

## THE EFFECTIVENES OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING TO TEACH SPEAKING SKILLS

<sup>1,2</sup>Lume, <sup>1</sup>Muh. Hisbullah

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Nahdlatul Wathan Mataram, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Co. Author Email: lumempd620@gmail.com

Article Info	Abstract
<b>Article History</b> Received: November 2021 Revised: December 2021 Published: January 2022	<i>This study aims to find out the effectiveness of task-based language teaching to enhance speaking skills. It applied a method to teach speaking skills in SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in Central Lombok. The research objectives are to know whether tasks-based language teaching is effective in teaching students speaking skills at ten-grade SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in the academic year of 2020/2021. The research was conducted in six meetings, the first meeting was given a pre-test and the second meeting until the fifth meeting for giving treatment with the descriptive text material, and six sessions to give a post-test. The researcher uses Quasi-Experimental Design. The population of the research was 127 students. The researcher used random cluster sampling to take the sample, and the samples of this research were eleventh-grade students of XI B as an experimental group that would be taught by using task-based language teaching and XI D as a control group would be taught by using the direct method. In experimental group consisted of 29 students, while the control group consisted of 30 students. The data was taken by test and analyzed by independent t-test. The mean score of students in the experimental group taught using Task-Based Language Teaching is 66.38. In the control group, the mean score of students taught using the direct method is 60.3. The results of t-test computation, <math>t_o</math> was 3.079 while <math>t_r</math> with the degree of freedom 57 in the level of significance 0.05, therefore, <math>t_o</math> was higher than <math>t_r</math>. It means the alternative hypothesis is accepted; Task-Based Language Teaching is Effective to teach speaking skills.</i>
<b>Keywords</b> Task-based Learning; Speaking Skill; Vocational Schools;	
<b>How to cite:</b> Lume., & Hisbullah, M. (2022). The effectiveness of task-based language teaching to teach speaking skills, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 10(1), pp. 85-93. DOI: <a href="https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.4399">https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v%vi%i.4399</a>	

### INTRODUCTION

The learners who are studying English in a non-English speaking setting need to experience real communicative situations in which they learn how to express their own views and opinions (Sevy-Biloon & chroman, 2019; Shin & Brenna, 2018). They develop their oral fluency and accuracy on speaking skills, which are essential for success of foreign language communication (Hartatik et al., 2016; Angelina & Garcia-Carbonell, 2019). Classroom interaction then, is necessary and useful as an educational strategy to enhance learning. It is in line with Ellis (2003) who states classroom interaction strives to involve and support learners in the learning process. Among the ways to create this language learning process in the classroom, task-based language teaching (TBLT) presents opportunities to employ effective and meaningful activities and thus promotes communicative language use in the classroom (Sumarsono et al., 2020). Task-based language teaching (TBLT) starts from an idea of task-based learning to facilitate learners to have chances to practice speaking. It was greatly popularized by N Prabhu (1987), who works with schools in Bangalore, southern India (Harmer, 2001).

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) focuses on the use of authentic language and asking students to do meaningful tasks using the target language (Chen, 2018; Gan & Leung, 2020). It is considered to be of great benefit in achieving communicative competence and increasing the motivation of second language learners (Hsu, 2019). This method brings the learners to the real world and using the task as the vehicle and core unit in learning. Task-based learning is much more beneficial to the student because it is more learner-centered (Chen, 2018), allows for more meaningful communication, and often offers a practical extra-linguistic skill-building (East, 2019). As the tasks are likely to be familiar to the students, they are more likely to be engaged, which may further motivate them in their language learning. In addition, tasks endorse language acquisition through the kinds of language interaction they necessitate.

Task-based language teaching has progressively achieved its popularity in recent years. It has been recommended by various experts in the field of teaching methodologies as a way forward in English language teaching. Prabhu stands as the first significant person in the development of TBLT. His main contributions have been raising the English Language Teaching world awareness to TBLT. Prabhu (in Richard and Rodgers, 2001: 233) defines a task as "an activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process". Willis (1996: 97) suggested that TBLT is seen as a method fostering a learning environment that finds appropriate in all skills and often combines more than one Skill in the same task.

