

The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Students' Speaking Achievement

Kory Dita Iswari*, Mahpul, Gede Eka Putrawan

FKIP University of Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1

*email: korydita133@gmail.com, Telp: 08975523597

Abstrak. Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada efek dari Task-based language teaching (TBLT) terhadap pencapaian berbicara siswa pada siswa tingkat pertama di SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kuantitatif dan kualitatif. Sasaran penelitian ini adalah 29 siswa tingkat pertama SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. Tes berbicara digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data dari performa siswa. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ada efek secara statistik dari penerapan TBLT terhadap pencapaian berbicara siswa. Dapat disarankan bahwa pengajaran berbicara menggunakan TBLT dapat membantu siswa untuk mengungkapkan gagasan-gagasan dan membuat siswa lebih aktif di dalam kelas.

Abstract. The aim of this study was to find out whether there was an effect of Task-based language teaching (TBLT) on students' speaking achievement at the first grade students of SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. The subjects were 29 students of the first grade of SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. Speaking tests were used to collect the data of the students' performance. The result of the research showed that there was a statistically significant effect of the implementation of TBLT on the students' speaking achievement of the first grade students in SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. This suggests that speaking through TBLT helps students express their ideas and makes them more active in the class.

Keywords: Task-Based Language Teaching, speaking, achievement.

INTRODUCTION

Since almost all of the people use oral communication to communicate, speaking is preferred rather than writing for simply maintaining communication. Speaking is used to bridge one to other individuals in their environment. Speaking is a process of producing and receiving meaningful sound using organ of speech and non verbal symbols like gesture and facial expression. Brown in Burns and Joyce (1997) states that speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning involving producing, receiving and processing information. Speaking is a very important thing when it comes to the learning process, especially in learning English.

Various kinds of speaking activities cannot be split from learning process of mastering English. However, most schools in Indonesia still use a traditional method to teach English to the students. They emphasize on the use of grammar than speaking activity in class. Lack of tasks in speaking skills is the problem why many students find it hard to speak English. This statement is supported by Richards (1990:233) who states that the English learners failed in speaking activity are caused by lack of curriculum focusing on speaking skills, the limited of teachers in English proficiency, the monotonous class atmosphere, minimum practice done outside the class, and the examination system which does not emphasize on speaking skills. To make students speak more in the class, teachers need to use a method which encourages students to speak in class.

Methods which enable students to communicate actively in effective and meaningful activities in the classroom are believed as the answers to solve this problem. Those classifications are found in Task-Based Language Teaching method. According to Sofyana (2015), Ellis (2003) states that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a form of teaching that treats language primarily as a tool for communicating rather than as a subject for study or manipulation. TBLT is based on the real world or target task by using language. Since this method is students-centered, it demands the students' involvement and creativity in the speaking activity. In line with the explanation above, TBLT emphasizes on the real-world activities. It means that TBLT focuses on interaction and communication among the students who do the task using the appropriate language at the correct time.

In TBLT, students are encouraged to do tasks spontaneously and creatively. The tasks are usually in form of performance tasks and problem solving since the purpose of TBLT is making students more active by themselves. Problem solving is a process of applying a method – not known in advance to a problem that is subject to a specific set of condition and that the problem solver has not seen before in order to obtain a satisfactory solution. Ormond (2006:111) notes that problem solving is using existing knowledge and skills to address an unanswered question or troubling situation. Problem solving demands students to think creatively. Students should express their own opinion to give solution based on the problem appeared.

Based on the previous research conducted by Fandana (2013) problem solving can increase students' speaking ability better and overcome the problem given to them during the treatment of teaching learning process. The highest progress was the students' fluency and comprehension in speaking. On the other hand, the lowest progress was pronunciation. This findings is in line with Hedge's (2000) who claims that the teacher will say that pronunciation is one of the most difficult area for students. Another research conducted by Sofyana (2015) shows that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching through Cartoon Story Maker effectively improved the students' speaking ability. The data collected from the observation showed that the students enthusiastically participated in learning activity through cartoon story maker in TBLT and TBLT also encouraged them to speak English without hesitation.

Based on the previous research with respect to TBLT, the current study focused on finding out whether there was an effect of TBLT on students' speaking achievement.

METHODS

This study was quantitative research with One group pretest-posttest design. The researcher used one class where the students received a pre-test before treatments and they received a post-test after the treatments. It was

conducted at the first grade of SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung in which the sample was Class X MIPA 2 consisting of 29 students in the second semester of academic year 2016/2017. Speaking tests were used as the data collection instrument for pretest and posttest. The pretest was applied before conducting the treatments. The test was in oral test with the instruction to give opinion and solution towards the task given. The posttest was administered after the treatments in which the instruction was the same with the pre-test with different topics.

