

**AN EVALUATION OF THE WRITING TASKS AND
THEIR IMPLEMENTATION: THE CASE OF GRADE
11 ENGLISH TEXTBOOK**

**BY
TARIKU MERSIEHAZEN ABEBE**

JUNE 2013

AN EVALUATION OF THE WRITING TASKS AND THEIR
IMPLEMENTATION: THE CASE OF GRADE 11 ENGLISH
TEXTBOOK

BY

TARIKU MERSIEHAZEN ABEBE

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY FOR PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS OF DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN
TEACHING ENGLISH AS FOREIGN LANGUAGE

JUNE 2013

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

This is to certify that the thesis prepared by Tariku Mersiehazen entitled: *An Evaluation of the Writing Tasks and their Implementation: The Case of Grade 11 English Textbook* and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether the writing tasks in grade eleven English textbook are designed and implemented in line with current theories of communicative tasks. The study employed a descriptive case study method. The data for this study were collected through document analysis, questionnaires, interviews and observations. The data were collected from grade 11 English textbook, and from 150 students and 3 teachers of Addis Ketema Preparatory School. Then, the data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively and evaluated using the checklist for communicative tasks.

The findings of the study show that all the writing tasks evaluated contain the five components of a communicative task, but they did not fully meet the criteria set on the checklist. For instance, majority of the objectives do not fulfill most of the criterion of a good objective. Besides, the inputs the tasks lack adequate authentic materials and enough non-verbal inputs. The activities are inappropriate for pair/group work. Moreover, the activities heavily rely on inauthentic materials, so they lack motivational value. The roles indicated allow the learners to play an active role only during the while writing phase and less active during pre and post writing phases. Moreover, the teachers do not appropriately implement the tasks.

The conclusion made from the study is that the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook do not fully meet the criterion set for communicative tasks and not enough focus is given in implementing these tasks. Therefore, it is recommended that textbook writers should consider the five basic components of communicative tasks while designing tasks; teachers should play their role effectively and implement the writing tasks in phases.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Melaku Wakuma, for his invaluable and constructive comments and suggestions throughout the development of this thesis. I am very much indebted to the kindness and patience he has shown me in the course of time. I would also like to extend my thanks to the teachers and students who participated in this study. Besides, I would like to thank the school principal and the department of English, in Addis Ketema Preparatory School, for allowing me to carry out this study in the school. Finally, I thank all those who helped in other ways until the end of this project.

3.5.3. Observation	43
3.5.4. Interview	44
3.6. Procedure of data collection	44
3.7. Method of Data Analysis	49
CHAPTER FOUR	48
DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION	48
4.1. Data from the Textbook Analysis	48
4.1.1. General Description of the Textbook	48
4.1.2. The Writing Tasks	48
4.1.3. Evaluation of the Writing Tasks	49
4.1.3.1. Goals(objectives)	49
4.1.3.2. Rationale for the use of the Writing Tasks	52
4.1.3.3. Input	56
4.1.3.4. Activities	59
4.1.3.5. Roles	63
4.1.3.6. Setting	66
4.1.4. Implementation of the Writing Tasks	67
4.1.4.1. Results of the Observation	68
4.1.4.2. Results of Students' Questionnaires	71
4.1.4.3. Results of Teachers' Interview	74
CHAPTER FIVE	78
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	78
5.1. Conclusions	78
5.2. Recommendations	81
References	82
Appendices	86
Appendix I	86
Appendix II	88
Appendix III	89
Appendix IV	90
Appendix V	91

LIST OF TABLES

Table-1. The Writing tasks in grade 11 textbook.....	49
Table 2- Writing task Objectives.....	50
Table 3.Result of the evaluation of the goals of the writing tasks.....	51
Table-4. Pedagogic tasks based on Rehearsal and Pedagogic Rationale.....	53
Table 5. Divisions of Pedagogic Tasks.....	55
Table -6. Forms and Types of Inputs.....	56
Table 7 The Activities in the Writing Sections of Grade 11 English Textbook.....	59
Table 8.The Main Writing Activities in Grade 11 Textbook.....	61
Table 9. Roles of Students in the writing tasks of grade 11 textbook.....	63
Table 10.Roles of Teachers'	65
Table 11. Classroom Setting for the Writing Tasks.....	66
Table 12. Observation Guideline-checklist.....	68
Table 13. Attitude concerning writing tasks on improving the learning of writing.....	72

ABBREVIATIONS

E.G.S.E.C.E. - Ethiopian General Secondary Education Certificate Examination

M.O.E. - Ministry of Education

T.B.L.T. - Task-based Language Teaching

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In this first part of the research report, the basic aspects that could give essential information on the general nature of the study are presented. To this end, background of the study, some highlights pertaining to what the problem is about, the objectives, importance, scope, and limitations are covered.

1.1. Background of the Study

According to White (1989), until the end of 1950s, second language teaching of writing was highly influenced by the audio-lingual approach. During that time, writing skill was regarded as being somewhat inferior form of the other language skills particularly speech. Besides, the focus of teaching writing was mainly on the achievement of linguistic knowledge for the approach was accuracy oriented (White, 1989). Therefore, attempts to teaching writing were carried out by merely giving students a topic of some kind and asking them to produce a 'composition' without further help (Nunan, 1989). Moreover, writing was hated by many students. Part of the distaste was related to the associations students make with it. As to the reason Richards (1995) states that writing process was learned mostly in an environment of constant criticism and repeated failure.

However, since the 1960s, the teaching and learning process has been showing dynamic changes due to the innovation of new teaching and learning theories, linguistic theories and language pedagogy (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, teachers know how to teach writing. Besides, writing is no more lowered to second place instead; it is given its own status in the English Language Teaching (ELT) courses.

For over three decades, classroom methodology has been heavily influenced by communicative approach, with its emphasis on task-oriented activities that involve, where possible exchange of information and free use of language, without undue concern for mistakes (Littlewood, 1981; Nunan, 1988). The Activity of teaching writing of this time was mainly concerned with teaching writing as a means of communication. That is, learners are expected to acquire formal and acceptable writing skills and to know how to use this skill outside the classroom (in real life situation). Besides, the ability to write logically and grammatically connected sequences of sentences is also given concern (White, 1989).

As some scholars, like Richards and Hyland cited in Desalegn (2011) indicate that a well developed writing skill is important for learners both in its academic importance and as a means of communication. According to their view, this can be possible if learners learn writing effectively with the help of effective teachers, teaching techniques, and particularly if ample activity is made in the classroom. Tasks (activities) have a vital role especially in the more recent version of communicative language teaching (CLT), which is Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

Task- based language teaching, is one of the recent versions of communicative language teaching methodology. It is a language instruction that can be described as a language course whose syllabus or teaching and learning activities are organized around tasks (Nunan, 1988). Unlike conventional syllabuses that are oriented towards language as the primary subject matter, a task-based syllabus is oriented towards the process of language learning in the classroom (Littlewood, 1981). TBLT draws on several principles that formed part of communicative language teaching movement from the 1980s (Richard & Rogers, 2001).

Since the end of 1960s, the communicative task has involved as an important component within curriculum planning, implementation and evaluation (Nunan, 1989). In current teaching approaches like TBLT, syllabus content and instructional processes are selected with reference to the communicative tasks. These tasks are tasks that learners will need to engage in outside the classroom. According to the same author, using ‘task’ as a basic planning tool is not new in the general educational field but it is relatively a recent arrival on the language-teaching scene.

As the primary goal in language instruction is shifted from an object of study to a system of communication, the need to assess students’ ability to use the language communicatively has been raised, and the effective designing of communicative tasks has become more and more popular. Therefore, different authors outlined different principles and criterion as to how tasks should be designed (Nunan, 1988).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Pincas (1989:28) states, “Writing is an integral part of everyday life”. The ability to write in a second and foreign language is considered as a necessity skill for ‘speakers’ of a foreign language as much as for everyone using their own first language. Besides, Atkins, Hailom, and Nuru (1996) note that writing is one of the most important skills for students in learning English for academic purpose. It is also worth mentioning that many exams are taken in written form and consequently students are evaluated according to their writing performances.

Therefore, teachers should be able to use appropriate teaching techniques and practices so that students progress in their writing skills. In line with this, Richard and Rogers (2001) add that a well-developed writing skill is important for learners both in its academic role and as a means of communication in a community. According to their

view, this can be possible if learners learn writing effectively with the help of effective teachers, teaching techniques and if ample practice is made in the classroom.

Besides, different scholars like (Byrne, 1991; Pincas, 1989; and White, 1989) have claimed that writing skill is a difficult and more challenging skill as compared to other skills by its nature. These authors said that the ability to write well is not a naturally acquired skill; therefore, it has to be taught. Rather, they claim it is a skill, which needs more effort, extended time and a good teacher to manage and properly guide the learners during the practice session.

While learning writing, many difficulties can occur as they do while studying reading or listening. Byrne (1991) explains the problem from three different perspectives: psychological, linguistic and cognitive area.

Concerning the psychological problems, it is worth mentioning that: "... writing is a solitary activity and the fact that we are required to write on our own, without the possibility of interaction or the benefit of feedback, in itself makes the act of writing difficult." (Byrne, 1991:35)

Among the linguistic problems, Byrne (1991) mentions the absence of items used in the spoken discourse, e.g. repetition, backtracks, ungrammatical utterances, dependence on the reaction of the other people. Consequently, the writer has to run the conversation only by himself or herself and has to be careful in the choice and order of sentences to make the text clear.

Cognitive problems are very simple to be identified. In spite of the fact that speaking is natural to us, writing has to be taught. Students have to be aware of structures used in the written discourse even if they are not used in the spoken. Another problem might be

the organization of text, which has to be clear and highly explicit in order to understand the meaning. Therefore, the writer has explained herself/ himself to the reader (Byrne, 1991).

In the context of our country, some researches disclosed that the teaching of writing was ineffective and the writing performance of students of high school and higher institutions are low (Geremew, 1999, Alamirew, 2005; Desalegn, 2011). In line with this, Hailemariam (2012) also adds that it is a common phenomenon that the level of Ethiopian students language skill in general is very low after they have learnt the language from grade one to university level. Particularly, their writing skill is often found to be below the expectations. Most of the problems are related to the teaching learning of writing skill. Besides these areas, teachers and students' attitude towards the teaching of writing, to the approach employed and the like have been researched previously.

Desalegn (2011) for instance, in his study of the practice of teaching writing skill at Bahir Dar University, his study focused more on the implementation of the different approaches to teaching of writing. In his finding, he revealed that most teachers do not use the genre-based approach. Besides, they do not even use the process and product approaches appropriately.

Hailemariam (2012) on the other hand, studied problems students face in writing. He identified the difficulty level of the writing tasks and the cause of students' writing problems. The result of his study identified eight major writing problems, namely: punctuation and capitalization problems, unclear writing, weak organization, auxiliary & preposition errors, spelling & vocabulary problems.

With regard to evaluation of language skill tasks, the researcher has found only three studies conducted in three different skills other than writing skill. Abdulatif (2011) for example, conducted his study on the speaking tasks of Grade 12 English Students Textbook. He analyzed the extent to which the tasks are well- structured and organized in such a way that they promote speaking skill. The result of his study shows that the speaking activities do not meet most of the relevant criteria stated in the checklist suggested by (Nunan, 1989). The other similar study, which was conducted by Abebaw (2012), was on evaluating the listening tasks presented in Grade 12 English Textbook. The result of his study shows that most of the tasks are designed fulfilling most of the relevant criteria of Nunan (1989) checklist. The only study, as far as the researcher of this study is concerned, conducted on the evaluation of the design and implementation of tasks was by (Gebaw, 2012). He evaluated the reading tasks of grade nine English Textbook. However, he formulated his own checklist in order to evaluate the reading tasks and their implementation. The results of his study revealed that most of the reading exercises/tasks were designed appropriately to be done in phases but hardly implemented in the classroom he observed.

Even if there are a number of studies conducted around the teaching and learning of writing, the researcher of this study could not find any study which links the problem to the design, and implementation of the writing tasks. Hailemariam (2012) for instance, focuses primarily on identifying the causes of students' writing problems. However, he only identifies the writing problems that students have. He did not relate those problems mentioned and the difficulty level of the writing tasks to the design and implementation of the tasks.

Besides, some of the researches mentioned above were conducted on the old textbooks, which were used until 2009 G.C. Therefore, the researcher of this study was also

interested to investigate whether some of the drawbacks of these textbooks that were identified by other researchers improved in the new one.

Therefore, since none of the above researchers made their investigation on how writing tasks are designed in the new textbook and implemented, there is a gap which has not been touched yet. As a result, this study was designed to fill this gap by investigating points that are related to the design and implementation of writing tasks in the new English for Grade Eleven Textbook and at Addis Ketema Preparatory School.

1.3. Objectives of the Study

In order to deal with the problem stated above, this study is aimed to achieve the following general and specific research objectives. The details of the objectives are as follow.

1.3.1. General Objective

The main purpose of this study is to assess whether the writing tasks are designed in line with current theories of communicative tasks or not.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives are derived from the above general one and are formulated based on the components of communicative tasks and their implementation. These include “goals, inputs, activities, roles and setting”. Therefore, the study attempts to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. To examine the components and the nature of the writing tasks and find out whether they meet the criteria set for communicative tasks or not
2. To explore how the writing tasks are implemented in the classroom
3. To find out the students’ reaction towards the writing tasks

1.4. Research Questions

In order to achieve the above stated objectives effectively, this investigation attempts to focus on the following specific research questions.

- * Do the components and nature of the writing tasks meet the criteria set for communicative tasks?
- * How are the writing tasks implemented in the classroom?
- * How do the students react towards the writing tasks?

1.5. Significance of the study

In Ethiopia, English serves as a medium of instruction in most high schools, colleges and universities. Students' success in learning other subjects is likely to be dependent on their mastery of the language skills of which knowledge of writing is an important one. Therefore, after the accomplishment of this investigation, the overall research is assumed important for the following concerned bodies:

- * To course book writers and syllabus designers by providing valuable information about the suitability of the design and nature of the writing tasks to current communicative classroom setting.
- * To English language teachers by providing them some tips that can help them evaluate their current practices in relation to handling writing tasks and making some adjustments in implementing them in the classrooms.
- * To future researchers who would like to investigate further by providing a reference point.

1.6. Scope of the study

This study focuses on the evaluation of the writing tasks found in English Textbook for Grade 11 and their classroom implementation at Addis Ketema Preparatory School. The

communicative tasks treat all the four skills and tasks in different grade levels. However, in order to study the issue thoroughly and effectively, the researcher chose only grade-eleven among the different grade levels and writing among the different skills. Therefore, the data collection was also limited to grade 11 textbook, and to students and teachers of grade 11 of the above-mentioned school.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

In conducting this study, the following limitations were faced by the researcher.

