



The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Students' Speaking Skills in EFL Classrooms

AUTHORS INFO

Sualih Mussa, Ph.D
Department of English Language & Literature,
Debre Markos University, Ethiopia
tagelesualih@gmail.com
+251911045440

Yoseph Zewdu, Ph.D
Department of English Language & Literature,
Debre Markos University, Ethiopia
yosephzewdu@gmail.com
+251912086298

Mr. Yenew Mekonen, MA.
Addis Alem secondary school,
Awi Zone, Ethiopia
yendet27@gmail.com
+2510912344413

ARTICLE INFO

e-ISSN: 2502-6909
p-ISSN: 2502-9207
Vol. 5, No. 2, December 2020
URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31327/jee.v5i2.1327>

Received	:	14 October 2020
Reviewed	:	9 November 2020
Accepted	:	29 November 2020

Suggestion for the Citation and Bibliography

Citation in text:

Mussa, Zewdu & Mekonen (2020) or (Saud, Zewdu & Mekonen, 2020)

Bibliography:

Mussa, Sualih, Zewdu, Yoseph & Mekonen, Yenew. 2020. Examining the Issues of Gender and Indigenous Knowledge in English Education Semester Courses. *Journal of English Education*, 5(2), 104-116 DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.31327/jee.v5i2.1327>

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of context specific task-based language teaching approach on students' speaking skills. The study was conducted on grade 9 students of Addis Alem Secondary school which is found in northern Ethiopia. For this purpose, quasi-experimental research design was employed. Two sections which contained 92 grade 9 students were selected using purposive sampling technique based on similarity of group identification test score. After identifying the control and experimental groups, speaking test (pre-and post-test) and students' questionnaire (for experimental groups only) were used to get data. To test the reliability of the speaking test, Cronbach's alpha was calculated. The internal consistency of the questionnaire gained from 27 pilot group students was 0.783. Thus, the tools of this study were reliable. The validity of the treatment

manual, the pre-test and the post-test were also evaluated by two well experienced EFL teachers in a nearby school. T-tests were run to compare the improvement between and within groups. When we see the findings of the study, the paired sample t-test result revealed that the experimental group students showed a progress in their speaking proficiency after the treatment. There was statistically significant differences at (sig.2-tailed=0.000) between the mean scores of the experimental group on the speaking pre-test and post-test. Again, the result of the independent sample t-test indicated that there were statistically significant differences (sig.2-tailed=0.000) between the mean scores of the experimental group exposed to the designed context specific task-based program, and the control group receiving the tasks in the text book on the post-test in speaking proficiency. Moreover, the result of experimental group students' questionnaire showed that task-based instruction had a positive impact on students' speaking skills, as well. Finally, based on the findings of the study, recommendations were forwarded on how to improve the students' speaking skills.

Keywords: task based language, speaking skills

A. Introduction

1. Background and statement of the Problem

In studying English as a foreign language (EFL), speaking skill is one of the most essential skills to be mastered due to its importance for academic, social and professional purposes. However, the proficiency of students may not become practical as it is aspired. A number of language teaching methods have been introduced to better serve the student population in making them proficient in using the language. Currently, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is the dominant method which is implemented in many schools all over the world. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has some varieties, among which task-based language teaching (TBLT) is one of them. According to the findings of some language researchers (Kasap, 2005; Rahman, 2010; Murad, 2009; Ehsan, et.al, 2019), task-based language teaching (TBLT) has a lot of advantages not only in improving the students' speaking skills but also other skills. As Prabhu (1987) proposed, it helps to teach in a meaningful manner and make students to use the language in groups.

In Ethiopian schools, it is a common experience that after studying English for many years, students do not show satisfactory progress in their language skills in general and speaking proficiency in particular. Among the problems mentioned by EFL teachers about this issue, the relevance of English language textbooks, lack of motivation and teachers' focus on form-based instead of meaning-based instruction in the teaching and learning process. These are often observed in the secondary schools throughout the country. English is taught using communicative approach from grade one to grade 12 to develop their proficiency although both teachers and students complain that their success is not satisfactory.

