I endeavor to offer solutions for the predicament through provision of interesting tasks for learners and making them busy. Then, I deliver to them awareness creation advices, suggestion, comments and feedbacks through instructional activities.”(Instructor4)

Instructors were also reacted to the question raised by the researcher on the conduciveness of the classroom circumstances. Fittingly, the entire of the interviewees agreed that the class size is

convenient though there are average 31 - 35 students in one class. Though, they criticize about the availability and quality of EFL classroom to implement TBI. Concerning taking training in the implementation of TBI the entire instructors responded that they have not attended and taken training on the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.

In analogous way, they were also asked to reveal certain constraints in the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom. In this regard, they signified that the constraints are of four types. These are factors related with instructors, students, instructional materials and instructional environment. As they asserted further, instructors afraid of taking the cost task based instruction needs from them, students' lack of awareness on the benefits of TBI through preferring their previous experiences and lack of formally written materials are major impediments. On the whole, it is promising to infer that there are constraints which hamper the implementation of TBI that ranges from instantaneous classroom state of affairs to the wide-ranging system of schooling.

4.4.2. The Outlook of Students

- **The experience and perceptions of TBI**

What was guaranteed by the entire interviewed students is the subsistence of variation between the methods of instruction used in secondary and at University level and that they prefer the methods which are exploited at University level. For example, Student₇ (see Appendix VII- item-2) has said the subsequent:

“In high school level the teachers were not giving pair work, group work and they did not give opportunity for students by using different kinds of strategies.”

Instructors might employ the benefit of their students' perception. The students reflected that there is variation between instructional methods employed at secondary level of education and at their current EFL classroom. Consequently, it might be feasible to afford further orientation and training to them on the benefits of TBI in order to implement it in EFL classroom.

- **Instructors' implementation and students' involvement in TBI**

In order to obtain information on the practice of TBI the students were asked the following question: "What types of instructional methods do you think your instructors use in the instructional processes?" (Please see appendix-VII, item-5). Fittingly, six of the respondents replied that instructor centered approach. Here three of the respondents pointed out student

centered approach. The reason for this might be reluctance of instructors to take the cost which the implementation of TBI desires from them.

- **Constraints on the implementation of TBI**

Concerning constraints on the implementation of TBI the entire students demonstrated that there are restrictions. The key restrictions they pointed out are inadequacy of instructional materials and their partners' confrontation to work within the assigned pairs and groups and lack of reference books and language labs.

4.5: Data Obtained through Content Analysis of EFL Courses

In this study the researcher and co- analyzers analyzed four EFL courses which were selected based on purposeful sampling methods. In this way, the activities which were implemented by EFL courses in different stages of classroom instruction were tabulated and analyzed below.

Table-X: Content Analysis of EFL Courses N=8

No	VG		G		S		L		NA		Mean
	F	%	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	1.36
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	75	2	25	1.25
3	-	-			4	50	3	37.5	1	12.5	2.38
4	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	-	-	2.38
5	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	-		-	-	3.38
6					3	37.5	5	62.5	-		2.38
7	-	-	-		-		6	75	2	25	1.25
8	-	-	-		3	37.5	5	62.5	-		2.75
9	-	-	-		5	62.5	3	37.5	-		2.63
10	2	25	5	62.5	1	12.5	-	-	-		4.13
11	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	-		2.63
12	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	37.5	5	62.5	1.38
13	-	-	-	-	6	75	2	25			2.75
14	-	-	5	62.5	3	37.5			-	-	3.63
GRAND MEAN											2.45

Key: VG=Very great (5), G=great (4), S=some (3), L= limited (2), NA=not at all (1) N= Number M= mean f=frequency

Concerning Item-1 (course material availability for each student) 62.5% of data demonstrate that its availability is not at all. Moreover, 37.5% of its results display that its availability is limited. Therefore, the inclination of the mean value ($m=1.36$) of the item to one reveal that there is no availability of EFL course material for each student in the classroom.

In response to Item-2 (Objectives of tasks) 75% of data disclose as presentation of objectives of tasks in the EFL courses materials contents are limited. Along with 25% of data illustrate that its presentation is not at all. The inclinations of the mean value ($m=1.25$) of the item to one show that objectives of tasks presented in the content analysis of EFL course materials are not at all.

In relation to Item-3 (authenticity of tasks) 50% of data explain as occurrence of authenticity of tasks in the content of EFL materials are some. 37.5% of data demonstrate as existence of it is limited. And 12.5% of data confirm as the presentation of it is great. The inclination of the mean value ($m=2.38$) of the item to two implies the occurrences of authentic of tasks in the EFL course materials contents are limited.

With respect to Item-4 (Clearly written instructions of tasks) 62.5% of data verify as the presentation of clearly written instructions of tasks in the content of materials are limited. Furthermore, 37.5% of data proves the presentation of it as some. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=2.38$) to two portrays as clearly written instructions of tasks in the contents of course materials are limited.

Regarding Item-5 (Tasks are emphasized on the integration of language skills) 62.5% of data exemplify as tasks in the content of materials are emphasized on the integration of language skills portrayed some. Moreover, 37.5% of data is evidence for the presentation of it in great manners. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=3.38$) of the item to three portrays as tasks which emphasize on the integration of language skills found in the course materials are some.

The responses to Item-6 (Tasks are sufficiently varied and interesting to students) shows that 62.5% of data confirm as tasks which are sufficiently varied and interesting to students found in the course materials in limited manners. Along with 37.5% of data illustrate as it is presented in the content as some. The inclination of the mean value ($m=2.38$) of the item to two shows as EFL course materials comprises of different types of tasks in their contents in some level.

Concerning Item-7 (Present tasks through three phases) 75% of data illustrate as presentation of tasks through three phases limited in the content of EFL materials. Moreover, 25% of data reveals presentations of tasks through three phases are not at all in the contents of EFL course materials. The inclination of the mean value ($m=1.25$) of the item to one shows as EFL course materials present tasks through three phases (pre-task, task, language focus cycle) in their contents not at all.

With regard to Item-8 (tasks can go from simple to complex) 62.5 % of data point up as tasks can go from simple to complex in the contents of the materials in limited manners. 37.5 % of data reveal as presentation of it is some in the contents. The inclination of the mean value ($m=2.75$) to two exhibits as tasks can go from simple to complex in the contents of EFL course materials in some way.

In relation to Item-9 (Tasks are meaningfully challenging) 62.5% of data make obvious the presentation of tasks which are meaningfully challenging in the content of EFL materials are some. Along with 37.5% of data demonstrate as presentation of it is limited. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=2.63$) to three portrays as tasks are meaningfully challenging in some manners.

With respect Item-10 (Tasks are open for multiple interpretations and create positive language learning environment). 62.5% of data attest as presentation of tasks which are open for multiple interpretations and create positive language learning environment is great. 25% of data bear out that presentation of it is very great. Furthermore, 12.5 % of data show as presentation of it is some. The inclination of the mean value ($m=4.13$) to four confirm as tasks open for multiple interpretations and create positive language learning environment in the classroom with great.

About Item-11 (Tasks motivate learners by considering their psychological, social and cultural factors) 62.5% of data show as presentation of it is limited. And 37.5% of data illustrate as presentation of it is some. The inclination of the mean value ($m=2.63$) to three reveals that the tasks motivates learners by considering their psychological, social and cultural factors in the classroom are some.

Pertaining to Item-12 (Tasks are rich in visuals i.e. pictures, photos, diagrams, etc.) 62.5% of data substantiates as presentation of it is not at all. Along with, 37.5% of data point up as

presentation of it is limited. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=1.38$) to one portrays that tasks are rich in visuals (pictures, photos, diagrams, etc presented with not at all practice.