The treatments were in two meetings with two kinds of task topics. To meet the validity of the speaking tests, both the materials and the topics of the test were adapted from the curriculum 2013. In order to make sure that data instruments were reliable, the researcher applied pearson product moment. After getting the result of the test, the researcher analyzed the students' score of pretest and posttest by using Paired Sample t-test which computed using SPSS 16 program.

RESULTS

As previously stated in the beginning, the students' speaking achievement increased in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The results were shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Mean Score of Pretest and Posttest in Each Aspect

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	postcomplex	39.194	29	3.54951	.65913
	precomplex	34.819	29	6.35587	1.18025
Pair 1	postaccuracy	74.837	29	28.85394	5.35804
	preaccuracy	37.182	29	35.37691	6.56933
Pair 1	postfluency	198.782	29	48.79812	9.06158
	prefluency	176.522	29	42.10588	7.81886

Table 2 . Paired Sample T-Test

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	postcomplex - precomplex	4.37586	7.62635	1.41618	1.47495	7.27677	3.090	28	.004
Pair 1	postaccuracy - preaccuracy	37.65521	31.56162	5.86085	25.64977	49.66057	6.425	28	.000
Pair 1	postfluency - prefluency	22.26901	42.12909	7.82318	6.24392	38.29402	2.847	28	.008

The results as shown in Table 1 show that the aspect of complexity increased from 34.81 to 39.19 and the increase was 4.38. The aspect of accuracy increased from 37.18 to 74.83. The increase of this aspect was 37.65. Then, the aspect of fluency increased from 176.51 to 198.78. The increase of this aspect was 22.27. Furthermore, as shown in Table 2, it can be seen that t ratio in each aspect is 3.090, 6.425,

2.847 where the t-table is 2.045. The two tail significance level of complexity is 0.004, the two tail significance level of accuracy is 0.000; and the two tail significance level of fluency is 0.008; they are all lower than 0.05 ($\alpha < 0.05$). It means that the score in pre-test was lower than in post-test. It can be inferred that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted since the two tailed significance is below 0.05.

It proves that the treatment which is given by the researcher had better effect to the students' speaking achievement.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this research show that there is an improvement of students' speaking achievement in each aspects after the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching. It can be concluded that there was a significant effect of students' speaking achievement after being taught by Task-Based Language Teaching. The students were interested in speaking English through Task-Based Language Teaching.

Based on the result presented before, it is proven that there was an improvement of students' speaking achievement after two times of treatments using Task-Based Language Teaching through problem solving tasks on accuracy, fluency, and complexity aspects. Then, aspect of speaking that improved the most was accuracy. The increase of accuracy is 37.65. It is in line with Birjandi and Ahangari (2008) findings which showed the results and the analysis of variance indicated that task repetition and task type, as well as the interaction between these variables, resulted in significant differences in subjects' oral discourse in terms of fluency, accuracy and complexity.

The pretest was administered to know the students' speaking achievement before the researcher gave the treatments. In the pretest, the researcher provided problem solving cases that contains the instruction of

making dialog related to the asking and giving opinion and solution. Then, the researcher asked the students to work in pair and asked them to discuss related to the topic. The students discussed to determine the problem, offer the solution and give an opinion to their friend's solution. While the students were discussing the idea, the researcher observed the students in order to control their works. When the students had done the discussion, they showed their performance in front of the class. While the students were showing their performances, the researcher recorded the students' performances. The researcher did so with all of students by giving the time around 4 minutes. From the result of the mean score of complexity in pretest was 34.81; the highest score was 47.3; the lowest score was 21.4. The mean score of accuracy in pretest was 37.18; the highest score was 100; the lowest score was 0. The mean score of fluency in pretest was 176.51; the highest score was 243.5; the lowest score was 82.55.

After conducting the pretest, the researcher conducted two times treatments. During the treatment, the researcher gave the student some materials related to the topic. First, in the pre-task stage, the researcher brainstormed the students related to the problem solving. After brainstorming the students, the researcher distributed the first task as a warming-up for the students. The task was in form of picture which had a case. The task had a connection to the task the students would perform in the during task. After discussing the first task, the researcher distributed the task in during-task stage. In this stage, the task was in form of letter which contained imaginative problem

solving. Then, researcher asked the students to discuss and share their opinion and solution related to the problem appeared with their chairmates. The students actively interacted and shared their opinions with their chairmates. It is in line with Thompson and Millington (2012) research which showed that tasks in Task-Based Language Teaching were successfully designed to elicit L2 interaction.

