**METHOD**

**RESEARCH DESIGN**

An embedded mixed-methods approach was adopted to obtain a detailed understanding of secondary school students' speaking self-efficacy with regard to Task Based Instruction (TBI). As Creswell (2014) asserts, utilizing triangulation, various data collection approaches will be achieved for the researchers. Concerning the quantitative part, two intact classes were selected by applying a quasi treatment approach. These participants went through pretest, intervention, and posttest procedures. In relation to the qualitative section, the data were collected through an interview.

**Participants** **and Sampling of the Study**

Participants were grade eleven social science students attending English subject in Shambu secondary School, HGWZ of Oromia in 2022 academic year. They had been selected for they had to carry a lot of EFL speaking tasks in the remaining years in the future and they were in their career of learning in the future is English. Therefore, this study adopted a pre-post quasi-treatment design with two intact classes.

 **Instruments**

**Speaking Self-Efficacy Questionnaire.**

### Questionnaire

The first data collection instrument was questionnaire which was used to measure the two groups students about their self efficacy beliefs about TBLI in their speaking classroom before and after the treatment. In this study, responses to the questionnaire was used in a more generic way to the degree of positive/ negative affective trainees’ responses to the particular TBLI. The self efficacy questionnaire was adapted from Asakereh, and Dehghannezhad (2015) with a little development and including informed-consent form which informed students about the questionnaire and it was conducted with the 5-point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree) and administered before and after the tasks treatment for the two groups.

The rubrics for speaking self efficacy beliefs evaluations were adapted by the researchers from (Hadi,2015) to measure the variables magnitude, generality and strength.

The validity and reliability of the instruments were checked in such a way that the instruments could measure what they were supposed to measure. The feedback obtained from the EFL teachers helped the researchers to modify and make changes. Like the tests, some of the changes were regarding the wording of the statements, their order, format, content and clarity.

**Interview.**

Another instrument used to examine students’ views of the effects of TBLI on their speaking self-efficacy in speaking skills used to triangulate the findings was conducted with eight students from the treatment group. The students’ participation was entirely voluntary, and they signed informed consent forms prior to the interview. Hence, the researchers prepared a set of preplanned interview questions to elicit various conceptions. In this case, the researchers investigated outer and inner conceptions of secondary school students about their experiences with TBLI intervention and how it affected their beliefs about their capabilities to generate specific levels of performance in speaking self-efficacy and how TBLI helped them to be ready to enter into conversation, at a particular time with a specific person or persons, using English language. The interview was thoroughly audio-recorded, transcribed, and analyzed using a content analysis approach.

**Data Collection Procedures**.

Before the process of gathering data, the researchers made series contact with the school directors so as to get the necessary information and cooperation. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the school. Then, the relevant literature was reviewed to establish the theoretical background of the study.

After the researchers selected the participants of the study, they assigned the students into treatment and comparison groups. Then, the researchers adjusted an EFL teacher to make a contact with them after giving training how the EFL instructor teaches and how the two raters analyze to assessed the students.

After the researchers adapted the questionnaire, the EFL teachers and the researchers checked the reliability and validity of the test questionnaire. Then, the questionnaire was administered by EFL teachers for both treatment and comparison group students in order to assess both groups self efficacy level before the treatment.

Next, the pre-questionnaire was analyzed, and the task based instruction was implemented by a volunteer teacher selected voluntarily. The instruction was applied in between March to June by EFL teacher for both groups because the comparison group was forwarded conventionally.

After three months of the TBLI intervention, the post questionnaire was given for both treatment and comparison groups to check the effects of TBLI on EFL students’ speaking self efficacy beliefs achievement..

At the end of the intervention, an interview session was held with the treatment group having the representatives from each group. It was used to triangulate the answers for the first basic research question. The findings of the study were analyzed and discussed by the researchers.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

The speaking self efficacy beliefs questionnaire (as pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire) and interview were analyzed to answer the basic research questions. Both pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire were analyzed and were converted into mean and S.D. The first step of the data analysis process was to determine the mean and standard deviation of each pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire score. In this research, after all the assumptions of ANCOVA was checked, it, ANCOVA (Pallant, 2010; Tavakoli,2012) was used to compare the scores via Statistical Packages of Social Science (SPSS) version 26 to check if there is a statistically significant difference between pre-questionnaire and post-questionnaire.

For the qualitative data content analysis (CA) was used as an essential technique with a chief purpose to analyze the repeated patterns in the textual data (Clarke & Braun, 2013).

