

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND  
LITERATURE (GRADUATE PROGRAM)**

**CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL IMPLICATION  
IN TEACHING ORAL COMMUNICATION  
THROUGH THE USE  
OF TASKS**

**BY  
MESERET GIZACHEW**

**Addis Ababa  
July 2007**

MESERET  
GIZACHEW

**CLASSROOM INTERACTIONAL IMPLICATION  
IN TEACHING ORAL COMMUNICATION  
THROUGH THE USE  
OF TASKS**

**BY  
MESERET GIZACHEW**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE DEPARTEMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND  
LITERATURE (GRADUATE PROGRAM)  
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES  
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN TEACHING  
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE**

**Addis Ababa  
July 2007**

## **Acknowledgements**

My sincere and profound gratitude go to my advisor Dr. Berhanu Bogale for his patient, indefatigable advice, unreserved guidance and encouragement, critical comments and constructive suggestions throughout the work of my thesis.

I would also like to thank AAU, ODRP for funding this project.

I am also very much obliged to express my special thanks and indebtedness to Amanuel High School principal, grade nine students and grade nine English teachers.

My heart felt thanks also go to my wife Etenat Gashaye for looking after our children (Behigue Meseret and Tinsae Meseret) and for giving me unreserved encouragement and support while I was in Addis Ababa.

# Table of Contents

	<b>Page</b>
Acknowledgments -----	i
Table of Contents -----	ii
List of Tables -----	v
List of appendices -----	vi
Abbreviations -----	vi
Abstract -----	vii
 <b>CHAPTER I</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
1.1. Statement of the Problem -----	1
1.2. Objective of the Study -----	5
1.3. Significance of the Study -----	7
1.4. Limitations of the Study -----	8
1.5. Definition of Terms -----	8
 <b>CHAPTER II</b>	
<b>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b> -----	9
2.1. General Definition of Communicative Tasks -----	9
2.2. The Notion of "Task" as Solving a Communicative Problem -----	10
2.3. The Importance of Task-based Instruction and Language Learning Tasks -----	12
2.4. Task- Based Language Teaching Methodology in an Interactive Classroom Context -----	14
2.5. Oral Interaction in the Classroom -----	15
2.6. Components of Oral Communicative Tasks -----	17
2.6.1. Goals -----	18
2.6.2. Input -----	19
2.6.3. Activities -----	20

2.6.3.1. Issues and Considerations in Relation to Activities-----	20
2.6.3.2. Ways of Characterizing Activities -----	23
2.6.3.3. Types of Task-oriented Activities-----	24
2.3.3.4. Levels of Difficulty in Communicative Activities-	27
2.6.4. Role -----	28
2.6.4.1. Learner Role -----	29
2.6.4.2. Teacher Role -----	29
2.6.5. Setting -----	30

### **CHAPTER III**

<b>RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY-----</b>	<b>32</b>
3.1. Design of the Study -----	32
3.2. The Research Setting -----	32
3.3. Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure -----	33
3.4. Instruments of Data Collection -----	34
3.5. Data Collection Procedure -----	37
3.6. Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation -----	38

### **CHAPTER IV**

<b>DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION -----</b>	<b>39</b>
4.1. Data analysis and Discussion Based on the Teachers' Responses to the Questionnaire -----	39
4.1.1. Conditions in Relation to Goals of Activities -----	40
4.1.2. Aspects in Relation to Contents as input-----	41
4.1.3. Conditions in relation to activities -----	42
4.1.4. Aspects in Relation to Roles -----	44
4.1.5. Aspects in Relation to Setting -----	49
4.2. Data Analysis and Discussion Based on Students' Responses to the Questionnaire -----	52
4.2.1. Aspects in Relation to Contents as input -----	52
4.2.2. Conditions in Relation to Activities -----	54

4.2.3. Aspects in Relation to Roles-----	56
4.3. Data Analysis and Discussion Based on the Results of Classroom Observation Checklist-----	61
4.3.1. Aspects Regarding to Activities-----	62
4.3.2. Aspects Regarding to the Roles of Classroom Teachers-----	62
4.3.3. Conditions in Relation to the Roles of Television Teacher in a Classroom Setting-----	64
4.3.4. Conditions Regarding to the Roles of Students-----	64
4.3.5. Aspects in Relation to the Conditions of Classroom Set up-----	65

## **CHAPTER V**

<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION</b> -----	66
5.1. Summary -----	66
5.2. Conclusions -----	67
5.3. Recommendations -----	68
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> -----	70
<b>APPENDICES</b> -----	75

## List of Tables

<b>Table 1:</b> Teachers' responses on the goals of oral interactional activities-----	40
<b>Table 2:</b> Teachers' responses on the contents as input of oral interactional activities -----	41
<b>Table 3:</b> Teachers' responses on the activities of oral interaction -----	42
<b>Table 4:</b> Teachers' responses on their roles during oral interaction ----	45
<b>Table 5:</b> Teachers' responses on the type of behaviors that students showed during oral interaction -----	48
<b>Table 6:</b> Teachers' responses on the type of feature(s) that learners showed during oral communicative activity-----	48
<b>Table 7:</b> Teachers' responses on the roles of television teacher (in a classroom setting) during oral interaction-----	49
<b>Table 8:</b> Teachers' responses on the most effective mode of classroom interaction during oral interaction-----	50
<b>Table 9:</b> Teachers' responses on the conditions of classroom set up during oral interaction-----	51
<b>Table 10:</b> Students' responses regarding to the contents as input of activities of oral interaction-----	53
<b>Table 11:</b> Students' responses on the activities of oral interaction-----	54
<b>Table 12:</b> Students' responses regarding to the roles of classroom teachers during oral interaction-----	57
<b>Table 13:</b> Students' responses on the roles of television teacher during oral interaction-----	60

## List of Appendices

<b>Appendix-A:</b> Teachers' Questionnaire -----	75
<b>Appendix-B:</b> Students' Questionnaire in English -----	80
<b>Appendix-B1:</b> Students' Questionnaire in Amharic -----	83
<b>Appendix-C:</b> Teachers' Interview Questions- -----	85
<b>Appendix-C1:</b> Teacher A's Interview Responses-----	86
<b>Appendix-C2:</b> Teacher B's Interview Responses -----	89
<b>Appendix-D:</b> Classroom Observation Checklist Result- -----	92
<b>Appendix-D1:</b> Classroom Observation Checklist -----	94
<b>Appendix-E:</b> Students' Responses Result from Open Ended Questions- -----	96
<b>Appendix-F:</b> Nunan's Checklist for Evaluating Communicative Tasks- -----	97

## Abbreviations

**CLT-** Communicative Language Teaching

**n.d.-** no date

**ESL-** English Second Language

**EFL-**English Florien Language

**TBI-**Task-Based Instruction

**Ppp-**present,practice,produce

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to find out whether the teaching of speaking through the use of tasks facilitates interaction in the classroom. To do this, goals, contents as input, activities, roles (roles of teachers and students) and setting (condition of classroom set up and satellite television led instruction) were the variables selected.

To achieve the aim, three different instruments were used: classroom observation, questionnaires and interview. In addition, the classrooms, students and teachers were used as sources of data.

Concerning the sampling techniques, all teachers who taught in grade 9 were selected using comprehensive sampling. In addition, after listing down the name of sections handled by these teachers, 1 from the five lists written under each teacher was selected using a lottery system. Furthermore, 35 students were randomly selected from every section. These randomly selected students and all the 5 teachers were asked to fill in the questionnaires. Out of 5 teachers, 2 were randomly selected for observation. Those observed were also interviewed.

After analyzing and discussing the data collected through the above instruments, the results of the investigation were obtained. According to the results, the explicitness of goals, the familiarity of contents to the students, the potential of goals and contents in reflecting learners' needs and interests, the authenticity, flexibility, purposefulness and communicative (interactive) nature of activities could facilitate oral interactions. On the other hand, insufficient information provision of the input data, inappropriate difficulty level of activities, ineffective teachers in acting according to the principles of communicative language teaching, lack of students' initiative and willingness to

interact with each other, heavy and combined desks found in neat rows, shortage of time given for interaction and the speed of television teacher's speech could make oral interactions difficult in the classroom. Based on the above findings, conclusions were drawn and recommendations were given.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### *1.1. Statement of the Problem*

Oral communication (speaking) skill is selected because until recently English was to a large extent a means of receiving information from outside, rather than sending out or exchanging information. From the perspective of language development, oral language (speaking) provides a foundation for the development of other language skills. For most students, the literacy learning process actually begins with speaking-talking about their experiences and talking about themselves. It is through speech that students learn to organize their thinking and focus their ideas (Lyle, 1993). The neglect of speaking in the classroom will destroy that foundation and severely hinder the development of other aspects of language skills. Before achieving proficiency in reading and writing and even after proficiency in reading and writing have been achieved – speaking is one of the important means of learning and acquiring knowledge (Lemke, 1989). Therefore, finding out the best way of teaching speaking skill is crucial.

The history of language teaching has been characterized by a search for more effective ways of teaching second or foreign languages because of the dissatisfaction with the prevailing methodologies (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, new approaches and methods proliferated throughout the twentieth century. Some achieved wide levels of acceptance and popularity at different times but were then replaced by other methods based on newer or more appealing ideas and theories (ibid). In addition, these different approaches and methods of language teaching guide syllabus designers to select and organize contents in various ways. For example, in the past, designing syllabuses was based on syntactic elements. Concerning this, Wilkins (1976:2) justifies "In synthetic approaches, different parts of the language are taught separately and step by step so that acquisition is the process of gradual accumulation of parts

and this resulted in proposals to make needs analysis as an essential component of communicative methodology (Prabhu, 1987). At the same time, methodologists focused on the kinds of classroom activities that could be used to implement a communicative approach, such as 'group work,' 'task work' and 'information gap activities' (ibid).

Today CLT can be seen as describing a set of core principles about language learning and teaching, assumptions which can be applied in different ways and addressing different aspects of the process of teaching and learning (Richards, n.d.). For example, some teaching proposals focus more directly on instructional process. Due to this reason, the task-based view of language teaching, based on the constructivist theory of learning and communicative language teaching approach, has evolved in response to some limitations of the traditional ppp approach, represented by the procedure of presentation, practice and performance (Ellis, 2003; Long and Crookes, 1991 in Jeon and Hahn, 2006). Thus, it has the substantial implication that language learning is a developmental process promoting communication and social interaction rather than a product acquired by practicing language items and that learners learn the target language more effectively when they are naturally exposed to meaningful task-based activities (Foster, 1999). From this, it is possible to say that task based instruction advocates the use of specially designed instructional tasks as the basis of learning. In relation to this, Crookes and Gass (1993) state that communicative task has ascended to a position of prominence as organization in syllabus design. In task-based teaching, syllabus content and instructional processes are selected with reference to communicative tasks which learners will either actually or potentially need to engage in outside the classroom and also with reference to theoretical and empirical insights into these social and psycholinguistic processes which facilitate language acquisition (Nunan, 1991:279). This approach to language teaching is characterized by the following features:

1. An emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language.

2. The introduction of authentic texts into the learning situation.
3. The provision of opportunities for learners to focus, not only on language, but also on the learning process itself
4. An enhancement of the learner's own personal experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning.
5. An attempt to link classroom language learning activation outside the classroom.

(Nunan, 1991)

Thus, theorists and practitioners have turned their attention to the students' ability in language rather than knowledge about it. Concerning this idea, Widdowson (1990:16) explains, "The first question to be raised in designing a language course should not be 'what language do we need to teach?' But rather 'what do we need to teach that will stimulate learning?'"

Because of the above reasons, the concept of task has received a considerable attention from CLT (Nunan, 1989). This current innovation (i.e., the use of task as a basic building block of pedagogy) is also influential in Ethiopian English language instruction in that now- a- days syllabus designing and course books development are said to follow the basic principles underlying CLT. The change has been made with the intention of enhancing English language learning. Likewise, Tylor (1996) as cited in Abreham and Setegn (2005:3) says:

The course is considered as more student-oriented and communicative than its predecessors. Every opportunity has been taken to involve the students in meaningful and realistic communicative activities. Many of the activities have therefore been designed so that the students work in pairs or small groups. In this way the amount of time that each student spends on practicing the language is significantly increased when compared with a situation where the teacher always initiates the communication.

The above extract, which is taken from grade nine teacher's guide, has several implications in the teaching of oral communication through the use of tasks in an interactional classroom. Firstly, it has notions about how best to teach the English language. These notions include 'student oriented', 'communicative', 'meaningful' and realistic communicative activities.' These very crucial notions

suggest that the oral communicative tasks in the course book should be:

- authentic
- communicative (interactive)
- purposeful
- flexible
- student-oriented

Secondly, the roles played by learners and teachers in carrying out the learning tasks during oral interaction are implicitly stated in the course book according to the principles of task-based language learning methodology. Teachers are expected to be consultants, catalysts, facilitators etc., and students are also expected to communicate (interact), participate, etc., with each other in oral interactions in pairs and groups.

