the students try to find out if it is possible or not to use subtitles while listening. That means they are trained to deal with different assumptions at the level of complexity.

Detailed survey results emphasize the need to describe learners’ existing skills and knowledge, or EFL competence level in teachers’ instruction and often the need to explicitly provide algorithms for performance or models of outcomes.

Indication of task complexity and variability as well as the degree of learners’ independence at accomplishing a task is found desirable. Optional and, therefore, redundant elements in instructions are implicit coherence with the objective or with the course. Although the assessment/control function does not directly relate to the instruction within this research framework, the survey results show students’ need to comprehensively include information about assessment in instructions as it presents a certain level of motivation.

The survey results also demonstrate relative insignificance of instruction timing for the students while the teachers perceive timing for instructions as a sequence of particular linguistic skills: reading comes before writing, listening before writing, etc. Finally, “non-transparent” reading of instructions by EFL teachers is mainly attributed to differences in terminology.

The conclusion of the analysis of teachers’ formalizing instruction is that key parameters and their variability in the educational environment have not been thoroughly studied yet. The advantages of instruction formalization are as follows: technological simplification, quality control in course development through: a) formal criteria like availability of elements, sequences; and b) semantic verification of instruction content in relation to exercises, tasks, etc. The overall conclusion is that EFL teachers’ instruction automation is possible as long as educational contexts are systematized.
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