- Because this study was conducted in one high school, only due to shortage of time, conclusions obtained from such narrow study area may not be generalized in the context of other highschools.
- Even if investigating the positive determinant factors in the tasks of writing skills is indispensable, this study focuses mainly on the weaknesses due to limitations of time .

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter focuses on reviewing literature and the contents of the chapter are treated under the following sub-headings.

- 2.1. Task : Concept
- 2.2. Rationale for the use of Tasks in Language Teaching and Learning Process
- 2.3. Components of a Communicative Task
- 2.4. The Nature of Writing
- 2.5. The Process Approach to Writing
- 2.6. Stages of Process Writing
- 2.7. Implementation of the writing tasks
- 2.8. Phases of Writing
- 2.9. Evaluation of tasks

In the view of this, the chapter embodies information obtained from different journals, books, and theses.

2.1. Task: Concept

The term 'task' has been defined in a variety of ways in different fields of studies. In the field of second and foreign language teaching too, different authors have defined the term from relatively different perspectives. The two major perspectives for defining task are pedagogic and 'real-world' (Nunan, 1989). When the term 'task' is defined from a pedagogical perspective, emphasis is given to what the learner will do in the classroom.

For example, Richards, Platt and Weber cited in Nunan (1989:10) define the term as:

An activity or action, which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e. as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and performing a command, may be referred to as tasks. Tasks may or may not involve the production of language. A task usually requires the teacher to specify what will be regarded as successful completion of the task. The use of a variety of different kinds of tasks in language teaching is said to make language teaching more communicative... since it provides a purpose for a classroom activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

(Richards, Platt and Weber 1986: 289)

On the other hand, 'task' can also be defined from the 'real-world' perspective, i.e. by giving emphasis to what the learner will do in the outside world. In this perspective, tasks in the classroom are expected to resemble what learners actually do in real-life situation- outside the classroom. Richards and Rodgers (2001) define this term from 'real-world' perspective as "an activity or goal that is carried out using language, such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map and giving directions, making a telephone call, writing a letter etc."

The common point between the above two definitions are, they both imply that tasks involve communicative language use in which the user's attention is focused on meaning rather than linguistic structure. These tasks are also called communicative tasks (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Nunan (1989) considers the communicative task as a piece of classroom work, which involves learner in comprehending, manipulating producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form.

Other authors also defined task based on its constituent parts or components. In line with this, authors like Candlin (1987); Wright (1987); Ellis (1997) and Nunan (1989) suggest different ideas as to what a communicative task should contain (see section- 2.3 for the details). Nunan (1989) identification of task components for instance, the goal, the input, and the activities derived from this input and the roles implied for the learners and the teacher and the setting. These components of a communicative task, according to the same author cover all the other task components, which were identified by the other authors mentioned.

Identifying task components also extends to the purpose of designing, analyzing and evaluating communicative tasks. However, the purpose of this study is to evaluating the

writing tasks, focus was given only to how tasks can be evaluated through their components. In line with this, Ellis (1997) adds that task is a necessary preliminary to plan a micro- evaluation where a teacher or a researcher evaluates tasks of one of the skills.

Different authors also formulated different criterions and area of focus for evaluating communicative tasks. However, Nunan (1989) confirms that though the different criterions overlap and base different aspects of a task, his classification of components of a task is believed to include other authors' points in to consideration.

As it was mentioned earlier, the main concern of this study was evaluating the writing task. However, the evaluation was conducted based on the second categorization of tasks i.e. based on Nunan's classification of task components. Up on his specification of task components he developed a checklist to evaluate each component of a communicative task. Therefore, this checklist was the major instrument that was used to evaluate the writing tasks and their implementation.

2.2. Rationale for the use of Tasks in Language Teaching and Learning

As it was mentioned in the preceding section, classroom tasks are generally classified based on either 'real-world' (target task) or 'pedagogic' perspectives. Real-world (target) tasks will result in communicative acts that we achieve through language in the world outside the classroom. The pedagogical tasks on the other hand are tasks, which are carried out in the classroom. Pedagogical tasks can further be divided into those with rehearsal rationale and those with pedagogical rationale (Nunan, 2004). These different elements are further defined and exemplified below.

- a) **Real-world or target task:** a communicative act we achieve through language in the world outside the classroom.

- b) **Pedagogical task:** a piece of classroom work, which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating producing or interacting in the language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than forms. They have non-linguistic outcome, and can be divided into rehearsal tasks or activation tasks (Nunan, 2004).
- c) **Pedagogical tasks Rehearsal:** (based on rehearsal rationale) a piece of classroom works in which learners rehearse, in class, a communicative act they will carry out outside of the class. Such tasks require learners to approximate, in class, the sorts of behaviors required of them in the world beyond the classroom (Nunan, 1989 and Ellis, 2003). As to the situation of classrooms Krashen (1989:121) argued that the classroom and the activities done in classroom can never be like ‘real life’ however, he believes“...classes should attempt to stimulate ‘real life’ and dictated that this will be the best way of spending the restricted, admittedly inadequate resources classes do have”.

Example: Write Your Resume.(Nunan, 2004)

- *Now, imagine you’re applying for one of these jobs. Your partner is applying for the other. (Students have two job advertisements)*
 - *Compare your partner with other applications for the job. Who is the best candidate?*
- d) **Pedagogical tasks Activation:** (based on pedagogical rationale) a piece of classroom work involving communicative interaction, but not one in which learners will be rehearsing of some out-of-class communication. Rather they are designed to activate the acquisition process. The assumption in incorporating these tasks while designing communicative task is that, they trigger language learners’ cognitive processes or mental computations Skehan cited in (Meseret, 2012).

Example: List three things you are thinking about doing this week. (Nunan, 2004)

Activity	Recommendation
1	
2	
3	

Group Work: Tell your partners what you're thinking about doing. For each activity, get a recommendation and a reason from three different people. Then write the best recommendations in the chart.

Moreover, according to Nunan (2004), pedagogic tasks help learners build up confidence, evaluate their own progress and become autonomous. Pedagogic tasks, unlike real-world ones, cannot be justified on the grounds that they enable, learners to rehearse real-world behaviors. However, such tasks are believed to stimulate internal processes of acquisition (Nunan, 1989).

In short, understanding these two important task rationales is vital in the selection, designing, implementation, and evaluation of tasks. Both task types are important for the students in different ways. Besides, the selection of both tasks to incorporate them in textbooks is different since their type (real world& pedagogic), their rationale (rehearsal & research based), and their reference (one is based on needs analysis and the other on research) are different (Nunan, 1989).

In this study, these rationales of the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook were evaluated. During the evaluation, all the writing tasks were identified with either rehearsal or pedagogic rationale. Further investigations were made to find out the extent to which all the writing tasks in the textbook inclined to these rationales and its implication towards the goals of teaching writing in grade 11 textbook.

2.3. Components of a Communicative Task

The communicative task has played an important role in curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation (Nunan, 1989). In evaluating tasks, which is the concern of this study, identifying components of a communicative task was an important activity. This is because the criteria that are developed by different authors base their focus on the different components of communicative tasks.

As it was discussed in section 2.1, different authors suggest different views as to what a communicative task should contain. Candlin (1987), for instance, suggests that tasks should contain input, roles, settings, actions, monitoring, outcomes and feedback. According to the same author, input refers to the data presented for learners to work on. Roles specify the relationship between participants in the task. Setting refers to the classroom and out-of-class arrangements entailed in the task. Actions are the procedures and sub-tasks to be performed by the learners. Monitoring refers to the supervision of the task in progress. Outcomes are the goals of the task and feedback refers to the evaluation of the task.

Shavelson and Stern cited in Nunan (1989) suggest that task design should take into consideration the following elements: Content- (the subject matter to be taught), Materials- (the things that learners can observe/ manipulate), Activities- (the things the learners and teacher will be doing during the lesson), Goals- (the teacher's general aim of the task), Students- (their abilities , needs and interests are important), Social community- (the class as a whole and its sense of groupness)

Wright cited in Nunan (1989) suggests that tasks need at least contain two elements. These are input data, which are provided by materials, teachers or learners and an initiating question that instructs learners on what to do with that data. However, Wright

rejects the notion that objectives or outcomes are obligatory on the ground that, with certain tasks, a variety of outcomes might be possible unlike the ones anticipated by the teachers.

On the other hand, Nunan (1989) accepted the Wright's point that outcomes of a task are unpredictable. Then, he identified components of a communicative task by combining all the components listed by other authors above. These are goals (objectives), input, activities, teacher role, student role and setting.

In this research, emphasis was given to components of communicative task, which are identified by Nunan (1989). This is because the researcher believed that Nunan's framework of task components addresses all the other components, which are suggested by the above-mentioned authors. Therefore, these components of a communicative task were used in order to evaluate the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook. The discussion of each of these components is as follow.

2.3.1. Task Goals

Goals, as one of the components of communicative tasks, can be defined as the general intentions behind any given communicative task and learning task (Graves, 2000). Setting the goals is very important before designing and implementing communicative activities because, communicative activities with no goals cannot encourage learners to conduct any task. Therefore, goals are the necessary elements of communicative tasks. Goals or outcomes of communicative tasks can be based on three goal areas. These according to (Clark, 1987:226) are:

1. Establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships, and through this to exchange information, ideas, opinions, attitudes and feelings, and to get things done

2. Acquiring information from more or less ‘public’ sources in the target language (e.g. books, magazines, newspapers, brochures, documents, signs, notices, films, television, slides, tape, radio, public announcements, lectures or written reports etc.) and using this information in some way.
3. Listening to , reading ,enjoying and responding to creative and imaginative uses of the target language (e.g. stories, poems, songs, rhymes, drama) and , for certain learners , creating them themselves.

Goals of a language-learning task can also be based on the national needs of a particular country. In Ethiopia too, the national need for teaching and learning of English language is English for academic purpose (MOE, 2008). That is, students learn the English language in order to learn other school subjects effectively. It is obvious that English is a medium of instruction especially in high schools and higher educational institutions. Therefore, students need to develop their language skills in order to deal with other subjects provided by their respective institutions/schools effectively.

For writing course, which is the concern of this study, the goal of a writing task depends on the concern of the development of a particular basic functional language skill or formal writing skill. Basic functional writing skills include such things as writing notes to one’s teacher, writing shopping lists, completing postcards and so on. Formal writing skills will include essay and report writing, writing business letters, and note taking from lecture and books (Byrne, 1991).

Objectives are statements about how the goals will be achieved. Through objectives, a goal is broken down into learnable and teachable units (Graves, 2000). By achieving the objectives, the goal will be reached. As to the usefulness of objectives, Manger cited in Graves (2000) suggests that objectives should contain three components: *performance*,

condition, and criterion. According to the same author, performance describes what the learner will be able to do, *conditions* describes the circumstances in which the learner are able to do something and *criterion* describes the degree to which they are able to do something. Besides, Brown cited in Graves (2000) adds two more components: subject and performance. *Subject* describes who will be able to do the task and *measure* refers to how the performance will be observed or tested.

In this study too, the objectives of all the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook and in its syllabus were identified and evaluated. During the evaluation, all the objectives of the writing tasks were identified and the four components of these objectives (performance, conditions, measure, and criterion) were used to measure their comprehensiveness. That is, investigation was done in order to find out how many of the objectives contain four of these components. The fifth component (subject) was left out of the evaluation because, it is obvious even if it is not mentioned in the textbook, that grade eleven students are the one who will achieve the objectives.

2.3.2. Input

After the making of goals, learners need to have enough materials as input before participating in communicative activities. Input is another important element of communicative tasks. Input is also a term used to mean the language that the students hear or read. According to Ellis, (1999) considered the input is used to refer to the language that is addressed to the foreign language learner either by a native speaker or by another foreign language learner.

As to the sources of input for communicative tasks, different authors identified a wide range of sources for preparing communicative tasks. Theories of second language acquisition agree that, for learning a modern language, learners must be exposed to a

considerable amount of language input either in natural or artificial teaching settings (Krashen1989). In line with this, Hover cited in Nunan (1989) presents a long list illustrating all kinds of written sources which exist around us.

- Letters (formal/ informal), Newspaper extracts, Picture stories, Business cards, Memo- note, Shopping lists postcards etc.

In short , input data, which task participants are supposed to comprehend and use in the language learning process, should reflect the learners' needs and interests, in so doing positively encouraging the use of the target language (Ellis, 1999; Mishan 2005).

Inputs of a language-learning task may take two forms: verbal or non-verbal. Verbal materials may be spoken or written texts which are provided as an input for a language task. That is, students may be required to listen to a lecture (verbal input) and write the report of it. On the other hand, non-verbal materials include pictures, photos, diagrams, charts, maps, etc. students can be instructed to analyze data which is presented in table (non-verbal input) and write a report of it.

Besides, authenticity is one of the questions that can be raised after discussing the forms of an input. Any language task input, whether verbal or non-verbal, can be authentic or inauthentic in type. Authentic here is any material, which has not been specifically produced for the purpose of language teaching (Krashen, 1989). In line with this, Mishan (2005), states the importance of using authentic or real-world materials as input especially in communicative tasks where students are required to rehearse real world activities in the classroom.

Besides, Cunningsworth and Tomlinson cited in Abebaw (2012) claim that textbooks can promote autonomy and self-reliance by incorporating authentic materials, creating realistic situation and encouraging learners to participate in activities. Moreover, such

inputs develop communicative skills and strategies of learners. As to the importance of incorporating authentic inputs (world materials) in language tasks, the same authors listed the following reasons.

- The language is natural. The language is not simplified or altered for teaching purpose
- It offers students the chance to deal with small amounts of print, which at the same time contain complete and meaningful messages.
- It provides students with the opportunity to make use of non-linguistic clues (layout, pictures, colors, symbols, the physical setting in which it occurs) and more easily to arrive at meaning from the printed word.

According to Nunan (1989), inputs of tasks can be analyzed in terms of the forms they take and their type. Therefore, as it was mentioned in the introductory section of the components of a communicative task, the inputs of the writing tasks in grade 11 text book were identified in terms of forms (verbal/non-verbal) and types (authentic/in authentic). Finally, an investigation was conducted in order to find out what proportion of the inputs contain verbal/non-verbal and authentic /inauthentic inputs. Moreover, a further investigation was conducted in order to find out the implications of the findings on the objectives of the tasks.