In Ethiopian context, there have been some studies (Hailu ,2011; Taggesse, 2008; Biruk, 2016;Yalmzewd ,2017) conducted on the use of task-based Language Learning (TBLL) in the EFL classes in order to look for better teaching and learning process. The results showed that although teachers and students have positive perception to implement TBLL, they did not use it effectively as forwarded by theoreticians. It seems that they do have problems in understanding and using the procedures.

The current research was initiated to see if TBLT could be a good alternative to help students improve their speaking skills. This is because EFL teachers used the textbook but students did not have motivation to do speaking activities; the students reported that the tasks are not meaningful and attractive. EFL teachers also shared this idea that speaking tasks in grade 9 text books are not contextualized to be meaningful for the students' social and cultural backgrounds. Thus, we were

initiated to do this experimental study by raising the following questions to check if TBLT is helpful for these students.

2. *Research Questions*

The study tried to answer the following research questions.

1. Is there any statistically significant mean score difference between the experimental and control groups after the intervention?
2. Is there any statistically significant mean score difference within the experimental groups after the intervention?
3. What is the students' perception towards the use of context specific task-based instruction to teach speaking skills in EFL classroom?

3. *Objectives of the study*

The study has the following specific and general objectives

3.1 *General objectives*

The main objective of this study was to examine the effect of context specific task-based language teaching on grade 9 students' English language speaking skills.

3.2 *Specific objectives*

The specific objectives of this study are to find out:

- a. if there is statistical mean score difference between the experimental and control groups
- b. if there is a statistical significant mean score difference within the experimental groups after the intervention
- c. students' perceptions towards task based instruction to teach speaking skills

4 **Literature review**

1. *The Meaning of Task*

The term task can mean different things to different people (Leaver and Willis, 2004). Just as there are weak and strong forms of communicative language teaching, there are different definitions of the word 'task'. Different definitions show that tasks are meaning focused. In other words, learners are free to use whatever language they want in order to convey their intended meaning and to sustain the interaction.

Prabhu (1987) defined a task as an activity which requires learners to arrive to an outcome from given information through some processes of thought which allowed teachers to control and regulate it. Therefore, a task needs learners and teachers to be committed on processes for their effectiveness. Nunan (1999) defines task as a piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. Willis (1996) asserted that task is a goal-oriented activity with real outcome. Skehan (1998) also defined task as an activity in which: meaning is primary.

2. *Meaning of Task-based language teaching*

Richards and Rodgers (2001) and Ellis (2003) define task-based language teaching (TBLT) or task-based instruction (TBI) as an approach in which communicative and meaningful tasks play a central role in language learning and in which the process of using language appropriately carries more importance than the mere production of grammatically correct language forms. Therefore, TBLT plays a prominent role in teaching language especially for purpose. In other words, tasks are prepared in order to develop the students' communicative ability by focusing on getting something

done while using the language rather than following the strict rules. Task-based instruction can also be defined as an approach in which communicative and meaningful tasks play the central role in language learning and in which the process of using language carries more importance than mere production of correct language forms. Therefore, TBI is viewed as one model of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in terms of regarding real and meaningful as the primary feature of language learning (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Willis, 1996).

Task-based teaching constitutes what Howatt (1984:41) has termed a “strong communicative approach”. This is because it aims at teaching learners engaging in authentic acts in the classroom. It requires learners to treat the language they are learning as a tool. Authentic language use, the real use of real language in classroom content, fosters a learning environment in which learners have their own say; they gain communicative practice within their own sense of the defined goals in TBI.

In other words, learners are to learn the language as they use it. Because of this, communicative language use comes into focus as an essential aspect of a task-based framework (Willis, 1996). In addition to developing communicative capability, attention to form is fundamental for language learning. Even though TBI emphasizes the primacy of meaning, a focus on form has a parallel importance in the language learning process (Bygate, Skehan & Swain, 2001).

3. *Guidelines for Designing Effective speaking activity tasks*

According to Long (2015), the following are some of the guidelines that should be considered when speaking tasks are prepared.

