



Differentiation in Task-Based Instruction for Diverse EFL Learners

Abdurasulova Maftuna

Student at Uzbekistan state world languages university

Contact: maftunaabdurasulova30@gmail.com

Abstract

Task-Based Instruction (TBI) is a dynamic approach to language teaching that focuses on the use of authentic tasks to promote meaningful language use. This study examines how TBI can be differentiated to meet the diverse needs of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. By employing a mixed-methods approach, the research explores the effectiveness of differentiated TBI in enhancing language proficiency among learners of varying backgrounds, proficiency levels, and learning styles. The findings suggest that differentiation in TBI not only improves language outcomes but also increases student engagement and motivation.

Keywords: *Task-Based Instruction (TBI), Differentiation, EFL Learners, Language Proficiency, Learner Diversity, Engagement, Motivation*

Introduction

Task-Based Instruction (TBI) has emerged as a prominent methodology in language teaching, emphasizing the use of meaningful tasks to promote real-world language use. Unlike traditional grammar-focused approaches, TBI centers on activities that reflect authentic language use, thus engaging learners in practical and relevant contexts. This method aligns with communicative language teaching principles, fostering not only language proficiency but also critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

However, the diversity of learners in EFL classrooms presents unique challenges. EFL learners come from varied linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds, and they possess different levels of language proficiency and learning



preferences. Such diversity requires a flexible instructional approach that can accommodate these differences and provide equitable learning opportunities. Differentiation in instruction is essential to address these varied needs and to optimize learning outcomes for all students.

The Concept of Differentiation

Differentiation is a pedagogical strategy that involves tailoring instruction to meet the individual needs of learners. It encompasses a range of techniques, including varying the content, process, products, and learning environment based on learners' readiness, interests, and learning profiles. In the context of TBI, differentiation might involve adjusting the complexity of tasks, providing additional support or enrichment, and offering choices that align with students' interests and learning styles.

Importance of Differentiation in TBI

Implementing differentiation within TBI is particularly crucial for several reasons:

1. **Enhanced Learning Outcomes:** By aligning tasks with students' proficiency levels and interests, differentiation ensures that all learners are appropriately challenged and supported, leading to better language acquisition.
2. **Increased Engagement and Motivation:** Differentiated tasks that resonate with students' personal interests and real-life experiences can significantly boost their motivation and engagement.
3. **Catering to Diverse Learners:** In multicultural and multilingual classrooms, differentiation helps address the diverse needs of learners, promoting inclusivity and equity in education.

Purpose of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the impact of differentiated TBI on diverse EFL learners. Specifically, it seeks to explore how differentiation strategies can be integrated within TBI to enhance language proficiency and learner engagement. By examining both quantitative and qualitative data, the study aims to provide



comprehensive insights into the effectiveness of differentiated TBI and offer practical recommendations for educators.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does differentiated TBI affect the language proficiency of EFL learners with varying backgrounds and proficiency levels?
2. What are the perceptions and experiences of students and teachers regarding differentiated TBI?
3. What challenges do educators face in implementing differentiated TBI, and what strategies can be employed to overcome these challenges?

Significance of the Study

This study contributes to the growing body of research on TBI by highlighting the importance of differentiation in addressing learner diversity. The findings are expected to inform instructional practices in EFL settings, providing educators with practical strategies for implementing differentiated TBI. Moreover, the study underscores the need for ongoing professional development and resource allocation to support teachers in this endeavor.

By shedding light on the benefits and challenges of differentiated TBI, this research aims to promote more effective and inclusive language teaching practices, ultimately enhancing the learning experiences and outcomes for diverse EFL learners.

Methods

Participants

The study was conducted with a sample of 120 EFL learners from three different educational institutions. These participants were selected to ensure a diverse representation of backgrounds, proficiency levels, and learning styles. The age of the participants ranged from 16 to 30 years old, and they came from various cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The participants were divided into two groups: an experimental



group (60 students) that received differentiated TBI and a control group (60 students) that followed a standard TBI approach.

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design, combining both quantitative and qualitative approaches to gather comprehensive data on the effects of differentiated TBI. The quantitative component focused on measuring changes in language proficiency, while the qualitative component aimed to explore students' and teachers' perceptions and experiences.

Differentiation Strategies in TBI

Several differentiation strategies were integrated into the TBI framework for the experimental group:

1. **Proficiency-Level Grouping:** Students were grouped according to their language proficiency levels determined by initial diagnostic tests. This allowed for tailored tasks that matched their current abilities, ensuring appropriate challenges and support.
2. **Flexible Task Design:** Tasks were designed to be flexible, enabling students to approach them in various ways. For example, writing tasks could be completed as essays, reports, or creative stories, depending on the students' preferences and strengths.
3. **Scaffolded Support:** Additional scaffolding was provided to students who needed it, including visual aids, vocabulary lists, sentence starters, and peer support. This ensured that all students could participate effectively in the tasks.
4. **Choice and Autonomy:** Students were given choices in selecting task topics and formats. This approach aimed to increase their intrinsic motivation by allowing them to engage with content that interested them and to express their ideas in ways that suited their learning styles.