2.3.3. Activities

Input is a base for students to conduct any communicative task and activities refer to what learners will actually do with this input they are provided through the communicative tasks (Nunan, 1989). In dealing with a certain writing activity for instance, students might be require to read an authentic text and write a short summary of it. Then students read the text (input), discuss what they read with each other, relate it with their background knowledge and then move to the actual writing process.

However, different authors categorize activities into different categories based on current communicative approach. Brumfit, (1984), generally characterize activities in to rehearsal for the real-world (authenticity)/pedagogic; skill getting/skill using; and fluency/accuracy.

- i. **Authentic / Pedagogic activity:** According to Clark and Silberstein (1977) cited in Nunan (1989), classroom activities should parallel the ‘real-world’ as closely as possible. That is, the type of communicative activities students do in the classroom need to be the same as what they do outside the classroom (Also called authentic activities). Moreover, such activities focus on the message not the medium. On the other hand, pedagogic activities are based on communicative competence. They are aimed to aware learners the language they are studying and to enable them use the language effectively for communication. Pedagogic activities focus on the form of the language through which the message is transferred. They do not necessarily mirror real world activities however; they are believed to stimulate the process of acquisition (Nunan, 2004).
- ii. **Skill getting / Skill using:** - according to Rivers and Temperley (1978)cited in Nunan (1989), a second way of characterizing activities is according to whether they are concerned with skill getting or skill using. These relate to the traditional distinction between controlled practice activities, in which learners manipulate phonological and grammatical forms, and transfer activities, in which learners are meant to apply their newly acquired mastery of linguistic forms to the comprehension and production of communicative language (Nunan, 1989).

During skill getting activities, focus is given only for introducing new language forms and their function. After that, examples, which contain the new forms, will

be provided for students to articulate the sequences of sound and to practice formulating communication. During skill using activities, focus is given for interaction or real communication. First students are required to understand the message over the form and discuss with other students about what they have understood.

iii. **Accuracy and fluency**:- A third way of analyzing learning activities is into those which focus the learner on developing accuracy, and those which focus on the development of fluency. According to Skehan, (1998) cited in Meseret (2012), fluency refers to the learner's capacity to communicate in real time. Accuracy on the other hand refers to the ability of the learner to use the target language according to its norms. According to Brumfit, C. (1984), the accuracy / fluency distinction could be used as another dimension to analyze and evaluate activities.

The distinction between activities that focus on accuracy and fluency can be used to analyze activities. In evaluating the writing activities/ tasks/ in this study, the writing activities incorporated in grade 11 textbook were evaluated. During the evaluation, focuses were given to:

- Identifying the focus of the writing tasks/activities and their implications to communicative oriented class
- Investigating the appropriateness of the activities to the goal and to the input of the task

2.3.4. Roles of Learners and Teachers

Role refers to the part that learners and teachers are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as the social and interpersonal relationships between the participants (Richard and Rodgers, 1986). In their comprehensive analysis of approaches and methods in language teaching, these authors consider learner and teacher roles. They

point out that a task will reflect assumptions about the contributions that learners can make to the learning process.

i. Roles of Learners

In line with this, Nunan (1989) lists the different learner roles which are implied by the different methodological approaches. In doing so, he identified that in communicative approach to language teaching, learners have an active and negotiative role. That is, they are expected to contribute and receive.

Besides, the roles of the students with regard to the four skills will also be different. For instance, in reading and writing tasks, learners will adopt a restricted range of roles because they are assumed to be solitary activities. In oral/aural language work, the roles can be varied and diverse (Richards and Rodgers 2001). The same authors also identified some basic roles of students in a communicative classroom. These roles are discussed as follow.

- a. **Group participant:** In communicative classroom, students may be required to do tasks in pairs/small groups than in whole class or individual works. In such cases, they are required also to play active roles in sharing ideas with each other.
- b. **Risk-taker:** many tasks will require learners to create and interpret messages for which they lack full linguistic resources and prior experience. This may be expected to Practice in restating, paraphrasing, etc. individually or in pairs using the language they have (Littlewood, 1981).
- c. **Monitor:** Tasks are employed in order to facilitate learning. Class activities have to be designed so that students have the opportunity to notice how language is used in communication. “Learners themselves need to attend not only to the message in the task work, but also to the form in which such messages typically come packed” (Richards and Rodgers,2001).

Meseret (2012) also adds to the role of learner particularly in task-based writing. She said that students play an active role during conducting a writing task. They take charge

of their own learning, select their methods, and monitor and evaluated their progress and achievements.

Learner roles, as the other component of a communicative task were analyzed and evaluated in this study. During the evaluation, the appropriateness of students' roles inherent in grade 11 textbook and in the teacher's guide were evaluated against to the goals and inputs of the writing task.

ii. Roles of Teachers

Richards and Rodgers (1986) state that learner roles are closely related to the functions and status of the teacher. They point out that some methods are totally teacher dependent, while others view the teacher as a catalyst, consultant or guide.

They point out that teacher roles are related to the following issues:-

- The types of functions teachers are expected to fulfill, e.g. whether that of practice director, counselor or model
- The degree of control the teacher has over how learning takes place
- The degree to which the teacher is responsible for content
- The interactional patterns that develop between teachers and learners

(Richard and Rodgers, 1986:24)

However, in the communicative classroom in particular, the teacher has three main roles. The first is to act as facilitator of the communicative process, the second is to act as a participant, and the third is to act as an observer and learner (Littlewood, 1981). In the writing tasks too, the roles of the teachers are to facilitate, encourage, and organize and sometimes to help the learners at every writing step. Moreover, Hyland (2003:12) puts the following point regarding the role of language teachers in the teaching of writing skill.

The teacher's role is to guide students through the writing process, avoiding an emphasis on form to help them develop strategies for generating , drafting and refining ideas,... encouraging brainstorming and outlining , requiring multiple drafts, giving extensive feedback, seeking text level revisions, facilitating peer responses, and delay surface correction until the final editing.

In this approach of teaching writing skill, the delivery of an in-depth input by the teacher is insignificant. Rather, as stated by Byrne (1988), in employing the process approach, teacher's primary role is to facilitate the learners' writing. Regarding this, the same scholar also points out that teachers are responsible to enhance collaborative writing in which students share and comment each other's written compositions in pairs and groups.

Roles of teachers, as the other component of a communicative task, were also evaluated in this study. The writing tasks in grade 11 textbook were evaluated through this component. That is, the roles of the teachers inherent in the writing tasks were identified and evaluated as to how they are appropriate to the goals, inputs and to the activities of the tasks.

2.3.5. Setting

Setting refers to a certain environment- classroom in this case, in which every task is performed (Nunan, 1989).The setting of a task is specified or implied in the task in relation to classroom arrangements. Besides, it requires consideration of how the task can be carried out. Wright (1987) for instance, suggests the different ways in which learners might be grouped physically based on individual, pair, small group, and whole class mode in order to do the task. Pica and Doughty cited in Abdulatif (2011), also

mention the positive role of group work in promoting a linguistic environment that can assist second language (L2) learning.

Besides, Nunan (1985) distinguishes between two different aspects of the learning situation. He refers to these as 'mode' and 'environment'. Learning mode refers to whether the learner is operating on an individual or group basis. Environment, which is closely connected with mode, refers to where the learning actually takes place. It might be a conventional classroom in a language center, a community class, a self-access learning center and so on. Nunan said each of these ways of arrangements and the environments have implications for task design and for task evaluation too.

In dealing with the evaluation of the setting of a writing task, this evaluative study will focus on assessing whether the setting of the tasks confined to the classroom or not.

These are:

- Can the task be done in the classroom?
- Is the sitting arrangement appropriate for the type of grouping the task requires?
- Do the tasks allow a varied form of arrangements

2.4. The Nature of Writing

“When we write we use graphic symbols that are letter or combination of letters which relate to the sounds we make when we speak” (Byrne, 1979). However, one does not just use graphic symbols for the sake of using them. The symbols which are used need to be arranged properly to form words and then to form the sentences with a view to communicate our ideas in an organized way. As to the meaning and nature of writing, White (1981:2) also puts it briefly as follows.

Writing is a natural activity. All physically and mentally normal people learn to speak a language. Yet all people have to be taught how to write. This is a crucial difference between the spoken and written forms of language. There

are other important differences as well. Writing, unlike speech, is displaced in time. Indeed, this must be one reason why writing originally evolved since it makes possible the transmission of a message from one place to another. A written message can be received, stored and referred back to at any time. It is permanent in comparison with the ephemeral 'here one minute and gone the next' character of spoken language –even of spoken language that is recorded on tape or disk.

So far, as the teaching of writing is concerned, the teacher should keep this nature of writing in mind. Writing always has become difficult to teach or to learn because it involves a different kind of mental process which includes the sub-skills like- drafting, editing, revising, organizing etc (McDonough and Shaw 1993). Moreover, writing is a very complex cognitive activity in which the writer is required to show control of a number of variables at the same time. At the sentence level, these include control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuations, spelling, and letter formation. Beyond the sentence, the writer must be able to structure and integrate information into cohesive and coherent paragraphs and texts Bell and Burnaby cited in (Nunan, 1989).

According to White (1989) in recent years, three different views on the nature of writing have emerged. These are the product approach, the process and the communicative one. The product approach to writing focuses on the end result of the act of composition, i.e. it is concerned with what students produce. For example, the letter, essay, story and so on (Nunan,1989).The writing teacher who subscribes to the product approach focuses only on the end results of the students writing i.e. whether it is readable, grammatically correct and obeys discourse conventions relating to the main points, supporting details and so on.

On the other hand, teachers who subscribe to the process approach to writing perceive the act of composition from a very different viewpoint focusing as much on the meaning

whereby the completed text was created as on the end product itself (Byrne, 1991). In order to find out more about how writers arrive at their final product, researchers studied writers as they went about their work. One of the most important discoveries, according to Zamel cited in (Italo, 1999), was that the act of composing evolves several stages as writers discover through the process. That is, one does not sit down and simply record, in a linear fashion, what it is that one wants to say. In many instances, the writer starts out with only the vaguest notion of this. The ideas are then refined, developed and transformed as the writer writes and rewrites.

The communicative approach unlike the other two focuses on the purpose and audience of writing Raime, Brumfit & Johnson, and Widdowson cited in (Hailemariam, 2012). According to the same authors, this approach concentrates on getting learners to do things with language. That is it allows them to express concepts and to carry out communicative activities of various kinds.

2.5. The Process Approach

The process approach, unlike the product one, focuses on how a writer goes through certain procedural and recursive steps instead of producing a text at once. The proponents of this approach of teaching writing skill such as Nunan (1988), Zamel (1983), Hyland (2003) and Richards (1990) cited in (Desalegn, 2011) pointed out that the teaching of writing skill through this approach is accomplished through many and varied steps as writers discover the process until they reach their final end products. Pincas (1989) identifies the following six micro steps of writing. These are Prewriting (brainstorming), first draft, conferencing, second draft, editing, and sharing/feedback. According to Chew cited in (Desalegn, 2011), the process approach of teaching writing skill is an approach in which learners at each steps of writing work cooperatively with

their classmates under the supervision of the classroom teacher. The details of each stage are as follow:

2.6. Stages of Process Writing

Pincas (1989), Byrne (1991), as well as White (1989) suggest the following steps of writing that teachers need to give emphasis and follow while allowing students to conduct a writing task.

- i. **Brainstorming:** this is the first and important pre-writing activity. This is the stage when the students figure out what they are going to write about by generating ideas. Brainstorming as one of the first step would be more effective if it is performed in groups/ pairs. During this stage, the teacher may order the students to sit and discuss in groups/ pairs and come up with ideas that can be included in their writing. According to Pincas (1989), there are various activities students /writers need to do during brainstorming. For instance, they can talk about their likes and dislikes and things, people, places and hobbies depending on the particular topic they are discussing.
- ii. **Planning:** this is the next stage through which students organize their ideas that they came up with in the brainstorming stage. This stage is an important one for it allows students set some kind of framework for their writing before they begin writing the first draft. In line with this, White (1989) identifies different ways of planning writing for instance, creating a cluster, diagram or web of ideas, making an outline, identifying pros and cons etc. Then, they can proceed to the next stage of writing.
- iii. **Drafting:** After generating and planning their ideas, the next stage the students undergo will be the drafting stage. During this stage, students are

expected to put the arrangement (framework) that they set in the planning step. They may need to go back and refer to their notes and the plan they determined in the previous stages. In this stage particularly, students concentrate on getting their ideas on paper, organize their information logically and develop them with enough detail rather than focusing on the mechanical language aspects such as spelling, and punctuation.

- iv. **Revising:** this is the stage when students look at their draft with a reader's eye. They need to check the organization, content of ideas, how they put their ideas. They may need to change the order of the information, expand certain sections, or cut details. This can be done by going back to their draft and re-word parts of the paper. Revising is not editing, therefore, editing spelling, grammar and sentences wait for next stage.

During this stage or writing a composition, according to Byrne (1991), lots of discussions among the students (in pair or group) and with the help of the teacher should be taken place. This is because discussion in this stage enables the students to think and improve the language that they used in their compositions. Besides, the students may also expand their compositions with new ideas or remove the parts that they found unnecessary depending on the feedback provided.

- v. **Editing:** this is a near final draft stage of the of process writing. This is a step at which, the students need to focus mainly on making the content of their composition clear to their readers. They also need to focus on making their compositions meet the conventions of standard written English. That is, correct grammar, sentence structure, word choice, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

vi. **Writing the final draft (publishing):** writing is communication(Pincas,1989) - if something is written in the classroom by the students, it is intended to be read by the teacher and or by other students in order to get feedback. In this final stage of the writing process, the students rewrite the text that they edited in the above step as a final draft.

2.7. Implementation of the Writing Tasks

Evaluating the writing tasks of grade 11 textbook is the major focus of this study. As it was discussed at the beginning, components of communicative tasks were used to evaluate these tasks. So far, these components of communicative tasks have been discussed. However, as Ellis (1997:41) argues that evaluation of the tasks on paper or only using checklist is not enough; or "...a task can only be said to have worked if the students have found it enjoyable and/or useful". He added that evaluation of tasks would be complete if one goes to an actual classroom and observe how the tasks are implemented and examine the students' reaction towards the tasks. Besides, Murphy, cited in Meseret (2012), adds that the situation in which the task is carried out is a major factor in TBLT next to the individual learner and the task itself.