Regarding Item-13 (Tasks clearly put the expected roles of instructors and students) 75% o of data verify as presentation of it is some. Furthermore, 25 % of data exemplify as presentation of it is limited. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m=1.38$) to three portrays that tasks clearly put the expected roles of instructors and students with some.

With reference to Item-14 (Tasks are designed and developed in line with English language curriculum) 62.5% of data illustrate as presentation of it is great. Also, 37.5% of data bear out as presentation of it is some. Thus, the inclination of the mean value ($m= 2.75$) to four portrays that tasks are designed and developed in line with English language curriculum with great practice.

The inclination of the grand mean value ($m= 2.45$) of the item to two indicates as tasks which found in the course materials are limited in their quality as well as quantity. Thus, the EFL course materials should be designed and developed in formal way.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter deals with summary, conclusions and recommendations. In this section, first a brief summary of the study is presented. Second, conclusions are made and then, recommendations are forwarded.

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was assessing the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom and exploring the underlying constraints of it in Wachemo University, Department of English language and Literature. The specific objectives of the study were:

- To describe instructors' and students' experiences and perceptions in the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.
- To look into instructors' and students' practice of their theoretical knowledge on the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.
- To show the extent to which instructors implement and students involve in TBI in EFL classroom.
- To identify the constraints that act against the implementation of TBI in EFL classroom.

The participants of the study were English language instructors and students. The data from both respondents were gathered through questionnaire, observation, semi-structured interview. Then, contribution of EFL course materials in the implementation of TBI were seen through content analysis. The data obtained were analyzed through quantitative and qualitative methods. At last based on the analysis of the data the following findings were obtained from the study.

❖ Major Findings

➤ Experience and perceptions of respondents towards TBI

- The background information of respondents revealed that students enrollment has been increasing from year to year as well as nearly all instructors are inexperienced in teaching profession though all of them are second degree holders.
- No in-service training and orientation provided for instructors as well as extra pre-service training for students in the implementation of TBI.
- The entire students in the study begun learning EFL through tasks after they have joined the University; however, some instructors did not have the experience of informing students about the benefits of TBI consistently in EFL classroom.

- The entire participants had optimistic perceptions towards the implementation TBI in EFL classroom. Thus, lion's share of them affirmed that TBI augment communicative abilities and knowledge of integrated language skill, makes the students accountable for their own learning through developing self confidence and sharing experience.
- **The knowledge of respondents on TBI**
 - Instructors have required knowledge about TBI; however, they practice medium form of it and instruct students through instructor derived tasks and instructor based error correction.
 - Students have restricted knowledge about TBI though instructors timed on activating students' knowledge of TBI.
 - Instructors know merits of TBI in EFL classroom; however, they did not instruct students based on the principles of TBI as well as they practice phases of TBI such as pre-task and while task more often than language cycle tasks which are analysis and practice in the EFL classroom.
- ❖ **Instructors' implementation and students' involvement in TBI in EFL classroom.**
 - The opinion exchange tasks, reasoning gap tasks, information gap tasks, listing tasks, order and sorting tasks, personal experience sharing tasks as well as comparing and contrasting tasks implemented in the EFL classroom frequently.
 - Most students are reluctant on the implementation of TBI due to their poor back ground.
 - Assignment, group work, pair work and individual work are commonly used mechanisms of TBI in EFL classroom. These demonstrated that instructors and students have been stick to selected methods of TBI.
 - A great number of scholars have stressed that in TBI classroom, the roles of instructors are facilitating the instructional processes through advising, counseling and organizing students. However, the results of data indicated that the majority of activities that are anticipated from the instructors and students have not demonstrated. Thus, the roles instructors and students played in the implementation of TBI could not found to be adequate.

- As to the classroom condition, the results of the analysis which is obtained from observation revealed that the classroom condition is not conducive to implement TBI due to its setting and quality.
- In TBI, assessment is an ongoing process and it helps the students to progress, and create a positive interaction between instructor and students. However, results from data showed that the assessment techniques highly focused on paper and pencil tests.
- The data obtained through content analysis of EFL course materials revealed that EFL courses materials should be designed formally because the course materials instructors have been employing currently lacks availability to each student, lacks objectives in its contents, lacks authenticity of tasks, lacks presenting tasks through phases and its principles and lacks tasks which are rich with pictures, photos and diagrams.
- **Constraints that act against the implementation of TBI in EFL Classroom**
 - TBI affected by internal and external factors in various ways.
 - **Internal factors** such as range of language skills among students, Amharic language use in the part of students and instructors, fear of making mistakes among students, instructors' tendency to use traditional instructional methods, lack of motivation and interest to learn and instruct, lack of trainings like workshops as well as seminars, poor back ground of students, instructors and students prior experiences, low communicative competence of students, mismatch between instructors instruction preferences and students learning preferences.
 - **External factors** like lack of resources (i.e. references and audio), lack of authentic texts, lack of formally designed module, the lack of English being spoken outside of the classroom.

Generally speaking, it can be deduced that from classroom affairs to wide ranging system of education are constraints of TBI. Besides, as the study revealed student and EFL course materials related factors are serious factors where as instructor and instructional environment related factors are ambivalent factors.

5.2. Conclusions

- Based on the major findings of the study, the subsequent conclusions were drawn.
 - Instructors have been very much convincing and students have been restricted awareness about the significance of TBI. Accordingly, in this study both instructors and students assured that they have optimistic perceptions. However, they were not observed in implementing various types of tasks recurrently in the EFL classroom. Thus, it can be concluded that their optimistic perceptions mismatch with their implementation of it with in the classroom.
 - Instructors and students lack required in service and pre-service trainings and orientation in the form of seminars and workshops that equip them with sound knowledge and profound skill in the implementation of task based instruction respectively. Hence, it can be deduced that there was a tendency to rely on their former experiences.
 - The findings of the study disclosed that the magnitude of implementing TBI in the classroom found to be stumpy. Both groups of the respondents confirmed that the different TBI mechanisms were practiced in limited manners. Since, they are stick to the selected mechanisms of task based instruction in the classroom.
 - The EFL course materials were not organized in a mode that facilitates the implementation of TBI since they have not been prearranged in such a means that the learners can actively involved in their learning tasks. It can therefore be concluded that the organization of instructional materials during their design and development do not address and consider the needs of students and hence, they are not formally written by module writers of Ministry of education in generally and instructors of the University in particularly.
 - The implementation of TBI depends on the role of the instructors and students who have enough experience, perceptions, knowledge and skills in handling instructional methodologies in general and TBI in particular. However, the findings of this study confirmed that, the roles of instructors and students expected playing in TBI implementation found to be inadequate. Thus, it can be concluded that instructors failed to equip the students with required skills and knowledge through tasks. Hence, it looks

like logical to wind up that instructors are better in theoretical notion of TBI than practical conception.

- TBI improves students' communicative competence significantly. However, the findings of the study divulged that instructors apply pre-task and while task phases in limited manners and shouldn't apply language cycle phases such as analysis and practice stages of the tasks while the instructional processes were going on.
- The findings of the study disclosed that assessment did not take place in line with facilitating the implementation of TBI in instructional processes of English language courses hence it focused on paper and pencil tests.
- The instructional processes have been going on based on duplicated materials prepared by individual instructors in fragmented manners in EFL classroom. Thus, it could not a bit satisfy the criterion EFL course materials need to be prepared for instruction purposes to produce competent English language users.
- The constraints accountable for the limited implementation of TBI were found to be students and EFL course materials related factors most often in EFL classroom. Along with instructor and instructional environment related factors are hesitant factors.