- a. The speaking tasks should include variety types of activities. Activities in the classroom should always mirror the linguistic reality of the outside world.
- b. Create situations. In order for students to be able to use it when they need to realize in what situations certain pieces of language are used.
- c. Include balanced approach. Students need practice in accuracy work and opportunities for fluency work through a combination of class, pair and group work.
- d. Primarily focus on meaning. The primary focus of the task should be on meaning. When the students try to understand the meaning of the task, unintentionally they improve their speaking skills.
- e. Make it purposeful. In real life when two people engage in conversation, we can be fairly sure that they are doing so for a reason.
- f. The speaking activity tasks should be contextualized. Tasks should prepare in line with the experiences, realities and linguistic abilities of the students.
- g. Speaking activity tasks should stimulate interaction and be generative in terms of language.
- h. Speaking skill tasks should have appropriate instructions.
- i. Speaking skill tasks should be designed based on the three phases of task-based language teaching. I.e. pre-task, during task and post task.

4. *Phases of Task-Based Language Teaching*

Though the phases of TBLT have been named differently depending on framework of the researchers, main actions and objectives of these phases remain nearly the same. In general, Task based language teaching include three phases- pre task, during task and post task.

4.1 *Pre-Task*

The pre-task phase works as an introduction for the topic to be taught in class and the tasks as well. It can be considered as the warm up activity to start the class interestingly. Here, the students get the opportunity to recall things that they know about the topic and also get an idea about what will be expected from them at this stage. The purpose of this phase is to prepare the students to perform the task in such ways that will promote language acquisition. Teacher in this phase might support students in performing a task which is similar to the task that they will perform in the

during task phase. Also, engaging students to designed activities and strategic planning of the main task performance for preparing them to perform the upcoming task.

Moreover, in most cases, it is teachers who control the timeline of classroom activity decide how much time will be spent to each item on the agenda, how long a particular whole-class discussion will take, and how much time will be devoted to the performance of a particular task. It is teachers, too, who get to decide to which extent a focus on meaning and a focus on form will be balanced and which particular forms will be highlighted, practiced, or covered explicitly (Breen, 1989). Long (2015) argued that in a task-based approach, teachers should firstly be guided by an analysis of the students' second language learning needs rather than the syllabus before selecting the contents and determining the focus of the actual session select content and determine the focus of actual lesson activities.

4.2 During Task

The next stage is called the during task phase in which the teacher plays an active role. In this stage tasks come to life. It can be divided into three parts starting with the task itself, followed by its planning and finally the report stage. The task-as-work plan (Breen, 1989) in this stage turns into a task-in-action and a task-in-interaction. Van den Branden (2009) emphasized that tasks in this stage do not necessarily determine learning. It is the intensity and quality of effort students put in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and also coping up with the situation demands they are exposed to which will determine the learning from TBLT. Also, the mental activity that students engage in while working with tasks and the verbal interaction will leave an impact in this regard. In this phase, teachers have some to pay a significant role.

The teacher remains a crucial interactional partner in task-based language classrooms, by taking the role of motivator, organizer (making sure that students know what they are expected to do and organizing different aspects of task performance), and, last but not least plays the role of a conversational partner and supporter who can feed the language-learning according to needs of different students in a different ways (Van den Branden, 2009).

In this stage, the teacher should also produce a wide variety of questions, cues, and prompts to elicit learner output. Providing feedback on the students' written and speaking output is also an important aspect of this stage. Feedback may come in different shapes, including explicit corrections, recasts, confirmation and clarification requests, meta-linguistic comments, extensions, and elaborations incorporating a focus on form in the meaning-oriented work that the students are doing.

4.3 Post Task

This is the final stage and it allows a closer study of some of the specific features naturally occurring in the language used during the task cycle. After the performance of tasks, teachers use the post task stage to look back on the students' performance focusing on forms to foster learners' language accuracy and complexity. In this stage, teachers are expected to assess students' task performance and language development through standardized, official tests or tests included in their syllabus.

However, teachers might also design tests themselves following task based language teaching or by observing and evaluating of students' task performance during class on the basis of their assessment and the feedback that they have provided before. Here, teachers are expected to use meaningful tasks for the assessment purpose and evaluating whether students have performed according to the task rather than focusing on specific linguistic forms with a view to providing feedback to the learner for facilitating language improvement (Long, 2015). Also, task repetition aids the shift of focus on forms as it is often difficult to acquire the rules rather than memorizing it for shorter periods.