**Results**

**The Results of the first research question.**

Research question one examined the effects of the TBLI on the participants’ self efficacy beliefs. To answer this basic research question, the pre/post data collected were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. After the skewenes and kurtosis checked as it is thus valid to use Ancova tests. Before using the Ancova tests, descriptive statistics were run to compare the two groups' pre/post mean scores. The results are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics of the Pre/post speaking Test Mean Scores

|  |
| --- |
| **Report** |
| Group | Pretest | Posttest |
| Treatment | Mean | 73.9286 | 82.5714 |
| N | 42 | 42 |
| Std. Deviation | 8.58357 | 7.22510 |
| Comparison | Mean | 74.4762 | 74.2619 |
| N | 42 | 42 |
| Std. Deviation | 7.82191 | 8.18404 |
| Total | Mean | 74.2024 | 78.4167 |
| N | 84 | 84 |
| Std. Deviation | 8.16661 | 8.73741 |

As Table 4.1 depicts, the pre-means for the comparison group (M = 74.47, SD =7.82) and the TG (M = 73.92, SD =8.58) were similar before treatment. The means for the comparison group (M = 74.26, SD =8.18) and the treatment group (M = 82.57, SD =7.22) were different after treatment. The post-mean score of the treatment group (M=82.57) was larger than the post-mean score of the comparison group (M = 74.26).

The Ancova were performed to verify if there were significant differences in the two groups’ pre/post mean scores at the 0.05 significance level. After Levene’s test was calculated to test whether the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met Ancova was run to identify if a significant difference existed in the two groups' post mean scores. The results of ANCOVA test is shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Ancova test for comparing both Groups' Post Mean Scores

|  |
| --- |
| **Tests of Between-Subjects Effects** |
| Dependent Variable: posttest |
| Source | Type III Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. | Partial Eta Squared |
| Corrected Model | 2556.504a | 2 | 1278.252 | 27.392 | .000 | .403 |
| Intercept | 2029.478 | 1 | 2029.478 | 43.490 | .000 | .349 |
| Pretest | 1106.492 | 1 | 1106.492 | 23.711 | .000 | .226 |
| Group | 1535.020 | 1 | 1535.020 | 32.894 | .000 | .289 |
| Error | 3779.913 | 81 | 46.666 |  |  |  |
| Total | 522867.000 | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| Corrected Total | 6336.417 | 83 |  |  |  |  |
| a. R Squared = .403 (Adjusted R Squared = .389) |

Table 4.2 shows that the Ancova value obtained from the scores of the two groups was sig value 0.000, p ˂ .05), indicating the existence of significant difference between the two groups. The table also shows that effect size (eta squared) was .289, indicated there is an effect. The results can suggest that the TBLI helped EG develop their speaking perceptions.

In summary, the Ancova analysis indicated that the EG did make significant progress in speaking self efficacy. But the comparison group showed insignificant progress in speaking self efficacy beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative one was supported.

**Results of the second research question**

The students’ interview is interpreted as follows.

Interviewee “A” replies since the tasks are done based on real-world events and situations, he is sure that if he practices speaking more, he will be able to speak with native speakers without any stress and difficulty. Therefore it can help him to decrease stress during practicing English in the classroom by increasing his mastery experiences. Besides TBLI showed him strategies like asking for clarification, predicting the topic, etc., that could compensate for the lack of knowledge that happens for all EFL students at times.

Interviewee “C” claimed that she is sure she is one of the best English speakers in her class. She realized that, compared with the rest of her class-mates, she cooperate in speaking sessions more actively. Generally speaking, she thinks if she does her best in English, she can achieve native-like fluency in the near future with TBLI techniques in speaking skills.

 Interviewee “E“ says that the TBLI program in their previous speaking classes, were totally controlled by the teachers speech and commands. But in this program, teacher was a facilitator in solving and doing the tasks. The teacher admired their slightest success in speaking. he realized that learning can be doubled by positive feedback from teachers as well.

Interviewee “G” says in their classmates did not act as competitors in the TBLI program. They were like real friends that appeared in difficult moments in speaking situations. His classmate’s guidance and help showed him a new way of learning which can last for life. Their approval enabled him to raise his confidence in speaking classroom.

**Discussion**

The current study was designed to determine the effect of the TBLI program on Shambu Secondary student’s speaking self-efficacy and how they were benefited from TBLI. The findings add to the growing body of evidence by suggesting that secondary students speaking self efficacy beliefs’ is increased in developing their speaking skills in the treatment group significantly differed from the comparison group on the post-questionnaire scores. Compared with the first self-efficacy questionnaire and interview responses, the results showed that students speaking ability enhanced in terms of speaking self efficacy beliefs aspects in the second administration of the questionnaire and interview. This progress might be ascribed to the TBLI instruction, supporting the students in the treatment group.