5.3: Recommendations

Based on the conclusions derived above, the subsequent recommendations are forwarded:

- Instructors expected to instruct English language courses through tasks based on their methodological decisions and contexts to encourage students in developing receptive and productive language skills through practice.
- The mismatch between perceptions and actual classroom implementations of TBI should be alleviated. Having good view and knowledge of TBI with limited practice can still be an indication of fuzzy knowledge of its phases, principles and components. Thus, the use of TBI in the setting is much less than formalistic approach. Therefore, it would be helpful if the ministry of education as well as WU should be aware of the gap between the instructors' and students' theoretical knowledge of TBI and their practical skills of it and then should take the responsibilities to organize practice-based professional development agenda related to planning, implementing and assessing. It should properly deal with both the strength and weakness of TBI as an instructional method ranging from basic principles to specific techniques.
- Instructors' derived tasks implemented in the actual classroom based on instructor based commentary typically. Due to reluctance of students to be involved in the scenario, instructors' stick to selected mechanisms of TBI more often. Also, classroom conditions are not motivating and assessment techniques are inclined to paper and pencil tests. EFL instructional materials therefore should be re-written in formal approaches so as to involve activities to process the new material and linking it to instructors and learners needs through providing concentration on variety types of tasks and put them in the library or provide them for each student to foster instructors' implementation and students' involvement in TBI.
- In the University students and EFL course materials related factors are serious problems even if factors related with instructors and instructional environment have got ambivalent nature. Thus, Ministry of Education in generally and WU in particularly dig out these barriers and inform them to instructors. These might facilitate instructors to spotlight on, offer consideration and arrive at the main problems. Moreover, it is crucial that department heads periodically solicit student feedback in a course about how it is progressing in ELT through tasks. Instructing students for the world of work and lifelong learning involves

philosophy based schooling to analyze problems, synthesize information and tackle a wide range of duties.

- In this study group work, pair work, individual work and assignment are allegedly the most repeatedly used TBI mechanisms in EFL classroom. However, these are not the merely TBI mechanisms in order to promote students communication ability and linguistic proficiency. Consequently, instructors should not glue at purely selected types of TBI mechanisms. As an alternative it is prudent to utilize range of mechanisms throughout classroom instructions to get students engrossed in their autonomous learning. What is more, in English language classroom employing debates, discussion, drama, brainstorming, asking and answering questions and role play and etc might make didactic processes etched in the mind of students. As the findings of this study discloses these mechanisms are infrequently used in the classroom. Thus, it would be better if multi-mechanisms are employed radically in EFL classroom to create competent and self reliant language users.
- At every aspect of schooling instructors know how to have a tendency to be role models for their students. As the finding of this study demonstrated the largest part of instructors were inclined towards instructor centered dogma of instruction. Along with they were also observed in applying it often. As anticipated, students possibly will be influenced by their instructors' instructional preference and will keep on spending in the matching method in their upcoming livelihood if they could be joined in analogous profession as instructor. Therefore, instructors should be role model in the application of TBI in the classroom to foster students' skills of language.

Reference

- Alene, K. (2012). *Investigation of EFL teachers' and students' views towards using literary texts in EFL Classrooms: The case of Aboker preparatory school, Grade 12, Harari Region*. Unpublished MA Thesis Haramaya University
- Atkins, J, Hailom, B. and Nuru, M (1995). *Skills Development Methodology*; Part One: Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University
- Bachman, L.F., and Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and Developing useful language tests*. Oxford University press
- Branden, K.V.D. (2006). *Task based language teaching: From theory to practice*. Cambridge. Cambridge. University press.
- Carless, D. (2002). *Implementing task-based learning with young learners*. Oxford University
- Carless, D. (2003). *Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools*. Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Road, Tai Po, Hong Kong press
- Carless, D. (2004). Issues in Teachers' Reinterpretation of a Task-Based Innovation in Primary Schools. *Tesol Quarterly* 38 (4).639-662
- Chang, M. (2011). Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Taiwanese college English classes. 4(2). 3-10
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. 4th ed. Pearson. University of Nebraska–Lincoln press
- Dailey, A. (2009). *Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching in Korean Classrooms*. Birmingham
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical research methods: A user friendly guide to mastering research techniques and projects*. How to Books Ltd, 3 Newtec Place. United Kingdom
- Donough, J. and C. Show (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ellen, Z.Y (2005). *The Implementation of the task-based approach in primary school English Language teaching in mainland China*. Unpublished PhD desertion. University of Hong Kong. The HUK scholars' hub
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol. 19(3)
- FDRGE (1994). *Education and training policy*. Addis Ababa. St. George printing press
- Freeman, L. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford University
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report* Volume (8).597-607

- Hu, R. (2013). Task-Based Language Teaching: Responses from Chinese Teachers of English. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*. Vol.16 (4).1-20
- Institute of International Education (2012). *Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia*. Report on a Future Search Conference: The Ministry of Education of the Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, the Institute of International Education, and Ambo University
- Ismail, M. (2012). Task-based Instruction. *International Journal of Linguistics* Vol. 4(3). 948-5425
- Israel, D.G. (1992). *Sampling the Evidence of Extension Program Impact: Program Evaluation and Organizational Development*. IFAS. University of Florida
- Jabbarpoor, S. (2011). *Task-based language assessment: Difficulty-based task items sequencing and Task-based Test Performance*. IACSIT Press, Singapore
- Jha, K. (2013). *Exploring Major Impediments in Mastering English: The Case of Eastern Ethiopia*: Haramaya University, Ethiopia
- Jones, L. (2007). *The Student-Centered Classroom*. Cambridge. Cambridge University press
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. (2nd). New age International Language policy unit
- Lazar G. (1993). *Literature and language teaching: Guide for teachers and trainers*. Cambridge : Cambridge University press.
- Meseret, T. (2012). *Instructors' and Students' perceptions and practices of task-based writing in an EFL context*. Unpublished a dissertation. Addis Ababa University
- Meyers, C. and Jones, T. (1993). *Promoting Active Learning: Strategies for the college classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Ministry of education (2013). *Nationally Harmonized Modular Curriculum for Undergraduate Program*. Wachemo University, Department of English language and literature
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education*. London..New Delhi. Thousand Oaks. Sage publications
- Nahavandi and Makunidani (2012). Task-based Language Teaching from Teachers' Perspective: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*. ISSN 2200-3592 (Print), ISSN 2200-3452 (Online) Vol. 1 (6).
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for communicative classroom*. Cambridge University press
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task based language teaching*. Cambridge University press
- Nunan, D. (2006). Task-based language teaching in the Asia context: Defining 'task': *An Overview*. *Asian EFL Journal* -.Vol. 8 (3). 1-3

- Oxford, L. R. (2006). Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning: An Overview. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol. 8(3). 1738-1460
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers T. S. (1986). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge. Cambridge Language Teaching Library
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers T. S (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University press
- Ross, K.N. (2005). *Quantitative research methods in educational planning*. UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning press
- Tagesse, D. (2008). *The practicability of task-based EFL instruction in higher institutes*. Unpublished MA thesis. Addis Ababa University
- Tanveer, M. (2007). *Investigation that cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in leaning speaking skills and the influence it cats on communication in target language*. Unpublished thesis of University of Glasgow
- Tayie, S. (2005). *Research methods and writing research proposals*. Cairo University
- Teshome, D. (1995). *AAU freshman students' views and preferences with respect to structure-based versus task-based approaches to ELT*. Unpublished MA Thesis Addis Ababa University
- Tomlinson (2011): *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University
- UNESCO (2001): *The development of education national report of Ethiopia*. International bureau of Education press.
- Tirualem, A. (2003). *The classroom practices of learner-centered approach in second cycle primary schools of Addis Ababa*. Unpublished MA Thesis Addis Ababa University
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University press
- Wang, Y, H (2010). Using communicative language games in teaching and learning English in Taiwanese primary schools. *Journal of Engineering Technology and Education*. Vol.7 (1)126-142
- Wills, J. (1996). *A frame work for task based learning*. Long man hand book for language teachers. Long man press.
- Wills, D. and Wills, J. (2007). *Doing task based teaching*. Oxford University press.
- Yeshimebet, B. (2009). *Teachers' and Students' perception of task based language teaching method and its practice: The case of Arbaminch College of teacher education*. Unpublished MA Thesis Addis Ababa University.