As it was discussed in the research methodology section, three data gathering instruments were employed in order to investigate the implementation of the writing tasks in this study. The instruments used were observation, questionnaire, and interview. Classroom observation was conducted in order to examine how students actually react towards the writing tasks and how these tasks are actually implemented in classroom. Therefore, during evaluating the implementation of the tasks, focus is given whether the tasks:

- Are implemented in phases
- Capture students interest and motivate them

- Stimulate genuine communication and interaction between and among the students
- Make them work in pairs/groups
- Make them participate actively

2.8. Phases of Writing

Writing tasks in a communicative oriented classroom are supposed to be implemented in phases. Besides, a great deal of discussion about the best way to implement tasks in the language classroom has been undertaken (Prabhu, 1987). According to Willis (1996), there are three principal phases of task based language teaching: pre-task, while-task and post-task. However, since the concern of this section is exploring how the writing tasks implemented, focus was only given for the phases of conducting a writing task. The details of each phase together with the teacher and students' roles will be as follow.

- Pre-Task Phase:** -This is the first phase in conducting the writing tasks. The purpose of the pre-task phase is to prepare students to perform the task. The activities in this phase are expected to give learners relevant exposure to the topic language and above all, create interest in doing the task (Willis, 1996).Prabhu (1987) explains that the pre-task is conducted through interaction of the question-and-answer type and it is teacher directed. At this stage, the teacher is expected to discuss or explain to the students the language forms which are important for the completion of the main writing task. He/she also explore the input of the task (written or verbal text, pictures, graphs etc.) with the students and show how to exploit them. The teacher also helps the students relate the input with the task. Generally, as Meseret (2012) explains, the teacher leads the class step-by-step to the expected outcome by breaking down a step into smaller steps.

- ii. **While Task Phase:** - learners' confidence grows when they realize they can do something without the teacher's direct support (Willis, 1996). This phase is therefore a vital opportunity for all learners to use whatever language they have gathered. This phase centers on the task itself and gives various roles to the students. Students are required to work simultaneously in pairs or small groups and rehearse the task in order to recycle the language and be familiar with the context. Therefore, during this phase students undergo through the various stages of writing (see section 2.7) before the report. Besides, the teacher's role turns in to being a language adviser. Willis, (1996:56) identifies some of the major roles of the teacher during this phase.

Besides, the major role of teachers during this phase is monitoring. Willis (1996:53) suggested the following.

- Encourage students to help each other
 - Acting as timekeeper
- iii. **The Post Task Phase:**-this is the final and the central part of the task phase (cycle) where the teacher comments on how the task went and the lesson will probably proceed smoothly into the report stages, where students prepare to tell the class about their findings (Willis, 1996).

After planning and conducting the main writing task, students are required to report their writings to the class or teacher and that marks the natural conclusion of the task cycle, whereas the teacher checks their writings and gives feedback.

2.9. Evaluation of Tasks

As it has been discussed in section-2.1, different authors like Candlin (1987); Wright (1987); Ellis (1997) and Nunan (1989) defined task based on its constituent parts or components and suggest different ideas as to what a communicative task should contain.

However, Nunan (1989) identification of task components which is a communicative task should contain five components namely: the goal, the input, and the activities derived from this input, the roles implied for the learners and the teacher and finally the setting. These components of a communicative task, according to the same author cover all the other task components, which were identified by the other authors mentioned in section-2.1 in this study.

Identifying task components also extends to the purpose of designing, analyzing and evaluating communicative tasks. However, the purpose of this study is to evaluating the writing tasks, focus is given only to how tasks can be evaluated through their components. In line with this, Ellis (1997) adds that task is a necessary preliminary to planning a micro- evaluation where a teacher or a researcher evaluates tasks of one of the skills.

As it was mentioned earlier, this evaluative study focused on evaluating the writing tasks of grade 11 English textbook. The evaluation was conducted through the stages of evaluating a task that was identified by Ellis (1997) and using the components of the communicative task that were identified by (Nunan, 1989; Candlin, 1987; and Wright, 1987).

i. Steps to Evaluate a Task

Step-1: Choosing a task to evaluate

Step-2: Describing the task

Step-3 Planning the evaluation

Step-4: Collecting the information for the evaluation

Step-5: Analyzing the information

Step-6: Reaching conclusions and making recommendations

Step-7: Writing the report

(Source: Ellis, 1997:38)

Step-1: Choosing a task to evaluate

According to Ellis (1997), a teacher or a researcher might have different reasons to select a task to evaluate. He/she may want to try out a new kind of task and be interested in discovering how effective this innovation is in his/her classroom. On the other occasions, they may want to experiment with a task they have used before by making some changes to the components of the task. Nunan (1989 and 2004) add that tasks can also be evaluated for effectiveness in their design and implementation.

According to the major objective of this study, the selection of the tasks for this study was also done by identifying all the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook. And the purpose was to examine whether these tasks are designed in line with current theories of communicative tasks.

Step- 2: Describing the task

Both, Ellis (1997) and Nunan (1989) state that, a clear and explicit description of the task is an important condition to plan a task evaluation. As suggested above, a task can be described in terms of its components. In this study too, all the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook were identified as in step-1 and described in terms of their constituent components. According to Nunan (1989); Candlin (1987); and Wright (1987), these are goals (objectives), inputs, activities, roles (of teacher and students), and setting.

Step-3: Planning the evaluation

According to Alderson cited in Ellis (1997), planning an evaluation involves working out answers to a number of questions concerning the purpose of the evaluation. In this study too, four specific research questions (See section 1.4) were formulated to which this study sought answers. Therefore, this study was planned to seek answers to those questions.

Step-4: Collecting the information for the evaluation

As it is indicated in chapter 3, there were major sources of data identified for this study. Those were all the writing tasks of grade 11 textbook and the syllabus for grade 11. Besides, in order to respond to the above third and fourth research questions (See section 1.4); additional information was collected through questionnaires, observations and interviews. The method and procedure of the data collection and presentation are discussed in detail in sections- 3.5 and 3.6

Step-5: Analyzing the information

The data obtained from the task evaluation were first categorized and interpreted. The information obtained from the questionnaire were also categorized, interpreted and presented parallel to the task evaluation. Data obtained from the observation and the teachers' interview were categorized and analyzed, interpreted and presented along with others. A comparison and contrast were made among these kinds of data with a description of words.

Step-6: Reaching conclusions and making recommendations

According to Ellis (1997), it is useful to distinguish 'conclusions' and 'recommendations'. Conclusions are general statements about what has been discovered about the writing tasks from the analysis that have been performed. Recommendations are the evaluator's ideas regarding future actions. Therefore, these two sections were also conducted and presented in chapter five. (See sections: 5.1 and 5.2)

Step-7: Writing the report

A report of an evaluation is basically written when the evaluator intends to share the conclusions and the recommendations with other (Ellis, 1997). Therefore, this study is conducted and its report is presented for the same purpose.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In an attempt to evaluate the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook and to explore their implementation, the present study has examined two related domains: the components of the writing tasks and their implementation in the classroom. This chapter discusses the methodological concept and how they were enacted. Therefore, first, the research design is discussed. Secondly, the research setting and approaches to sampling of the participant are sketched. Thirdly, data collection instruments and data analysis and interpretation procedures are described.

3.1. The Research Design

As mentioned under the ‘statement of the Problem’ (section, 1.2) the main objective of this study was to evaluate the design and implementation of the writing tasks (activities) in the new Grade-Eleven English Textbook. In order to achieve this objective, a descriptive case study research design was chosen. The case study was chosen, for it is an excellent research type for obtaining thick description of a complex issue in its context (Kumar, 2006). In other words, employing the case study, a researcher selects an instance from the class of objects and phenomena and investigates the way this instance functions in context (Nunan, 1992). Therefore, the researcher of this study took one instance which is evaluation of the writing tasks and investigated how the tasks were designed in the textbook and implemented in the classroom.

According to Nunan, (1992), case study is a ‘hybrid’ in that it generally utilizes a range of methods/ approaches for collecting and analyzing data, rather than being restricted to a single procedure. Therefore, this study utilized mixed approach - both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative was chosen to discuss the data collected from the writing tasks

and from the interview using words. To support the qualitative approach, quantitative approach was also used. Quantitative was chosen in order to analyze the writing tasks, the questionnaire and the classroom observation using the evaluating checklists (See Appendix III). That is the writing tasks in the textbook were grouped based on the components of communicative tasks as well as their particular characteristics and expressed in terms of numbers and percentages. In a similar manner, both the questions in the students' questionnaire (See Appendix I) and in the observation guideline (See Appendix IV) were categorized into groups and the responses were tallied and expressed in terms of numbers and percentages. Finally, all these findings were evaluated by the checklist.

3.2. Research Setting

The data collection was carried out in one governmental preparatory school called Addis Ketema Preparatory School. This school is located in Addis Ababa, around Kolfe Keranio Sub-city. The data were collected in a period of 29 days that was from 22nd of March to 19th of April.

3.3. Source of Data

The major source of data for this study was the new English Students Textbook for Grade-Eleven. The main target of the study was evaluating the writing tasks of this textbook. All the writing tasks of this textbook were the source data for this study and considered in the evaluation. As it was explained in statement of the problem (section1.2), this textbook was chosen because the researcher was interested to investigate whether some of the weaknesses of the textbook which were raised by earlier researchers were improved in the currently in use one and whether it is currently helping students to develop their writing skills.

Besides, grade-eleven is the first preparatory level, most courses the students will take the following year and after that when they join higher institutions require advanced ability in writing skills (Meseret, 2012). Therefore, the researcher believed that the writing tasks have to be designed and implemented appropriately.

3.4. Research Participants

After identifying the major source of data, the next major task in this study was identifying the population and the participants. Therefore, Grade-eleven students and English language teachers of Addis Ketema Preparatory School were identified as the population of the study. This is because; they are directly related to this study. These students and teachers were used as the context for this evaluative research.

The students were attending their education in 27 sections. The total number of students in these sections was 1381 and that was the population of the study. However, conducting the study on the total population is not possible and it is also impracticable because of some practical limitation like cost, time and other factors. Therefore, conducting sampling was needed in order to make the research findings economical and accurate.

As to the selection of the representative sample among the total population, a stratified sampling method was chosen. This type of sampling was basically chosen because of two reasons. First, this type of sampling is a type of probability sampling that gives the probability that the sample is representative of the population (Kumar, 2006). That is, every student of grade eleven has equal probability to be taken into the sample. The other reason was that, the population (grade 11 students) was not confined in one place or room rather; they were attending classes in 27 sections. This situation allowed the

researcher chose stratified sampling method. Therefore, these sections were considered as stratum.

Determining the sample size was the other issue before conducting the sampling. This was done by taking the type of research this study employed that is descriptive research. According to Kumar (2006:94), descriptive research typically uses larger samples; “it is sometimes suggested that one should select 10-20 per cent of the accessible population for the sample”. Therefore, out of the total 1381 students, 10.8% or 150 students were chosen. The actual selection was done using disproportionate sampling techniques. This is because, the number of students selected from each section (strata) was not the same. Moreover, the number of students in each section was not equal. That is, the total number of students in 15 of the sections was 50 and in the rest 12 sections the total number of students was 46. There the sampling techniques had to be conducted in a disproportional manner. The actual selection was done based on the following formula.

$$N = \frac{\text{Number of students in each section} \times \text{Sample Size}}{\text{Total Number of Population}}$$

Based on the above formula, a total of 90 students were selected from 15 sections which have 50 students. Those are 6 students from each section. The rest, 60 students were selected from the rest 12 sections which have 46 students each. Those are 5 students from each section.

The English language teachers as the other participants were 18 in number and that was the population of the study. They divide and teach the 27 sections of students. The type of sampling technique employed was voluntary sampling. This type of sampling technique is selected by some arbitrary method because it is known to be

representative of the total population, or it is known that it will produce well matched groups (Kumar, 2006). Therefore, the researcher chose three teachers who were willing to be observed in the classroom and interviewed afterwards.

3.5. Instrument of Data Collection

In evaluative research, evaluators can use different ways of data gathering tools. The selection of each way of data collection depends on the focus which the evaluator (researcher) aims at. For instance, Nation and Macalister (2010) list sample of the focal areas of material evaluation and systematic course-book evaluation checklist or teacher and learner questionnaire. For examining the quality of curriculum design, systematic course evaluation checklists, analysis of the syllabus and evaluation of the course materials can be used as means of data gathering tools. Likewise, to evaluate teacher and learner satisfaction about the material or program being evaluated, the researcher can envisage self- report scales, interview, observation etc. (Nation and Macalister, 2010).

In short, evaluative research usually uses interviews, self- report scales, observation and checklists. This study employed four tools. These were document analysis, self-report scale, observation (structured) and semi- structured interview. The detailed descriptions of these data gathering instruments are as follows.

3.5.1. Document Analysis

Document analysis as a major instrument was used to gather data in this study. The document that has been taken for analysis was the new grade 11 English textbook and all the writing tasks were the focus of the evaluation. The whole textbook consists of twelve units and the total number of the writing tasks in this textbook is nineteen. The total number of the writing tasks were found manageable to evaluate and believed that it would maximize the validity of the study. As Kumar (2006) states, the larger the sample,

the greater the precision and accuracy of the data it provides. Therefore, all the writing tasks were evaluated.

The analysis was undertaken based on current theories of communicative language teaching and task based language teaching. For this purpose, an evaluating checklist was used. This checklist was partly adapted and modified from Nunan (2004); Nunan (1989) and Ellis (2003) (see appendix: III).The checklist was modified in order to incorporate the broad areas a task evaluation should cover. The details of these areas and the components of task and their relationship with the evaluating checklists are discussed in the review of related literature (section 2.3).This evaluating checklist focuses on three different aspects of the writing tasks. These are:

- * The components of the writing tasks(goals, inputs, activities, roles of teacher and students', and settings)
- * Implementation of the writing tasks

The actual evaluation was made by answering each question in the checklist for all the writing tasks selected. Finally, the results of the data collected through the evaluation were kept for further analysis with other data collected by the following three other instruments.

3.5.2. Self- Report Scale

Self-report scale was the other data-gathering tool used in this study. It is a kind of questionnaire with rating scales at which respondents report what is true for them or the material being evaluated (Kothari, 2004). This type of instrument is used when there is a need to examine students' attitude or reaction on the material being evaluated (Morrison and Scott, 2005).Using this questionnaire, students were asked to rate their attitude/ reaction towards the writing tasks and their practice of conducting them in the classroom.

The instrument, a one-page questionnaire, for the randomly selected students was prepared to examine their attitude towards the writing tasks in the textbook. This questionnaire was composed of 5-point Likert scale having two sections. The first section A (items 1-5) deals with students' practice during conducting the writing tasks and the second section B (items 6-10) focuses on the students' attitude towards the writing tasks (see appendix: D).