According to Nunan (2004), task-based language teaching has strengthened as follows: 1) a need-based approach to content selection, 2) an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language, 3) the introduction of the authentic texts into the learning situation, 4) the provision of opportunities for learners to focus not only on language but also on the learning process itself, 5) an enhancement of the learner's own personal experience as important contributing elements to classroom learning, and 6) the linking of classroom language learning with language use outside the classroom. This research aims to investigate how effective task-based teaching TBLT has been at the Junior High School works with 12-14-year-old students who have disengaged from formal learning and have low motivations for second language learning, or any learning.

The concept of teaching method used by the teacher in the classroom plays a significant role in the process of foreign language learning (Sumarsono et al., 2020). In fact the considerable interest in the role of interaction in the context of learning becomes an important factor for the researchers of this field because it creates opportunities for the classroom community to develop knowledge and skills. Another clear purpose of choosing TBLT is to increase learner activity; TBLT is concerned with learner-centered activity. It lies on the teacher to produce and supply different tasks that will allow the learner to experiment spontaneously, individually and originally with the foreign language. Long (1985:95) defines each task will provide the learner with new experience with the foreign language and at this point the teacher has a very important part to play. The term task, which one of the key concepts in TBLT is defined as a piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward.

Dealing with cases mentioned above, in teaching and learning process basically, English teachers have begun attempting to teach foreign language in a way that was more similar to first language acquisition. However, in fact their endeavor seems completely difficult to encourage students to speak English. Feeling awkward to always say things in English sometimes attack students that it becomes problems toward English teaching. In addition when attempting to speak, learners must muster their thought and encode those ideas in the

vocabulary and synthetic structures of the target language. Therefore, it brings about uncomfortable to use the target language toward students eventually.

In SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in central lombok, the English teacher teaches English by using monotonous teaching-learning activity in which he reads loudly a dialogue that has been written on the students' workbook in the front of class as well as the meaning of the dialogue. After reading it, he instructs the students to repeat after him until the overall dialogue is read. Then the teacher asks the students to practice the dialogue in pairs by using the textbook. The teacher seldom asks the students whether they are really understand the use of those expressions. On the other hand, the students' activities in the classroom only read a dialogue, write its meaning based on what the teacher's say and then practice it in front of the class with their friend without knowing when they have to use the expression in real situation.

## RESEARCH METHOD

### Research Design

This research will be experimental research because the researcher wants to establish possible cause and effect between independent and dependent variables. The independent variable "caused" or "probably caused" is the dependent variable, or in the word the independent variable influences the dependent variable (Creswell, 2012: 295). The independent variable is Task-Based Language Teachings, while the dependent variable is Speaking Skill. Experimental research seeks to determine if a specific treatment influences an outcome (Creswell, 2014: 13). There are several different kinds of experimental design: the true experiment, the field or quasi-experiment, the natural experiment (Cohen et al., 2007: 274). This research will be quasi-experimental design and use pretest-posttest non-equivalent group design. Quasi-experiments include assignments, but not random assignments of participants to groups. The design will be as follow.

Table.1

Pre-test and post-test design			
Class	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experiment	O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>
Control	O <sub>1</sub>	Y	O <sub>2</sub>

Annotation: O<sub>1</sub>:Pre-test  
 O<sub>2</sub>:Post-test  
 X:Learning by task based language teaching  
 Y:Learning does not use task based language teaching

The dashed line separating the parallel rows in the diagram of the non- equivalent control group indicates that the experimental and control groups have not been equated by randomization—hence the term non-equivalent" (Cohen et al, 2007: 283). Both the class will be given pre-test and post- test, but they will get different treatment. The experimental group will taught by using Task-Based Language Teaching, while the control group will be taught by Direct Method. Both the groups will be given pre-test and post-test.

### Population and Sample

Population is a group of individuals who have the same characteristic (Creswell, 2012: 142). In this research, researcher chooses the Eleventh grade of SMK Darul Abror NW at Kuta in Central Lombok the academic year of 2020/2021. In practice, quantitative researchers sample from lists and people available. A target population (or the sampling frame) is a group of individuals (or a group of organization) with some common defining characteristic that the researcher can identify and study (Creswell, 2012: 142). The population of this research is all of the students at seventh grade students of the school which have four

classes. The total of the population was 127 students. Sample is part of population And the target sample is B and D class. There were two samples in this study, experimental class and control class. Experimental class is taken from B class consist of 29 students. Control class is taken from D class consisted of 30 students.

### Instruments

In this study, there were two instruments that used in collecting the data; pre- test and post-test. First, pre-test was administered to identify the students' ability in both groups; experimental group and control group before giving the treatment. Second, post-test was administered to know the students ability after given treatment. Post-test was held in the end of the research and after 4 times treatments in experimental group. The post-test was also administered to the both groups.