Thirdly, the currently satellite television based instruction is being implemented in Ethiopian government high schools. As the innovation is new to the country's formal education, its implication can be seen in various aspects. Some common instances may be the adequacy of time given, the speed of the television teacher and clarity of voice during oral interaction.

Lastly, the classroom set up (the nature of chairs and tables) is expected to be suitable for students in order to interact with each other in pairs and groups in oral interaction.

Therefore, whether the goals, contents as input data and activities in the tasks; the roles of the teachers and students and the setting (i.e., the environment, in which every task is performed and the satellite television led instruction) facilitate oral interaction or not need exploration. It is on this ground that the researcher is interested to conduct a study on the classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication through the use of tasks.

### ***1.2. Objective of the Study***

The major objective of the study is conducted to answer the following broad

research question. To what extent do the new changes in these materials enhance oral interaction in teaching speaking through the use of tasks and what factors influence it?

The specific objectives that are derived from the above general one are formulated based on the components of communicative tasks discussed by Nunan. These include, "goals, inputs, activities, roles and setting" (Nunan, 1989:48). Therefore, the study is conducted more specifically in order to answer the following questions.

1. Do the goals, the contents as input, and activities in the tasks adequately realize oral interaction in the classroom in various aspects? These include:
  - the explicitness of goals and their potential in reflecting learners' needs and interests
  - the potential of contents as input in providing sufficient information
  - the familiarity of contents as input to the students
  - the potential of activities in meeting the needs and interests of students
  - the appropriateness of the difficulty level of the activities to the students
  - the potential of activities in helping the learners to interact (communicate) with each other
  - the potential of activities in meeting the criteria of authenticity, flexibility presentation style and purposefulness in their nature
2. Do the roles of teachers and students acknowledge the principles and theories of communicative language teaching in general and task based language teaching in particular implied in the course book?
3. Do the mode of interaction (the uses of pair work and group work), the classroom setup (the nature of tables and chairs) and the satellite television led instruction (clarity of television teacher's voice, the adequacy of time given for interaction and the speed of television teacher's speech) facilitate oral interaction?

### ***1.3. Significance of the Study***

This study tries to fill the gap that was not seen by others either by grade level or by research perspective. For example, Sisay (1999) studied on "Classroom Interaction and Its Influence on the Development of Students' Speaking Skill in English at Grade 11 Level in Government Schools" mainly focuses on the method of teaching, classroom interpersonal relations and affective elements. The other researcher, Abdulkadir (1983) studied on "Student-Teacher Interaction at Grade 12 Level" mainly focuses on the teachers' behavior. Furthermore, Gemechu (1998) studied on "The Effectiveness of Teaching Oral Fluency in Grade 9" mainly focuses on the adequacy and integrity of oral activities and the teachers' roles in adapting supplementary oral fluency activities to enhance the learners' proficiency level. On the other hand, Lilay (1992) studied on "Teaching Spoken English to a Grade Nine Class: An approach" which focuses on the preparation of alternative teaching materials and finding out the difficulties encountered by the students in learning spoken English.

However, this study differs basically in the variables selected where these were not mentioned by other researchers in the way the researcher tried to look at them and the study will give possibility to investigate the classroom interactional implications in teaching oral communication (speaking) through the use of tasks under the variables mentioned in the objectives of the research. Therefore, this study is hoped to be significant in the following respects:

1. It would have an immediate relevance to English language teachers, especially of high schools, to evaluate their current practices in relation to handling and managing oral communicative activities.
2. It would possibly give some important advice (recommendations) that may help high school English teachers to make some adjustments in implementing oral communicative activities in the classroom.
3. It would also give feedback to the concerned bodies to see for course

materials and programs that can well facilitate real communication in the classroom.

4. It would help the students to improve their performance of English and the way they learn oral interaction in the classroom.
5. The study would help as reference material for those who are interested in this area (on the issue of organization and implementation of oral communicative tasks in foreign language teaching classroom contexts).

#### ***1.4. Limitations of the Study***

Resource and time constraints have enormously affected the method and outcome of the study. The other challenge was the problem of broadcast time table of the satellite television program. In addition, a lesson was made to run only in one channel with few time alternatives. This forced the researcher to observe two classrooms only once. Last but not least, the television led instruction was given to the preparatory classes in most high schools of East Gojjam. Due to this reason, the study is conducted only in Amanuel High School, East Gojjam [grade 9 in focus]. Although the study is far from conclusive, it is believed that the investigation will help to gain some insights into the manner of classroom interactional implication in teaching speaking through the use of tasks.

#### ***1.5. Definition of Terms***

**Interaction** is "the students' facility in using a language when their attention is focused on conveying and receiving authentic message that is message that contains information of interest to the speaker and listener in a situation of importance to both (Rivers, 1987:4).

**Oral communicative tasks**-this is a general term in which aspects of goals, input (contents), activities, roles and setting in connection to oral interaction are analyzed (Nunan, 1989).

## ***2.2. The Notion of 'Task' as Solving a Communicative Problem***

If we quote exactly the definition of 'task' from the main proponents who have definitely influenced this approach, we can discover some common key elements in all the definitions. This may indicate that there are some unique characteristics in all tasks which can be used in Task-based language teaching. Within much discussion and interpretations as the definition of tasks, Long (1985:59) as cited in Nunan (1989:5) suggests that a task is:

a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. Thus, examples of task include painting a fence, dressing a child, filling out a form, buying a pair of shoes, making an airline reservation, borrowing a library book, taking a driving test, typing a letter, weighing a patient, sorting letters, taking a hotel reservation, writing a cheque, finding a street destination and helping someone across a road. In other words, by 'task' is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between.

Nunan (1989) states that the above extract is a non-pedagogical definition in that it describes sorts of things individuals do with language outside the classroom, and is the sort of characterization which might be offered by a learner if asked why he/she is learning the language. This defining characterization of task content is that it uses activities that the learners have to do for non-instructional purposes outside of the classroom as opportunities for language learning.

In giving a more pedagogically oriented definition, Richards, Platt and Weber (1985:289) suggest that a task is "any activity or action which is carried out as a 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, or may be referred to as tasks."

The value of tasks, according to the authors, is that they provide a purpose for the activity which goes beyond the practice of language for its own sake.

Breen (1987:23) as cited in Nunan (1989:23) defines that a task is:

... any structured language learning behavior endeavor which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. Task is therefore assumed to refer to a range of work plans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning- from the simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision making.

This quotation suggests that tasks can be conceptualized in terms of the curricular goals they are intended to serve, the input data which forms the point of departure for the task, and the activities or procedures which the learners undertake in the completion of the task and outcome (Nunan, 1991). Nunan (1989: 11) also defines the communicative task as, "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 form."

Nunan in the above extract defines tasks with instructional purposes, different from tasks that imitate the genuine world of communication, which he calls 'pedagogic tasks'.

Having a short glance at the above quotes, one can find a highlighted and fixed slogan as using tasks for communicative purposes. Obviously, there are varieties of tasks, but all of them have one common feature and that is every task is on solving a communicative problem connected with the real world problems of students who may encounter everyday. This is evident in the examples provided. For example, Long mentions "filling out a form", "making an airline reservation", "taking a driving test", etc. Richards, et al. refer to "drawing a map", "listening to instructions" and "carrying out a command". Breen talks about "problem solving" and "decision making". Nunan mentions "comprehending", "manipulating", "producing" or "interacting" in the language.

### ***2.3. The Importance of Task-based Instruction (TBI) and Language Learning Tasks***

The task-based approach to language teaching and learning has evolved in response to a better understating of the way oral communication is learnt. In relation to this idea, Cho (2000) points out that TBI is one of the best teaching methodologies for the communicative language teaching. In addressing the question in communication, TBI method promotes all three dimensions of communication such as 'expression', 'interpretation' and 'negotiation of meaning' (ibid). In addition, TBI to language teaching comprises materials for which the target language is used as a means to an end. In this regard, Crookes and Gass (1993) justify that task-based materials focus mainly on communication function of the language. Therefore, a task is more than doing an activity (doing something) in the context of classroom language teaching (Wright, 1987).

According to Foster (1999:69), the core element in TBI is giving learners tasks to transact, rather than items to learn. This in turn provides an environment which best promotes the natural language learning process (ibid).

As the aim of language instruction is to enable learners to be efficient in communication (Harmer, 1991) explains that learners should be provided with the opportunity to actively use the language that they know in meaningful task of their interest (McDonough and Shaw, 1993). This, according to Howatt (1984) encourages the 'strong' version of the communicative approach in which the classroom interactions through various kinds of tasks enable learners to engage in authentic acts of communication. This directly reflects the learning principle underlying the TBI which justifies that learners will learn a language best if they engage in tasks that have interactional authenticity, i.e. require them to use language in ways that closely resemble how language is used naturally outside the classroom (Ministry of Education, 2006).

Despite of the fact that TBI is used in so many different ways, one consensus is that communicative task focuses on a learner's ability to communicate in the target language. On this issue, Nunan (1989) points out that language learning tasks give learners many opportunities to interact in the target language, allows learners to incorporate authentic texts into learning, and lets learners use their own insight. In addition learners are able to connect what they have learned in the classroom with outside world. Moreover, Candlin and Murphy (1987) state that presenting language in the task form forces learners to take risks which is important in developing communicative skills. In addition, 'Negotiated meaning' tasks promote conversational adjustments and interactional modification (Long in Ministry of Education, 2006).

Focusing on the importance of language learning tasks, (Akbarnejad, n.d.) justifies that in task based instruction, the tasks are central to the learning activity. It is based on the belief that students can learn more effectively when their minds are focused on the task rather than on the language they are using. Learning to speak and to understand a language automatically in a vast variety of situations requires intensive exposure to language and unlimited interaction with language users.

Nunan (1989) also argues that language learning tasks help learners to learn by themselves by doing activities of psycholinguistic importance (pedagogic tasks) and enable them to evaluate their own progress in learning. This in turn would help learners build up confidence leading them to become autonomous. Furthermore, Mekasha (2005: 21) says that research has shown that meaningful learning tasks, among other things, would create variety, interest and motivation in learning.

## ***2.4. Task Based Language Teaching Methodology in an Interactive Classroom Context***

In order to implement the principles underlying the various perspectives on task based learning in a classroom context, scholars have proposed different models for task-based instruction. Although there may be several effective frameworks for creating a task based learning lesson, a rather comprehensive one is suggested by Willis (1996) as cited in Encyclopedia Wikipedia (2007). Willis (1996) as cited in Klapper (2003) envisages a 'task cycle' consisting of three broad phases: (1) "pre-task", (2) "task", and (3) "language focus".

In the 'pre-task phase', the teacher explores the topic with the class, highlights useful words and phrases and helps learners prepare for the task. Learners may hear a recording of others doing a similar task (but not so similar to act as a model for exact copying).

The 'task cycle' is divided into three parts. First in 'task', learners perform the task in pairs or small groups. The teacher monitors from a distance but doesn't intervene to correct errors. The key thing is learners' focus on meaning in this phase, use of language to exchange meanings for a real purpose, employing whatever language they choose or are capable of. In 'planning', learners prepare to report to the whole class orally, how they performed the task, what they decided or discovered, how they resolved the problem. The teacher's role is to circulate and help learners polish their language. In 'Report', some groups present their reports to the class. Here, the teacher may provide written or oral feedback as appropriate, and the students observing may do the same.

The 'Language Focus' phase consists of two parts. In 'Analysis', the focus returns to the teacher who reviews what happened in the task, in regards to language. It may include language forms that the students were using, problems that students had and perhaps forms that need to be covered more or were not used enough. During 'practice', the teacher practices new words, phrases or patterns that occur in the data analyzed. This idea is not that

students will gain immediate command of these features but that by noticing them, they will recognize them when they meet them again in the other texts.

Given the contemporary development, task based teaching and analysis of L<sub>2</sub> classroom extracts-one might have expected that there would be a plethora of studies demonstrating the advantages of task-based interaction by means of analysis of transcripts of the interaction, and producing concrete evidence that the theoretical benefits are delivered in practice in the classroom. However, (Seedhouse, 1999) explains that there is lack of evidence in the form of a lesson transcript to conform those benefits which are claimed for tasks about studies of task based teaching. Expressing the puzzling omission of studies which aim to demonstrate a holistic analysis of interaction, Seedhouse worked from a database of published and unpublished transcripts of approximately 330 L<sub>2</sub> lessons or fragments of lessons from 14 different countries. The data base includes many extracts from task-based lessons, as well as a small number of whole lessons involving task-based interaction.

### ***2.5. Oral Interaction in the Classroom***

Vygotsky (1978) as cited in Smith (1999) claims that all human learning, including language learning, is attained through interaction with other people. Coming to specifically to the classroom situations, this scholar points out that learners will benefit most from social interaction when the tasks they are engaged in cannot be accomplished alone, but instead, must be achieved collaboratively. Concerning to this point, (Panitz, n.d.) explains, "Cooperation enhances student satisfaction with the learning experience by actively involving students in designing and completing class procedures. Effective teams or groups assume ownership of a process and its results when individuals are encouraged to work together toward a common goal."

