EDUVELOP
Journal of English Education and Development
Nationally Accredited Journal Decree No. B/1410/E5/E5.2.1/2019

Volume 4, No. 1, September 2020
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

ISSN 2597-713X (print)
ISSN 2597-7148 (online)

The Use of Task-Based Language Teaching in Improving Students' Speaking Proficiency

Marhaeni Sabil
STIE AMKOP Makassar
Email: marhaenisabil@yahoo.com

Abstract. This article explores the use of Task-Based Language Teaching can improve the speaking proficiency students of class XII IPA SMAN 1 Amali Bone Regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The research method was used is Experimental design. The populations were 350 students of SMAN 1 Amali Bone and samples were 50 students, purposive sampling was the technique in taking sample. Data on students' speaking were collected in line with the instrument pre test and post test that analyzed by inferential statistic. Based on the research findings and discussion, the conclusions are: 1) The use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in teaching speaking class can improve the students' speaking skill. It was proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group was 79. 69 and the mean score of the students' posttest in discussion technique was 73.85. It means that there was higher improvement in experimental class; 2) The students are interested in learning English through Task - Based - Language Teaching (TBLT). The mean score of students' interest was 92.0 %. It was classified as very high interest.

Keywords: Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Speaking Proficiency.

1. INTRODUCTION

English becomes a compulsory subject taught to the students from primary school to university. School as formal institution not only has a role to expand academic skill but also other skills such as social skill and emotion. English teaching learning process at school must be able to give experience for students to win a competitive competition. As we all know that mostly Indonesian students have some difficulties to improve their skills in English. The demand of this competitive era, we have to be ablespeak, listen, write, and to read English. Speaking, as one of the linguistic skills, is often perceived to be a task that comes naturally to an individual. Speaking is also the most difficult skill to be mastered in learning a language.

Many language learners regard speaking ability as the measure of knowing a language. These learners define fluency as the ability to converse with others, much more than the ability to read, write, or comprehend oral language. They regard speaking as the most important skill and they assess

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

their progress in terms of their accomplishments in spoken communication.

In the communicative model of language teaching, instructors help their students develop this body of knowledge by providing authentic practice that prepares students for real-life communication situations. They help their students develop the ability to produce grammatically correct, logically connected sentences appropriate to specific contexts, and to do so using acceptable (that is comprehensible) pronunciation. It means that the teaching of speaking plays an important role to promote learners speaking ability.

Concerning how important the mastery of speaking proficiency in learning English, the researcher would like to do experimental research to the third year students of SMAN 1 Amali because the students cannot speak even a little English although they have learned it for years and they are not motivated in English teaching and learning process.

Me, as an English teacher at the school, the researcher realizes that there are still many weaknesses in English teaching and learning process in his class. Therefore, in this chance, the researcher is interested to do experimental research to improve her students speaking proficiency by applying one approach in teaching speaking called Task -Based Language Teaching which can help both teacher and students in English teaching and learning process. It has done because she felt that the teaching approach she used previously worked less effectively and there were not varied which could not provide many chances for the students to speak and can not motivate the student in learning English speaking.

Task -Based Language Teaching (TBLT) A theory of language teaching, which as Levy and Stockwell (2003: 249) suggest, does not have one particular method, but most methods usea three stage construction of pretask, task, and posttask activities. The pretask serves as an introduction to the activity, the task itself involves planning on and reporting the results of the assignment while the posttask or "language focus" entails analysis of the task and subsequent practice (Klapper, 2003: 36). Klapper said that the tasks have real world application and they help cause interactional dialogue which in turn produces adequate "...comprehensible input to 'trigger' acquisitional processes."

Jeon & Hahn (2006) believe that the task-based view of language teaching, based on the constructivist theory of learning and communicative language teaching methodology, has evolved in response to some limitations of the traditional PPP approach, represented by the procedure of presentation, practice, and performance (Ellis, 2003; Long & Crookes, 1991). Thus, it has the substantial implication that language learning is a developmental process promoting communication and social interaction rather than a product acquired by practicing language items, and that learners learn the target language more effectively when they are naturally exposed to meaningful task-based activities.

Jeon & Hahn (2006) continue that given the fact that language acquisition is influenced by the complex interactions of a number of variables

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

including materials, activities, and evaluative feedback, task-based language teaching has "a dramatic, positive impact on these variables". It implies that task-based language teaching provides learners with natural sources of meaningful material, ideal situations for communicative activity, and supportive feedback allowing for much greater opportunities for language use. Specifically, in an Asian EFL environment where learners are limited in their accessibility to use the target daily language, it is first necessary for language learners to be provided with real opportunities to be exposed to language use in the classroom.

2. METHOD

The research method was used is Experimental design. The populations were 350 students of SMAN 1 Amali Bone and samples were 50 students, purposive sampling was the technique in taking sample. Data on students' speaking were collected in line with the instrument (pretest and posttest) and analyzed by inferential statistic.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The frequency score and the percentage of the students' accuracy in pretest both experimental and control group can be seen in the following tables.

Table 1. The Frequency and Percentage of the Students' Achievement in Term of Accuracy in Pretest.