Appendices

Appendix-I

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
POST GRADUATE PROGRAM
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTRUCTORS

Dear Instructors,

The aim of this questionnaire is to “**Assess the Implementation of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classes of Wachemo University, Department of English Language and Literature**”. I use the information you provide in the questionnaire only for my MA thesis in TEFL program. You are kindly requested to read the items carefully and give your genuine responses for each item. Since your responses will be treated with the confidence, feel free to answer all the items frankly and honestly. Don't forget that the value of this study is dependent on the care and truthfulness with which you answer each item. You do not need to write your name.

Thank you for your valuable cooperation.

Mulugeta Birhanu

Dear instructors, the researcher would like to inform you with great pleasure as Task means a piece of classroom work that involves learners in understanding, operating and interacting with the target language through focus on activating grammatical knowledge in order to express and convey meaning than to manipulate form (Nunan,2004).

INSTRUCTION:

PART-I: Background Information

Read the following questions and then circle on the answer which fits your personal biography.

- 1.1. Qualification: A. BA degree B. MA degree C. Doctor of philosophy D. Other (specify)
- 1.2. Specialization: A. MA in TEFL B. MA in linguistics C. MA in literature
D. MA in journalism E. Other (specify).
- 1.3. Work experiences
A. 0-5 years B. 5- 11 years C. 11 – 17 years D. 17 – 22 years E. other (specify)

PART-II: Instructors’ Experiences of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classroom

The following are items on instructors’ experiences in teaching English language courses through tasks. Select appropriate answer from “Yes’ or “No” alternatives and then put (X) mark on the box based on your answer.

No	Items	Alternatives	
		Yes	No
2.1	Did you teach English language courses through tasks before you join tertiary level of education as an instructor?		
2.2	Have you got in-service training about teaching English language courses through tasks in the classroom?		
2.3	Have you been informing students about the benefits of learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom?		

PART-III: Instructors’ practice of Knowledge of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classroom

The following are items on instructors’ theoretical knowledge of teaching English language courses through tasks in the classroom. Thus, choose the answer that matches your position most, according to the following scales.

Key: 5= Always, 4= Usually, 3= Sometimes, 2= Rarely, 1= Never

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
3.1	I explain grammatical forms and patterns					
3.2	I involve students in planning the task they are going to do through phases in the classroom					
3.3	I involve students in group or pair work in the classroom					
3.4	I correct students’ mistakes and errors					
3.5	I asses students’ progress on the basis of their day to day communicative performance					

PART-IV: Instructors’ Perceptions of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classroom

The following are items on instructors’ perceptions of task based instruction in EFL class room.

Thus, choose the answer that matches your position most, according to the following scales.

Key: 5= strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3=Undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= strongly disagree

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Tasks are communicative oriented					
4.2	Tasks put a primary focus on meaning					
4.3	Tasks have different solutions which encourage students to see different perspectives					
4.4	Tasks promote self-confidence and autonomous learning.					

PART-V: Instructors’ Implementation of Types of Tasks

Direction: Below are items containing different types of tasks. Please choose the appropriate alternative and put (X) mark to indicate how often different types of tasks are implemented in your classroom.

Key: 5= Always, 4= Usually, 3= Sometimes, 2= Rarely, 1= Never

5:1.The gap principle

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.1.1	Reasoning gap tasks					
5.1.2	Information gap tasks					
5.1.3	Opinion gap tasks					

5.2. Reaching a decision (solution)

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.2.1	Decision-making tasks					
5.2.2	Problem-solving tasks					
5.2.3	Opinion exchange tasks,					

3.3. Cognitive process

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.3.1	Listing tasks					
5.3.2	Ordering and sorting tasks					
5.3.3	Comparing and contrasting tasks					
5.1.4	Personal experience sharing tasks					
5.3.5	Creative tasks and projects					

PART –VI: Factors affecting the implementation of task based instruction in EFL classroom

To what extent the following factors affect the implementation of task based instruction in your EFL classroom. Please, rate them from “serious” to “not serious” based on the gravity of the problem and use “X” mark to indicate your response. Key: 4 = Most serious, 3 = Serious, 2 = Undecided, 1 = Not serious.

6.1. Instructor related factors

No	Items	4	3	2	1
6.1.1	Negative Wash-back effect of the exam				
6.1.2	Instructors perception				
6.1.3	Lack of motivation				

6.2. Student related factors

No	Items	4	3	2	1
6.2.1	Students’ lack of interest /motivation				
6.2.2	Students’ perception				
6.2.3	Range of language skills among students				
6.2.4	Lack of exposure to practice language skills				
6.2.5	Learners use of Amharic tongue				
6.2.6	Fear of making mistakes				

6.3. EFL course materials related factors

No	Items	4	3	2	1
6.3.1	Lack of authentic texts				
6.3.2	Lack of adequate tasks in the content of modules				
6.3.3	Unavailability of EFL teaching materials for each student				

6.4. University related factors

No	Items	4	3	2	1
6.4.1	Lack of resources i.e. audio/ language lab				
6.4.2	Large class size				
6.4.3	Limited periods for ELT schedule				

If there are any other factors, please specify

PART –VII: OPEN ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE

Read the following questions carefully and then provide answer

- What are the benefits of teaching English language courses through tasks in the EFL classroom?
- What mechanisms do you use to implement task based instruction in the EFL classroom?
- What are your roles and students roles in the EFL classroom? List them.

Appendix-II
JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
POST GRADUATE PROGRAM
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear students,

The aim of this questionnaire is to “**Assess The Implementation of Task Based Instruction in English As A Foreign Language Classroom: The Case Of Wachemo University, Department of English Language and Literature**”. I use the information you provide in the questionnaire only for my MA thesis in TEFL program. You are kindly requested to read the items carefully and give your genuine responses for each item. Since your responses will be treated with the confidence, feel free to answer all the items frankly and honestly. Don't forget that the value of this study is dependent on the care and truthfulness with which you answer each item. You do not need to write your name.

Thank you for your valuable cooperation.

Mulugeta Birhanu

Dear students, the researcher would like to inform you with great pleasure as Task means a piece of classroom work that involves learners in understanding, operating and interacting with the target language through focus on activating grammatical knowledge in order to express and convey meaning than to manipulate form (Nunan,2004)

INSTRUCTION:

PART-I: Background Information

Read the following questions carefully and then circle on the answer which fits your personal biography.

1.1. Year A. I B. II C. III

PART-II: Students' Experiences of Task Based Instruction in the EFL Classroom

The following are items on students' experiences of task based instruction in EFL classroom. So, select correct answer from “Yes” or “No” alternatives and then put (X) mark in the boxes.