Communication cannot also be effective without interaction. Malmah-Thomas

(1987:10) points out "Interaction is more than action followed by reaction. Interaction means acting reciprocally, acting upon each other. There is a constant pattern of mutual influence and adjustment." From this extract, it is possible to say that interaction is a two way process. Therefore, in situations where there is no interaction, but only action and reaction, there can be no communication. In addition, oral interaction skills involve various decisions in the minds of the speaker. Concerning this, Bygate (1987:6) points out, "Interaction skills involve making decisions about communication, such as, what to say, how to say it, and whether to develop it in accordance with one's situations, while maintaining the desired relation with others."

Emphasizing on the role and nature of interaction, Lier (1988) also says that language development is a thread that runs through the social interaction learners engage in at times visible, at times not. Therefore one expects at least part of the time in the classroom to be taken up by purposeful interaction that involves working with the target language (ibid).

Brown and Yule (1983) distinguish two kinds of conversational interactions. These are the transactional function, which is primarily concerned with the transfer of information, and the interactional function, in which the primary purpose of speech is the maintenance of social relationship. These scholars further point out that within the spoken code of communication the interactional function of language is more useful than transactional ones in developing students' skills. Concerning the teaching of spoken language, Howarth (2006) suggests that using longer transactional turns and an awareness-raising approach should be the focus of teachers in the class.

Unlike written communication, oral interaction can be affected by at least two demands, namely processing conditions and reciprocity conditions (Bygate, 1987). This scholar further explains that processing conditions of speech entails the fact that speech takes place under time pressure i.e. time constraint in the case of short turn interaction patterns whereas reciprocity condition of oral interaction refers to the relation between the interactants in the process of

speaking. Although interaction seems so desirable and sensible in theory, we all know that actually promoting and increasing it can be an uphill strategy. According to Howarth (2006), some of the reasons are: "student-resistance, self-consciousness, large classes, mixed abilities, lack of motivation and insufficient language". On the other hand, some studies have also shown that even in a classroom where there is a communicative oriented instruction, teachers fail to create opportunities for genuine interaction (Kumaravadivelu, 1993 in Seedhouse, 1996). In relation to this issue, Seedhouse (1996:17) says, "Most teachers produce interaction which features examples of the IRF (teacher initiation-learner response-teacher follow-up) and display questions; these are typical of traditional classroom interaction but rarely occur in genuine or natural communication."

However, it is the area of communication interaction in particular which has nourished the approach to the teaching of speaking skills in a communicative way (McDonough and Shaw, 1993). An increase in student interaction, can be promoted by teaching process language, pre-teaching task language, providing support, giving preparation time, providing supportive atmosphere, varying the interaction and repeating tasks, having different levels of task and providing a reason to interact (Howarth ,2006).

## ***2.6. Components of Oral Communicative Tasks***

Candlin and Murphy (1987) assert that tasks can be effectively organized based on systematic components including goals, input, setting, activities, roles and feedback. Candlin (1987) as cited in Nunan (1989:47) also suggests that the tasks should contain input, roles, settings, actions, monitoring and feedback. And still others such as Shavelson and Stern (1987) as cited in Nunan (1989:47) who are concerned with general educational planning suggest that task design should take into account the following elements: content, materials, activities, goals, students and social community. Furthermore, Wright (1987) suggests that tasks need minimally to contain just two elements. These are input data which may be provided by materials, teachers or learners

Speaking is a desire and purpose-driven, in other words we genuinely want to communicate something to achieve a particular end. This may involve expressing ideas and opinions, expressing a wish or a desire to do something; negotiating and/or solving a particular problem; or establishing and maintaining social relationships and friendship.

It will be clear from this extract that we need not only knowledge of the target language but also to be able to the use of language, namely speaking skills to achieve these speaking purposes. Therefore, good task-essentially goal-oriented, requires group or pair to achieve an objective that is usually expressed by an observable result, which is attainable only by interaction between participants. Brindley (1984) as cited in Nunan (1989:60) also states that goals which reflect the communicative needs of the learners have greater face validity than those in which the goals were either unstated, inexplicit, or which did not reflect learners' goals. Whatever activity the students are involved in, if it is genuinely communicative and if it is really promoting language use, the students should have a desire to communicate, therefore they should be using language in some way to achieve an objective, and this objective (or purpose) should be the most important part of the communication (ibid). Therefore, without clearly articulated sets of goal statements, there is a risk that task-based teaching programs will lack coherence (Widdowson, 1978).

Goals generally refer to the sorts of things which learners want to do with the language outside the classroom.

### **2.6.2. Input**

"Input" is the other component of communicative tasks which refers to the data that form the point of departure for the task (Nunan, 1989). Input data also refers to verbal or non-verbal materials, which task participants have to deal with when performing a task. While verbal materials may be spoken or written language, non-verbal materials include pictures, photos, diagrams, charts, maps, etc. Actually, input data can be derived from a wide range of sources in

a real world context. For instance, Hover (1986) as cited in Nunan (1989:53) provides a long list illustrating all kinds of written sources which exist around us, and Brosnan, Brown and Hood (1984) as cited in Jean and Hahn (2006) point out the richness and variety of texts that learners will need to face in real life situations. For verbal materials, Brown and Yule (1983) indicate that all, other things being equal, dialogue texts containing descriptions are easier than instructions, which are easier than stories to comprehend and manipulate than non-dialogue texts, which include arguments or abstract concepts.

Proponents of authentic materials point out that classroom texts and dialogues do not adequately prepare learners for coping with the language they hear in the real world outside the classroom and thus they argue that learners should get opportunities for engaging in the real world texts in class (Nunan, 1989). Therefore, the input data, which task participants are supposed to comprehend and manipulate in communicative process, should reflect the learners' needs and interests, thereby positively encouraging the use of the target language.

### **2.6.3. Activities**

#### ***2.6.3.1. Issues and Considerations in Relation to Activities***

"Activities" specify what learners will actually do with the input which forms the point of departure for the learning task (Nunan, 1989). It is through balanced communicative activities that language is entertained in the classroom to enhance communicative skills of the learners. To this end, Harmer (1991:42) says:

A balanced activity approach sees the job of the teacher as that of ensuring that students get a variety of activities which foster acquisition and which foster communication will tend to predominant over (but not by any means exclude) controlled language presentation and practice output. It is on this basis that we affect our balance.

On the nature of activities, Richards and Rodgers (2001) point out that language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process. These scholars further discuss that learning activities are selected according to how

well they engage the learner in meaningful and authentic language use rather than mechanical practice of language patterns. In support of this idea, Hyland (1993) suggests effective interactive activities should be manipulative, meaningful and communicative, involving learners in using English for a variety of purposes. In addition, it is argued that communicative activities are vital in a language classroom since the students can do their best to use the language as individuals, arriving at a degree of language autonomy. In relation to this idea, Harmer (1991:50-51) states, "Communicative activities are those exhibit the characteristics at the communicative end of our continuum. Students are somehow involved in activities that give them both the desire to communicate and a purpose which involves them in varied use of language."

Regarding to communicative activities in relation to a non-English speaking setting, Nunan (1989:28) says, "For learners who are studying English in a non-English speaking setting, it is very important to experience real communicative situation in which they are taken seriously."

Discussing the contributions of communicative activities, Littlewood (1981:17) has stated the following:

1. **They provide 'whole-task practice'**. In foreign language learning, our means of providing learners with whole-task practice in the classroom is through various kinds of communicative activity, structured in order to suit learners' level of ability.
2. **They improve motivation**. The students' motivation to learn is more likely to be sustained if they can see how their classroom learning is related to their objective and helps them to achieve it with increasing success.
3. **They allow natural learning**. Language learning takes place inside the learner and as teachers know their frequent frustration, many aspects of it are beyond their pedagogical controlled.
4. **They can create a context which supports learning**. Communicative activity provides opportunities for positive personal relationships to

develop among learners and between learners and teacher.

Stern (1992:180) explains further arguments in favor of communicative activities:

- a. Communicative activities offer opportunity to develop coping techniques that are needed when the learner is on his own in the natural language environment. Such coping techniques require regular exposure to real-life language situations.
- b. Communicative activities give the learner opportunity to develop a personal relationship with the target community through direct contact with individual speakers and thus to experience and define his status as a 'foreigner' vis-a-vis the new language, its culture and community.

While talking about the communicative activities which are believed to encourage subconscious learning of speaking, Stern (1992) discusses that since in the acts of communication the learner's attention is mainly on the meaning of the message and not on the code, whatever learning occurs during such language use must be largely subconscious. In this regard, language acquisition according to Krashen is the unconscious incorporation of the target language system through its use in communication (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). Therefore, to achieve this, task must be designed in such way that when students are assigned to solve them, they can't help repeating the unpredictable language items so many times that they acquire the target language unconsciously (Akbarnejad, n.d). While discussing the reasons for silence in classroom communicative activities, Lawtie (2004) justifies:

A completely different reason for student silence may simply be that class activities are boring or are pitched at the wrong level. Very often our interesting communicative speaking activities are not quite as interesting or as communicative as we think they are and all the students are really required to do is answer 'yes' or 'no', which they do quickly and then just sit in silence or worse talking noisily in their L<sub>2</sub>.

The above extract suggests that a carefully selected activity potentially arouses

more interest, more talk, more participation, more motivation and enjoyment. Furthermore, focusing on the importance of visual supports that can give the student to have a continuous communication, (Akbarnejad, n.d.) points out:

... it might seem much better, and more logical and profitable to present activities visually such as diagrams, pictures, drawings, sketches, etc. The effort is to make a suitable atmosphere in which the learners use the target language to communicate with each other. We know, on the other hand, that talking in a vacuum is much harder for EFL/ESL learners than talking about something visible or teachable.

On the issue of easiness and difficulty of the activity, Akbarnejad also justifies that activities should not be very difficult, because difficult activities require swift and high level of mental processing to communicative meaning.... On the other hand, they shouldn't be so easy, much easier than the students' ability in using the target language, because the students will get bored and, infact, the activity will not lead to any extension of their ability in using language. In addition, variety in itself would provoke learner's interest to activities. To this end, Harmer (1991:42) says, "by presenting students with a variety of activities, we can ensure their continuing interest and involvement in the language program. Classes which continuously have the same activities are not likely to sustain interest."

#### **2.6.3.2. Ways of Characterizing Activities**

Three things characterize learning task activities: These are activity authenticity, the kinds of skills they promote and their focus either on fluency or accuracy (Nunan, 1989).

Authenticity of activities lies in the fact that the activities in the task should rehearse the real world (Mekasha, 2005). A task can have an activity reacting to a given letter by writing; as such an activity is also very common in our day-to-day life (ibid). Nunan, however, doubts if all authentic inputs can be correlated with authentic task activities in the classroom.

Task activities may also be divided into two as to whether they promote skill getting or skill using (Rivers and Temperley, 1978 in Nunan, 1989). Activities that enhance learners' knowledge of the language by focusing their attention to the perception of phonological and grammatical forms and thus by abstracting these to the extent of production fall under the skill getting activities. However, activities that would help learners interact in the real world of communication by expressing themselves come under the skill using category (Nunan, 1989).

Activities also vary as to whether they focus on accuracy or fluency aspects of learners' language. Brumfit's quotation best illustrates the distinction between accuracy and fluency. He justifies "language display for evaluation tended to lead to a concern for accuracy, monitoring, reference rules, possibly explicit knowledge, problem solving are evidence of skill getting. In contrast to this, however, language use requires fluency, expression rules, and reliance on implicit knowledge, and automatic performance (Brumfit, 1984:51).

#### ***2.6.3.3. Types of Task-oriented Activities***

One of the greatest challenges that have faced CLT have been to find some way of linking attention to linguistic form with the communication of meaning. Littlewood's (1981) transition from the 'pre-communicative' (Structural and quasi-communicative activities) to the 'communicative' (functional and social interaction) was influential in suggesting the methodological way forwarded the classic lesson structure of presentation-practice-production (ppp) (Klapper, n.d.). Therefore, the traditional language practice activities are meant to 'display' command of structures or other linguistic elements taught previously and often to reproduce other people's meanings (e.g. "Describe these pictures using the following phrases"). On the other hand, in task-based learning they have to use their linguistic resources to complete the task; only later do they pay attention to language form (Willis, 1996b in Klapper, n.d.).

In task-based learning, the task-oriented activities should center on involving learners in 'authentic communication' and in 'real communication' (Stern, 1992:177). Task-oriented activities should also involve 'reflective thinking'. In

such activities, a problem is solved, a question is answered, a conflict is resolved, a rule is formed or a principle is exemplified (Taruin and Al-Arishi, 1991).