Language teachers and learners feel, behave, and interact differently from day to day, and the language and tasks they work on vary, making every lesson unique. Global prescriptions and

proscriptions, therefore, are unwarranted and doomed to failure. Teachers will have lesson plans, but they will need to react differently in real time to situations as they arise (Long, 2015).

C. Methodology

1. *Design of the study*

This study followed quasi- experimental research design because it is an appropriate technique to test the effectiveness of context specific task-based instruction on students' speaking skills.

2. *Research setting and participants of the study*

The study was carried out in Addis Alem General Secondary School which is found in Guagusa district in Awi Zone of Amhara regional state, Ethiopia. Among the four sections of grade 9, two were taken as participants of the study since the researchers have close contact with the school. Thus, it helps them for frequent follow up of experiment and creates a better opportunity to gather accurate information easily and successfully. The study was conducted in 2019 academic year.

Two sections were taken using purposive sampling because these section students scored nearly similar results in the group identification speaking test. They were almost similar in their socio-economic status. Consequently, almost homogeneous participant students were selected in each intact group or section. Later on, section B students were selected as control group and section D students were selected as experimental by using simple random sampling technique. There were 46 students in each class.

3. *Data instruments*

The researchers used speaking tests and questionnaire as a tool for this research. Almost similar subjective speaking tests were used to collect data from participant students in both the experimental and the control group about their speaking skills before and after the treatment. Subjective types of tests were used to measure students' speaking skill because they are better ways of testing communicative skill.

The researchers piloted these speaking test questions in the same school using other section students who were not selected for the experiment. This helped to estimate the time taken to answer both pre-test and post-test speaking questions and to check the reliability of them before distributing to the experimental and control group students.

3.1 *Pre-test*

Pre-test was done prior to the intervention to make sure those participants of the experimental and control groups were at the same level of speaking skills before starting the experiment. The questions were adapted and evaluated by experienced two preparatory English language teachers. Four questions were adapted to assess students and the evaluation scheme of speaking test was adopted from Van den Branden (2009) (2004). Next the result mean scores of both the experimental and the control group students were calculated and compared using t-test to look if there was statistically significant mean score difference between the two groups.

3.2 *Post-test*

Four post-test questions were taken from TOEFL speaking tests with slight modification. Each student in both the control and the experimental was given two minutes to answer the questions and the evaluation scheme of speaking test which was adopted from Brown (2004) to see changes in fluency, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation and comprehension. Then, the mean scores of both the groups was computed and compared to see the difference or the effectiveness of the proposed task based program by using T-test.

3.3 Students' questionnaire

In this study, the students' questionnaire was used to measure the perceptions of the experimental group students in response to the program in their speaking skills improvement after the treatment. The questionnaire was adapted from Brown (2004). The questionnaire was piloted in the same school in other group of students before it was distributed to the experimental group.

4 Treatment Procedures

Before the treatment, the researchers carried out a pre-test on participant students in both the control and experimental group to examine their speaking skills proficiency difference at baseline. Then, to measure the effects of contextual task-based instruction, they prepared a context specific task-based manual which has six topics based on the guidelines used for designing effective speaking activity to teach the treatment group students. Three of the topics of the tasks: debate, shopping and puzzle were taken from the grade nine English text book and improved based on the guidelines used for designing speaking tasks, and the other three topics of the tasks i.e. storytelling, asking and offering invitations and my hobbies were taken from a guide book: "Key to Basic Concepts of Spoken English". Before the treatment, the manual was evaluated by other English language teachers. The students were taught for 3 hours per week for about six weeks. They were taught by a teacher who used to teach them.

While context specific task-based instruction was used in experimental group, the usual instruction was used in the control group because the aim of the research was to find out the effects of context specific task-based instruction in the improvement of students' speaking skills. Both the experimental and control groups received instruction on the same shift by the same teacher. Finally, the post- test was given after the implementation of the treatment and the questionnaire was distributed to the experimental group students.

5 Data Collection Procedures

First, after getting the permission from the school principal, the preparation was done to conduct the study. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants of the study briefly. Next, the group identification speaking test was given to participant students and recorded.

The questions were asked by one of the researchers and the results were scored by the others. Again, after the intervention, a post-test was given for both the control and experimental group students in the same way as the pre-test. Then, questionnaire was distributed for the experimental group students. Finally, the result of all the data gained from these tools were analyzed and triangulated.