No	Items	Alternatives	
		Yes	No
2.1	Did you hear about learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom when you were in high school?		

2.2	Did any of your instructors ask your opinion about what to do in English language courses in the classroom?		
2.3	Have you attended orientations or trainings on learning English language courses through tasks in addition to what have you been learning in the classroom?		
2.4	Have any of your instructors informed you about benefits of task based instruction in English language courses classroom?		

PART-III: Students' knowledge of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classroom

The following are items on students' theoretical understanding of task based instruction in EFL classroom. For each of the item, please put (X) mark on the answer that matches your position most based on the scales.

Key: 5= Always, 4= Usually, 3= Sometimes, 2= Rarely, 1= Never

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
3.1	I give time for grammatical rules discussions					
3.2	I plan for the task I am going to do					
3.3	I learn through instructor based discussion					
3.4	I correct mistakes and errors of my partners					
3.5	I asses my progress on the basis of my day to day performance					

-IV: Students' Perceptions of Task Based Instruction in the EFL Classroom

The following are items on students' perceptions of task based instruction in EFL classroom. Thus, for each of the following items, please put (X) mark on your answer that matches your position most, according to the following scales. Key: 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=Undecided, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
4.1	Tasks are appropriate to develop integrated language skills					
4.2	Tasks engage me to put a primary focus on meaning					
4.3	Tasks have different solutions; I believe this can help me to see different perspectives					
4.4	Tasks promote my self-confidence and independent learning					
4.5	Tasks provide me room to decide on how to arrive at the outcomes					

PART-V: Students’ implementation of task based instruction in EFL Classroom

Direction: Below are items containing different types of tasks. Please choose the appropriate alternative and put (X) mark to indicate how often the tasks are implemented different in your classroom. Key: 5= Always, 4= Usually, 3= Sometimes, 2= Rarely, 1= Never

5.1: The gap principle

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.1.1	Reasoning gap tasks					
5.1.2	Information gap tasks					
5.1.3	Opinion gap tasks					

5.2. Reaching a decision (solution)

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.2.1	Decision-making tasks					
5.2.2	Problem-solving tasks					
5.2.3	Opinion exchange tasks,					

3.3. Cognitive process

No	Items	Alternatives				
		5	4	3	2	1
5.3.1	Listing tasks					
5.3.2	Ordering and sorting tasks					
5.3.3	Comparing and contrasting tasks					
5.3.4	Personal experience sharing tasks					
5.3.5	Creative tasks and projects					

PART-VI: Factors affecting the implementation of task based instruction in EFL Classroom

To what extent the following factors affect its implementation of task based instruction in EFL Classroom. Please rate your answer from “serious” to “not serious” based on the weight of the problem and use “X” mark to indicate your response. Key: 4 = Most serious, 3 = Serious, 2 = Undecided, 1 = Not serious.

6.1. Instructor related factors

No	Items	Alternatives			
		4	3	2	1
6.1.1	Negative Wash-back effect of the exam				

6.1.2	Instructors negative perception				
6.1.3	Lack of motivation				

4.2. Student related factors

No	Items	Alternatives			
		4	3	2	1
6.2.1	Students' lack of interest				
6.2.2	Students' negative perception				
6.2.3	Range of language skills among students				
6.2.4	Lack of exposure to practice language skills				
6.2.5	Students' use of Amharic				
6.2.6	Fear of making mistakes				

4.3. EFL course materials related factors

No	Items	Alternatives			
		4	3	2	1
6.3.1	Lack of authentic texts				
6.3.2	Lack of adequate tasks in the content of modules				
6.3.3	Unavailability of EFL teaching materials/ modules /for each students				

4.4. University related factors

No	Items	Alternatives			
		4	3	2	1
6.4.1	Lack of resources i.e. audio/ language lab				
6.4.2	Large class size				
6.4.3	Limited periods for ELT schedule				

If there are any other factors, please specify

PART –VII: Open Ended Questionnaires

Give your responses to the following questions in narrative form.

- 7.1. What are the benefits of learning English language courses through tasks in the classroom?
- 7.2. What mechanisms do your instructors use to implement teaching English language courses through tasks in the classroom?
- 7.3. What are your roles and your instructors' roles in the EFL classroom?

Appendix-III

JIMMA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

GRADUATE PROGRAM

Classroom Observation Check List

The main purpose of this observation checklist is to *Assess the Implementation Of Task Based Instruction In EFL Classroom In Wachemo University, Department Of English Language And Literature*. The activities underneath in the table marked in the category of Major emphasis (4), some emphasis (3), little emphasis (2), no emphasis (1) on the basis of whether the instructor and students practiced them in the classroom or not.

Key: ME=major emphasis, SE=some emphasis, LE= little emphasis, NE= no emphasis

Class observed: _____ Date: _____ Time _____

Observer: _____ Year _____ Course title (Code): _____

No	Items	ME	SE	LE	NE
PART-I	PHASES OF TASKS				
1.1	Pre-task				
1.1.1	Instructor presents familiar tasks to students				
1.2.2	Students plan the task they are going to do				
1.3.3	Instructor gives introduction about the topic				
1.4.4	Instructor gives clear directions on the tasks				
1.2	While Task				
1.2.1	Instructors give advice to students to assist each other.				
1.2.2	Instructor moves around the class to assist students.				
1.3	Language cycle				
1.3.1	Students comment on each other's work.				
1.3.2	Students rewrite tasks by using the corrections and comments they get from their instructor and peers.				
1.3.3	Instructor give general comments on students work				
2	Instructional Activities				
2.1	Classroom activities capitalize communication opportunities through interactions and negotiation of meanings.				

2.2	Language forms are addressed within a communicative context.				
2.3	Student-centered				
3	Classroom conditions				
3.1	Presence of enough sitting space for all students.				
3.2	Presence of movable seats				
3.3	Presence of classroom layout arranged to facilitate task based instruction.				
3.4	Appropriateness of class size for task based instruction				
4	Instructor's roles				
4.1	Organizing students to carry out tasks in group or pair.				
4.2	Clarifying the learning objective.				
4.3	Giving clear instruction for doing tasks.				
4.4	Authoritative and dominant during the class discussions.				
5	Students' roles				
5.1	Listening to instructor's explanation				
5.2	actively participating				
5.3	Giving comments				
6	Instructional materials used				
6.1	Module				
6.2	Duplicated materials				
6.3	Audio-visual material				
6.6	Pictures, maps ,charts, posters, diagrams				

Appendix-IV

Interview questions for instructors

1. Welcome to this interview session.
2. What is task mean to you?
3. What does task based instruction mean to you
4. Are there similarities and differences in the methodology of instruction between secondary school education and tertiary education?
5. Do you think your current mode of instruction has been predisposed by the means you were educated? How?
6. What is your sensation towards implementation of task based instruction in English language classrooms? Can you talk about a number of significance of it?
7. What feelings have you observed from your students when engaged in task based instruction?
8. Can you state some of the task based instruction techniques that you employ to get the students in as well as outside of the classrooms?
9. How do you avoid students' unwillingness in learning English language in a cooperative way?
10. Do you think the classroom environment is encouraging the implementation of task based instruction?
11. Have you taken in-service training on instructing English language courses through tasks?
12. What are constraints of task based instruction in English classroom?

Appendix-V

Sample Interview with instructors

Key: **R:** Researcher, **I₁:** Instructor one, **I₂:** Instructor-two, **I₃:** Instructor-three, **I₄:** Instructor four

R: Welcome to this interview.

I₁: It is my pleasure.