There are a number of task-oriented activities that encourage communicative processes in the classroom, namely: information sharing, negotiation of meaning and interaction (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). In the literature on TBLT, several attempts have been made to group tasks into categories. For example, it is believed that the notion of 'gap' between speakers can be used to provide a reason for communication. To this end, (Rees, n.d.) points out that gap may be taken to mean difference. If there are two students, A and B, and if A has some information which B does not have, and possibly vice-versa, then there is a difference or gap between the two students. A task which requires B to find out information that A has (i.e. a task which closes the gap will provide a reason for communication).

Taking the above idea into account, Prabhu (1987:46-47) identified three principal gap activity types in the Bangalore project to promote learners oral communicative proficiency. These are:

1. **Information gap activity**, which involves the transfer of given information from one person to another. One example is pair work in which each member of the pair has a part of the total information (for example an incomplete picture) and attempts to convey it verbally to the other.
2. **Reasoning gap activity**, which involves deriving some new information from the given information through the process of inference, deduction, practical reasoning or a perception of relationships or patterns. One example is working out a teacher's time table on the basis of given class time tables.
3. **Opinion gap activity**, which involves identifying and articulating a personal preference, feeling or attitude in response to a given situation. One example is story completion; another is taking part in the

discussion of social issue.

Researchers working on TBI have developed various ways of classifying task. To this end, (Jacobs and Navas, n.d.) forward the following classification of tasks:

1. **Open Vs closed.** It refers whether learners believe there is one right answer or many possible answers. Concerning this issue, Long (1990) as cited in Jacobs and Navas (n.d.) points out that negotiation of meaning is seen as important because it increases the comprehensibility of the language which others comprehend. On the other hand, others, such as de Bono (1973) as cited in Jacobs and Navas (n.d.) argue that open tasks foster development of thinking skills and creativity.
2. **Planned Vs unplanned.** It refers whether an activity provides time for learners to plan the language they will speak or write. In relation to this, Long (1990) as cited in Jacobs and Navas (n.d.) suggests that providing opportunities to plan can increase the quantity and quality of the language learners generate.
3. **One-way Vs two-way tasks.** It refers whether the task involves a one-way exchange of information or a two-way exchange. Long (1980) as cited in Celce-Murcia (1991) justifies that two-way tasks (in which all students in a group discussion had unique information to contribute) simulated significantly more modified interactions than one way tasks (that is, in which one member of the group possessed all the relevant information).
4. **Convergent Vs divergent.** It refers whether the students achieve a common goal or several different goals. To this end, Duff (1986) as cited in Celce-Murcia (1991) found that convergent problem-solving tasks prompted significant interactional and discourse differences with more and shorter turns than divergent debating task.

Willis (1991) as cited in Richards and Rodgers (2001:234) has also adapted the views of many professionals and has proposed six types of task as the basis for TBI:

1. **Listing tasks:** it entails pair or class brain storming, or fact finding. For

example, students might have to make up a list of things they would pack if they were going on a beach vacation.

2. **Sorting and ordering:** it can involve sequencing, ranking in order of priority or cost and classifying. For example, students work in pairs and make up a list of the most important characteristics of an ideal vacation.
3. **Comparing:** this can involve the process of matching, finding similarities or finding differences.
4. **Problem solving:** it includes short puzzles, including logic problems or riddles, real-life problems such as those typically found on problem pages in magazines, or longer case studies such as those used in business simulations. For example, students read a letter to an advice columnist and suggest a solution to the writer's problems.
5. **Sharing personal experience:** such task gives learners a chance for more sustained, personal talk i.e. talk that is more typical of social interactions, rather than being purely functional or transactional. They include anecdotes telling, reminiscing such as childhood memories of holidays or of critical incidents, and giving opinions on or describing reactions to a specific issue or event.
6. **Creative tasks and projects:** these will normally take a longer time and sometimes be done over a series of lessons. They may be preceded by preparatory tasks of a listing or ordering type.

#### **2.6.3.4. Levels of Difficulty in Communicative Activities**

Stern (1992:199-201) proposes that it is important to develop criteria to assess the difficulty of a communicative activity for learners of different degrees of proficiency. They devise the following criteria:

- a. **The predictability-unpredictability dimension.** Language teaching techniques have often been criticized on the grounds that much of the task is predictable, and new information is rarely transmitted from the speaker to the listener.
- b. **Length of an utterance.** Brown and Yule (1983:16) in their analysis

of conversational English, make a simple distinction between 'short turns' and 'long turns.' It is obvious that long turns are more demanding than short turns in comprehension as well as production.

- c. **Contextual support.** Communicative activities which are embedded in practical activities, for example, cooking while listening to instructions or doing art work under verbal guidance are easier to handle than, say, following an hours lecture on philosophy. In school settings, subject matter drawn from history, which makes use of abstractions and relies mainly on speech or written text, is more demanding linguistically than art or physical education, both of which are visual and involve movement.
- d. **Familiarity of content.** Subject matter with which the L<sub>2</sub> learner is familiar is easier to handle than topics which are entirely novel.
- e. **Clarity and familiarity of delivery.** If voices are clear they are more manageable for the L<sub>2</sub> learner. Familiarity with the style of delivery is also helpful.
- f. **Stress.** Communicative activities are likely to be more difficult to engage in for a second language learner under conditions of stress, discomfort, fatigue, physical danger, emotional distress, or hostility than in calm and positive formed situation.

#### 2.6.4. Role

"Role" refers to the part that learners and teachers are expected to play in carrying out learning tasks as well as social and interpersonal relationship between the participants (Nunan, 1989).

In analyzing task in terms of power and control, Nunan (1989:86) writes "Drills and the like vest power in the teacher, while communicative tasks such as role plays, problem-solving tasks and simulations give much more control to the learner." Therefore, the type of classroom activities proposed in CLT implied new roles in the classroom for teachers and learners (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

#### **2.6.4.1. Learner Role**

The development of communicative language teaching has had a dramatic effect on the roles that learners are required to adopt (Richards and Rodgers, 2001). This is particularly true of oral interaction tasks (Nunan, 1989). Nunan's notion in this regard points out, "In small-group interaction tasks... learners are required to put language to a range of uses, to use language which has been imperfectly mastered, to negotiate meaning, in short, to draw on their own resources rather than simply repeating and absorbing language."

Breen and Candlin (1980) as cited in Richards and Rodgers (2001:166) also describe the learner's role within CLT in the following terms:

The role of the learner as a negotiator between the self, the learning process and the object of learning-emerges from and interacts with the role of joint negotiator within the group and within the classroom procedures and activities which the group undertakes. The implication for the learner is that he should contribute as much as he gains, and thereby learn in an interdependent way.

From the above extract it is possible to say that students are, above all, communicators. They are expected to interact primarily with each other rather than with the teacher. In support of this idea, (Richards, n.d) states that learners now had to participate in classroom activities that were based on a cooperative rather than individualistic approach to learning. Students had to become comfortable with listening to their peers in group work or pair work task, rather than relying on the teacher for a model.

#### **2.6.4.2. Teacher Role**

As students, several roles are assumed for teachers in CLT. After explaining that learners' roles are derived from the nature of language and ways of learning, Nunan (1989) says that in the past, i.e. traditional language pedagogy, the role of the teacher was restricted to manager of materials. In contrast to this, according to Richards and Rodgers (2001), in a communicative classroom the teacher is assigned to be catalyst, consultant or guide, leaving

the entire task to learners. On the issue of the authority, power and control shared between the teacher and students, Nunan (1989) explains that teacher fronted or teacher dominated classroom interaction has a debilitating effect because teachers have forgotten or ignored the fact that in the real world speakers shape their own conversations (Basturkmen ,1994).

Giving the learners a different role (such as greater initiative in the classroom), requires the teacher to adopt a different role. To this end, according to Breen and Candlin (1980) as cited in Nunan (1989:87), the teacher has three main roles in the communicative classroom. The first is to act as a "facilitator of the communicative process", the second is to act as a "participant" and the third is to act as "observer and learner" (ibid).

In general terms, according to Larsen-Freeman (1986); Littlewood (1981); Harmer (1991) in communicative oriented classroom, the teacher should act as 'counselor', 'facilitator', 'organizer', 'participant', 'prompter', 'resource etc' instead of being an actor of the stage.

#### **2.6.5. Setting**

"Setting" refers to the classroom arrangements specified or implied in the task, (Nunan, 1989). In addition, setting also signifies the instructional setting where pedagogical conditions are treated. In relation to the ways for learners to use language in the classroom, (Moss, 2003) explains:

The classroom setup can hinder or enhance interaction opportunities. If the desks are in neat rows with everyone facing the chalk board and the teacher, learner-to-learner interactions are more difficult to initiate. Round tables, desks arranged in small groups, or even a semicircle of desks help make interactive task easier.

Jean and Hahn (2006) also explain that classroom setting refers to certain environment, in which every task is performed. In relation to classroom arrangements, Wright (1987) suggests the different ways in which learners might be grouped physically based on individual, pair, small group and whole class made. For the relationship between task participants' roles and each

setting, Alderson and Lynch (1988) as cited in Jean and Hahn (2006) advocate the effectiveness of group work compared to that of individual work for general pedagogic reasons (e.g., increasing the cooperation and cohesiveness among learners), and (Celce-Murcia, 1991) mentions the positive role of group work and pair work in promoting a linguistic environment likely to assist L<sub>2</sub> learning. This scholar further explains that the most effective and appropriate classroom organization is pair work and group work.

Nunan (1989) discusses that the setting with respect to 'environment' refers to where the learning, actually takes place. In the case of mode of learning, the implication of teacher-directed based interaction, for example, television-teacher directed classroom pedagogy is worth discussed as one aspect of setting.

This review of related literature section has explored, interpreted, synthesized and discussed what has been researched and documented in the previous works. While reviewing the literature, the researcher is acquainted with various approaches which can help him to look the problem from various perspectives. In the next part, the research methodology of this paper will be discussed.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### ***3.1. Design of the Study***

The researcher followed a descriptive study design. The descriptive method was employed with the intention of obtaining pertinent data. The study focused on describing, recording, analyzing and interpreting the conditions that prevail in the school under question in relation to classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication through the use of tasks. In relation to 'pedagogic' tasks, the whole study talked and justified the realization and implementation of oral communicative tasks, students' and teachers' roles and setting, i.e. mode of interaction, classroom set up and satellite television led instruction in the target grade level of English language classroom.

#### ***3.2. The Research Setting***

Amanuel High School was selected because it is a typical case study. The other important reason for choosing this school is that the researcher was familiar with this problem while he had been teaching English, in the school, for five years and this made the research somewhat appealing to the researcher. Thus, if the classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication through the use of tasks was studied in this school, the researcher believes, it became the best place to learn.

The researcher focused only on a government school because the satellite television lesson is implemented only in government schools and the satellite television based instruction was taken in the study as a potential variable under instructional setting. Furthermore, only grade nine was chosen because it was more convenient for the study in that oral communication interaction is possibly given more room than in lower grades. The researcher did not include grade 10 in his study because the actual class ended up early in the academic year.

### ***3.3. Sources of Data and Sampling Procedure***

#### **A. The Classroom**

The main research question is on the classroom interactional implication in teaching oral communication through the use of tasks which is, of course, an instructional process that takes place in the classroom. Thus, the classrooms were taken as the main source of data. It was here that where observations were made to see what really happened in the classroom. In order to select them, the name of classrooms occupied by each teacher was listed. After that, one class from each teacher's list was selected using the lottery system. Using this sampling procedure, 5 classrooms out of 19 were taken. However, only 2 out of 5 were randomly selected for observation.

#### **B. Teachers**

Teachers are one of the most important elements in the teaching and learning process. Through their experience they have gathered useful information that can be channeled to useful practice. Therefore, teachers were considered to be rich sources of data. With this in mind, the researcher used the comprehensive sampling technique to choose the teacher respondents. Therefore, all (the five) English teachers who were involved in teaching English language in grade nine were taken.

#### **C. The Students**

Oral communication interaction is implemented on students. Therefore, students are the main actors/ actress in the implementation of oral communication interaction. Since reality is very complex and it couldn't be fully comprehended and understood by a single mind and method, students were taken as one source of data as to furnish important information pertaining to the problem at hand. To select students, the researcher used the simple random sampling technique. Thus, 35 students from each sample sections were selected. Out of the total number of 1,600 students, 175 were taken as a sample, representative of the target study.

### **3.4. Instruments of Data Collection**

The data were collected through three instruments: questionnaire, interview and observation.

#### **A. Questionnaire**

Questionnaire was used as the instrument for the data gathering process. The major reason why questionnaire was used in the data gathering process is to get much information from the large number of respondents. It is also easy to distribute and gather information, particularly when the respondents are very large in size. Two types of questionnaires were prepared to be filled by grade 9 English teachers and students. These were, one for students and the other for teachers. The teachers' questionnaire contained 27 closed- ended and 5 open - ended items. On the other hand, the students' questionnaire contained 21 closed- ended and two open- ended items. In order to avoid communication barriers, the students' questionnaire was translated into Amharic (Appendix B-1). The questionnaire for teachers had four parts. These were used to examine:

- 1 whether the goals, contents as input and activities in the task adequately realize oral interaction (part- I)
- 2 the classroom teachers' roles and satellite television teacher's roles in facilitating oral interaction (part-II)
- 3 the conditions of the classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction (part -III)
- 4 the students' roles and the mode of interaction used in oral interaction (part- IV)

Part one and part two of the teachers' questionnaire contained question items which are likert-type of opinion scales ranging from 'strongly agree; to 'strongly disagree'. Part three also contained question items which are designed under three divisions of 'yes', 'no' and 'undecided' categories. In addition, part four contained closed- ended question items in the form of multiple choices.