6 Ethical Consideration

A researcher should respect rights, needs, values and desires of the participants according to the Helsinki declaration of ethical principles in doing research. First, the researchers got permission from the school principal to carry out the study on grade 9 students. The proposal was evaluated by the post graduate research evaluation committee, which is found in the Department of English Language and Literature at Debre Markos University, Ethiopia.

Then, the researchers informed the participants about the purpose of the study and how the data is collected. Informed consent was obtained from the students to participate in the study. As the treatment can be considered as a kind of tutorial, there is no harm in getting extra training in the opposite shift for these students. Care was taken about anonymous and confidential nature of the study in not sharing the background details of the participants to a third party.

D. Data Analysis and Discussion of Findings

1. Data Presentation and Analysis

The first question raised was if there was a statistically significant mean score difference between the pre-and post-test results in the performance of experimental and control group students. The following data shows this result.

Table 1: Paired sample T-test results of control group

Variables	N	Mean	Mean difference	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pre-test for control group	46	10.760	0.153	1.649	1.159	45	0.253
Post-test for control group		10.913		1.603			

*The value of t-Table is 2.00 at p 0.05 level of significance

As indicated in the above Table, the calculated Table value of t is 1.159 and the critical Table value of t is 2.00 (df=45) at 0.05 level of significance is 0.153. To say there is a significance difference on the mean scores of students' speaking skills of the control group, the calculated t-value should be greater than the critical Table value of t. Hence, the calculated t-value (1.159) is less than the critical Table value t (2.00). Therefore, it is insignificant. Besides this, the p-value (0.253) is greater than the standard level of significance (0.05). This confirms that the participants in the control group did not show a significant improvement in their speaking skill after learning the speaking activity lessons in the text book.

Table 2: Paired sample T-test results of experimental group

Variables	N	Mean	Mean difference	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig(2-tailed)
Pre-test for experiment	46	11.152	5.81	1.074	16.863	45	0.000
Post-test for experiment		16.957		1.920			

* The value of t-table is 2.00 at p 0.05 level of significance

The mean score difference is 5.81 and the critical t-value (df=45) at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00, and the calculated t-value is 16.863. We cannot simply judge there is a significance difference between the pre and post-tests by looking the mean difference. We should also look at the T value and the p value.

As it is said earlier, when the calculated t-value is less than the critical Table value of t, then there is no significance difference between the two means. However, the observed t-value (16.863) is greater than the critical t-value (2.00) showing there is the presence of a significant difference between the experimental group students' pre and post-test mean scores. Besides this, the p-value (0.000) is less than 0.05. Therefore, it is significant. From this, we can conclude that the experimental group students' speaking skills performance is improved as a result of the treatment.

The other question was looking at if the experimental group students' speaking skills improved more significantly than the control group students' after the intervention. The following table presents the data for this question.

Table 3: The Independent T-test mean scores for the control and experimental group students' pre-test results

Test type	Group	N	Mean	Mean difference	St. Deviation	Df	T	Sig (2-tailed)	Levine's test for equality of variance	
									F	Sig
Pre-test Result	Control	46	10.760	0.392	1.649	90	1.348	0.181	13.487	0.000
	Experimental	46	11.152		1.074					

* T-Table or critical valve 2.000 at 0.05 level of significant

The mean scores of the control group and the experimental group was found to be similar 10.760 and 11.152 respectively. The experimental and the control group participants' result were calculated using Leven's test for equality of variances. Here, the P- value (level of significance) of the Levine's test for equality of variances is greater than 0.05 (sig=0.181). This implies we consider Leven's test assumptions for analysis. At the same time if the value of t-Table is greater than the t-calculated, it is significant, but if the t-calculated is less than the t-Table (critical value). Then one can conclude, as there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups being compared. Similarly, if the p-value is less than 0.05 (the standard limit of significance), it can be said there is significance difference between the average score of the groups. However, if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the difference is non-significant. The researcher applied this principle to determine significant difference between the groups in this study.

The t-calculated of the pre-test was less than the value of t-table with 90 degree of freedom (t-calculated =1.348 t-table =2.000, df = 90). In addition to this, the p-value is greater than the assumption 0.05 (p=0.181 > 0.05). This shows there is no difference between the two groups being compared. Accordingly, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the control group students in their speaking skills performance before the intervention.