### Data Analysis

Experimental Group and control group. The data analysis of pre-test and post-test was employed exactly the same steps as in the pilot data analysis. In addition, the data was calculated by using SPSS program. Coolidge (2000) states that there are some specific assumptions that has to be fulfilled in using independent t-test appropriately. First, in each group, the participants have to be different. Second, the scores are normally distributed in each group. Third, the variances of two groups' score are equal.

The calculation covers data description, normality distribution test, homogeneity test, and independent t-test. The description refers If  $t_{obtained} > t_{table}$  with the degree of freedom =  $(n_1+n_2 - 1)$  on the significant level 5%, it could be concluded that there was significant influence of Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching speaking at the Seventh grade of SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in Central Lombok in the academic year of 2020/2021.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### Research Findings

The purpose of this research was to know whether Task-Based Language Teaching is effective to teach speaking Skill at the Seventh grade of SMK NW DARUL ABROR in the academic year of 2019/2020. The researcher took two classes as the sample, there were XI.B and XI.D. The students of XI.B as the experimental group consisted of 29 students, while the control group was XI.D, consisting of 30 students. The experimental group was treated by using Task-Based Language Teaching, while the control group was treated by using Direct Method. The data were obtained from pre-test scores and post-test scores. The treatments were held in the experimental group twice a week for 90 minutes by using Task-Based Language Teaching. The data descriptions of the data were presented bellows:

Table. 2  
Resume of the Scores

Descriptive Statistics						
Group	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
Pretest Experimental	35	65	49.48	50.00	55	8.275
Posttest Experimental	50	80	66.38	65.00	65	7.780
Pretest Control	30	65	49.83	50.00	50	9.330
Post test Control	40	75	60.33	60.00	65	7.303

The data of pre-test scores in experimental group showed that the pre-test's highest score was 65, while the lowest one was 35. The mean of the scores was 49.48, the median was 50.00 and the mode was 55. The standard deviation of the data was 8.275. Meanwhile, The

data of post-test scores in experimental group showed that the highest score of the post-test was 80, while the lowest one was 50. The mean of the scores was 66,38, the median was 65,00. and the mode was 65.. The standard deviation of the data was 7.780.

Dealing with the data of pre-test scores in control group, the data of the test showed that the highest score of the pre-test was 65, while the lowest one was 30. The mean of the scores was 49,83, the median was 50.00, and the mode was 50. The standard deviation of the data was 9.330. meanwhile, the data of post-test scores in control group showed that the highest score of the post-test was 75, while the lowest one was 40. The mean of the scores was 60.33, the median was 60.00, and the mode was 65. Standard deviation of the data was 73.03.

A normality test was used to test that the data distribution was normal or not. The normality testing was used in this research was Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The sample was on normal distribution at the level of significance  $> 0.05$ . Further explanation on normality test was presented at the table 2 as followed:

Table. 3  
Normality Testing

		Tests of Normality					
		Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Group	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Gain percent	Experimental	.144	29	.131	.948	29	.165
	Control	.110	30	.200*	.936	30	.070

The table above shows the result of the normality test. The samples were in normal distribution because the significant value. in the experimental class in the number of sample was 29, (Sig) was 0.131 which was higher than 0.05. It could be concluded that the samples in the experimental group were normal. Then, in the control group, the number of samples was 30, (Sig) was 0.200 which was higher than 0.05. It could be concluded that the samples in the control group were normal.

A homogeneity test was used to know whether the data was homogeneity or not. If significance  $> 0.05$ , it could be concluded that the data was homogeneous. Further explanation on homogeneity was presented in the table 3 as followed:

Table. 4  
Homogeneity Testing

		Test of Homogeneity of Variance			
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Value	Based on Mean	.545	1	57	.463
	Based on Median	.482	1	57	.490
	Based on median and with adjusted df	.482	1	56.947	.490
	Based on trimmed mean	.532	1	57	.469

Based on the table above, it could be seen that the (Sig) based on mean is 0,463  $> 0,05$ . It means the experimental post-test and control post-test group are Homogeneous variant.