On the other hand, the questionnaire for students had two parts. These were intended to examine:

- 1 whether the contents as input and activities facilitate oral interaction (part- I)
- 2 the role of classroom teacher and satellite television teacher in an oral interaction (part- II)

Part one of the students' questionnaire contained question items which are likert-type of opinion scales ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. Furthermore, part two contained question items that are assigned under three divisions of 'yes', 'no' and 'undecided'.

Open- ended items were added at the end of both teachers' and students' questionnaires in order to consider unanticipated responses within these structured questions. However, the responses obtained from these open- ended questions were used to strengthen and substantiate the information collected through closed- ended questions. Although these open- ended questions were prepared for both teachers and students, only students were trying to give sets of information in relation to activities, roles of teachers and roles of satellite television led instruction. These sets of information are given on Appendix-E. (A

## **B. Observation**

The other major and central instrument of data collection is the classroom observation. It describes what was really happening in the classroom during instruction. According to Mariam (1998), classroom observational data gives first hand account of the situation under study and when combined with interviewing and document analysis allows a holistic interpretation of the phenomena being studied.

Therefore, for this study, an observation scheme in the form of checklist was used. The checklist contained five parts. The first part examined the effectiveness of activities in facilitating oral interaction, the second part was for classroom teachers' role, the third part justified the role of television teacher,

the fourth part examined students' role, and the fifth part investigated the conditions of classroom set up. The observation checklist was adapted from Nunan (1989:135-137). Nunan's checklist is designed to examine communicative language tasks (not specific to oral language (Appendix F). The major points to be examined in the checklist are: goals, input, activities, roles (of teachers and students) and setting. Under these major points, there are list of minor points (39 items). The researcher did not use all the 39 items in the checklist. Items which have direct relevance with the study were taken. Some items which are not used to achieve the objective of this study were omitted and replaced by others. After this, the researcher of this paper adapted them into a table form. The table contained 21 items (Appendix D-1). Besides, these items were rated using a tick (√) mark under 'Yes', 'No' and 'Undecided' categories during oral interaction lesson. The total number of ticks (√) given to the observed teachers was used to analyze and interpret the data (Appendix D).

In addition to the researcher, one observer participated at a time. The assistant was given a detailed orientation on how to use the checklist. By directly observing what happens in the classroom using the checklist, the researcher and the assistant checked whether what people say, do or think was reflected in the actual condition. The sets of information collected through observation were analyzed using description. 2 teachers out of 5 were randomly selected for the observation. The reason for having few teachers to be observed was due to the difficulty to get the television program so many times in a day and shortage of time.

### **C. Interview**

Much of what we cannot observe for ourselves has been or is being observed by others. Thus, the researcher used interview to fill the gaps if any. Thus, interview is very useful instrument to understand the reasons why and how things happen the way they are happening. In order to give the interviewees a degree of control and power over the issue and to give the interviewer a great deal of flexibility as stated by Nunan (1992), semi-structured interview type

was preferred in designing questions (Appendix- C)

The teachers selected for interview were those who observed because the interview would give the researcher the chance to raise questions that he had seen during observation. The interview was recorded in audio tape and transcribed into a text (look Appendix C-1 and C-2). Sets of information collected through this interview were used to crosscheck and substantiate those taken from the questionnaire. After conducting the interview, the findings were organized and treated in light of their relevance to the aim of research.

### ***3.5. Data Collection Procedure***

The data gathering instrument, the questionnaires were pilot tested and reviewed in order to make essential correction and maintain the validity of the instrument before the final study was conducted. This helped the researcher to avoid errors likely to happen. The questionnaires were tried out in the sample area (Menkorer High School) on the students and teachers who were not included in the final research study. After this, they were revised depending on the comments given. As a result of this, some items were rephrased and the sequence was rearranged.

Orientations were given to respondent teachers and students at the beginning on the goal of the study as well as the nature of the questionnaires.

The observation had been made first in order to avoid the occurrence of some artificial behaviors and acts which can be exhibited by teachers and students after they got information from questionnaires. The observation was made when the actual teaching learning process was going on.

The questionnaires prepared for the students and teachers were administered following the speaking skill section. After that, these questionnaires were collected in the same session. However, some of the respondent teachers and students who couldn't go through all the questions at once were told to return them at other times. Out of 175 students, only 159 returned the

questionnaires. However, all the teachers' questionnaires were returned to the researcher.

The interview was made at the end after identifying possible issues that were not well addressed through the questionnaires and observation. Then, the data was categorized according to the research variables.

### ***3.6. Method of Data Analysis and Interpretation***

After the questionnaires had been returned from respondents, the process of tallying and tabulation were carried out. The analysis was made based on the questionnaires and the results of observation checklist. As it was pointed out in the instruments of data collection part, however, sets of information collected through interview and open-ended questions were utilized to strengthen those taken from the questionnaires and observation. In addition, data interpretation of students' questionnaire was worked out using percentages. Since the target of the study is to describe what is being practiced, the researcher perceived that percentage was an appropriate statistical procedure. However, data interpretation of teachers' questionnaire was worked out simply by writing in numbers. In addition, the data interpretation of the observation was made using description taking the total number of ticks into consideration.

- whether the goals, contents as input, and activities in the task facilitate oral interaction
- the roles of teachers and students in facilitating oral interaction as implied in the course book
- the role of television teacher in the classroom setting in facilitating oral interaction
- the perception of teachers on the mode of interaction used in oral interaction
- the conditions of classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction

#### 4.1.1. Conditions in Relation to Goals of Activities

One of the questions teachers were asked in the questionnaire was to identify whether the goals of oral communicative activities facilitate oral interaction or not. The information obtained is indicated in the table below.

**Table 1: Teachers' responses on the goals of oral interactional activities**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The goals of activities are explicit	2	3	-	-	-
2	The goals are relevant to the communicative needs of the students	-	4	-	1	-

The target respondents for the given items above are only teachers because the concepts in relation to 'goal' might not be well interpreted by the students.

In item 1, the teachers were asked to reveal their perceptions on whether or not 'the goals of oral communicative activities are explicit.' As a reaction to the statement, out of 5 respondents, 2 strongly agreed and 3 agreed. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, all of them assured that the goals of activities are explicit. In relation to this, Brindly (1984) as cited in Nunan (1989) states that without clearly articulated sets of goal

statements, there is a risk that task-based language teaching programs will lack coherence. Therefore, it seems that the goals of the oral communicative activities in the course book are expressed by observable results which can be attained by interaction between participants.

In response to whether 'the goals are relevant to the communicative needs of the students' in item 2, out of 5 respondents, 4 agreed and 1 disagreed. The majority of respondents (4 out of 5) answered that the goals of the activities are relevant to the communicative needs of the students. Brindley (1984) as cited in Nunan (1989) explains that the goals which reflect the communicative needs of learners have greater face validity than those in which the goals are either unstated, inexplicit, or which do not reflect learners' goals. Therefore, it would be possible to say that the goals of the oral communicative activities of the course meet the communicative needs of the students.

#### **4.1.2. Aspects in Relation to Contents as input**

One of the questions teachers were asked in the questionnaire was to identify if the contents as input of the activities adequately realize oral interaction in the classroom. The information obtained is indicated in the table below.

**Table 2: Teachers' responses on the contents as input of oral interactional activities**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	disagree	Strongly disagree
1	Students are familiar to the contents as input of activities	1	4	-	-	-
2	the contents as input have sufficient information		1		3	1

In item 1, Table 2 above, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the students are familiar to the contents as input of the activities.' Thus, 4 agreed and 1 strongly agreed on this item. When the results of agree and strongly agree are lumped together, all respondents said that students are familiar to the

contents of oral communicative activities. Therefore, it would be possible to say that the contents of activities as inputs are selected on the basis that they are closer to the students' experiences and exposures. Students also give similar responses to this item (Look at Table 10: item 1).

In item 2, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the contents as input give sufficient information to the students.' In this regard, one of them agreed, 3 disagreed and 1 strongly disagreed. By lumping disagree and strongly disagree together, it can be indicated that the contents as inputs in the activities don't give sufficient information. From this, it is possible to infer that contents as input in the activities don't adequately prepare learners for coping with the oral interaction in the classroom. A similar response is given by students (Look at Table 10: item2)

#### 4.1.3. Conditions in Relation to Activities

In this section, an attempt was made to examine the potentials of oral communicative activities in facilitating oral interaction in various aspects as indicated in the table below.

**Table 3: Teachers' responses on the activities of oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	The activities motivate the students to speak	1	4	-	-	-
2	The activities are communicative (interactive)	-	4	-	1	-
3	The difficulty level of the activities is appropriate to the students	-	1	-	3	1
4	The activities in one way or another relate with the real world conditions	2	3	-	-	-
5	The activities involve flexibility in presentations	1	4	-	-	-
6	The activities are designed in order to achieve a particular goal.	3	2	-	-	-

In item 1, Table 3 above, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the activities motivate the students to speak.' Out of 5 respondents, 1 showed strong agreement and 4 showed agreements. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, 5 respondents said that the activities motivate the students to speak. Therefore, this suggests that the activities selected in the course book potentially arouse more interest, motivation and enjoyment.

In item 2, the teachers were asked to reveal their perceptions on whether or not 'the activities are communicative (interactive).' All the teachers who took part in the study responded as follows: 4 agreed and 1 disagreed. Therefore, the majority of respondents (4 out of 5) justified that the oral activities are communicative. One can infer from this data that the oral communicative activities have potentials in arousing more talk and participation.

In statement 3, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the difficulty level of the activities is appropriate to the students.' As a reaction to the statement, out of 5 respondents, 1 showed his or her agreement, 3 showed their disagreement and 1 showed his or her strong disagreement. When the results of disagree and strongly disagree are lumped together, 4 respondents asserted that the difficulty level of the activities is not appropriate to the students. This data indicates that the oral communicative activities in the course book are pitched at the wrong level. For this reason, tasks must be designed in such way that students can solve them. A similar response is given by students (See Table 11: item 3). Therefore, the difficulty level of the oral communicative activities did not have potential in facilitating oral interaction.

In item 4, the subjects were asked whether or not 'the oral communicative activities in one way or another relate with the real world life.' Thus, 2 strongly agreed and 3 agreed. By lumping strongly agree and agree together, all respondents answered that the oral communicative activities in the course book in one way or another relate with the real world life. It is worth noting here that aspects of authenticity are considered as a potential factor affecting interaction (Nunan, 1989). Nunan further discusses that if a given activity is

related in one way or another to the real life of the students, it provokes their interest so that interaction would be active and warm.

In item 5, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the activities have flexible presentation.' Responding to this item, all subjects agreed that the oral communicative activities have flexible presentation styles, i.e., the lessons are presented through motion pictures with a variety of alternatives. In addition, according to the interview result (Appendix C1 and C2) indicates, models are shown to the students on the way how to involve in pair work and group work activities through the plasma television screen. In connection to this idea, literature in the area tells us that the more the presentation of activities is flexible, the better it grabs the students' attention and consequently paves the way for lively interaction (Harmer, 1991).

In item 6, the teachers were asked whether or not 'the activities are designed in order to achieve a particular goal.' As a reaction to this statement, out of 5 respondents, 2 strongly agreed and 3 agreed. When strongly agree and agree are lumped together, all the respondents asserted that the oral activities are designed in order to achieve a particular goal. A similar response is given by students (See Table 11). In relation to this, Jean and Hahn (2006) state that in real life, we always have a reason for speaking and so our speaking activities should aim to reflect this wherever possible.

#### **4.1.4. Aspects in Relation to Roles**

Learners and teachers are expected to play a role in carrying out learning tasks in the classroom. Therefore, in this section, an attempt was made to examine teachers' attitude towards the roles that learners and teachers are required to adopt in order to facilitate oral interaction. The information obtained is indicated in the tables below.