I₂: Never mind

I₃: Don't mention

I₄: Thank you

R: Please let know me which year students you have been teaching at the University currently.

I₁: Well. I have been teaching second and third year language students.

I₂: I teach second year language students

I₃: I have been teaching year one language students.

I₄: I have been teaching year two and three language students

R: Alright. What is a task mean to you?

I₁: Well. To me task means an activity where target language is employed by the learner for communicative purposes in order to achieve certain outcome

I₂: Good question: To my knowledge task means an activity in which students are exposed to meaningful communication.

I₃: Good: As I think task means an activity that makes learners to use the target language in meaningful communication.

I₄: I believe that task is a means of enabling learners to learn a language by practicing how it is used in communication.

R: Good. What does task based instruction mean to you?

I₁: Well. Task based instruction to me is, method of teaching in which students receive scheme for learning through using target language in meaningful communication.

I₂: Okay. Task based instruction is just techniques of teaching English language courses based on providing a wide exposure for learners to use language skills for an intended outcome.

I₃: Okay. Task based instruction means to me is when students are learning through discussion, taking responsibility, touching their view, exploring their sentiment, and communication; however, they are not motionless in the classroom.

I₄: Good. Task based instruction is a methodology teaching through providing an exposure for learners to apply what they now about the language in the document to practice

R: Are there resemblances and variations in instructional methodology of English language courses between secondary school and tertiary education?

I₁: I would say yeah. Really when I was in secondary school, mostly instruction was teacher reliant. We anticipate the whole thing from the teacher. With any luck this trend is changing these days. Because of the differences between secondary and the instruction here at University level is; our students as compared to the ones in secondary school are a bit experienced. They know what they are doing and they can do things the way you organize things for them to do. That is the basic difference. If they can use the benefit that suitably we can just make them better students.

I₂: Of course. It is becoming the identical now days I do not know why. Most of the time here in University just most us, I can utter instruct like we were taught in secondary school.

I₃: Yehea. Most of the time teaching in high school focuses on rearing and spoon feeding learners with formalistic ideology of teaching. However, in University teaching focuses on practical activities hence students are the new generations who will be part and parcel of the society in decision making processes by future.

I₄: To my knowledge, teachers in high school should be anticipated to teach students based on the formally designed and developed textbook book, teaching syllabus and there is high follow-up there. Although in University students take part active role in learning by using the language. Thus, independent learning highly practiced. Due to freshness of the University here, teaching by doing is very difficult here.

R: Do you believe your present style of teaching has been influenced by the method you were taught? How?

I₁: Yeah, I would utter all right. Since most of my instructors were my role models and it is obvious that most of them in particular in instructing English language courses were usually based on grammar approach, instructing the language structure and explaining everything, normally memorizing and learning rules. In one way or another that has influenced me and I am trying to detach myself from it.

I₂: Of course. I was taught by the instructors who just follow the instructor centered method. Now I am influenced by the way I was taught.

I₃: Might be. When I was a student teaching was highly tended to formalistic approach in high school. Teachers were implemented it because of the wish of not to take the duty the instruction offers for them. I think currently this ideology influenced my instruction through making me an instructor who fills up the empty account of students through feeding what I know about the subject matter.

I₄: Why not! Teaching is very complex in high school. Students require a lot from the teachers and the teaching is based on the textbook. Here in University, instruction highly inclined to autonomous learning and helping learners in the way they are carrying out instructional activities. Thus, instructors have not been anticipated to utilize passive approach; however, it depends on his knowledge of methodology of ELT.

R: What is your sensation towards implementation of task based instruction in English language classrooms? Can you mention some value of it?

I₁: Yeah. Task based instruction is good if the condition is favorable for teaching English language. It is learnt for the purpose of communication. If that is the case, students should practice the language in the classroom and develop confidence to use the language in the real life situation. As a result, it facilitates or promotes this aim of the language learning. Subsequently, task based instruction is useful to students.

I₂: I have just positive feeling towards task based instruction. If situations are comfortable, as much as possible I endeavor to pertain it in my classroom.

I₃: Oh. Good question. I perceive optimistically about teaching English language courses through tasks. It helps me and my students to do tasks in a cooperative and collaborative comportment.

I₄: Well. I perceive teaching English language courses through tasks negatively. As you now its practice in the classroom costs you. In here situations are not that much good for its implementation.

R: What feelings have you observed from your students when engaged in task based instruction?

I₁: Students reveal struggling. The struggling as I imagine has two rationales. The primary thing is, normally they deem as learning grammar is constructive as they were taught towards that for the justification of intention when they were in high schools. And second is lack of awareness on the payback of task based instruction.

I₂: Really, I can say some are very interested in task based instruction. Whereas others, you know consider it as if the instructor is idle in the classroom and they want to be just inactive. What can I say? To tell them the whole thing they want everything from the instructor is anticipated. They want instructor to write the entire note other than involving them in tasks.

I₃: Indeed. Most students have negative feeling about task based instruction. The reason might be their poor background. Students joined in the field of English language without interest. Thus, they need to learn through instructor based teaching.

I₄: To the scope that my knowledge is concerned, there is partiality among students regarding task based instruction in the classroom. Certain groups of students like learning English language courses through tasks; however, others not like it. It can be concluded that students have pessimistic sensation about task based instruction.

R: Can you talk about a number of the task based instruction techniques that you employ to get the student involved in and outside of the classroom?

I₁: Actually the most common way I utilize is; just trying to form groups, interaction between groups, and interaction between individuals.

I₂: Ok. In the classroom I just use brainstorming, pairs and small group works. As to outside I have provided them assignment.

I₃: Well. In my classroom I employ asking and answering question, group work, individual presentation, pair work, panel discussion and drama. However, I instruct most of the time through lecture method.

I₄: Good. To my knowledge I have been applying commonly pair, individual and group work in the classroom. Moreover, I employ lecturer method habitually because students need to be held through it. Therefore, learning by using language applied in my classroom infrequently due to the nature of courses.

R: Well, how do you avoid students' unwillingness in learning in a cooperative method?

I₁: The main thing is to generate the awareness initially. For example, ahead of starting any activity I design for them just I endeavor to explicate what benefit that does to them in improving their language, why we are doing that principally. If they suitably understand that besides the language fence they have, they are disposed to participate. However, there is a kind of confrontation in employing it

I₂: It is really a big problem for me. It needs the whole system to be changed beginning from the ministry of education curriculum, and students must be actually oriented.

I₃: It is a trouble to me. However, I endeavor to solve this problem through offering awareness creation advices in the classroom such as what they will be near future if they carry out their duties carefully in learning English language courses.

I₄: Indeed students' disinclination is prime problem. Thus, I endeavor to offer solutions for the predicament through provision of interesting tasks for learners and making them busy. Then, I deliver to them awareness creation advices, suggestion, comments and feedbacks through instructional activities.

R: Do you think the classroom condition is encouraging to implement task based instruction?

I₁: As far as the economic situation and freshness of this University is considered, I would say yes. Some of my colleagues were complaining about class size and we have an average of thirty one to thirty three students and manageable size generally. As a result, I would say yes it is.

I₂: Of course, it is not; in most of the classes it is not suitable.

I₃: Well. This is hardship that I have been taking in the University. No ample classes and appropriate situation to implement task based instruction. Even if there is high number of chairs in the classroom, the size of the class is not appropriate for task based instruction.

I₄: Good. As far as the newness of the University the classroom condition and environment is high-quality. However, in the context of quality education, it is located at lower stage. Thus, they are not motivating to implement task based instruction effectively.

R: Have you taken training on teaching English language courses through tasks?