3. Independent t-test. Independent t-test could be done after the result of normality and homogeneity test were fulfilled. If  $t_{obtained}$  ( $t_o$ ) was higher than  $t_{table}$  ( $t_t$ ) for the degree of freedom ( $df$ ) =  $n_1+n_2-2$  and the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) was 0.05, it meant that alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. Further explanation was presented at table 4 as follows:

Table. 5  
Independent t-test Hypothesis

<i>Df</i>	$t_o$	$t_t$	$\alpha$	Conclusion
57	3.079	2.002	0.05	SIGNIFICANT

The result of t computation showed that  $t_o$  was 3.079 while the  $t_t$  for the degree of freedom ( $n_1+n_2-2$ ) was 57 and at the level of significant 0.05 was 2.002. It could be seen that  $t_o$  was higher than  $t_t$  ( $3.0795 > 2.002$ ). It meant that the alternative hypothesis was accepted. Task-Based Language Teaching was effective to teach speaking at the Eleventh grade of SMK NW Darul Abror in the academic year of 2020/2021.

#### Paired sample t-test

The Paired Samples *t*-Test compares two means that are from the same individual, object, or related units. If  $t_{obtained}$  ( $t_o$ ) was higher than  $t_{table}$  ( $t_t$ ) for degree of freedom ( $df$ ) =  $n_1+n_2-2$  and the level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) was 0.05, it meant that alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted. Further explanation was presented at the experimental: table 5 and the control: table 6 as follows:

Table. 6  
Paired sample t-test experimental

<i>Df</i>	$t_o$	$t_t$	$\alpha$	Conclusion
28	12.149	2.048	0.05	SIGNIFICANT

  

<i>Df</i>	$t_o$	$t_t$	$\alpha$	Conclusion
29	7.473	2.045	0.05	SIGNIFICANT

The result of t computation showed that  $t_o$  was 12.149 on the experimental group and 7.473 on the control group. While the  $t_t$  for the degree of freedom ( $n_1+n_2-2$ ) was 28 on an experimental group and 29 on the control group. And at the level of significant 0.05 was 2.048 on experimental group and 2.045 on the control group. It could be seen that  $t_o$  was higher than  $t_t$  (experimental: ( $12.149 > 2.048$ ) and control: ( $7.473 > 2.045$ )). It meant that the alternative hypothesis was accepted.

#### Discussion

The researcher found the mean score after calculating the pre-test and post-test scores in experimental and control groups. The mean of pre- test score of experimental group was 49.48 and the control class was 49.83. After the treatments were conducted, the researcher administered the post-test. From the data calculation, the researcher found the different mean scores of the post-test in both groups. The experimental group got 66.38 while the control group got 60.33. From the independent t-test calculation, it was known that the value of  $t_o$  = 3.079 was higher than  $t_t$  = 2.002, the degree of freedom ( $n_1+n_2-2$ ) = 57 and in a significant level 0.05.

Therefore, it can be concluded that teaching is speaking using Task-Based Language Teaching had an influence on students' willingness in speaking achievement. The scores of students taught by using Task-Based Language Teaching were higher than students taught by using Direct Method. It could be clarified with a related theory that had been discussed in chapter II that Task-Based Language Teaching refers to teaching second/foreign language that seeks to engage learners in interactional authentic language use by having them perform a series of tasks. This method had characteristic learners-centered and the task served as the means for achieving natural use of language (Ellis, 2003:64). The learners' role in TBLT are act as a negotiator or interactor, capable of giving as well as taking; act as a performer and

listener, with little control over the content of the learning; and they take responsibility for their own learning, so the students got more chances to be active in teaching learning process.

The strength of TBLT was useful for moving the focus of the learning process from the teacher to the students, so the teaching-learning process could be focus on the students' activities (Shin & Brenna, 2018; Hartatik et al., 2016). The activities in class were dominated by the students, because they as the interactor/performer and they take responsibility for their own learning. By using this teaching model, the researcher could use some kinds of task which helps the students got their interest and explore them to can solve some kind of task. One of the strengths of TBLT above was found during the researcher implementation that method in research at SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in Central Lombok.

In Task-Based Language Teaching, Learners need to understand the forms, meanings and functions of language and take into consideration the social situation (Angelina & Garcia-Carbonell, 2019). It was in line with the statement from Larsen-Freeman and Anderson that for communicative competence and linguistic competence, the knowledge of forms and meanings form parts of the communicative purpose in TBLT (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2000). Using some kinds of task the learners explored their attitude, opinions and reactions during the teaching learning process, so this method was effective to teach speaking for students. It was proven from the data calculation in a significant difference in mean score, and independent t-test calculation showed that the result is significant. The result of this research was supported by the theory above.