3.5.3. Observation

According to Kumar (2006), the choice of a particular method for recoding observation is dependent on the purpose of the observation, the complexity of interaction and the type of population being observed. Lesson observation was important because it supplements the document analysis, interview and questionnaire methods in cross checking if what the respondents say do converge. Therefore, Observation as data gathering tool was used to observe and record how writing tasks were carried out in the classroom. This tool as a data-gathering instrument was selected over the unstructured interview one to find out how actually students undergo through the different stages of writing, to observe how teachers and students play their role, and to observe the reactions of the students towards the writing tasks.

For this purpose, an observation guideline was prepared. (See Appendix IV) The guideline has three main phases: the pre-task phase, the while-task phase, and the post-task phase as suggested by Willis (1996). Detailed discussions of these phases of writing were presented in (section 2.6.). Based on this, the guideline was prepared to see how the students practice the writing tasks in the classroom and observe their reaction towards the tasks.

Therefore, six periods of classroom observations were conducted. During the observations, writing sessions were recorded using the guideline by the researcher. Each period was observed from the beginning to the end. However, this study focuses on the design and implementation of the writing tasks, therefore; only the teaching writing sessions were recorded. For two weeks three days of lesson, observation per week was made. Besides, all the writing lessons observed were started in one period but completed in the next period. Therefore, one writing lesson was observed from the beginning to the end in two periods however, the second periods were observed only until the writing sessions were over. Following each three full observations, semi-structured interviews with the lesson teachers were held in order to raise questions which arose from the observation. The lesson observations were important to see if what the teachers explained in the interview , students responded in the questionnaire , results obtained from document analysis and what students did in the classroom converge.

3.5.4. Interview

Interview is any person-to-person interaction between two or more individuals with a specific purpose in mind Kumar cited in (Meseret, 2012). A semi- structured interview was prepared and conducted (See Appendices: V).The interviews were conducted with three teachers who were observed teaching writing. Each of these teachers were interviewed after they delivered the writing lessons and observed. The purpose of the interview was to investigate how teachers see the writing tasks which are found in grade 11 textbook and to ask questions which arose from the observation.

3.6. Procedure of data collection

The data from the textbook analysis were collected first and in the meantime, classroom observations were held. In order to avoid behavior modification self-report scale for

students and interview for teachers were undertaken respectively. In collecting data through questionnaire, all questionnaires for 150 students were distributed at the same time within school time. Interview with the observed teachers were held on different days that were convenient to them.

3.7. Method of data analysis

As it is mentioned in chapter one, the objective of this study was to evaluate all the writing tasks in the new “English Students Textbook for Grade-Eleven” in order to find out whether the writing tasks in the textbook are designed and implemented in the classroom according to current theories of communicative tasks. Therefore, for this purpose data were gathered. The data gathered through document analysis, classroom observation, questionnaire and interview were analyzed using the following procedures.

The data analysis process consisted of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative data from the task analysis and from the classroom observations were analyzed using Yes/No- type item analysis whereas the other qualitative data from the students’ questionnaire were analyzed using Likert- type item analysis. In Yes/No scale, numerical values to responses and the numerical representation (coding) of the items were made in the following two ways: -the favorable items were coded as - Yes. The unfavorable items were coded as No. For Likert- scale on the other hand, the items of the questionnaire for ‘classroom practice’ and ‘students’ attitude towards the tasks’ were coded in the following ways: ‘Strongly Agree’ (SA)= 5; ‘Agree’ (A)= 4; ‘undecided’ (U)= 3; ‘Disagree’ (D)= 2; and ‘Strongly Disagree’ (SD)= 1.

The data gathered using checklist and questionnaire were tallied, tabulated, and analyzed using statistical techniques such as percentage was used for describing the different features of the task components, and students’ practice and attitude towards the writing

tasks. Tabular descriptions which were incorporated in the study were made based on the sections identified in the evaluating checklist. To make the discussion easier, the checklist was categorized into 6 thematic units as follow:

- Goals/Objectives,
- Inputs,
- Activities,
- Roles of teachers' & students'
- Setting
- Implementation

After classifying the categories, each writing task was evaluated against the checklist. The checklist was prepared in questions form (see appendix III). Therefore, each question from every category is asked for each writing task and the answer is recorded in a table as 'Yes' or 'No'. Finally, the number of times (frequency) answered as 'Yes' and 'No' for each item in each category was counted and analyzed in percentile.

As to the implementation of the writing tasks, which were included in the questionnaire, two sections were identified. These were:

- Students Practice of the writing tasks
- Students attitude towards the writing tasks

As it was mentioned earlier, an observation guideline was prepared in order to explore how the writing tasks are implemented in the classroom setting (See Appendix, IV). The guideline contains three sections that focus on the three phases of writing. These were: Pre-task, While- task and Post –task Phases.

In each of the three sections, there were questions to be answered by observing while the teacher and the students undertook the writing process. Therefore, the researcher evaluated each stage using each item in the guideline by putting a tick mark against the

‘Yes’ for the activities which were observed, or ‘No’ for the activities which were not observed. Finally, the number of times (frequency) answered ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ were counted and analyzed in percentage.

The qualitative data gathering instruments were prepared and used in order to obtain information on the objectives of the writing tasks , teachers’ and students’ roles during the writing classes. The interview questions prepared to obtain these data were categorized in two sections.

1. Understanding concerning the phases of teaching writing
2. Reactions towards some of the components of the writing tasks

The selected and observed teachers were asked question. The questions these teachers asked were questions which were related to the above themes and which arose from the observation. The responses obtained from these teachers helped the researcher to see if what they responded in the interview and what they actually did in the classroom converged.

Finally, the data obtained from the task evaluation were first categorized and interpreted. The information obtained from the questionnaire were also categorized, interpreted and presented parallel to the task evaluation. Data obtained from the observation and the teachers’ interview were categorized and analyzed, interpreted and presented along with others. A comparison and contrast were made among these kinds of data with a description of words.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Data from the Textbook Analysis

4.1.1. General Description of the Textbook

The task analysis and evaluation have been done on the new Grade 11 English for Ethiopia Students Textbook. This textbook has been used as a teaching material since 2011/12 G.C. This textbook contains 12 units. Each unit contains 9 sections: introduction, listening, language focus, study skills, speaking, reading, word power, writing and assessment. There is a revision part at the end of every three unit. Every unit is divided in to two sections, namely: Part A and B. Each part contains all the nine sections mentioned. Besides, each part has its own objectives and tasks.

4.1.2. The Writing Tasks

Identifying the writing task for the proposed evaluation was the first and important activity conducted in this study. In order to do that, the writing tasks which were suitable for evaluation had to be selected. Then, according to the identification, there are a total of 19 writing tasks (excluding the writing tasks presented in the introduction, and revision sections) in the textbook. The writing activities in the introduction section were left out because they were not convenient for evaluation; they are presented together with other micro-skill tasks. Besides, tasks in the revisions sections were not also included in order to avoid repetition. Therefore, the main writing tasks, which were selected for evaluation, were 19 in number. These are all the writing tasks found in all the 12 units under the title 'Writing'. The following table shows the selected writing tasks in each unit.

Table-1. The Writing tasks in grade 11 textbook

Unit	Tasks
1	Write a Report about the African Union
2	Write a Letter to a Friend Write an article arguing that Ethiopia needs more educated women
3	Write an essay in response to this statement Write Government Health Leaflet
4	Reply to Mr. Bona's Letter Write a Report on HIV/AIDS
5	Write one or two paragraphs to include it in a Tourist Brochure Write a letter to the tourist agency
6	Write a story of 250 to 300 words Write a letter of reply
7	Write a summary using the information in your notes Write An Information Leaflet on one of the topics given above
8	Write 2 to 3 paragraphs about the best water conservation method or methods
9	Write a survey Report
10	Write an essay on an aspect of development
11	Write a one paragraph Report on the data about NGO Write a brochure
12	Write An Opinion Essay

4.1.3. Evaluation of the Writing Tasks

As it was mentioned in the previous chapters, the major purpose of the study was to evaluate the design and implementation of the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook. Besides, a detailed explanation was given as to how this study precedes the evaluation of the tasks in the textbook and their implementation in actual classrooms. This section focuses on the actual analysis of the components of each tasks and their implementation.

4.1.3.1. Goals (Objectives)

The first important feature to be treated in evaluating a communicative task is to check the existence of list of objectives that provide students with an opportunity to determine for themselves where they are going and what they can expect to achieve (Hyland, 2006).

At the beginning of each unit in the textbook, there are objectives that students are expected to achieve. Most of the units also contain writing objectives together with the objectives of other skills. The following table shows the writing objectives mentioned at the beginning of each unit.

Table 2-The Writing Task Objectives

Units	Objectives
1	<i>(Independently follow the 7 stages of writing)</i> • write a report of 350 to 400 words paragraph
2	• Write informal letter using correct conventions. • Write 2-3 paragraphs to persuade
3	• Write 2-3 paragraphs to inform <i>(Independently follow the 7 stages of writing)</i> • Independently write an essay of 5 paragraphs
4	• Write a reply to a short formal letter. • Write and present a report of 350-400 words.
5	• Write 2-3 paragraphs to inform and explain. • Write a short formal letter using correct conventions
6	<i>(Independently follow the 7 stages of writing)</i> • Write stories independently in 5 paragraphs.
7	• Summarize a text in various forms including bullet points • Write 3 paragraphs to inform explain and persuade.
8	• Write 2-3 paragraphs to explain
9	• Write and present a report of 350 to 400
10	• Write a five paragraphs essay independently
11	• Interpret simple statistics and write a report • Write 2-3 paragraphs to inform and persuade.
12	• Write essays independently in 5 paragraphs (including an introduction and conclusion when appropriate) <i>(Independently follow the seven stages of writing)</i>

As it was mentioned previously, the goals (objectives) of the writing tasks were evaluated against current theories of communicative tasks. As it was discussed in the review of the related literature (section, 2.3.1), a good objective needs to have five components (subject, performance, condition, measure and criterion). According to Graves (2000), these components are important for the comprehensibility of the objectives. Therefore, these components were employed as parameters to evaluate the

comprehensibility of each objectives stated both in grade 11 textbook and in the syllabus. Therefore, all the components except ‘subject’ were identified from all the objectives stated in the textbook and in the teachers syllabus, and evaluated. The results of the evaluation are as follow.

Table 3.Result of the evaluation of the goals of the writing tasks

Units	Components of an Objective			
	Performance	Conditions	Measure	Criterion
1	1	1	0	1
2	2	1	2	0
3	2	2	1	1
4	2	2	1	0
5	2	2	2	0
6	2	1	1	2
7	2	2	2	2
8	1	1	1	0
9	1	1	1	0
10	1	1	0	0
11	2	1	1	0
12	1	1	0	1
Total	19	16	12	7
%	100	84.2	63.2	36.8

As it is indicated in table-3 above, all the objectives stated in the textbook and in the syllabus were found to contain one of the components of objectives (performance). That is, 100% of the objectives clearly indicate what the learners /students will be able to do. With regard to the other component (condition), 84.2% of the objectives of the writing tasks were found to specify the conditions/ circumstances in which the learners are able to undertake the writing tasks. That is, these objectives indicate the students how many lines, words, or paragraphs they are expected to write. Besides, 63.2% of the objectives were found to have the other component (measure). This component according to Graves, (2000), shows the way the performance will be observed or measured.

Therefore, these objectives indicate how the writing tasks will be evaluated or show where the teacher is going to focus during checking the final composition.

The last component of an objective that was evaluated in this study was criterion. According to the above result, only 36.8% of the objectives were found to show this component. The rest 63.2% of the objectives do not clearly indicate how well the students are expected to perform the writing tasks or do not show the type of writing stages students need to pass through in order to accomplish the required performance.

Generally, objectives should be expressed in terms of what students/ learners should do (Nunan, 1988). With this regard, all the objectives of the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook were found to succeed. All the objectives state what students are able to do. Besides, indicating the condition component is also crucial. Graves (2000) states that students should be informed how much work is expected of them. For instance, they should be informed how many paragraphs, lines or words they are required to write. Moreover, it is also necessary to state clearly the degree to which learners are able to do something (Graves, 2000). However, in this evaluation, majority of the objectives were found to lack this component. Most of the objectives do not show the students the required stages of writing they should follow or how effectively they are required to accomplish the writing tasks.

4.1.3.2. Rationale of the Writing Tasks

As it was explained in the review of the related literature (Section: 2.2), rationale of the writing tasks is the other issue that was discussed under goal of the tasks. The types of tasks incorporated in the writing section of grade 11 textbook have obviously been justified with different rationale. Besides, according to the same section, this justification of task with different rationales was purposely included in the textbook for

different reasons. Both pedagogic and rehearsal rationales address the different needs of students and these two rationales were evaluated in order to investigate the extent to which the writing tasks promote each rationale. The findings of the investigation are as follows.

Table-4. Pedagogic tasks based on Rehearsal and Pedagogic Rationale

Unit	Tasks on rehearsal Rationale	Exercises on pedagogic Rationale
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write A Report on the African Union 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language Exercises
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write A Letter to a Friend • Write an article arguing that Ethiopia needs more educated women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill in word formation table • Complete this outline plan with notes
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing an Essay in response to this statement • Write A Government Health Leaflet 	
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reply to Mr. Bona's letter • Write a report o HIV/AIDS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write your answers about the above letter • Identify the layout of a letter • Identify the structure of Mr. Bona's letter
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a paragraph or two to include it in a tourist brochure • Write a letter to the tourist agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the following mind map • What is good writing?
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a story of 250 to 300 words • Write a letter of reply 	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a summary using the information in your notes • Write an information leaflet on one of the topics given above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make notes on the text on why weather forecasts are important in this way
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write 2 or 3 paragraphs about the best water conservation method or methods 	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write A Survey Report 	
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write An Essay on an aspect of development 	
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a one paragraph report on the data about NGO • Write a brochure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete this description of graph with the relevant names of regions • Complete these sentences with comparative forms
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write An Opinion Essay 	
Tot.	19	11
%	63.3	36.7

As it can be observed on Table-4, majority (63.3%) of the tasks were designed based on real world situations. That is, they involve students in rehearsing the type of behavior needed outside of the classroom. In other words, these activities let students write the type of writings they are expected to do outside the classroom. On the other hand, 36.7% of the tasks were based on pedagogical rationale. These activities are meant to teach students some form of language or some skill, which is not necessarily applied outside of the classroom.