**Table 4: Teachers' responses on their roles during oral interaction lesson**

No	Questionnaire item	Number of Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1	You introduce the topic before the television lesson to help learners to prepare for the task	3	2	-	-	-
2	You clarify the learning objective of the oral activities to make them purposeful	2	3	-	-	-
3	You act according to the instruction given by the television teacher to facilitate oral interaction	3	1	-	1	-
4	You group students with mixed abilities to facilitate oral interaction	-	-	-	3	2
5	You encourage students to interact freely by moving between the desks	2	3	-	-	-
6	You provide a rich environment that contains collaborative work	-	-	1	4	-
7	You let students to work on difficult areas at the end of the television lesson to help them to overcome their oral communicative problems	3	1	1	-	-

In item 1, Table 4, the teachers were asked whether or not 'they introduce the topic before the television lesson.' In this regard, out of the 5 respondents, 3 strongly agreed and 2 agreed. By lumping together strongly agree and agree, it can be observed that all respondents said that teachers introduced the topic before the television lesson to help learners to prepare for the task. This contradicts with the students' response (See Table 12: item 1). As the observation result (Appendix D) and students' response indicate, teachers didn't introduce the topic before the television lesson is started. In the open ended questions, students explained that teachers usually appeared in the middle of the lesson in the classroom. From this data, it would be possible to say that learners failed to take part in a preliminary activity that introduces the topic and the situation (Richards and Rodgers, 2001).

In statement 2, the teachers were asked whether or not 'they clarify the learning objective of the activities to make them purposeful.' Thus, 2 strongly agreed and 3 agreed on this item. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, all respondents (5) assured that teachers clarified the

**Table 9: Teachers' responses on the conditions of classroom set up during oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of responses		
		Yes	No	Undecided
1	Is it possible to organize the class for pair and group activities?	-	5	-
2	Are there enough seating spaces for interaction?	1	4	-
3	Are the desks and tables easily movable to make groups?	-	5	-

In item 1, Table 9, the teachers were asked if 'it is possible to organize the class for pair and group activities.' In responding to this item, all teachers (5) claimed that it is impossible to organize the class for pair work and group work. As the observation result (Appendix D) indicates, most students sat in groups of three through out the whole period although the television teacher ordered the students to perform the activities with a partner. In the interview (Appendix C1 and C2) teachers also explained that it is impossible to organize the students in pairs because of the unwillingness of students to move on to other seats. However, during group work and pair work, students can face and talk directly to one another, so it is much closer to the way we use language outside the classroom (Byrene, 1987).

In item 2, the teachers were asked whether or not 'there are enough seating spaces for interaction in the classroom.' In this regard, the majority of respondents (four out of five) confirmed that there are no enough seating spaces for interaction. From this data, it is possible to infer that the classroom is filled with tables, chairs and large number of students.

In item 3, the teachers were asked if 'the desks and tables are easily movable to make groups.' As a reaction, all of the respondents answered that the desks and tables are not easily movable to make groups. As the interview result (Appendix C1 and C2) indicates, chairs and tables are combined and one combined desk may weigh up to 30k.g. However, Moss (2003) explains that

round tables, desks arranged in small groups, or even a semi- circle of desks help make interactive task easier.

As it can be seen from the above table, the classroom set up did not have potentials in facilitating oral interaction.

#### ***4.2. Data Analysis and Discussion Based on the Students' Responses to the Questionnaire***

This part of the students' responses to the questionnaire is intended to examine:

- whether the contents as input and activities in tasks adequately realize oral interaction
- the roles of classroom teachers in facilitating oral interaction
- the roles of the television teacher (in a classroom setting) in facilitating oral interaction

##### **4.2.1. Aspects in Relation to Contents as input**

This section investigated the perception of students have regarding to the nature of contents as input of activities in facilitating oral interaction. To attain this specific objective, the subjects were required to respond 3 statements as indicated in the following table.

**Table 10: Students' responses regarding to the contents as input of the activities of oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number and Percentage of Responses									
		Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	<b>A contents as input</b> You are familiar to the contents of activities	46	28.8	60	37.8	23	14.5	17	10.7	13	8.2
2	You get sufficient information from the contents of the activities	15	9.4	20	12.6	12	7.5	68	42.8	44	27.7
3	You are interested with the contents of the activities	63	39.6	37	23.3	20	12.6	16	10	23	14.3

With respect to familiarity of contents, the data in item 1 above shows that 66.6% of the respondents agreed on the fact that students are familiar with the contents of activities. The information from the above table indicates that the majority of the students at least agreed that there is no problem of familiarity with the contents of the activities. In the literature section of this paper, it has been pointed out that the extent of content familiarity of a given activity has something to do with promotion of interaction. In addition, subject matter with which the L<sub>2</sub> learning is familiar is easier to handle than topics which are entirely novel (Stern, 1992).

With respect to getting sufficient information from contents as input in response to item 2, the majority of respondents (70.5%) said that students did not get sufficient information from the contents of the activity as the input. A similar response is given by teachers (Table 2). However, in order to interact with each other effectively, students should get sufficient information from the content of the activity.

In response to whether or not 'the contents of the activities are the students' interest' in item 3, the majority of respondents (62.9%) agreed that students are interested with the contents of the activities. In the literature section of this

paper, it has been stated that the input data, which task participants are supposed to comprehend and manipulate in the communicative process should reflect the learners' needs and interests, thereby possibly encouraging the use of the target language. Therefore, it seems that since the contents of activities are selected on the basis of learners' interests, they can promote oral interaction in the classroom

#### 4.2.2. Conditions in Relation to Activities

In this section, an attempt was made to examine whether the oral communicative activities adequately realize oral interaction or not. To attain this specific objective, the subjects (students) were required to respond to six statements in the following table.

**Table 11: Students' response on the activities of oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number and Percentage of Responses									
		Strongly agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
1	<b>A Activities</b> The activities engage you to communicate (interact) with each other	43	27.1	67	42.1	8	5	21	13.2	20	12.6
2	The activities motivate you to speak	52	32.7	46	28.9	21	13.2	24	15.1	16	10.1
3	The difficulty level of the activities is appropriate for you	18	11.3	23	14.5	27	17	52	32.7	39	24.5
4	The activities in one way or another relates with your real life conditions	52	32.7	67	42.2	14	8.8	19	11.9	7	4.4
5	The activities are provided in a flexible manner	59	37.1	66	41.5	17	10.7	11	6.9	6	3.8
6	The activities are designed to achieve a particular goal	72	45.2	61	38.4	6	3.8	11	6.9	9	5.7

In response to whether or not 'the activities engage the students to interact with each other' in item 1, Table 11, 27.1% strongly agreed and 42.1% agreed, 5% rated undecided, 13.2% disagreed and 12.6% strongly disagreed. When strongly agree and agree are lumped together, 69.2% of respondents agreed that the activities in the course book engaged the students to communicate (interact) with each other. Therefore, one can infer from this data that the oral

communicative activities have potentials in facilitating free communication in their very nature.

In item 2, the students were asked whether or not 'the activities motivate the students to speak.' All the students who took part in the study responded as follows: 32.7% showed their strong agreement, 28.9% showed agreement, 13.2% rated undecided, 15.1% disagreed and 10.1% strongly disagreed. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, the majority of respondents (61.6%) asserted that the oral communicative activities motivate the students to interact with each other. In relation to this, Howarth (2006) states that motivation is a fundamental aspect of successful learning. Therefore, interactional activities should lead learners to increase their level of motivation when they participate in communication.

In response to whether or not 'the difficulty level of the activities is appropriate' in item 3, 11.3% strongly agreed, 14.5% agreed, 17% rated undecided, 32.7% disagreed and 24.5% strongly disagreed. When the results of disagree and strongly disagree are lumped together, the majority of respondents (67.2%) claimed that the difficulty level of the activities is not appropriate for the students. In relation to this idea, Akbarnetaj (n.d.) states that the activities should not be very difficult because difficult activities require swift and high level of mental processing to communicate meaning.

In item 4, the students were asked whether or not 'the oral communicative activities in one way or another relate with the real life of students conditions.' In this regard, 32.7% strongly agreed, 42.2% agreed, 8.8% rated undecided, 11.9% disagreed and 4.4% strongly disagreed. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, the majority of respondents (74.9%) agreed that the oral communicative activities relate with the real world life. In relation to this, Stern (1992) points out that task oriented activities should focus on involving learners in 'authentic' and 'real' communication. In addition, the most motivating language to learn enables us to talk in a realistic condition.

In item 5, the students were asked whether or not 'the activities are provided in a flexible manner.' In this regard, 37.1% showed their strong agreement, 41.5% showed their agreement, 10.7% rated undecided, 6.9% showed their disagreement and 3.8% showed their strong disagreement. When the results of strongly agree and agree are lumped together, the majority of respondents (78.6%) responded that the activities are provided in a flexible manner. To this end, Harmer (1991) states that by presenting students with a variety of activities, we can ensure their continuing interest and involvement in an oral interaction. However, classes which continuously have the same activities are not likely to sustain interest.

In item 6, the students were asked whether or not 'the activities are designed to achieve a particular goal.' As a reaction to this statement, 45.2% strongly agreed, 38.4% agreed, 3.8% rated undecided, 6.9% disagreed and 5.7% strongly disagreed. When strongly agree and agree are lumped together, the majority of respondents (83.6%) responded that the oral communicative activities are designed to achieve a particular goal. Good task-essentially goal-oriented, requires group or pair to achieve an objective that is usually expressed by an observable result, which is attainable only by interaction between participants (McDonough and Shaw, 1993).

#### **4.2.3. Aspects in Relation to Roles**

This section investigated the perception that students have regarding the roles played by their English teachers and television teacher (in classroom setting) in facilitating oral interaction. To attain this objective, the subjects were required to respond to nine items in Table 12 and 3 items in Table 13 respectively.

**Table 12: Students' responses regarding to the roles of classroom teachers during oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of responses					
		Yes		No		Undecided	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Does the classroom teacher: introduce the oral activities before the television lesson is stated?	35	22	112	70.4	12	7.6
2	clarify the learning objective of the oral activities?	40	25.2	108	67.9	11	6.9
3	act according to the instruction given by the television teachers?	37	23.3	103	64.8	19	11.9
4	group students by mixing weak and clever students?	8	5	147	92.5	4	2.5
5	encourage students to interact by moving between desks?	55	34.6	89	56	15	9.4
6	Provide a rich environment that contains collaborative work	23	14.5	109	68.5	27	17
7	diagnose problems faced by students who have difficulty in expressing themselves?	8	5	126	79.3	25	15.7
8	encourage students to sit in pairs or groups for oral interaction?	45	28.3	109	68.6	5	3.1
9	let students to work on difficult areas at the end of the lesson?	31	19.5	116	73	12	7.5

In item 1, Table 12, the students were asked whether or not 'their English teacher introduces the oral communicative activities.' As a reaction to this statement, out of 159 respondents, 70.4% of them said that classroom English teachers did not introduce the oral activities before the television lesson is started. In relation to this, (Willis,1996 in Klapper, 2003) states that in the 'pre-task phase' the teacher should explore the topic with the class and highlight useful words and phrases and help learners prepare for the task.

In item 2, the sample students were asked whether or not 'their classroom teacher clarifies the learning objective of the oral activities.' In this regard, out of 159 respondents, 67.9% of them answered that teachers did not clarify the learning objective of the oral activities. From this data, it is possible to infer that teachers failed to provide the learners with a reason to speak. Therefore, it

seems that teachers didn't present what will be expected of the student in the oral activity during introduction. However, an increase in student interaction can be promoted by providing a reason to interact (Howarth, 2006).

In item 3, the students were asked whether or not 'their classroom teacher acts according to the instruction given by the television teacher.' In responding to this item, out of 159 respondents, 64.8% of them replied that teachers did not act according to the instruction given by the television teacher. Although it contradicts with the teachers' response, a similar result is observed in the observation checklist (Appendix D). From this data we can infer that teachers failed to supervise the activities when they were told to do so.

In item 4, the students were intended to uncover their perception of their classroom teacher's role 'in grouping them by mixing weak and clever students.' As a reaction to the statement, the majority of respondents (92.5%) confirmed that teachers didn't group students by mixing weak and clever students during oral interaction. In relation to this, Byrne (1987) states that mixed ability groups with fast and slow students together do help one another, because the kind of work they have to do involve cooperation and collaboration in oral interaction.

In item 5, the students were asked whether or not 'their teacher encourages them to interact with each other by moving between the desks.' In this regard, 56% of respondents explained that teachers didn't encourage students to interact freely by moving between desks. In the open ended questionnaire (Appendix E), students stated that teachers became angry and impatient when they were asked for help during oral interaction. From this, it is possible to infer that students did not voice their own opinion freely. Concerning this idea, (Kayi, n.d.) justifies that teachers should circulate around the classroom to ensure that students are on the right track and see whether they need the teachers' help while they work in groups or pairs.

In item 6, the students were asked to reveal their perceptions on whether or not 'their classroom teacher provides a rich environment that contains

collaborative work.' In this regard, the majority of respondents (68.5%) answered that teachers didn't provide a rich environment that contains collaborative work. Moss (2003) explains that teachers should create positive relationships by encouraging learners to voice their ideas and feelings. Therefore, teachers should reduce classroom anxiety created by new and unfamiliar situations faced by students during oral interaction. Oral communicative activities are likely to be more difficult to engage in for a second language learner under conditions of stress, discomfort, fatigue, physical danger and emotional distress (Stern, 1992).