## **CONCLUSION**

This experimental research is carried out on the Eleventh grade students of SMK NW Darul Abror Kuta in academic year 2020/2021. The result of t-test computation shows that  $t_{obtained}$  ( $t_o$ ) is 3.185 and  $t_{table}$  ( $t_t$ ) is 2.002 with the degree of freedom ( $n_1+n_2-2$ ) 57 and in the level of significance is 0.05. The result provides that  $t_o$  be higher than  $t_t$  so the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference in speaking between students taught by using Task-Based Language Teaching and students taught by using Direct Method. It can be seen from students' score. The mean score of the experimental group is 61.37 and the mean score of control class is 52.5. It means that the experimental group (XI.B) is higher than the control group (XI.D). It can be concluded that the use of Task-Based Language Teaching is effective to teach speaking at the eleventh-grade students of SMK NW Darul Abror kuta in the academic year 2020/2021.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Firstly, the researchers would like to say many thanks to Mr. Hisbullah for support the finishing this research. Secondly, we also would like to say to principles of SMK NW DARUL ABROR KUTA Mr. Rafi'i, SH. during the process of collecting data, and the last we would like to say to LLDIKTI VIII under of Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education who has given us opportunity and support to conducted this research

## REFERENCES

- Angelini, M. L., & García-Carbonell, A. (2019). Developing English speaking skills through simulation-based instruction. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(2), 3–20.
- Carter. (1997). *Investigating English Discourse*. Taylor and Francis-library: Routledge
- Chen, I. C. (2018). Incorporating task-based learning in an extensive reading programme. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 404–414. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy008>
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational Research (Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research) fourth edition*. USA: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approach fourth edition*. USA: Sage Publications.
- Cunningham, R. 1999. *Teaching English in a Speaking Setting*. Valencia: University of Valencia Press.
- Dalley. 2009. *Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching in Korean classrooms* England: University of Birmingham.
- East, M. (2019). Sustaining innovation in school modern foreign language programmes: teachers' reflections on task-based language teaching three years after initial teacher education. *Language Learning Journal*, 47(1), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1221440>
- Ellis, R. 2003. *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford Harmer, J. 1996. *How to Teach English*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Gan, Z., & Leung, C. (2020). Illustrating formative assessment in task-based language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 74(1), 10–19. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccz048>
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching third edition*. Cambridge: Longman.
- Hartatik, Sri Fatmaning ; Lestari, H. D. (2016). Reading experience non-native English speaking students majoring in English language teaching. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 1(October), 105–114. <https://doi.org/10.21070/jees.v1i1>
- Hsu, H. C. (2019). The combined effect of task repetition and post-task transcribing on L2 speaking complexity, accuracy, and fluency. *Language Learning Journal*, 47(2), 172–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1255773>
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (2000) *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research Essex*, UK: Pearson Education.
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A textbook for teacher*. U.K Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, David. 2004. *Task-based Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sevy-Biloon, J., & Chroman, T. (2019). Authentic use of technology to improve EFL communication and motivation through international language exchange video chat. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(2), 44–58.
- Shin, H., & Brenna, B. (2018). Multicultural english picture books and critical response in asian EFL classrooms. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(4), 1230–1238. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.4.26.1230>
- Skehan, P. (1996). *Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sugiono. 2011. *Statistika Untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Sumarsono, D., Muliani, M., & Bagis, A. K. (2020). The Forecasting Power of Task-Based Language Teaching and Self-Efficacy on Students' Speaking Performance. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 8(4), 412. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i4.2848>

- Syakur. 1987. *Language Testing and Evaluation*. Surakarta: SebelasMaret University.
- TareqMitibMurad. 2009. *The effectiveness of Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Improving Students' Speaking Skills among the Palestinian Secondary EFL Students in Israel And their Attitudes towards English*. Jordan: Yormouk University Press.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. U.K: Longman.
- Widdowson, H.G. 2003. *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, D.andJ.Willis. 2007. *Doing Task-based Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Willis, Jane. 1996. *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. England: Longman
- <https://www.spssindonesia.com/2018/05/uji-homogenitas-kelas-eksperimen-kontrol-spss.html>
- <https://www.spssindonesia.com/2015/05/cara-uji-independent-sample-t-test-dan.html>
- <https://www.spssindonesia.com/2019/04/uji-independent-sample-t-test-n-gain-score.html>