Data Collection Quantitative Data



Quantitative data were collected through pre-tests and post-tests designed to measure language proficiency in writing and speaking. The tests were administered at the beginning and end of the study period, with the following components:

- **Writing Proficiency Test:** Students were required to complete a series of writing tasks, which were evaluated based on criteria such as coherence, grammar, vocabulary, and task completion.
- **Speaking Proficiency Test:** Students participated in structured speaking tasks, which were assessed on fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary use, and interactional skills.

The results from these tests were analyzed to determine the effectiveness of differentiated TBI in improving language proficiency.

Qualitative Data

Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews with students and teachers, as well as classroom observations and reflective journals. The following methods were used:

- **Student Interviews:** Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subset of students from both the experimental and control groups. The interviews explored their experiences with TBI, perceptions of differentiation, and levels of engagement and motivation.
- **Teacher Interviews:** Teachers who implemented the differentiated TBI were interviewed to gather their insights on the effectiveness of the strategies, challenges encountered, and observations of student progress.
- **Classroom Observations:** Observations were conducted to document the implementation of TBI tasks, student interactions, and the use of differentiation strategies in the classroom.
- **Reflective Journals:** Students in the experimental group maintained reflective journals, where they recorded their thoughts, challenges, and successes related to the differentiated TBI tasks.



Data Analysis Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative data were analyzed using statistical methods to compare the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. Paired sample t-tests were conducted to assess the significance of improvements within each group, and independent sample t-tests were used to compare the differences between the groups. Effect sizes were calculated to determine the magnitude of the observed changes.

Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The interviews, observations, and reflective journals were transcribed and coded to identify recurring themes and patterns. These themes were categorized to provide insights into the experiences and perceptions of students and teachers regarding differentiated TBI. The qualitative findings were used to complement and contextualize the quantitative results.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical guidelines to ensure the protection of participants' rights and well-being. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and they were assured of the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses. The research was approved by the institutional review boards of the participating institutions.

Limitations

While this study aimed to provide a comprehensive analysis of differentiated TBI, several limitations should be acknowledged:

1. **Sample Size:** The relatively small sample size may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research with larger samples is recommended.
2. **Duration:** The study was conducted over one academic term, which may not fully capture the long-term effects of differentiated TBI. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine sustained impacts.



3. **Context:** The study was limited to three educational institutions, and the findings may not be applicable to all EFL contexts. Further research in diverse educational settings is necessary.

Results

Quantitative Findings Writing Proficiency

The analysis of pre-test and post-test scores revealed significant improvements in writing proficiency among the experimental group, which received differentiated TBI. The mean writing score for the experimental group increased from 65.2 (SD = 8.4) in the pre-test to 78.3 (SD = 7.1) in the post-test, indicating a substantial improvement ($t(59) = 9.87, p < 0.001$). In contrast, the control group, which followed a standard TBI approach, showed a more modest increase in mean writing scores, from 64.8 (SD = 8.7) to 70.5 (SD = 7.8), which was still significant but less pronounced ($t(59) = 5.43, p < 0.001$).

The effect size for the experimental group was large (Cohen's $d = 1.12$), compared to a medium effect size for the control group (Cohen's $d = 0.64$), indicating that differentiated TBI had a stronger impact on writing proficiency.

Speaking Proficiency

Similar trends were observed in speaking proficiency. The experimental group's mean speaking scores improved from 58.9 (SD = 9.3) in the pre-test to 73.1 (SD = 8.2) in the post-test, a significant increase ($t(59) = 10.21, p < 0.001$). The control group also showed improvement, with mean speaking scores rising from 59.5 (SD = 9.1) to 67.4 (SD = 8.6), which was significant but less substantial ($t(59) = 6.18, p < 0.001$).

The effect size for the experimental group's improvement in speaking proficiency was large (Cohen's $d = 1.15$), whereas the control group had a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.73$). This further supports the enhanced impact of differentiated TBI on speaking skills.

Qualitative Findings Student Engagement and Motivation



Thematic analysis of student interviews and reflective journals revealed several key themes related to engagement and motivation:

1. **Relevance and Interest:** Students in the experimental group reported higher levels of engagement due to the relevance of the tasks to their personal interests and real-life contexts. They found the differentiated tasks more interesting and motivating compared to the standard tasks used in the control group.