In item 7, the students were asked whether or not 'their classroom teacher diagnoses problems faced by students who have difficulty in expressing themselves.' Responding to this item, 79.3% of respondents assured that teachers failed to diagnose problems faced by students who have difficulty in expressing themselves. In relation to this idea, Moss (2003) states that to make interaction meaningful and effective, teachers need to know their students well. They should know which students work well and which don't. From this data, we can infer that teachers failed to give advice, assistance and support for those who have a problem in oral interaction. However, facilitating learner-to-learner interaction by providing assistance when students request it or when students are unable to repair communication breakdowns on their own would be important.

In item 8, the students were asked whether or not 'their classroom teacher encourages the students to sit in pairs and groups for oral interaction.' As a reaction to this item, the majority of respondents (68.6%) said that teachers didn't encourage students to sit in pairs or groups for oral interaction. This data revealed that teachers neglected group work and pair work which increase the amount of students talking time. They didn't also give emphasis on the opportunities they gave students really to use language to communicate each other (Harmer, 1991). This data shows that since there is no collaborative work among students, teachers failed to develop a higher degree of accomplishment in oral interaction by all participants. Students cannot help with each other

and in doing so cannot build a supportive community which raises the performance level of each student in an oral interaction.

In item 9, the students were intended to uncover their perceptions on their classroom teacher's role in 'letting them to work on difficult areas at the end of the lesson.' In this regard, 73% of the respondents answered that teachers didn't let students to work on difficult areas at the end of the lesson. The open ended questionnaire result (Appendix E) indicates that teachers went out of the classroom as soon as the television lesson is completed rather than ask students whether or not they have problems. Therefore, it seems that teachers did not clear the doubts of students and clarified points which are difficult to understand.

**Table 13: Students' responses on the roles of television teacher during oral interaction**

No	Questionnaire items	Number of responses					
		Yes		No		Undecided	
		No	%	No	%	No	%
1	Does the television teacher: give you enough time to interact with each other?	10	6.3	143	89.9	6	3.8
2	use appropriate speed in speaking?	17	107	136	85.5	6	3.8
3	speak clearly to you	95	59.7	56	35.2	8	5.1
	Total	122	76.7	333	210.6	20	12.7

In item 1, Table 13, the students were asked whether or not 'their television teacher gives them enough time to interact with each other.' As regards this, the majority of respondents (89.9%) answered that the television teacher didn't give enough time to the students to interact with each other. As it was observed in the classroom, students were forced to stop their discussion and dialogue reading before they completed (Appendix D). Howarth (2006) explains that the reasons for interaction breaks down is that because of the learners haven't had time to think about what they want to say and how to say it. Therefore, the

time given for students to interact with each other is not enough. A similar response is given in the teachers' response (Appendix C1 and C2)

In item 2, the students were asked whether or not 'their television teacher uses appropriate speed in speaking.' As a reaction to this item, the majority of respondents (85.5%) said that the television teacher didn't use appropriate speed in speaking. A similar result is seen in the observation checklist (Appendix D). From this data it is possible to infer that the television teacher speaks fast therefore the lessons may run fast without appropriate pause and this may create difficulty for students to follow appropriately.

In item 3, the students were asked whether or not 'their television teacher speaks clearly.' In this regard 76.7% of respondents assured that the television teacher speaks clearly to the students. A similar response is given by teachers (Table 7). To this end, Stern (1992) states that if voices are clear they are manageable for the L<sub>2</sub> learners. However, clarity of voice is not guarantee for managing the television teacher's speech because students were expecting teachers to explain every thing during oral interaction lesson (Appendix-C2).

#### **4.3. Data Analysis and Discussion Based on the Results of Classroom Observation Checklist.**

This part of the researcher's and co-observer's results of the observation checklist (Appendix D) is intended to examine whether:

- The activities in the tasks facilitate oral interaction
- ✓ • The roles of classroom teachers in facilitating oral interaction
- The television teacher's roles in a classroom setting in facilitating oral interaction
- ✓ • The students' roles during oral interaction
- ✓ • The conditions of classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction.

#### **4.3.5. Aspects in Relation to the Conditions of the Classroom Set up**

Since there was no enough seating space for interaction and the desks and tables were not easily moveable, the classroom layout couldn't be arranged in a different way to facilitate oral interaction (Appendix D: items 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 respectively). As it was already stated, tables in the classroom were combined, heavy and immovable, because of this reason, the students were sitting in neat rows with every one facing the chalkboard. Therefore, this made learner-to-learner interactions more difficult.

## CHAPTER V

### ***SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***

#### **5.1. Summary**

This study has examined the classroom interactional implication in teaching speaking through the use of tasks. In recent years, the focus on language teaching has placed a great emphasis on changing the classroom practice from the traditional passive form to more communicative and student-oriented form of learning through the use of tasks so that learners can be more easily exposed to the target language. In order to implement these communicative and student-oriented forms of learning in teaching oral interaction (speaking), various aspects are taken in to consideration. Therefore, this research paper analyzed those aspects related to components of communicative tasks (goals, contents as input, activities, roles (roles of teachers and learners) and setting.

As the overall findings of this study revealed, classroom interaction in teaching speaking through the use of tasks in the target grade level and school is not successfully implemented. There are a number of reasons for this. These include:

- insufficient information provision of contents as the input data.
- inappropriate difficulty level of activities to the students.
- ineffective teachers in introducing the topic, clarifying the learning objective, acting according to the instruction given by the television teachers, grouping students with mixed abilities, providing a rich environment, letting students to work on difficult areas and grouping students in pairs or groups to facilitate oral interactions.
- heavy and combined desks found in neat rows with everyone facing to the chalkboard.
- the speed of the television teacher and insufficient time allotment for interaction.

- lack of learners' initiative and willingness to interact with each other in groups and pairs.

However, the explicitness of goals ; the familiarity of contents to the students; the potential of goals and input( contents) in reflecting the learners' needs and interests; the authenticity, flexibility, purposeful and communicative (interactive) very nature of the activities facilitate oral interaction.

## **5.2. Conclusions**

From the above findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The goals of the oral communicative activities in the course book meet the needs and interests of learners. In addition, they are also explicitly stated.
2. The contents as input are familiar to the students. They also meet the needs and interests of students. However, they do not give sufficient information to the students during oral interaction lesson.
3. The activities meet the criteria of flexibility, authenticity, purposefulness and communicative (interactive) power. However, they are difficult when they are compared to the students' level.
4. Most classroom teachers fail to acknowledge the principles of communicative language teaching in general and the task-based language teaching in particular. They do not act as facilitators, catalysts, consultants, etc.
5. The implementation of satellite television led instruction is not conducive for teaching oral interaction. The television teacher doesn't give enough time for the students to interact with each other. In addition, the speed is too fast. This in turn discourages the students from attending the lesson properly and accomplishing the oral tasks appropriately.
6. The combined desks that are found in neat rows with everyone facing the chalkboard makes learner-to-learner oral interactions more difficult.

- It is advantageous to organize students into pairs and groups in order to give them a better opportunity to participate in oral interactions.
- The regional bureaus, administrators of schools and the community should do something to solve the problem of the classroom set up using different techniques like, raising awareness of the community about the problems and making linkage with government and non- government donors.

- Lilay Tedla. 1992. Teaching Spoken English to a Grade Nine Class: An Approach. Unpublished B.A. Senior Essay. Addis Ababa University.
- Littewood, W. 1981. **Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Losiewicz, B.L. 1988. "An Introduction to New Ideas in Language Teaching. An Annotated Bibliography for Teachers." <http://www.jstor.org/view/00182/33/ap020324/02a00500/0> [Date accessed 10/10/2006].
- Lyle, S. 1993. "An Investigation into Ways in which Children Talk Themselves into Meanings." **Language and Education**, 7(3), 181- 87. [EJ 485 116].
- Malama-Thomas, A. 1987. **Classroom Interaction**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mariam, S. 1998. **Case Study Research in Education**. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher.
- McDonough, J. and Shaw, C. 1993. **Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide**. Oxford: BlackWell Publishers.
- Mekasha Kassaye. 2005. An Exploration of the Task Design Procedures of EFL Teachers in Ethiopia- A Case Study. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Addis Ababa University.
- Ministry of Education. 2006. "The Task-based Approach." <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/print-doc.cmf?> {Date accessed 10/03/2007}.
- Moss, D. 2005. "Teaching for Communicative Competence." **A.//NCSALL Teaching for Communication Competence html** [Date accessed 18/04/2006].
- Nunan, D. 1989. **Designing Tasks for Communicative Classroom**. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum. **ELT Journal** 25(1): 279-293.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. **Research Methods in Language Learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Panitz, T. (n.d.). "Benefits of Cooperative Learning in Relation to Student Motivation." <http://home.capecode.net/z+panitz/tedstarticles/>

**motivation. html [Date accessed 6/03/2007].**

- Prabhu, N. S. 1987. **Second Language Pedagogy**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rees, G. n.d. "Find the Gap-Increasing Speaking in Class" British Council Teaching English. <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/speak/find-gapshtml> {date accessed 13/03/2007}.
- Richards, J. C. (n.d.). "Communicative Language Teaching" <http://www.cambridge.com.mx/site/EXTRAS/Jack-CD.pdf>. [Date Accessed 6/03/2007].
- Richards, J.C., Platt, J. and Weber, H. 1985. **Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguists**. London: Longman.
- Richards, J and Rodgers, T. 2001. **Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, W.M.1987. **Interactive Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. 1996. "Task-Based Interaction." **ELT Journal** 53 (1): 148-155.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1999. "Communicative Tasks." **ELT Journal** 50(1):127-135.
- Sisay Assefie. 1999. Classroom Interaction and Its Influence on the Development of Students' Speaking Skill at Grade 11 Level in Governmental Schools. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Addis Ababa University
- Smith, J. 1999. "An International Journal for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages." **ELT Journal**. 55(1): 69-92.
- Stern, H.1992. **Issues and Options in Language teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trauin, W.L, and Al-Arishi, A.Y. 1991. "Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching: Reflection and the EFL Classroom." **ELT Journal** 25(1): 9-25.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1978. **Teaching Language as Communication**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1990. **Aspects of Language Teaching**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



## Part One

### Questions Related to goals, contents as input and activities in facilitating oral communicative interaction

**Instruction:** for each of the following statements, please decide whether you **Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, disagree or Strongly disagree**. Indicate your answer by putting "✓" mark under the appropriate column in the right side.

		Responses				
		<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
1	<b>A. Goals</b> The goals of the activities are explicit					
2	The goals are relevant to the communicative needs of the students					
	<b>B. Contents as input</b>					
3	Students are familiar to the contents of the activities					
4	The contents as input have sufficient information					
	<b>C. Activities</b>					
5	The activities motivate the students to speak					
6	The activities are communicative (interactive)					
7	The difficulty level of the activities is appropriate to the students					
8	The activities in one way or another relate with the real world conditions					
9	The activities involve flexibility in presentation					
10	The activities are designed in order to achieve a particular goal					

11. If you have other reasons about the oral communicative tasks, write them down

---



---

## Part Two

### Questions Related to Classroom teachers' and Satellite

#### Television Teacher's Roles

**Instruction:** for each of the following statements, please decide whether you **Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, disagree or Strongly disagree**. Indicate your answer by putting "✓" mark under the appropriate column in the right side.

No	Items	Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<b>A. Roles of Classroom Teacher</b>					
1	You introduce the topic of before the television lesson to help learners to prepare for the tasks					
2	You clarify the learning objective of the oral activities to make them purposeful					
3	You act according to the instruction given by the television teacher to facilitate oral interaction					
4	You group students with mixed abilities together to facilitate oral interaction					
5	You encourage students to interact freely by moving between desks					
6	You provide a rich environment that contains collaborative work					
7	You let students to work on difficult areas at the end of the television lesson to help them to overcome their oral communicative problems					
	<b>B. Roles of the Television Teacher in a classroom setting</b>					
8	He/she gives you enough time to perform your duty effectively					
9	He/she has appropriate speed of speaking					
10	He/she has clear voice which can be managed by students easily					
11	He/she gives enough time for students to interact with each other orally					

12. If you have additional ideas on your roles and the roles of television teacher, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### Part Three

#### Questions Related to the Conditions of Classroom Set up

**Instruction:** Please, mark a tick (✓) in the column provided in the category of 'Yes', 'No' or 'Undecided' that corresponds the statement.

No	Items	Responses		
		Yes	No	Undecided
1	Is it possible to organize the class for pair and group activities?			
2	Are there enough seating spaces for interaction in groups?			
3	Are the desks and tables easily movable to make groups?			

4. If you have additional idea on the conditions of classroom setup, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### Part Four

#### Questions Related to Students' Roles and Mode of Interaction

**Instruction:** Read the following statements and answer by putting a tick (✓) mark in the box that satisfies your choice.

##### A. Students' Roles

1. What behaviors do students usually show when they engage in oral communicative interaction?

- They all show interest to the activity and interact willingly
  - Only few or some members in a group or pair devote more while others are passive
  - Almost all members engage themselves in other activities rather than work with the target activity.
  - Please specify if you have any other idea \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

---

2. What feature(s) of learners' roles is/are usually exhibited while the students accomplish a given oral communicative activity?