While analyzing the above data, the researcher has found out that the tasks are designed based on current theories of communicative tasks. According to Nunan (1989) and Ellis (2003), the kind of tasks the students are expected to undertake in the communicative classrooms need to base on rehearsal rationales. That is more focus should be given to rehearsal activities since students are required to rehearse, in class, the type of communication they will carry out outside the class.

Basic functional writing skill and formal (academic) writing skill are the other reasons that are given due emphasis in grade 11 textbook. In this evaluative research as well, the extent to which focus is given for each of these skills were investigated. The result of the investigation is as follows.

Table 5. Pedagogic tasks based on formal and functional writing skills

Pedagogic Tasks		
Task on formal(academic)writing skill		Tasks on basic functional writing skill
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write An Opinion Essay 2. Write a one paragraph report 3. Write An Essay on an aspect of development 4. Write A Survey Report 5. Write 2 or 3 paragraphs about the best water conservation method or methods 6. Write a summary 7. Write a report o HIV/AIDS 8. Writing an Essay in response to this statement 9. Write an article arguing that Ethiopia needs more educated women 10. Write A Report on the African Union 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Write a brochure 2. Write a letter of reply 3. Write an information leaflet 4. Write a story of 250 to 300 words 5. Write a letter of reply 6. Write a letter to the tourist agency 7. Reply to Mr. Bona’s letter 8. Write A Government Health Leaflet 9. Write A Letter to a Friend
Total	10	9
%	52.6	47.4

According to Table-5, 52.6% of the tasks are designed to improve students’ formal (academic) writing skill. As a major emphasis is given to this skill in the syllabus for grade eleven, academic writing skill is emphasized in the textbook too. Besides, 47.4% of the tasks were found to focus on basic functional writing skills. It was observed that relatively equal emphasis is given for tasks which focus on both types of skills.

According to the above table, major focus is also given for tasks which focus on formal (academic) writing skills. This can be taken as the strength of the textbook since it fulfills one of the major goals of the curriculum. As it was stated in section 2.2, more focus is given for writing as these are the skills that students most need to develop if they want to study effectively at university or enter the world of work (MOE, 2010). Besides, there are relatively equal number of tasks which focus on basic functional writing skills. This can also be taken as strength since it facilitates the rehearsal aspect of language learning tasks.

However, very little focus is given to the teaching of language. That is, only a few tasks, which teach forms, structures, and lay out of a particular writing are included in the textbook. As one can easily observe from the syllabus for grade 11, at the beginning of

every writing section, the teacher is required to teach some language forms, however, exercise and activities to stabilize what students learn are not presented

4.1.3.3. Input

According to Nunan, (1989), inputs of tasks can be analyzed in terms of the forms they take and their type. In this evaluative study too, the language input of the writing tasks as the other important component of a communicative task were analyzed and evaluated. In doing so, the amount of the different forms and types the inputs take and its implication on the objectives of the tasks were investigated. The result of the investigation is presented in the table below.

Table -6.Result of the forms and types of inputs

Units	No. of Tasks	Description of Inputs	Forms of the inputs			Types of the Inputs		
			Verbal	Non-verbal	Total	Authentic	Inauthentic	Total
1	1	A listening a reading text about AU	2	1	3	1	1	2
2	2	A Magazine article	4	2	6	1	3	4
3	2	A reading text & a real picture of a city Newspaper article	7	1	8	1	3	4
4	2	A sample letter Article about HIV/AIDS	3	0	3	0	3	3
5	2	A listening & a reading text Sample brochure	4	0	4	2	2	4
6	2	A listening story read by the teacher A sample letter from uncle.	2	2	4	2	0	2
7	2	Weekly weather report A reading and a listening texts	5	2	7	2	3	5
8	1	A reading text and real pictures	4	2	6	2	2	4
9	1	A text about survey report writing	3	1	4	1	2	3
10	1	A factual article about poorest countries	3	1	4	1	2	3
11	2	A data about NGO projects in Ethiopia A listening text	4	4	8	3	1	4
12	1	A Newspaper article	2	2	4	1	1	2
Total	19		43	18	61	17	23	40
%	100		70.5	29.5	100	42.5	57.5	100

As it can be seen in Table-6 above, both types and forms of inputs were found in the textbook. However, the greater amount (57.5%) of the inputs were found to be inauthentic or contrived and the rest 42.5% were authentic. As to the different forms of inputs incorporated, majority of the tasks were found containing greater number of verbal inputs. That is, about 70.5% of the inputs were presented in listening and reading text forms. Whereas the rest 29.5% of the forms were presented as tables charts, photographs etc.

As it was discussed in the literature review section, in current trends of communicative language teaching and learning, language learning activities are required to incorporate real-world or authentic inputs as a major source of meaning. Besides, Language learning classes have to be an imitation of real-world activities (Krashen, 1989). Moreover, to bring theory in to practice, language tasks have to resemble real-world activities and have to use authentic inputs like, magazine articles, menus, newspaper articles, advertisements etc (Mishan, 2005).

According to the above findings, it can be said that most of the tasks rely on inauthentic inputs of different forms. In addition, this can be taken as one of the weaknesses of the tasks' designing. Because having more inauthentic inputs in tasks where a communicative oriented class is expected is not advisable (Nunan, 2004). As the proponents of authentic materials point out, classroom texts do not adequately prepare learners for coping with the language, they hear or need in the real world (outside the classroom), unless students are provided opportunities for engaging these real-world texts in class (Mishan, 2005).

As to forms of the inputs, a greater number of inputs forms were found to be in verbal form. About 70.5 % of the inputs were presented in listening and reading forms. Reading texts like, magazine articles, sample brochure, sample letter, survey reports etc.

listening texts like, a listening text about AU, story, weather forecast etc. Of the other form of inputs, 29.5% of them were found to appear in non-verbal forms. These include pictures, photographs, charts, etc. This finding also shows the positive side of the inputs of the writing tasks. As it is discussed in the review of literature section, having the different forms of input for doing tasks is very helpful since different forms address the different learning styles of students. However having more non-verbal materials like visual aids than verbal ones is advisable. As to the reason, Cunningsworth and Tomlinson cited in (Abebaw, 2012) claim that visual aids can catch the attention of learners and encourage them to do the tasks effectively.

The last issue that is related to the types and forms of inputs are their applicability to the goal/objective of the task. As it was discussed in chapter 2, the goals of doing the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook is to develop learners' academic writing skill or to prepare them for further study and to attain a communicative oriented classroom where students rehearse real-world tasks (Meseret 2012). However, According to the above result, majority of the writing tasks rely on inauthentic text. This situation does not help students achieve one of the major goals. That is majority of the tasks do not help students rehearse tasks that are found in the real world.

As to the forms, in communicative oriented classrooms students are required to participate and cooperate actively (Richard & Rodgers, 2001). Most of the accomplishment of the writing task should be done by the students. For this purpose, students need to be motivated both by the teacher and by the task. And non-visual inputs play a great role in motivating and increasing interest in the students while doing the writing tasks, Brosnan, Brown and Hood cited in (Abebaw, 2012). As to this point, the design of the writing tasks in the textbook fails to fulfill the goal of communicative tasks that is motivating students to do the task.

Whereas for the other goal, which is academic writing skills, it was found out that various language inputs were provided. According to the syllabus for grade 11, the teacher is required to teach different language forms that are important before doing every writing task. Besides, 70.5% of the verbal inputs both reading and listening were provided as inputs for the total number of 19 tasks in order to help students model the academic writing they were required to write.

4.1.3.4. Activities

Activities as the other major component of a communicative task were evaluated in this study. The writing tasks in grade 11 textbook, which were the concerns of this study, were found to have different types of activities. This ranges from activities that focus on form to activities that focus on rehearsal of real-world situations. The following table show all the writing activities found in all the 19 tasks.

Table 7. The Activities in the Writing Sections of Grade 11 English Textbook

Unit	Tasks
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write A Report about the African Union
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write A Letter to a Friend • Complete this outline plan with notes about the article • Write an article arguing that Ethiopia needs more educated women
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write an essay in response to this statement • Write Government Health Leaflet
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify the layout of a letter • Identify the structure of Mr. Bona's letter • Write your answers about the above letter • Reply to Mr. Bona's Letter • Write a Report on HIV/AIDS
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a or two to include it in a Tourist Brochure • Write a letter to the tourist agency • complete the following mind map • What is good writing? • Write some comments in this table
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a story of 250 to 300 words • Write a letter of reply
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make notes on the text on why weather forecasts are important in this way • Write a summary using the information in your notes • Write An Information Leaflet on one of the topics given above

8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write 2 to 3 paragraphs about the best water conservation method or methods
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a survey Report
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write an essay on an aspect of development
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write a one paragraph Report on the data about NGO • Make four sentences about the information in the pie chart. • Write a brochure • Complete this description of graph • Prepare a list of questions to be asked in the interview for the job • Complete this description of graph with the relevant names of regions
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write An Opinion Essay

According to Table-7, there are 31 activities that help students accomplish the entire writing tasks. For instance, in unit 4, first students are required to identify the layout of a sample letter then learn the parts of a letter of another letter, and then they write a reply letter to Mr. Bona.

Besides, the above analysis, evaluation of the nature of activities was also conducted in order to examine whether they are selected and designed in line with current theories of communicative tasks. The evaluation was conducted in order to respond to the following questions.

1. Are the activities appropriate to the communicative goals of the task?
2. Are the activities appropriate to the input data?
3. Are the activities designed in a way to allow students to communicate and cooperate in pairs and groups?

The following table shows the results of the evaluation.

Table 8. The Main Writing Activities in Grade 11 Textbook

units	The Main Writing Activities								
	Suitability for pair/group			Purposefulness			Activity Authenticity		
	No. of Tasks			No. of Tasks			No. of Tasks		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
2	1	2	3	3	0	3	2	1	3
3	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	0	2
4	1	4	5	5	0	5	2	3	5
5	0	5	5	5	0	5	2	3	5
6	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
7	0	3	3	3	0	3	3	0	3
8	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
9	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
10	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
11	1	5	6	6	0	6	2	4	6
12	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
Total	5	26	31	29	2	31	19	12	31
%	16.1	83.9	100	93.5	6.5	100	61.3	38.7	100

According to Table-8, almost all of the tasks were found to be appropriate to the objectives set both in the syllabus and in the textbook. The result shows, 93.5% of the activities were found to be goal oriented. They were found to be appropriate vehicles for students to achieve the objectives. However, the rest two activities were found weak in addressing the assumed objectives of the task

The other major issue evaluated was the applicability of the writing activities to the inputs of the tasks. Activities according to Nunan (1989), activities specify what learners will actually do with the input. He also adds that inputs are the starting point to the learning task. Therefore, the type of activity selected or designed need to get along with the input so that it can utilize the input.

Activity authenticity was the other issues that were to address in this study. Therefore, the activities were identified and evaluated as authentic and inauthentic. According the

result in Table-8, 61.3% of the writing activities in the textbook were found to be authentic activities. These tasks fulfill the two major criteria set by Mishan, (2005). That is, these tasks involve purposeful communication between learners and approximate real-life tasks.

The last issue evaluated in order to respond to the last question of the checklist was the issue of the suitability of the tasks for pair/group work. Then, the result of the above table shows that only a few (16.1%) of the tasks were found to be suitable either for pair or for group work whereas the rest (83.9%) of the tasks/activities, were designed to be done individually.

By examining the above results of the evaluation, it can be inferred that the writing activities in the textbook are well designed and selected. That is almost all of the activities are goal oriented. Activity authenticity was also the other positive side of the design of the writing tasks. According to Clark and Silberstein cited in (Nunan, 1989) and Mishan, (2005), activities which are conducted in the classroom should resemble what students do outside of the classroom –in the real-world. As to the suitability of the tasks for pair / group work, majority of the tasks or 83.9% of the tasks were found to be inappropriate for pair /group works. Group /pair work on the other hand, considered to be important communicative activities (Richards, and Rodgers, 2001). However, they were not given emphasis while designing the writing tasks. In fact, students may conduct the actual writing individually particularly in the task stage, however, during the primary stages of writing i.e. prewriting stages, students need to work in pairs/groups so as to brainstorm, share ideas and share the writing task and in the after writing stage in order to give feedback for each other's work (Willis, 1996).

4.1.3.5. Roles

As it has been mentioned in the review of literature section, role refers to the part that learners and teachers are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as social and interpersonal relationships between the participants (Richards, and Rodgers, 2001). Unlike the traditional pedagogy, communicative tasks are expected to give more control to the learner while the teacher is assigned to be catalyst, consultant or guide, leaving the entire task to learners. The following section presents and discusses the findings of the roles of the students' and teachers, which are inherent in the writing tasks.

i. Roles the of Students

According to current trends of communicative language teaching, students are required to play an active role in the language learning and teaching process. Richard and Rodgers (2001), identify various roles of students and teachers in the communicative classroom. In this evaluative study, these roles of students' were investigated in order to reveal how they are effectively allocated for them both in the textbook and in the syllabus. The following table shows the results of the investigation.

Table 9. Roles of Students in the writing tasks of grade 11 textbook

Students' Roles in the Writing Tasks																
Units			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	%
Group Participant	No. of Tasks	Yes	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	26.3
		No	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	73.7
		Tot.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100
Active	No. of Tasks	Yes	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100
		No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Tot.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100

The primary roles of students that are implied by the task as it is identified by Richards & Rodgers (2001) are to be group participants, risk takers, and monitor of their learning progress. These roles of students were investigated in all the writing tasks. The result in Table-9 above shows that the students cannot participate in pair/group in the majority

(73.7%) of the tasks. In these writing tasks, the implied roles for students are restricted. Students are required to do these tasks individually. In the rest (26.3%) of the tasks however, students are allowed to participate both in pair and in group works. They contribute and receive to and from the group while conducting a certain writing task.

The other issue investigated was whether the tasks, regardless of their design for pair, group or individual work, are designed to allow learners play an active role in conducting them. The result in the above table shows that all the writing tasks in the textbook are designed and make the students to be active and risk taker and monitor of their own progress.

By analyzing the above findings, it can be concluded that the majority of the writing tasks were designed to promote individual work. This may not be a weakness of the design since writing is a solitary activity that is done individually (Ellis, 1992). However according to Littlewood, (1981), group and pair work is compulsory especially during the pre-writing stage when students brainstorm and after-writing stage when students need peer- feedbacks.

As to the active role of the students in conducting the writing tasks, all the writing tasks are designed to effectively allow students participate in choosing a topic to write on, and choosing a partner to work with. And undergoing all the different writing stages on their own and finally assess their own work and progress.

ii. Roles of Teacher

Roles of teachers as another component of a communicative task were also evaluated. The evaluation was conducted in order to respond to the questions stated in the checklist for evaluating communicative tasks. These questions were:

- What teacher roles are inherent in the task?
- Are they appropriate?