While collecting and preparing their solution to be performed, the researcher checked the students' works. The researcher did so because as stated by Ellis (2003) Task-Based Language Teaching is a method for teaching a second/ foreign language that seeks to engage the learners in interactionally authentic language use by having them perform a series of task.

Then, the researcher asked some students to show their performance in front of the class. After that, the researcher discussed and checked the students' performance with the students. The students also noted the points needed to make their speaking better. As stated by Willis (1996), it is needed to ask students to present a report on how they did the task and on what they decided or discovered. While discussing it, the researcher also explained the students the material about asking and giving opinion since the task related to the material. Last, the researcher gave reflection and feedback focusing on form to the students performance in terms of fluency, accuracy, and complexity. Willis (1996) sees the primary goal of 'task component' as that of developing fluency and promoting the use of communication strategy. The post task stage was needed to counter the

danger that the students would develop fluency at the expense of accuracy.

In the second meeting of the treatments, the researcher gave the same treatments with that of the first, the differentiation laid on the topic being discussed by the students.

After two meetings of treatments, the researcher accomplished the posttest to see the students' speaking achievement after Task-Based Language Teaching applied in their speaking class. From the result of the mean score of complexity in posttest was 39.19; the highest score was 47.25; the lowest score was 32.4. The mean score of accuracy in posttest was 74.83; the highest score was 100; the lowest score was 0. The mean score of fluency in posttest was 198.78; the highest score was 285.8; the lowest score was 104.75.

From the results above, the researcher concludes that Task-Based Language Teaching gives an improvement on students' speaking achievement. There is a significant effect of students' speaking achievement after Task-Based Language Teaching applied in the learning activity. It can be seen from the comparison of mean scores of pre-test and post-test which have improvements in each aspect of speaking marked. The aspect of complexity increased from 34.81 to 39.19 and the increase was 4.38. The aspect of accuracy increased from 37.18 to 74.83. The increase of this aspect was 37.65. Then, the aspect of fluency increased from 176.51 to 198.78. The increase of this aspect was 22.27. This finding is in line with the finding of Sofyana (2015) saying that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching effectively

improved the students' speaking ability.

CONCLUSIONS

Task-Based Language Teaching is very useful to give a better effect on students' speaking ability in all aspects of speaking especially in accuracy aspect. It is proved from the result of computation that shows the two tail significance level (0.00) is lower than 0.05 ($\alpha > 0.05$). By using this method, the students can find it easier to express their idea since it emphasizes on the real communicative task. Then, by doing the real word tasks, the students sharpen their analytical thinking by themselves. The findings support the theories from previous researches using TBLT in teaching speaking, showing the same effects which improved students' speaking ability and made them more active in the class.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of the study and conclusion, the researcher would like to suggest as follows:

1. English Teachers
Since the students' speaking ability has a progress after Task-Based Language Teaching is applied in the learning activity, English teachers are suggested to apply this method in teaching speaking.
2. Further Researchers
This study applied Task-Based Language Teaching to improve students' speaking ability. The findings of this study are expected to be used as a starting point for future researchers to conduct similar research in different field or task types. The future researchers are also expected to prepare the material well before applying TBLT as their research topic.

REFERENCES

- Birjandi, P., & Ahangari, S. 2008. Effects of task repetition on the fluency, complexity and accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' oral discourse. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol (10) (3), pp. 28-52.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. 1997. *Focus on speaking*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Ellis, R. 2003. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fandana, R. 2013. Increasing students' speaking ability through problem solving at the first grade of SMAN 1 Simpang Pematang. University of Lampung. (Unpublished Script).
- Hedge, T. 2000. *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lochana, M., & Deb, G. 2006. Task based teaching: Learning English without tears. *Asian EFL Journal*, Vol (8) (3), pp 140-154.
- Ormrod, J. E. 2006. *Essentials of educational psychology*. Colorado: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Richards, J. C. 1990. *Con conversationally speaking: Approaches to the teaching of conversation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sofyana, A. W. 2015. Task-based language teaching in improving students' speaking skill through cartoon story maker. Salatiga: State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Salatiga.
- Thompson, J., & Millington, T. 2012. Task-based learning for communication and grammar use. *Language Education in Asia*, Vol (3) (2), pp. 159-167.
- Willis, J. 1996. *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow: Longman.