Table 4: The Independent T-test mean scores for the control and experimental group students' post-test results

Test type	Group	N	Mean	Mean difference	St. deviation	Df	T	Sig (2-tailed)	Levine's test for equality of variance	
									F	Sig
Post-test result	Control	46	10.848	6.11	1.673	90	16.269	0.000	0.531	0.468
	Experimental	46	16.957		1.920					

*T-Table or critical valve 2.000 at 0.05 level of significant

The post training performance mean scores of the control and the experimental groups were compared in table 4. For this analysis, the critical t-value (df=90) at 0.05 level of significance is 2.00, and the calculated t-value is 16.269. The calculated t-value is greater than the critical t-value (16.269 > 2.00 at (df=90)) with the mean difference is 6.11 and the p-value 0.000 is less than 0.05; hence, there is significant difference between the average scores of the groups. From this, we can summarize that context specific task-based language teaching helps the students to improve their speaking skills.

Questionnaire was also used to see the attitudes of students towards task based instruction. The following table shows what students feel.

Table 5: Experimental group students' feelings to the treatment

No	Scales	Grand mean
1	The effect of tasks on their speaking skills	3.01
2	The appropriateness of the content of the designed material	4.58
3	Students' general feeling about the experiment	3.29

According to table 4 most of the participants strongly agreed that context specific task-based language teaching enhances understanding between interlocutors at the time of conversation. It shows that experimental group students had positive feelings on context specific task-based language teaching to develop the components of speaking skills, i.e. pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency, grammar and comprehension.

With regard to the impact of the treatment, the students reported that it minimizes their shyness or frustration, increases their motivation to speak, promotes the use of English language, helps to involve actively in pairs and groups, develops critical thinking skills, and provides conducive classroom atmosphere to learn speaking skill. Generally, it is observed that the treatment helped students to be communicative in using their speaking skills. In relation to the tasks of the teaching materials, the participants reported that they were prepared based on the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, included variety types of activities and had easily understandable language. Generally, it was obtained that task-based instruction has a positive impact in improving speaking skills.

2. Discussions of the Findings

As to the analysis of the data, the control group students didn't show significant mean score difference after the intervention because they didn't receive well organized speaking tasks. Ellis (2003) states that to develop speaking skills of the students, speaking tasks should be designed in line with the learners' linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Long (2015) also states that tasks should be prepared based on the guidelines used for designing speaking activity. But the speaking activities in students' textbooks were not designed based on the linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

Students in the experimental group, however, show a significant improvement after the treatment was given because the tasks were designed based on the guidelines stated in the literature review which were formulated by Long (2015). When the researcher observed the experimental group students during the intervention, most of them were actively participating and eager to speak without frustration.

With regard to question two which asks if the experimental group students' speaking skills improved more significantly than the control group students after the intervention, it was found out that the experimental group scored better than the control group because students in the experimental group had opportunities to improve their speaking skills due to the nature of the tasks. Before the treatment, the learners used fillers as long pauses, whereas after teaching, they used fillers as short pauses, indicating the flow of speech.

The experimental group students learnt tasks which invite the learners to do the activities with their own interest. According to Skehan (1998), in task based learning, the tasks are central to the learning activity. The method is based on the belief that students can learn more effectively when their minds are focused on the task rather than on the language they are

using. The experimental group students learnt these types of tasks in such ways and their speaking was improved.

Thus, we can generalize that context specific task-based language teaching helped the students to talk using correct and grammatical sentences, to be fluent speakers and to express feelings freely. Regarding this, Willis (1996) stated that in the task-based framework, it is desirable that learners achieve accurate and fluent use of language.

Furthermore, it was found out that students had a positive feeling towards the use of context specific task-based instruction in improving the elements of speaking skills. That means, the perception questionnaire result showed that students believed their fluency, accuracy, vocabulary, pronunciation and comprehension improved due to the implementation of context specific task-based instruction. This result was consistent with the findings of Bygate, (1996), and Skehan and Foster (1997). Moreover, the findings showed that most of the experimental group students were motivated to speak freely and conducted hot discussions with their partners compared to the control group students during the treatment. To support this, Ellis (2003) stated that those who are unwilling to talk in front of the whole class can be motivated in task-based language teaching.