In order to respond to these questions, the roles of teachers in current communicative language teaching and learning were identified and all the writing tasks were evaluated against them. In the evaluation, it was tried to investigate whether teacher can play his/her role as facilitator, observer, and or participant. The following table shows the result of the evaluation.

Table 10. Roles of the Teachers'

Roles of Teacher in the writing tasks																
Units		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	%	
Facilitator	No. of Tasks	Yes	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	31.6
		No	0	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	13	68.4
		Tot.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100
Observer	No. of Tasks	Yes	1	0	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	15	78.9
		No	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	21
		Tot.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	19	100
Participant	No. of Tasks	Yes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		No	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100
		Tot.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	19	100

According to Table 10, it can be easily seen that the roles of teacher are minimized to none. Besides, most of the roles are not at all stated in the syllabus. However some are implied by the tasks themselves.

According to the above table, most of the tasks that account (78.9%) are designed to make the teacher an observer of the process of conducting a certain writing task. Besides, the roles of teacher implied by the writing tasks and explicitly stated in the syllabus make the teacher play an observer role. However, 31.6% of the tasks make the teacher to be facilitator of the process. Here teachers allot time for a certain writing task, provide topics for students to choose and write an essay, ask questions in pre-writing stages to help students brainstorm etc. Besides, none of the tasks allows the teacher to become participant of the process.

Analyzing the above findings, it can be said that the roles of teacher inferred from the writing tasks and stated in the syllabus are appropriate to current communicative

oriented classroom. None of tasks allow the teacher to control or dominate the class time. According to Littlewood (1981), this situation does not allow the teacher to become sole provider of the knowledge or be an active participant.

According the result in Table 9 and 12, most of the writing activities are designed to be done individually; therefore, major role is expected to be played predominantly by the students. Therefore, all the tasks are designed to allow the teacher to play the role of facilitator and supervisor.

4.1.3.6. Setting

As it has already mentioned in the literature review section, setting denotes the classroom arrangement specified or implied in the task. The following table shows the setting of the writing tasks in each unit.

Table 11. Classroom Setting for the Writing Tasks

Units	Number of Tasks Appropriate for:-				Total
	Individual work	Pair work	Group work	Whole class work	
1	0	1	0	0	1
2	2	1	0	0	3
3	1	1	0	0	2
4	1	1	0	0	2
5	2	0	0	0	2
6	2	0	0	0	2
7	2	0	0	0	2
8	1	0	0	0	1
9	1	0	0	0	1
10	1	0	0	0	1
11	1	1	0	0	2
12	1	0	0	0	1
Total	15	5	0	0	20
%	75	25	0	0	100

As it can be seen in table 11 above, 75% of the activities were found to require individual work. These activities explicitly instruct student to undergo the different stages of writing and complete the witting task individually.

However, some (25%) of the activities are designed to be done in pairs. They allow learners to form pairs, discuss, brainstorm, plan, divide the writing activity and give feedback.

Analyzing the above findings, it can be concluded that all the writing tasks are suitable for the classroom setting. They are designed in such a way to allow students to do them individually /in pairs in the classroom. However, having majority of the tasks to be done only individually is not appropriate for communicative oriented classroom. Even if theories indicate writing is a solitary activity, a task needs to be designed to incorporate pair and /or group activities particularly in the pre and after stages of writing (Willis, 1996).

4.1.4. Implementation of the Writing Tasks

As it was explained in the previous chapters, the major purpose of the study was to evaluate the design and implementation of the writing tasks found in grade 11 textbook. So far the study dealt with the design of the writing tasks. Now this section is devoted to the evaluation of the implementation of the writing tasks in actual classroom.

For this purpose, as it was indicated in chapter three, section-3.5, three major instruments were employed. These were observation, questionnaire and interview. These tools were used in order to collect data on two major points of task implementation.

These were:

- Investigating whether the tasks capture students' interest and motivate them
- Whether the tasks stimulate genuine interaction between and among the students

The results of from the three tools presented and discussed as follow.

4.1.4.1. Results of the Observation

As it was mentioned in the research methodology section-3.5.3., observations of six sections of grade 11 were conducted prior to the distribution of the questionnaire. The results of the observation are as follows:

Table 12. Observation Guideline- Checklist

Phases	Guideline	Yes	No	Tot	Comme
Pre-task	Is the topic for the writing task familiar to the students?	6	0	6	
	Are the students made to brainstorm on the topic of the day and before doing the writing task?	1	5	6	
	Does the teacher give preliminary introduction about the topic?	6	0	6	
	Are the students made to plan for the task they are going to do?	6	0	6	
	Does the activity prompt genuine interaction among the majority of the students?	2	4	6	
	Do the majority of the students look interested while doing the tasks?	2	4	6	
While-Task	Are these students advised to assist each other?	2	4	6	
	Does the teacher go round the class to assist students in their writing?	2	4	6	
	Are the majority of the students engaged in the writing?	5	1	6	
Post-Task	Are the students made to comment on each other's work?	0	6	6	
	Does the teacher give general comments to the students as a whole?	2	4	6	
	Are the students made to rewrite using the corrections and comments they get?	0	6	6	

According to the above Table-12, six sections of grade 11 among the total of 27 sections were randomly selected and observed. The observations were conducted using a guideline. As it is shown in the above table, the three phases of teaching writing were observed and recorded using the guideline as a checklist. The results of the observation in each phase were summarized in themes as follows.

a. Pre-Task Phase

As it was discussed in the review of literature section, this is the phase where teachers play their major roles in introducing the topic and help the students plan for the task they are going to do. In the observed six sections too, all the six different teachers did introduce the topic, explain and help the students to plan for the writing task. However, only five out of the six teachers made the students to brainstorm on the topics before planning and doing the task while one teacher directly defined, explained and made students plan for the task.

Coming to the major objective of the observation, in two of the sections the tasks made majority of the students interact in English. Besides, in these sections majority of the students were made to genuinely interact and they also looked interested in the whole activity. Whereas in the majority of the sections that were in the rest four of the sections, only a few students were observed interacting in English and interested while the majority of the students were observed chattering in Amharic and others were not involved at all.

By examining the above analysis, it can be understood that teachers play roles which are irrelevant for communicative classroom. They were actually expected to introduce the topic and explain, however, they were also expected to make students involve actively in the process. Students were required to brainstorm and discuss between and among each other. They were required to be made the major actors of the writing process. Therefore, in this pre-writing phase, students were observed in majority of the sections less interested in doing the tasks and less motivated in interacting with each other about the topics.

While-writing Phase

After the students were made to plan the writing, that is after they were made to select a partner to work with and share the writing task between them, they started the actual writing task. In this phase, in two of the sections, teachers were observed while advising students to assist each other and were monitoring their progress while in four of the sections the teachers were observed to keep reminding the students not to disturb rather than assisting them. However, in five of the sections, majority of the students were observed engaged in the tasks.

In this phase too, majority of the teachers were not playing their roles effectively. As it was discussed in chapter two by Willis (1996), in this phase, teachers are required to encouraging all students to take part, making sure that all pairs or groups are doing the right task and are clear about the objectives, assist students in their difficulties and advise them to assist each other and go round the class and monitor the process. However, these teachers were disturbing the process by trying to keep the discipline of the classroom.

b. Post-Task Phase

In the previous phase students were engaged in the actual writing, however, finalizing their writing task was what they do at home. Therefore, post-task phase is the last phase in the process of doing the writing task and it took place in the following period.

In this last phase as it was discussed in chapter two, teachers are required to give feedback for the task the students did at home or made the students comment on each other's work. Students on the other hand are required to incorporate the feedbacks and rewrite their final draft. However, what was observed in four of the classes was different. The teachers in six of the classes began the period by going round the class

and checking whether the home works were done and checked two or three exercise books and gave general comments for the whole class. None of the teachers made the students to comment on each other's work nor made them to rewrite using the corrections and comments they gave.

By examining the above result, it can be said that like in previous phases, teachers in this phase too were not observed playing their role effectively. Besides, students also fail to play their active role in involving in peer feedback and in incorporating corrections and writing their final draft. Therefore, it can be said that in the observed six sections, the writing sessions ended before the process of writing was completed.

4.1.4.2. Results of the Students' Questionnaires

The other instrument employed in this evaluative research was questionnaire. The purpose of employing this tool was to gather information, which was important for the goal of this study. Therefore, through this tool information were gathered on the following two points:

- Students attitude towards the practice of the writing activity
- Students attitude towards the writing tasks in general

In order to investigate students' attitude towards these issues, a questionnaire was prepared and administered for 150 students. The items in the questionnaire were 10 in number and they were grouped under two categories namely: the practice of writing activities and students' attitude towards the writing tasks. The results of the findings and the analysis are as follow.

Table 13. Attitude concerning writing tasks on improving the learning of writing

SA - (Strongly Agree) = 5 A - (Agree) =4 U - (Undecided) =3 D - (Disagree) = 2 SD - (Disagree) = 1

No.	Statements	percent	SA	A	UN	D	SD	TOT.
	Practice during the Writing Activities		5	4	3	2	1	
1	Most of the writing tasks in the textbook are familiar to me.	%	12 8	78 52	13 8.7	39 26	8 5.3	150 100
2	The writing tasks help me use my background knowledge while i do them.	%	15 10	85 56.7	8 5.3	38 25.3	5 3.3	150 100
3	The writing tasks help me how to do my writing.	%	23 15.3	51 34	12 8	48 32	16 10.7	150 100
4	The writing tasks in the textbook encourage me to work alone	%	22 14.7	28 18.7	18 12	64 42.7	18 12	150 100
5	The writing tasks in the textbook make me to work in pair	%	37 24.7	43 28.7	21 14	40 26.7	9 6	150 100
	Attitude towards the Writing Tasks							
6	The writing tasks make me communicative with other students in writing classes.	%	18 12	47 31.3	9 6	46 30.7	30 20	150 100
7	I like doing the writing tasks.	%	13 8.7	42 28	5 3.3	62 41.3	28 18.7	150 100
8	The writing tasks in the textbook are difficult; therefore, the teacher should provide me other opportunities to improve my writing.	%	28 18.7	72 48	15 10	31 20.7	4 2.7	150 100%
9	Most of the writing tasks in the textbook are interesting to me; therefore, I pay attention on my writing.	%	18 12	39 26	21 14	59 39.3	24 16	150 100%
10	The writing tasks in the text book help me think more about my writing because they are related to things I do outside the classroom.	%	27 18	62 41.3	11 7.3	40 26.7	10 6.7	150 100%

Category 1. Attitudes Concerning the Practice of Writing Activities

The purpose of investigating students' attitude towards the practice of the writing activities was to reveal their views towards the three phases of doing writing tasks in helping them improve their own writing abilities and to cross check the classroom observations, which were conducted earlier.

The responses in table 13 above show that more than half (60%) of the students confirmed that most of the writing tasks are familiar to them and they make them use their background knowledge while 31.3% of them disagreed to these issues. With regard to the planning of the writing task in the pre-writing phase, almost half of the students agreed that the task help them plan before they start the actual writing while the other 42.7% of the students disagreed.

As to the settings of the tasks, 53.4% of the students agreed that the tasks encourage them to work in pairs while less number (33.4%) of them agreed that tasks are appropriate for individual work instead. Besides, about 13% of the students could not tell the setting clearly from the tasks.

Category 2. Attitude Concerning Writing Tasks on increasing Interest and creating Communication

In category two, the questionnaire items were designed to investigate students' attitude concerning the writing tasks in interesting and making them interact with each other. The results are shown in table-14 above.

As shown in table 14 above, majority (70.7%) of the students disagreed to the design of the tasks in making students communicate with each other. Besides, 60% of the students also disagreed to the statement that states students like doing the writing tasks (item 7). Moreover, a few more than half (55.3%) of the students again disagreed to the statement which stated the writing tasks

are interesting and I pay attention on my writing (item-9). However, majority of the students (59.3%) agreed that the tasks are related to things they do outside the classroom and 66.7% agreed that the tasks are not difficult for them.

However, as it was discussed in the review of literature section, language tasks should be designed in order to allow students interact genuinely. Besides, majority of the students agreed that most of the tasks are based on real world tasks however, a lot more students who were observed disinterested in doing the tasks.

4.1.4.3. Results of the Teachers' Interview

The last instrument employed in this study was interview. This tool was chosen in order to collect additional information which could not be gathered by the other three tools which were discussed so far. This tool was primarily used to gather data from the three teachers who were observed while teaching and conducting writing tasks in three different sections.

As it was in the students' questionnaire, the items in this semi-structured interview were also categorized in to two categories. However, follow up questions were also incorporated. The two categories were: questions related to some of the components of the writing tasks like (objectives and setting) and the other category contains questions related to the practice of writing activities which were observed in the classroom. The results of the three interviews and their analysis will be presented in themes as follow.

Category 1. Components of the writing tasks

a. Objectives of the Writing Tasks

As it was learnt from the three interviews, the objectives of the writing tasks were found to be clear only for teacher- one. While, teacher- two said that most of the objectives were not specific

and hard to understand and teacher-three said that they sometimes modify them in their weekly lesson plans or discuss with other colleagues to make them understandable.

The above responses of teacher about the objectives of the writing tasks were found to get along with the results obtained from the task evaluation (see table 4). That is, 36.8% of the objectives of the writing tasks were found to lack one of the components of a good objective called measure. That is, these objectives do not show the way the performance will be observed or measured or they do not indicate how the writing tasks will be evaluated. Moreover, 63.2% of the objectives also lack the other component called criterion. That is, the objectives do not clearly indicate how the students need to pass through the different types of writing stages in order to accomplish the required performance. Therefore, lack of these two major components of a good objective has impaired the comprehensibility of the objectives. In line with this, Graves (2000) states that indicating all the four components of an objective while formulating one is crucial.

b. Setting of the Tasks

Three of the teachers interviewed agreed that the tasks are applicable for the classroom. They said most of the tasks require the students to work in pairs and that is suitable for the type of classroom they have. However, there were points that they raised towards the effectiveness of doing writing tasks in pairs. They said that it was time consuming and created disturbance. Therefore, they do not usually allow students especially to discuss in pairs or pass through the different phases of writing.