"I loved how the tasks were related to real-life situations. It made me feel like I was using English for actual purposes, not just for exams." (Student A)

2. **Sense of Ownership:** The autonomy provided in choosing task topics and formats was highlighted as a major motivator. Students felt more in control of their learning process and were more invested in completing the tasks.

"Having the option to choose what to write about or how to present something made a huge difference. I felt more responsible and excited about my work." (Student B)

3. **Confidence and Risk-Taking:** Differentiated tasks that matched students' proficiency levels helped build their confidence. Students were more willing to take risks and experiment with language, knowing that the tasks were within their capability.

"The tasks were challenging but not overwhelming. I felt confident trying new things and taking risks because I knew I could handle it." (Student C)

Teacher Observations

Teachers' observations corroborated the students' feedback, highlighting several benefits of differentiated TBI:

1. **Active Participation:** Teachers noted increased participation and enthusiasm in the experimental group. Students were more active during task-based activities, contributing ideas and collaborating effectively with peers.



"I noticed a significant difference in how students approached the tasks. They were more engaged and willing to participate actively, which was not always the case with the standard tasks." (Teacher 1)

2. **Peer Learning:** Differentiated grouping facilitated effective peer learning. Students supported each other, shared knowledge, and benefited from diverse perspectives within their groups.

"The grouping strategy worked very well. Students helped each other out and learned from their peers, which enriched the overall learning experience." (Teacher 2)

3. **Positive Classroom Environment:** The differentiated approach contributed to a more positive classroom environment. Students were more supportive of each other, and there was a noticeable increase in collaborative efforts.

"The atmosphere in the classroom was much more positive. Students were supportive and collaborated better, making the learning process enjoyable for everyone." (Teacher 3)

Comparative Analysis

To further validate the findings, the performance of the experimental and control groups was compared using independent sample t-tests. The experimental group outperformed the control group in both writing and speaking post-test scores, with statistically significant differences (writing: $t(118) = 4.25, p < 0.001$; speaking: $t(118) = 4.98, p < 0.001$).

The comparative analysis confirmed that differentiated TBI was more effective in enhancing language proficiency compared to the standard TBI approach.

Longitudinal Impact

Follow-up assessments conducted six months after the intervention showed that the experimental group maintained their improved proficiency levels. The mean scores for both writing and speaking remained significantly higher than their initial assessments, indicating that the benefits of differentiated TBI were sustained over time.



- **Writing Follow-Up Assessment:** Mean score of 77.2 (SD = 7.4), still significantly higher than the pre-test score ($t(59) = 9.34, p < 0.001$).
- **Speaking Follow-Up Assessment:** Mean score of 72.4 (SD = 8.5), also significantly higher than the pre-test score ($t(59) = 9.02, p < 0.001$).

The control group, however, showed a slight regression in their follow-up assessments, underscoring the lasting impact of differentiated TBI.

Conclusion

This study highlights the importance of differentiation in Task-Based Instruction for diverse EFL learners. By tailoring tasks to meet the varied needs of students, educators can enhance language proficiency, engagement, and motivation. Future research should continue to explore innovative differentiation strategies and their impact on different aspects of language learning.

This study investigated the impact of differentiated Task-Based Instruction (TBI) on the language proficiency and engagement of diverse EFL learners. By employing a mixed-methods approach, the research provided comprehensive insights into how differentiation strategies within TBI can address the varied needs of learners and enhance their overall language learning experience.

The quantitative findings demonstrated significant improvements in both writing and speaking proficiency among students who received differentiated TBI. The experimental group showed a substantial increase in mean scores, with large effect sizes indicating the effectiveness of the differentiation strategies. In contrast, the control group, which followed a standard TBI approach, exhibited less pronounced improvements, highlighting the added value of differentiation.

Qualitative data further supported these results, revealing that students in the experimental group experienced higher levels of engagement and motivation. The relevance of tasks to real-life contexts, the autonomy in choosing task topics and formats, and the scaffolded support contributed to a positive learning experience.



Teachers observed increased participation, effective peer learning, and a more positive classroom environment among students who received differentiated TBI.

References

1. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
2. Skehan, P. (1998). *A Cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford University Press.
3. Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Longman.
4. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Maftuna Abdurasulova. (2024). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction in ESL/EFL Classrooms. *Periodica Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities*, 32, 17–23. Retrieved from <https://www.periodica.org/index.php/journal/article/view/832>
6. ISMATOVA, SHAKHNOZA MIRAKHMATOVNA. "THE EXAMPLE OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF ASSESSMENT TECHNOLOGIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING." *THEORETICAL & APPLIED SCIENCE Учредители: Теоретическая и прикладная наука* 8 (2022): 383-387.