I₁: No. However, currently I have been attending higher diploma program in teaching.

I₂:No. Though, I have been participating in English language improvement center and I was taken training on CLT when I was in another educational setting.

I₃:No. I have not got such a kind of trends.

I₄:No.yet, I have certified with higher diploma in teaching.

R: What are constraints of task based instruction?

I₁: Lack of resources (i.e. Language lab and reference books, formally designed modules), lack of suitable classroom, and disrespect of certain instructors in teaching profession.

I₂: Students' lack of interest, fear of making mistakes, language lab, and dearth of formally prepared teaching module and resources are main factors.

I₃: Lack of teaching materials, low linguistic proficiency of students, lack of comfortable classroom for task based instruction, mismatch between my preferences of teaching and students' preferences to learn are factors.

I₄: Lack of resources i.e. reference books and language lab are factors. As well, most students consider English as a medium of obstruction rather than instruction due to their background problems. As I suppose lack of commitment of instructors in adopting a task-based approach in their classroom might affect its implantation in the classroom.

R: Thank you.

I₁: You are welcome.

I₂: My pleasure.

I₃: Do not mention

I₄: Never mind

Appendix-VI:
Interview with students

1. Do you like your University education?
2. Do you observe any variations and resemblances between the methods of teaching by your teachers in high school and instructors here at University level?
3. What mechanisms do your instructors' employ commonly when teaching English language courses through tasks in the classroom?
4. What is your feeling when your instructors ask you to work in pairs and small groups?
5. What types of methodology of teaching do you think your instructors use in the teaching learning process?
6. Have you taken training or orientations on task based instruction on addition to what have been learning in the classroom?
7. What are constraints of TBI in EFL classroom?

Appendix -VII
Follow-up Interview with students

Key: **R**: Researcher, **S₁**: student one, **S₂**: student -two, **S₃**: student -three, **S₄**: student- four, **S₅**: student five, **S₆**: student six, **S₇**: student seven, **S₈**: student eight, **S₉**: Student nine

Researcher (R): How are you enjoying your University education?

S₁: It is very nice.

S₂: It is okay.

S₃: Well. I think it is better than before.

S₄: I am enjoying very well.

S₅: Well. I have been enjoying very well even if courses are a bit difficult for me.

S₆: Good news. To me learning in here is interesting.

S₇: Well. I have been enjoying astonishingly.

S₈: Good. I am enjoying good; however, I have got difficulties in learning here.

S₉: Well. I have been enjoying very well.

R: Well, do you see any variations and resemblances between the methods of teaching by your teachers in high school and instructors here at University level?

S1: Yes. In high school we learnt only English language course based on text book. However, here we have been learning different courses with instructors who have different backgrounds.

S2: Of course. In high school more focus is on the theory although at University level it focuses on practice. It is learning by doing. Therefore, this is the difference

S3: Yeah. In high school teachers were autocratic nevertheless here instructors are democratic.

S4: Well. Teaching in high school was text book based although in University it is instructor designed materials based.

S5: In high school we learnt with those students who came from the same environment. In here we have been learning with students who came from different parts of Ethiopia.

S6: In high school teaching was theoretical but here it is mostly practical.

S7: In high school level the teachers were not giving pair work, group work and they did not give opportunity for students by using different kinds of strategies.

S8: To my experience of learning, teaching in high school was based on spoon feeding; however, in here it needs most work from students.

S9: In University teaching focuses on practical tasks but high school it couldn't be.

R: What mechanisms do your instructors' employ commonly when teaching English language courses through tasks?

S1: In fact instructors' most ordinarily use techniques such as forming groups, pair and facilitating active participation individually in the classroom.

S2: Indeed, in the classroom instructors apply brainstorming, demonstrations, pairs and small group works.

S3: Certainly, instructors teach English language courses through asking and answering question, group work, individual presentation, pair work, panel discussion and drama. Nevertheless, they teach most of the time through formalistic approach.

S4: Well. Instructors commonly apply pair, individual and group work in the classroom. Moreover, they employ passive teaching method customarily because most students necessitate being in custody through it. Therefore, learning by doing applied in the classroom sometimes.

S5: Definitely, most instructors teach English language courses through instructor based instructions. However, sometimes they organize students in group and pair works. Individual work is most common in English language courses classroom.

S₆: Really, students learn English language courses through tasks in the classroom based on group work, pair work, and individual work. Instructors mostly tended to the application of traditional approaches to language teaching.

S₇: In truth. Instructors have been teaching English language courses in the class room through asking and answering questions, panel discussions, presentation, project method and group work while their tendency to traditional approaches to language teaching is expected.

S₈. Actually, as far as my knowledge is concerned instructors employ pair and group work most commonly. However, they teach English language through tasks through instructor based discussions.

S₉. Really, instructors have been teaching English language courses through tasks based on formalistic approaches. However, they sometimes providing us an opportunity to play drama, make public presentation, work activities in group, pair and individually.

R: What is your sensation when your instructors ask you to work cooperative method?

S₁: I feel positively for I think it improve my work and language skills.

S₂: I feel optimistically. Because we human beings are different and we have different knowledge so we can share different ideas. It is important to improve our English so it is nice.

S₃: My feeling is positive. I think it helps me to practice English language skills inside and outside of the classroom.

S₄. My feeling is negative. It puts work load and high responsibility on me.

S₅. My feeling is negative. I think its implementation needs more work from us.

S₆. My feeling is positive. It makes teaching environment and instructional materials comfortable to practically use them.

S₇. I feel negatively even if I know learning English language through tasks are valid to promote language skills. Because, it makes me busy since I have poor prior knowledge in structural and communicative aspects of English language. In may stay in the University what I have observed is only certain group of instructors provide for students the opportunities to learn English through tasks. Moreover, I have joined in the department without my interest. Thus, I do not know why I am learning English currently in Wachemo University.

S₈. I perceive learning English through tasks positively. Also, I have developed learning English through tasks beginning from my early schooling. I believe as it helps to enhance communicative skills through practicing the reading, writing , listening and speaking skills of language even if instructors have-not given motivation for students while teaching English in the classroom. Moreover, I suppose that learning English through tasks can help me to develop language skills to communicate with it internationally.

S₉. My feeling is positive. It helps me to improve language proficiency (accuracy and fluency) in grammatical and communicative aspects. Also, it helps to share experiences from other learners while learning English through tasks in cooperative ways. It helps to encourage each other's through five to one strategies. Moreover, I believe that learning English language courses through tasks can promote my language skills.

R: What types of instructional methods do you think your instructors employ in the classroom?

S₁: Indeed, Student centered.

S₂: Well, student centered methods

S₃: Certainly, instructor centered

S₄: Definitely, instructor centered

S₅: Really, student centered

S₆: Without a doubt, instructor centered

S₇: In fact, instructor centered

S₈: Undeniably, Instructor centered

S₉: Surely, Instructor centered

R: Have you taken training or orientations on task based instruction on addition to what have been learning in the classroom?

S₁: No. I do not know the reason.

S₂: No. The University is new

S₃: No. We are learning in the classroom

S₅: No. The University is new

S₆: No. The University is new.

S₇: No. I do not know the reason

S₈: No. The University is fresh

S₉: No. The University is new.

R: What are constraints of task based instruction

S₁. Well. As I believe poor back ground of students such as students' lack of interest to learn English and lack of language lab are also problems.

S₂: Okay. Students' using Amharic language, afraid of speaking in front of their partners

S₃. Okay. Students' lack motivation and Unsuitable classroom condition

S₄. Good idea. Lacks of teaching materials, Lack of language lab and poor back- ground of students.