- They take the initiative to engage in the activity
  - They expect much from the teacher
  - They are easily discouraged by the problems they face
  - If you have any other idea, please write them own \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

***B. Questions Related to Classroom Mode of Interaction***

3. Which mode of interaction is more effective in promoting students' oral proficiency in your opinion?

- pair work
- group work
- whole class based work
- individual work
- If you have any other ideas, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

8. How do you evaluate your role in comparison to the television teachers' role during oral interaction lesson? Since I don't have much opportunity to help students during the oral interaction, I encourage the students to speak in English by creating different situations. I give various activities to the students in order to help them to interact with each other after the television lesson.

- c. authenticity? Are the oral activities related to the real conditions of students? Although they don't use English outside the classroom, activities are in one way or another related with their real life conditions. They are taken from what students do in their L<sub>1</sub>.
  - d. time allotment to complete the task. Is the time enough? It is very short. After the students start learning through the plasma television, students don't work anything. Not only the students but also teachers don't do any activity.
4. How do you evaluate the students' role during oral interaction. They are passive. 95% of them are passive. Surprisingly, when the speaking lesson is presented, they hate it. Their faces are not bright. Therefore, they are not willing to communicate. They hate the lesson because they are afraid to speak and they don't know the advantage of speaking in English.
  5. How do you organize pairs and groups? For example, during practicing and completing dialogue in expressing certainty and uncertainty, it was observed that when two students interacted with each others, the third student couldn't get any opportunity to communicate with other students in the class. What was the difficulty to organize the students accordingly? First, they don't have time. Secondly, they are not interested with the lesson. Therefore, they are not willing to go quickly and make groups and pairs.
  6. What do you say about the nature of classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction? Here, the classroom is not suitable. One combined desk weight at least 30 kg. To carry and circulate this kind of desk in the classroom is difficult. Therefore, tables and chairs are not suitable to arrange them for pair work and groups work.
  7. What does television led instruction contribute for oral interaction lesson? It is used to teach how to pronounce words correctly. It is used as a model. In addition, the television teachers show models to the students the way how to perform that type of lesson. However, the model that is shown in the plasma screen and the students' situation in the classroom are different. What is produced in the plasma screen cannot

## Part One

### Questions Related to goals, contents as input and activities in facilitating oral communicative interaction

**Instruction:** for each of the following statements, please decide whether you **Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, disagree or Strongly disagree**. Indicate your answer by putting "✓" mark under the appropriate column in the right side.

		Responses				
		<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
1	<b>A. Goals</b> The goals of the activities are explicit					
2	The goals are relevant to the communicative needs of the students					
3	<b>B. Contents as input</b> Students are familiar to the contents of the activities					
4	The contents as input have sufficient information					
5	<b>C. Activities</b> The activities motivate the students to speak					
6	The activities are communicative (interactive)					
7	The difficulty level of the activities is appropriate to the students					
8	The activities in one way or another relate with the real world conditions					
9	The activities involve flexibility in presentation					
10	The activities are designed in order to achieve a particular goal					

11. If you have other reasons about the oral communicative tasks, write them down

---



---

## Part Two

### Questions Related to Classroom teachers' and Satellite

#### Television Teacher's Roles

**Instruction:** for each of the following statements, please decide whether you **Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, disagree or Strongly disagree**. Indicate your answer by putting "✓" mark under the appropriate column in the right side.

No	Items	Responses				
		Strongly agree	Agree	uncertain	Disagree	Strongly disagree
	<b>A. Roles of Classroom Teacher</b>					
1	You introduce the topic of before the television lesson to help learners to prepare for the tasks					
2	You clarify the learning objective of the oral activities to make them purposeful					
3	You act according to the instruction given by the television teacher to facilitate oral interaction					
4	You group students with mixed abilities together to facilitate oral interaction					
5	You encourage students to interact freely by moving between desks					
6	You provide a rich environment that contains collaborative work					
7	You let students to work on difficult areas at the end of the television lesson to help them to overcome their oral communicative problems					
	<b>B. Roles of the Television Teacher in a classroom setting</b>					
8	He/she gives you enough time to perform your duty effectively					
9	He/she has appropriate speed of speaking					
10	He/she has clear voice which can be managed by students easily					
11	He/she gives enough time for students to interact with each other orally					

12. If you have additional ideas on your roles and the roles of television teacher, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### Part Three

#### Questions Related to the Conditions of Classroom Set up

**Instruction:** Please, mark a tick (✓) in the column provided in the category of 'Yes', 'No' or 'Undecided' that corresponds the statement.

		Responses		
No	Items	Yes	No	Undecided
1	Is it possible to organize the class for pair and group activities?			
2	Are there enough seating spaces for interaction in groups?			
3	Are the desks and tables easily movable to make groups?			

4. If you have additional idea on the conditions of classroom setup, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### Part Four

#### Questions Related to Students' Roles and Mode of Interaction

**Instruction:** Read the following statements and answer by putting a tick (✓) mark in the box that satisfies your choice.

##### A. Students' Roles

1. What behaviors do students usually show when they engage in oral communicative interaction?

- They all show interest to the activity and interact willingly
  - Only few or some members in a group or pair devote more while others are passive
  - Almost all members engage themselves in other activities rather than work with the target activity.
  - Please specify if you have any other idea \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

---

2. What feature(s) of learners' roles is/are usually exhibited while the students accomplish a given oral communicative activity?

- They take the initiative to engage in the activity
  - They expect much from the teacher
  - They are easily discouraged by the problems they face
  - If you have any other idea, please write them own \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- 

***B. Questions Related to Classroom Mode of Interaction***

3. Which mode of interaction is more effective in promoting students' oral proficiency in your opinion?

- pair work
- group work
- whole class based work
- individual work
- If you have any other ideas, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix-B**  
**Addis Ababa University**  
**Institute of Language Studies**  
**Department of Foreign Languages and Literature**  
***Students' Questionnaire***

***Dear Student,***

This study is aimed at investigating the classroom practices in relation to the effectiveness of contents as input, activities, classroom teachers' and television teacher's roles in facilitating oral interaction. Responses given objectively and sincerely contribute a lot for the success of the study.

Thank you in advance!

The respondent's background information

Sex:                    Male                    Female

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

## Part One

### Questions related contents as input and activities

**Instruction:** for each of the following statements, please decide whether you **Strongly agree, Agree, Undecided, disagree or Strongly disagree**. Indicate your answer by putting "√" mark under the appropriate column in the right side.

		Responses				
		<i>Strongly agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Strongly disagree</i>
1	<b>A. Contents as input</b> You are familiar to the contents of the activities					
2	You get sufficient information from the contents of the activities					
3	You are interested with the contents of the activities					
4	<b>B. Activities</b> The activity engages you to communicate (interact) with each other					
5	The activities motivate you to speak					
6	The difficulty level of the activities is appropriate for you					
7	The activities in one way or another relates with your real life conditions					
8	The activities are provided in a flexible manner for you					
9	The activities are designed to achieve a particular goal					

10. If you have other reasons, please write them down

---



---



---

## Appendix- C1

### Teachers A's Interview Responses

First of all I would like to thank you for your cooperation for this interview.

1. To start our interview, the first question is, in the past decades we taught our students in the structural method. However, currently we are applying task based language teaching method which is supposed to be scientific in order to achieve the principles of communicative language teaching. Which do you appreciate? Well, I appreciate the method that we use to teach English at present? Do you mean task based language teaching method? Yes, because this gives an opportunity for students to interact with each other. Task-based language teaching methodology in an interactive classroom context consists of three broad phases. These are: pre-task, task cycle and the language focus phases. Have you taken any training/work shop on how to implement these phases in the classroom? No, I haven't taken any training, workshop or course on how to apply them before.
2. How do you evaluate the contents of the speaking lesson in terms of their clarity and potential in reflecting learners' needs and interests? Of course, the contents are clear in the textbook. However, since students don't have background and habit of speaking, they don't participate in the oral interaction.
3. What do you say about the nature of speaking lessons in the satellite television led instruction in terms of:
  - a. flexibility of presentation? In general, it is provided in a good way. It is presented in a diagram form, dialogue form and the like. It is provided in a way in which students can participate in an oral interaction. Although the students don't have background and habit in speaking English, the speaking lessons are presented in various way.
  - b. difficulty level? What about their appropriateness of difficulty level to the students? The difficulty level of the oral activities in the

- course book is medium. They are not too difficult and they are not too easy. Therefore, students try their best to manipulate them
- c. authenticity? Are the activities related to the real life conditions of students? Yes, the activities in the course book are directly related with their real life conditions. Although students don't have the habit of speaking English, they do it in their L<sub>1</sub> when they communicate with people.
  - d. time allotment to complete the oral communicative activities. ? Is the time enough? It is not enough. There is shortage of time to complete the tasks. The time is completed when the students are ready to discuss in pairs or groups.
4. How do you evaluate the students' role during oral interaction? Are they active? No, they are not active. They don't actively participate. They need much explanation from the teacher. They can't understand the information given to them very quickly.
  5. How do you organize pairs and groups? For example, during practicing and completing dialogue in expressing certainty and uncertainty, it was observed that when two students interacted with each other the third student couldn't get any opportunity to communicate with other student in the class. What was the difficulty to organize the students accordingly? First of all there is no enough time to do that. Secondly, students may not be volunteer to move to another seat.
  6. What do you say about the nature of classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction? The classroom is not suitable to organize students in Pairs and groups. Tables and chairs are not movable. They are also combined. They are also heavy to move form place to place.
  7. What does television led instruction contribute for oral interaction lesson? I think it is good because it shows samples (models) to the students in the form of diagram, picture, and dialogue. Therefore, it encourages students to participate in an oral interaction by looking at those models in the television screen.

8. How do you evaluate your role in comparison to the television teachers' role during oral interaction lesson? Since I don't have much opportunity to help students during the oral interaction, I encourage the students to speak in English by creating different situations. I give various activities to the students in order to help them to interact with each other after the television lesson.

## Appendix-C2

### Teacher B's Interview Responses

First of all I would like to thank you for your cooperation for this interview.

1. To start our interview, in the past decades we taught our students in the structural method. However, currently we are applying task based language teaching method which is supposed to be scientific in order to achieve the principles of communicative language teaching. Which do you appreciate? I appreciate the task-based language teaching method. I believe that it brings a change in teaching learning process. It can also be used to put the principles of communicative language teaching in to practice. Task-based language teaching methodology in an interactive classroom context consists of three broad phases. These are: pre-task, task-cycle and the language focused phases. Have you taken any training/workshop/ on how to implement these phases in the classroom? Yes, I have taken. I learnt them in my diploma course by dividing them into phases.
2. How do you evaluate the contents of the speaking lesson in terms of their clarity and potentials in reflecting learners' needs and interests? The contents of the lesson don't reflect the needs and interests of learners. Students would like to talk about HIV/AIDS and things that are relevant to their age. However, the contents don't reflect this.
3. What do you say about the nature of speaking lessons in the satellite television led interaction in terms of:
  - a. flexibility of presentation? Although it doesn't have face-to-face contact with the students, it tries to provide activities in a variety of ways; using pictures, dialogue and the like.
  - b. difficulty level? What about appropriateness of difficulty level to the students? The activities are difficult for the students because they don't easily understand them and respond quickly. Therefore, the difficulty level of the activities is not appropriate to the students. It is beyond their capacity.

- c. authenticity? Are the oral activities related to the real conditions of students? Although they don't use English outside the classroom, activities are in one way or another related with their real life conditions. They are taken from what students do in their L<sub>1</sub>.
  - d. time allotment to complete the task. Is the time enough? It is very short. After the students start learning through the plasma television, students don't work anything. Not only the students but also teachers don't do any activity.
4. How do you evaluate the students' role during oral interaction. They are passive. 95% of them are passive. Surprisingly, when the speaking lesson is presented, they hate it. Their faces are not bright. Therefore, they are not willing to communicate. They hate the lesson because they are afraid to speak and they don't know the advantage of speaking in English.
  5. How do you organize pairs and groups? For example, during practicing and completing dialogue in expressing certainty and uncertainty, it was observed that when two students interacted with each other, the third student couldn't get any opportunity to communicate with other students in the class. What was the difficulty to organize the students accordingly? First, they don't have time. Secondly, they are not interested with the lesson. Therefore, they are not willing to go quickly and make groups and pairs.
  6. What do you say about the nature of classroom set up in facilitating oral interaction? Here, the classroom is not suitable. One combined desk weight at least 30 kg. To carry and circulate this kind of desk in the classroom is difficult. Therefore, tables and chairs are not suitable to arrange them for pair work and groups work.
  7. What does television led instruction contribute for oral interaction lesson? It is used to teach how to pronounce words correctly. It is used as a model. In addition, the television teachers show models to the students the way how to perform that type of lesson. However, the model that is shown in the plasma screen and the students' situation in the classroom are different. What is produced in the plasma screen cannot