According to the results of the evaluation too, the setting of the writing tasks were found to be suitable for classroom. However, contrary to the teachers' response 75% of the tasks were designed to be done individually. (See table-12)

c. Activities in the Writing Tasks

In relation to the activities, three of the teachers confirmed that only some of the students in each class were observed to be interested in doing /while doing/ the tasks. As to the reason, three of the teachers further confirmed that it is because there are not any writing exams included in both their final exams at the end of each semester and in GSLCE exam and that is why majority of the class is less interested. Besides, even if they were less interested in conducting the writing tasks, two of the teachers said that some students do communicate in English while doing the tasks.

Besides, the results from the observation and the students' questionnaire also confirmed that 73.7% of the tasks are familiar to the students. (See table- 9 , 13 & 14) familiarity of the task contribute to the students' interest, however, 60% of the students responded in the questionnaire that they do not enjoy doing the writing tasks while 55.3% of them said the tasks are not interesting. According to the result of the observation too, in 4 out of the 6 sections observed, students looked less interested and did not genuinely interact in English. Therefore, to this end the data collected through these three instruments are similar.

Category 2. Results Concerning the Practice of Writing Tasks

In this section too, results of the interview of the three teachers will be presented. The questions focus on the practice of writing and the responses are presented in themes as follow.

a. Phases to Conduct the Writing Tasks

Three of the teachers said that they conduct the writing tasks using the three phases. But they said that they do not usually make students brainstorm in the pre-writing phases. As to the reason, they said that it is time consuming, and allow students to disturb the class. Therefore, they make the discussion themselves with the students. However, they agreed on the importance

of pre-writing phase but forwarded different reasons for its inapplicability. During the observation too, 5 out of the 6 teachers did not make students to brainstorm.

As to the post writing phase or giving feedbacks, two of the teachers responded that they do not allow students to give feedbacks for each other. They said it is time consuming. Therefore, they give general comments for the whole class. However, they do not make them take corrections and rewrite their final drafts. According to the observation too, 2 out of the 4 sections observed gave general comment to the whole class while none of the teachers in the six sections made students comment on each other's work or rewrite using the corrections.

b. The Writing Tasks in the Textbook

In response to the general reaction these teachers have towards the writing tasks in grade 11 textbook, three of the teachers responded that the tasks are appropriate to develop the writing skills of students. They also emphasized the positive aspects of the tasks like the inclusion of the three phases the stage of writing indicated in the textbook. As to the drawbacks, they said that a task could not be completed in one period.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1. Conclusions

The main objective of this study was to examine the design and implementation of the writing tasks in the grade 11 English textbook based on current theories of communicative tasks. The instruments that were used to collect data for this research were document analysis, questionnaire, observation and interview. In order to evaluate the findings about the components of the writing tasks, the researcher used an evaluating checklist for communicative tasks. The researcher used the checklist in order to evaluate the components of the writing tasks and the implementation of the tasks in the classroom.

As the findings of the study revealed, the writing tasks presented in grade 11 English for Ethiopia textbook are designed fulfilling some of the relevant criteria of the checklist. Based on the findings identified, the following conclusions are made.

- All the objective of the writing tasks were written in terms of the students and indicated what the learners /students will be able to do. Besides, 84.2% of the objectives of the writing tasks were found to specify the conditions/ circumstances in which the learners are able to undertake the writing tasks. Besides, 63.2% of the objectives were found to show the way the performance will be observed or measured. However, 73.2% of the objectives do not indicate how well the students are expected to perform the writing tasks or do not show the type of writing stages students need to pass through in order to accomplish the required performance.
- The inputs of the writing tasks have both verbal and non-verbal forms however, 70.5% of the tasks were found to rely on verbal forms (reading and listening texts). Besides, the tasks

incorporated both authentic and inauthentic types of input. However, 57.5% of the tasks were found to rely on inauthentic input types. Besides, most of the inputs are not appropriate to the goals of the tasks since they do not incorporate more non-verbal and authentic inputs.

- Most of the writing activities are appropriate to the communicative goals of the tasks. All the activities presented in the writing tasks are designed in accordance with the input data. The activities also designed to allow students use the different stages of writing. Moreover, 73.7% of the activities are familiar to the students and 94.7% of them are authentic (similar with what students do outside the classroom. However, 73.7% of them are not designed to allow learners to work in pairs or groups and interact.
- The roles of the learners and teachers in the writing tasks are appropriate. All the tasks are designed to allow students to do much of the writing activity however; only 26.3% of them allow group participation. The roles of the teacher on the other hand, also found to be appropriate for communicative classroom. The result of the investigation shows that 78.9% of the tasks allow the teacher to be an observer while students conduct the writing task while all (100%) do not allow the teacher to take part in conducting the task with the students. And 31.6 % of the tasks allow the teacher to facilitate.
- About 75% of the writing tasks are not appropriate for pair works therefore, they do not allow students to actively participate particularly in the pre and post writing phases of the writing process. Even if writing is a solitary activity as many authors mentioned it needs to incorporate pair and group works specially in the first- pre-writing and last- post- writing phases. However, all the tasks are appropriate to be undertaken in the classroom setting but inappropriate for pair and group works.

➤ The three phases of writing are very important for accomplishing the writing tasks effectively. Most of the writing tasks in the textbook are designed incorporating these phases. However, according to the results of the classroom observations, most teachers do not allow students to pass through these phases. Although most of the students were observed engaged in the while-writing phases, they were not interested in doing the writing tasks. This is because; they do not have any kind of writing exam. Therefore, most of them do not consider writing as an important skill.

5.2. Recommendations

To alleviate some of the problems seen in the writing tasks of grade 11 English textbook for Ethiopia, it is good to give some possible solutions. Thus, based on the findings and the conclusions, the following recommendations are forwarded.

- Textbook writers' should consider the five components of language tasks (goal, input, activity, roles and setting) when they design communicative tasks or develop textbooks.
- The goals of each writing task should be clearly stated both in the textbook and in the syllabus considering the criteria or including the components of a good objective (performance, conditions, measure, and criteria).
- While designing the writing tasks, more non-verbal and authentic inputs should be incorporated, because these input forms and types increase students' motivation and they also help the students solve communication problems they face in the natural environment.
- The writing activities should be designed in order to allow learners cooperate, and communicate particularly in both the pre and post writing phases.

- The roles of the students and teachers in the writing tasks should be clearly stated both in the textbook and in the syllabus. Particularly, when deriving the roles from the task is difficult or when roles are not implied in the tasks clearly.
- Teachers should follow the three phases of writing while implementing the tasks in the classroom. Since the writing task in the textbook are designed and presented to be done in phases and stages, teachers should also students to stick to the procedures.
- Assessing students' writings should be included in school examinations.

REFERENCES

- Abdulatif Hajji-Ismael. (2011). An Analysis of the Speaking Tasks: The case of Grade 12 English Textbook. (Unpublished MA Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Abebaw Dessalew. (2012).An Evaluation of the Listening Tasks Presented in Grade 12 English for Ethiopia Textbook. (Unpublished MA Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Alamirew G. /Mariam.(2005). A Study on the Perception of Writing, Writing Instruction and Students' writing Performance (Unpublished PhD Dissertation.).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Atkins, J, Hailom Banteyirga & Nuru Mohammed.(1996). **Skills Development Methodology, Part II**. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Brumfit, C. (1984). **Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bygate, M &Samunda, V. (2008).**Tasks in Second Language Learning**. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Byrne, D. (1991). **Teaching Writing Skills**.UK: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Candlin, C., & Murphy, D. (Eds.) (1987).**Language Learning Tasks**. Edinburgh: Prentice Hall International.
- Candlin, C. (1987).**Towards task-based Learning**. In Candlin and Murphy.
- Clark, J. (1987). **Curriculum Renewal in School Foreign Language Learning**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Desalegn Simachew. (2011). A Study of the Practice of Teaching Writing Skills: the Case of Bahir Dar University. (Unpublished MA Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Ellis, R. (1992). **Second Language Acquisition & Language Pedagogy Multilingual Matters**.UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

- Ellis, R. (1997). 'The Empirical Evaluation of Language Teaching Materials', **ELT Journal**. Vol. 51 no 1(pp.36- 42). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2003). **Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Gebaiw Shimels. (2011). An Evaluation of the Design and Implementation of Reading Exercises of Grade Nine English textbook.(Unpublished MA Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Geremew Lemu. (1999). A Study of the Requirements in Writing for an Academic Purpose at Addis Ababa University.(Unpublished PhD Dissertation).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Graves, K. (2000). **Designing Language Courses: A Guide for Teachers**. Canada: Heinle and Heinle Punishers.
- Hailemariam Welegebrial. (2012).Problems Students Face in Writing: Grade Ten Students of Higher 12 Secondary School in Focus. (Unpublished MA Thesis).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Hyland, K. (2006). **English for Academic Purposes**. New York: Taylor& Francis e-Library.
- Italo Beriso (1999). A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher versus Peer Feedback on Addis Ababa University Students' Writing Revisions.(Unpublished PhD Dissertation).Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Kothari, R. C. (2004). **Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques**. (2nd Ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
- Krashen, D. (1989).**Language Acquisition and Language Education: Extensions and Applications**. Great Britain: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Kumar, S.Y. (2006). **Fundamental of Research Methodology & Statistics**. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.

- Littlewood, W. (1981). **Communicative language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meseret Teshome (2012). Instructors' and Students' Perception and Practice of the Task-Based Writing in an EFL Context. (Unpublished PhD Dissertation). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- MOE.(2003 E.C.). **English for Grade 11 Students Textbook**. Edinburgh: Pearson Education Ltd.
- MOE.(2008). **English Language Syllabus for Grade 11**. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education
- Mishan, F. (2005). **Designing Authenticity into Language Learning Materials**. USA: Intellect Ltd.
- Morrison, M. and Scott, D.(2005). **Key Ideas in Educational Research**. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Nation, I. and Macalister, J. (2010). **Language Curriculum Design**. New York: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1985). **Language Teaching Course Design: Trends and Issues**. Adelaide: National Curriculum Recourse Center.
- Nunan, D. (1988). **Syllabus Design**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1989). **Designing Tasks for Communicative Classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). **Task-based Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough. J, and C, Shaw. (1993). **Materials and Methods in ELT**. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Pincas, A.(1989). **Teaching English Writing**. London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Richards, J.(1995). **The Language Teaching Matrix**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. and Rodgers, T. (2001). **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: Description and Analysis**. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Tiglu Geza. (2008). The Study of the Appropriateness of Communicative Grammar Teaching at Grade 10. (Unpublished MA Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.

White, R. (1989). **Teaching Written English**. London: Heinemann International.

Willis, J. (1996). **A Framework for Task-based Learning**. London: Longman.

Wright, T. (1987). **Roles of Teachers and Learners**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX- I

1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire for Students

This questionnaire is designed to obtain data for the research called “An Evaluation of the Writing Tasks and their Implementation”. The researcher is interested only in investigating your writing practices and your reaction towards the writing tasks that you have done so far in your textbook. The information you provide is helpful for the successful completion of this research.

Thank you for your cooperation

Section I. General Information

Grade:- _____

Section:- _____

Section II. Students' Practice and their reaction towards the writing tasks

Please read each statement in this section and decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement by putting a tick (√) mark in the column that matches your position most, according to the following five responses.

SA - (Strongly Agree) =5 A - (Agree) =4 U - (Undecided) =3

D - (Disagree) = 2

SD - (Disagree) = 1

No.	Statements	SA	A	U	D	SD
Practice during the writing activities						
1	Most of the writing tasks in the textbook are familiar to me.					
2	The writing tasks help me use my background knowledge while I do them.					
3	The writing tasks guide me how to do my writing.					
4	The writing tasks in the textbook encourage me to work alone					
5	The writing tasks in the textbook make me to work in pair					
Attitude towards the writing tasks						
6	The writing tasks make me communicative with other students in writing classes.					
7	I like doing the writing tasks.					
8	The writing tasks in the textbook are difficult; therefore, the teacher should provide me other opportunities to improve my writing.					
9	Most of the writing tasks in the textbook are interesting to me; therefore, I pay attention on my writing.					
10	The writing tasks in the textbook help me think more about my writing because they are related to things I do outside the classroom.					

Adapted from (Meseret, 2012)

Appendix II

Interview Questions

Interview Questions for Teachers

I. Questions Related to the Components of a Communicative Task

- a) Are the objectives of the writing tasks written both in the textbook and in the syllabus clear to you?
- b) Do you think the writing tasks in the textbook interesting to the students?

II. Questions Related to the Practice of Writing

- a) Do you allow students conduct the writing tasks using the three phases of conducting a writing task? (Like pre, while and post writing task phases)

Appendix III:

Checklist for Evaluating Communicative Tasks

1. Goals

- Does the goal of the task contain all the components of a good objective?
- To what extent does the task reflect a real-world or pedagogic rationale? Is this appropriate?
- To what extent does the task reflect formal or functional writing skills?
- Does the task encourage learners to apply classroom learning to the real world?

2. Input

- What form does the input take?
- Is it authentic?
- Are the forms and the types of input appropriate to the goal of the task?

3. Activities

- Are the activities appropriate to the goals of the task?
- Are the activities designed to stimulate learners to use the stages of doing writing tasks?
- Are the activities appropriate to the input data?

4. Roles of teachers and students'

- What learners and teachers roles are inherent in the task and in the teacher's guide?
- Are the roles appropriate to communicative classroom?

5. Settings

- What levels of complexity are there in the classroom organization implicit in the task?
- Is the setting confined to the classroom?
- Does the setting prompt group and pair work activities?

6. Implementation

- Does the task actually hold the learners' interests?
- Do the activities prompt genuine communicative interaction among students?
- Are the tasks implemented in phases?
- How do students react towards the tasks

Adapted from Nunan (1989); Graves (2000) and Willis (1996)

APPENDIX IV

Classroom Observation Guideline

Section _____ Teacher _____

Lesson _____ Date _____ Time _____

Phases	Guideline	Yes	No	Comments
Pre-task phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the topic for the writing task familiar to the students? ▪ Are the students made to brainstorm on the topic of the day and before doing the writing task? ▪ Does the teacher give preliminary introduction about the topic? ▪ Are the students made to plan for the task they are going to do? ▪ Does the activity prompt genuine interaction among the majority of the students? ▪ Do the majority of the students look interested while doing the tasks? 			
While-task phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the students advised to assist each other? ▪ Does the teacher go round the class to assist students in their writing? ▪ Are the majority students engaged in the writing? 			
Post-task phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the students made to comment on each other's work? ▪ Does the teacher give general comments to the students as a whole? ▪ Are the students made to rewrite using the corrections and comments they get? 			

Adapted from (Meseret, 2012)

APPENDIX- V

The Writing Tasks in Grade 11 Students English Textbook