S₅. Students' poor performance as well as preferences, Amharic language use while doing tasks and lack of materials such as reference books and language lab.

S₆. Back ground of students, negative perception and attitudes and lack of authentic resources to learn English.

S₇: lack of confidence, Exam Anxiety and Lack of performance based assessment and lack of audio visual teaching in the classroom.

S₈. Back ground of students, lack of interest to learn English, Using Amharic language, exam based teaching, and instructor centered teaching methodology.

S₉. As I believe exam anxiety due to exam based methodology of teaching as well as lack of performance based assessment, Students' background, lack of materials (reference and audiovisual materials) and lack of authentic texts in the course materials are factors.

R: Thank you very much.

S₁: Thank you.

S₂: You are welcome

S₃: Do not mention.

S₄: It is my pleasure.

S₅: Never mind.

S₆: Thank you.

S₇: Okay.

S₈: Take it easy.

S₉: You are welcome.

Appendix-VIII

JIMMA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND LAW
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
GRADUATE PROGRAM

EFL Course Materials Content Analysis check list

The main purpose of this content analysis checklist is to” *Assess the Implementation of Task Based Instruction in EFL Classroom in Wachemo University, Department of English Language and Literature*”. The checklist categorized under Very great (5), great (4), some (3), limited (2), not at all (1) on the basis of whether listening course materials/modules/ promote task based instruction or not through their contents.

Key: VG=Very great (5), G=great (4), S=some (3), L= limited (2), NA=not at all (1)

No	Items	VG	G	S	L	NA
1	course material availability for each students					
2	Objectives of tasks					
3	Authenticity of tasks					
4	Clearly written instructions of tasks					
5	Tasks are emphasized on the integration of language skills.					
6	Tasks are sufficiently varied and interesting to students					
7	Present tasks through three phases (pre-task, task, language focus cycle)					
8	Tasks can go from simple to complex					
9	Tasks are meaningfully challenging					
10	Tasks are open for multiple interpretations and create positive language learning environment					
11	Tasks motivate learners by considering learners' psychological, social and cultural factors					
12	Tasks are rich in visuals (pictures, photos, diagrams,					
13	Tasks clearly put the expected roles of instructors and students					
14	Tasks are designed and developed in line with English language curriculum					

Appendix-IX
Profile of Wachemo University EFL Courses
Course Title: Reading and Study Skills
Course Code: (Enla, 103)

Unit One: The Reading Process

- Set-1.1: An overview of reading
- Set 1.1.1: Reading Awareness: Reflection
- Task-1: Brain storming: Activating your reading experience
- Set-2: What is reading?
- Task-1: Definition of reading
- Set-3: View of reading
- Task-1: Traditional vs. Modern views
- Set-4: Approaches to reading
- Task-1: Bottom up and top down reading
- Set-5: Reading habits and practices
- Task-1: Introducing/ bad reading habits
- Task-2: Effective reading

Unit-Two: Reading Strategy Development

- Set-1: Scanning
- Task-1: Introducing/Practice scanning
- Set-2: Skimming
- Task-1: Introducing/ practice skimming
- Task-2: Practice extracting general information from a passage
- Set-3: Literal comprehension
- Task-1: Sentence arrangement
- Task-2: Analyzing cohesion and texts structure in a short story
- Task-3: Guessing the meaning of words
- Set-4: Literal comprehension Interpretative comprehension
- Task-1: Brain storming/ Introduction
- Set-5: Critical reading skills
- Task-1: Brainstorming/ introduction
- Task-2: Reading for detail
- Task-3: Choosing a book for pleasure reading

Task-4: Reviewing the rubric

Unit-Three: Writing From Reading

Set-1: Writing parallel paragraphs

Task-1: Identifying parallel sentence

Task-2: Writing parallel sentence

Task-3: Practicing writing parallel paragraphs

Task-4: Sharing paragraphs and identifying parallelism

Set-2: Note making and summary writing

Task-1: Introduction/Note making

Task-2: Note summary and prose summary

Task-3: Writing summary

Task-4: Practicing Writing summaries

Task-5: Paraphrasing Vs Summarizing

Task-6: Practicing paraphrasing

Task-7: Interpreting a bar graph

Unit-Four: Study Skills

Task-1: Study skills survey

Task-2: Study techniques survey

Task-3: Study motivation survey

Course Title: Listening Skills

Course code: (Enla, 1021)

UNIT-ONE: Defining listening

Task-1. What is listening?

Task-2: Sharing experiences on the practices of listening

Task-3: Differentiating hearing from listening.

Task-4: opinion expression tasks

Task-5; explaining factors affect the process of listening

Task-6: Discuss the properties of good and poor listeners.

Set-4: Characteristics of effective listening

UNIT-TWO: Explain the habit of effective listeners

Task-1: Prediction

Task-2: Practical listening skills

Task-3: Listening for main and/or specific points

UNIT-THREE: Sub-skills of listening

Task-1: Listening and note taking

Course Title: Spoken English –I

Course Code: Enla -206

Unit-One: Greeting and Introducing

Set-1: Greeting and saying good bye

Task-1: Sharing language expressions

Task-2: Asking and giving for advice

Unit-Two: International Phonetic Alphabet System

Set-1: Letter and sound

Task-1: Pronouncing words

Task-2: Describing letter and sounds

Task-3: Writing phonetic transcription

Task-4: Expressing words based on their length and quality

Task-5: Problems of pronunciation

Task-6: Drawing syllable analysis

Task-7: Recognizing intonation

Unit-Three: Oral Reporting

Set-1: Presentation techniques

Task-1: Describing presentation techniques

Set-2: Opining face to face conversation

Task-1: Writing expressions to deliver a speech or to begin a conversation.

Set-3: Closing/discontinuing face-to-face conversation

Task-1: Writing expressions to deliver discontinuing face-to-face conversation

Unit-Four: Interview

Set-1: Employment interview

Task-1: Identifying dos and don'ts of the interviewee

Task-2: Writing the responsibilities of interviewers in employment interview

Set-2: Making business speech

Task-1: Identifying business speech types

Task-2: Deliver a business speech on a topic

Course title: Basic Writing Skills

Course Code: (Enla 1012)

Unit-One: Writing Effective Sentences

Set-1: Parts of a sentence and their order

Task-1: Identifying parts of sentences

Set-2: Types of Clauses

Task-1. Defining types and roles of clauses

Task -2. Identifying the dependent and the independent clauses

Set-3: Types of Sentences

Task-1: Writing types of sentences

.Set-3: Functional classification of sentences

Task-3: Writing different types functional classification of sentences with their examples

Set-2: Common errors in sentence construction

Task-4: Identifying the type of fragments.

Task-5: Revising the run-on sentences.

Task-6: Correcting run-on sentences

Task-7: Identifying sentences with non-parallel construction and rewriting them

Task-8: Rewriting sentences

Set -3: Structural Classification of sentences

Task-1: Coordination, correlation, subordination and using semi-colon

Task-2: Faulty Sentences (common sentence errors)

Task-3: Using Mechanics (Punctuation and Capitalization)

Unit-Two: Writing an Effective Paragraph

Set-1: Elements of a Paragraph

Set-2: Characteristics of a Good Paragraph

Set-3: Types of paragraphs

Set-4: Techniques of Paragraph Development

Unit-Three: Essay Writing

Set-1: Steps in writing essays

Set-2: The Structure of an essay

Unit-Four: Letter Writing

Set-1: Types of Letters

Set-2: Writing a curriculum vitae (CV)

Set-3: Writing a Covering Letter