		Experimental Group		**Control Group**	
Range of Score	Classification	F	%	F	%
81- 100= A	Very Good	0	0	0	0
66- 80= B	Good	0	0	0	0
56- 65= C	Average	14	56	13	52
41- 55= D	Poor	9	36	10	40
< 40=E	Very Poor	2	8	2	8
Total		**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**

Table 1 illustrates that most of the students in experimental and control group were in low achiever category. The aggregate percentage of experimental group, categorized as low achiever was 44. 0 percent (11 students) and high achiever was 56. 0 percent (14 students). While in control group, categorized as low achiever was 48. 0 percent (12 students) and high achiever was 52. 0 percent (13 students). Based on aggregate percentage experimental group was high achievers bigger than low achievers, and control group showed that low achievers was bigger than high achievers. It indicated that both of the

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

groups still needed to be improved. The frequency score and the percentage of the students' accuracy in posttest both experimental and control group can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. The frequency and Percentage of the Students' Achievement in Term of Accuracy in Posttest of Experimental and Control group

		Experimental Group		**Control Group**	
Range of Score	Classification	F	%	F	%
81- 100= A	Very Good	3	12	0	0
66- 80= B	Good	6	24	0	0
56- 65= C	Average	13	52	14	56
41- 55= D	Poor	3	12	11	44
< 40= E	Very Poor	0	0	0	0
Total		**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**

Table 2 illustrates that the students' achievement in experimental and control group were improving after treatment. The aggregate percentage of students both of the groups tend to spread in high achiever category. The aggregrate percentage of experimental group categorized that almost students got high achiever after giving treatment. While in control group, categorized as high achiever was 56. 0 percent (14 students) and low achiever was 44. 0 percent (11 students).

The score distribution for experimental group and control group on accuracy in posttest showed the difference from the pretest. After the treatment conducted, both of them showed an improvement but the experimental group gave higher achievement than control group.

The frequency and percentage of the students' pretest achievement in term of fluency shows that most of students in experimental and control group were in low achiever category. The aggregate percentage of experimental group, categorized as low achiever was 52. 2percent (13 students) and high achiever was 48. 0 percent (12 students). While in control group, categorized as low achiever was 56. 0 percent (14 students) and high achiever was 44. 0 percent (11 students). Based on the aggregate percentage both experimental and control group showed that low achievers were bigger than high achievers. It indicated both of the groups still needed to be improved.

The frequency and percentage of the students' posttest achievement in term of fluency shows that

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

the students' achievement in experimental and control group in term of fluency were improving after the treatment. The aggregate percentage of students both of the groups generally tend to spread in high achiever category. The aggregate percentage of experimental group categorized as high achiever was 80. 0 percent (20 students) and low achiever was only 20. 0 percent (5 students). While in control group, categorized as high achiever was 60. 0 percent (15 students) and low achiever was only 40. 0 percent (10 students).

The score distribution for experimental group and control group on fluency in postest showed the difference from the pretest. After the treatment conducted, both of them showed an improvement but in experimental group gave higher achievement than control group.

The mean score, the Standard Deviation of the Students' Pretest and Posttest in Term of Comprehensibility

Table 3. The mean score and Standard Deviation of the students' postest in term of comprehensibility

	Mean	**N**	**Std. Deviation**	**Std. Error Mean**
Experimental • Pretest • Posttest	 59. 28 71. 76	 25 25	 6. 33 10. 68	 1. 26 2. 13
Control • Pretest • Posttest	 56. 28 62. 16	 25 25	 7. 31 6. 53	 1. 46 1. 30

In table 3 above, the researcher presented the mean score and standard deviation of the students' score in pretest and posttest to analyzed the scores before and after treatment through Task- Based Language Teaching using SPSS 18. 0. Table 4. 9 indicates that there was an improvement of the students' posttest in term of comprehensibility of the experimental and control group. It can be seen on the mean score of the pretest 59. 28 to posttest 71. 76 for experimental group and also for the pretest 56. 28 to posttest 62. 16 for the control group. In fact, the mean score of posttest in term of comprehensibility in experimental group is higher than control group (71. 76 > 62. 16).

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion, the conclusions are:

The use of Task- Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in teaching speaking class can improve the students' speaking skill. It was proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group was 79. 69 and the mean score of the students' posttest in discussion technique was 73.85. it means that there was higher improvement in experimental class. The students are interested in learning speaking English through Task- Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The mean score of students' interest was 92.0 %. It was classified as very high interest.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31605/eduvelop.v4i1.779

REFERENCES

Brown, Douglas, (1994). Principle of language learning and teaching, California: San Fransisco State University.

Carless, D. (2002). *Implementing task-based learning with young learners***.** *ELT Journal, 56*(4), 389-396.

Ellis, R. (2000). Task-based research and language pedagogy. *Language teaching Research, 4*(3), 193-220.

Harmer, Jeremy (2001). *The Practice in English Teaching.* New York: Longman.

Hornby, A. S (1995), Oxford *Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levy, M. Hubbard,P., Stockwell, G., & Colpaert, J. (2015) Summary of synthetic versus analytical syllabuses, 2 and 13.

Marcel, 1978. English speaking elements. Last update June, 15th 2008. Available on http//eng.gsu.edu/mos.dos/ghtml.

Webster.1998. *Encyclopedic can bridge Dictionary of Language.* New York, Portland House.

Widdowson. H.G.1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. London: Oxford. University Press.