E. Conclusions, Recommendation and Pedagogical Implications

1. Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

- a. Context specific task-based language teaching helped the students to talk using correct and grammatical sentences.
- b. Context specific task-based language teaching has a great role to improve the students' speaking skills.
- c. Students were more interactive in context specific task-based teaching than teaching speaking tasks in the conventional way.
- d. Context specific task-based language teaching improved students' speaking skills and developed positive attitudes towards English language.

2. Recommendations and Pedagogical Implications

According to the findings of the study and the conclusion drawn from findings, the following recommendations were given.

- a. EFL teachers should use tasks in their teaching, since it enhances students' accuracy and fluency as well as their attitudes towards English.
- b. The English language teachers should localize the speaking activity tasks in line with the students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
- c. Task designers should prepare speaking tasks based on the phases of task-based language teaching.
- d. Teachers should teach speaking tasks by using contextualized tasks.
- e. Students should participate actively in speaking activity tasks to develop their speaking skills.
- f. The ministry of education as well as NGOs who have hands in education area should give continuous training to teachers on how task should be used and employed.

F. References

- Biruk Lishan (2016). *English Teacher Perception and Implementation of Task-based Language Teaching: The Case of Three Secondary Schools in East Harergie Zone, Oromiya Region*. Unpublished MA thesis, Haromaya University.
- Brown, H.D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman.
- Breen, (1989). *The Evaluation Cycle for Language Learning*. In Johnson, R. K. Editor, *The Second Language Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bygate, M. (1996). Speaking. In C Carter & D. Nunan (Ed). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bygate, M., Skehan, P., & Swain, M. (2001). *Researching Pedagogic Tasks: Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Testing*. Harlow, England, Longman.
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Teaching and researching motivation*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ehsan, N., Arash, H. & Sajad, S. (2019) The impact of opinion-gap, reasoning-gap, and information-gap tasks on EFL learners' speaking fluency, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5:1, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2019.1630150>
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hailu, Kebede. (2011). *An Expeloration of Teaching Speaking Skills in English through Communicative Activities in Raya Timuga Secondary Schools*. M.A thesis, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.
- Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kasap, B. (2005). *The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction in the improvement of learners' Speaking skills*. a Master's thesis. Anadolu University, School of Foreign Languages: Turkey.
- Leaver, Betty Lou and Willis, Jane R. (2005). Task-Based Instruction in Foreign Language Education: Practices and Programs. *The Slavic and East European Journal* 49(4):724 DOI: 10.2307/20058391
- Long, M. H. (2015). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Murad, S. (2009). *The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Developing Speaking Skills among the Palestinian Secondary EFL Students in Israel and Their Attitudes towards English*. MA thesis. Haifa University.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston, Mass: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second Language Pedagogy*. Oxford, England: Oxford University press.
- Rahman, M.M. (2010). Teaching Speaking Skills: A Task based Approach. Retrieved, February 3rd, from: *ESP World, Issue (27, Vol, 9, 2010*. [http://www.es\(worldinfo\)](http://www.es(worldinfo)).
- Richards, J., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Skehan, P. (1998). Second Language Research and Task-Based Instruction. In J. Willis and D. Willis Challenge and change in language teaching. (pp. 17-30). Oxford.
- Skehan, P. and Foster, P. (1997). Task Types and Task Processing Conditions as Influences on Foreign Language Performance. *Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1, (3), pp. 185-2011. DOI: 10.1177/136216889700100302

- Tagesse Daniel (2008). *The Practicality of Task-based EFL Instruction in Higher Institute*. Unpublished MA Thesis, Addis Ababa University.
- Van den Branden, K. (2009). Mediating Between Predetermined Order and Complete Chaos. The role of the teacher in task-based language education. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19 (3), 264–285
- Willis, J. (1996). *A Flexible Framework for Task-Based Learning*. In J. Willis and D. Willis. Challenge and change in language teaching. (pp. 52-62). Oxford: Macmillian.
- Yalemzwd Kelkay. (2017). *Perception and Practice of Task-Based Instruction in Teaching Speaking*. Unpublished MA thesis. Debre Markos University, Ethiopia.