TBLI sets the stage for FL learners to use language to solve problems by offering hard tasks (e.g., giving opinion gaps). As a result of their participation with the FL language, FL students were able to process form, meaning, and function holistically (W. Eskildsen and G. &eod ́orsd ́ottir, 2017). Furthermore, Bygate, Norris, and Branden (2015) argue that speaking tasks can organize language learning and use by determining the performance context, clarifying the learning activities outcomes, and encouraging learners to appropriately use FL to reach the task outcomes.

The findings further confirm Ellis et al. (2019) findings that the participants acquired the meaning and form of the target linguistic structures sufficiently during task execution. Van den Branden (2021) believes, in line with the findings of this study, that TBLI can address the requirements and wants of FL students to solve real-life situations by encouraging them to employ all of their language skills at the same time.

TBLI can also be successfully used in Shambu Secondary student classes according to the results of the self-efficacy questionnaire and interview responses. That is, TBLI increased student’s motivation and self-efficacy beliefs through speaking activities. Further-more, in a cooperative environment, pupils were encouraged to employ additional language abilities. As a result, speaking activities prioritized meaning and followed explicit real-world language use objectives. The findings of the study can be explained using constructivist theories (Vygotsky, 1978; Vygotsky, 1986). In this way, the students communicated with one another in a communicative setting to create the necessary knowledge. Students could fill in the deficiencies in their speaking skills with the help of their peers in a social process (Cutrone and S. Beh, 2018; Harris and Leeming, “&e, 2021; Moore, 2018).

According to the results obtained from the interview, the participants had many benefits of TBLI. The findings of the study show that in TBLI, the emphasis is on a way rather than the what (Nunan, 2004). That is, students benefited from this school of thought, which emphasizes procedural knowledge in order to do a task effectively (Jordan and H. Gray, 2019). Similarly, Experiential Learning theory (Kolb, 1984) [58] states that students can use new knowledge and abilities to supplement what they already know to create a well-organized meaning.

Furthermore, the learner’s positive views toward the benefits of TBLI can be attributed to the belief that TBLI was beneficial in generating a learning environment that was conducive to student’s involvement and motivation (Bao and X. Du 2015). Furthermore, one possible explanation for the findings is that TBLI valued the student’s participation and cooperation in the learning processes and encouraged those to use group work to talk based on the intended criteria (R. Ellis, P. Skehan, S. Li, N. Shintani, and C. Lambert, 2019); R. Ellis , 2003; P. Skehan, 2003).

The comments of interview participants in this regard are empirically well corroborated by the findings of the study are consistent with those of Iwashita and Li (2012), who found that TBLI encouraged their participants to participate actively in classroom interactions. Furthermore, their findings revealed that the learners rebuilt non target structures after receiving feedback during interactions and that the feedback was incorporated into the following production.

**Conclusions and Pedagogical Implications**

Despite their strong theoretical basis, communicative techniques in general and TBLI in particular, appear to be underutilized at Shambu secondary school. This prompted the researchers to use quantitative and qualitative methods to investigate the effects of TBLI on Shambu secondary student’s self-efficacy in speaking skills and the benefits of TBLI. The results showed that after implementing the TBLI program, the treatment group’s speaking self-efficacy in speaking ability improved significantly compared to the comparison group and they are benefited from TBLI.

A variety of educational implications are proposed based on the study’s findings. To begin, first, pre-service and in-service teacher training for Shambu secondary school English teachers might be offered to familiarize them with the basic ideas of TBLI and how to use them in their classrooms. Second, educational policymakers in Ethiopia/Oromia may be able to identify and pick instructional tasks that correspond to the actions that secondary students are required to perform at their place of employment. The speaking section of the course books, in particular, can be constructed using a TBLI based approach to speaking. Third, through the TBLI program, it is crucial to foster a good, supportive, low-stress environment that stimulates innovation and risk-taking, particularly among less confident pupils.

Given the current study’s limitations, a number of recommendations for further research are offered. As previously said, the current study looked into the effects of TBLI on self-efficacy in the speaking performances of Shambu secondary school students. More mixed methods research is needed to examine the impacts of TBLI on other language skills in order to gain a more thorough knowledge of its efficacy (e.g., reading, writing, and listening). Though the study outcomes were encouraging in terms of the usefulness of TBLI in the development of secondary students’ speaking self efficacy in speaking classes, future research can look into its benefits in a variety of settings (e.g., primary schools, private language schools) with a variety of participants (e.g., children, teenagers, and adults).