

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING (TBLT) TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN WRITING NARRATIVE TEXT¹

Irkah Taswirah Karim², Djamiah Husain³, Sukardi Weda⁴
State University of Makassar

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this research were to find out whether or not the implementation of TBLT improves the students' ability in writing narrative text. The method used was quasi-experimental research design involving two groups; experimental group and control group. The sample consisted of 33 students in experiment group and 33 students in control group. This research applied TBLT as tool to improve the students' ability in writing narrative text. The researcher employed writing test to measure the effects of the treatment. The data obtained through writing test and were analyzed by using descriptive and inferential statistics through SPSS Version 20 while data on questionnaire were analyzed by using Likert Scale. The result showed that the probability value (significant 2-tailed) was lower than the level of significance ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means there was a significant difference between experimental group and control group after the treatment. The mean score in posttest of experimental groups was 58.97 and the mean score in posttest of control group was 38.51. It means that the experimental group's score was higher than control group's score. Based on the data analysis, it was found that there was improvement on the students' ability in writing narrative text in experimental group. It means that the implementation of TBLT improved the students' ability in writing narrative text. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the implementation of TBLT improved the students' ability in writing narrative text.

Keywords: TBLT, The Frame work of TBLT, The Concept of Writing, Narrative text.

INTRODUCTION

One of the approaches that can be adopted for teaching is Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as the part of communicative approach. This approach can create a communicative learning in the classroom because the students are asked to do any tasks or activities toward their learning, especially English. Husain (2011: 27) argued that to construct a motivation, teacher sets up a role in the classroom with a small group by given a task to the learners. The students can do many things in or out the classroom. The students can do more tasks in order to motivate them in learning language because some people believe that the more they do, the more they will get or know. The tasks also have to be related to the learning subject and learning objectives.

There are some reasons of using TBLT as an alternative teaching method. According to Nunan (2004: 77-81), TBLT can facilitate the learners with the materials which focus on meaning, can demonstrate the language acquisition during interaction in the classroom, and can involve four language skills such as listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Another reason is TBLT encourages the students' interaction in class (Acar, 2006: 174).

One of the reasons of using TBLT is because it involves four language skills; listening, speaking, reading, and especially writing. Those skills are being taught in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classroom and started in the basic, so there are no doubt that the students

¹ Disampaikan pada Seminar Nasional Pendidikan Karakter di Gedung SCC Palopo pada Sabtu, 03 Mei 2014

² Staf Pengajar STIK Avicenna Bantaeng

³ Guru Besar Universitas Negeri Makassar

⁴ Staf Pengajar Universitas Negeri Makassar

also learn how to write English. Through writing, people can transfer their ideas and thoughts.

Additionally, the demand of writing mastery is also supported by the competency standards in every school. At the junior high school, the students are introduced about the types of writing and how to write those types simply. Next, at the senior high school, the students begin to explore more their writing skill. The students are expected to be able to write some types of writing such as recount, descriptive, procedure, and especially narrative. TBLT can be used in teaching writing skill. For the higher level of difficulty in teaching writing, students write narrative text based on a conclusion from one or three to five paragraphs. It is supported by Nunan (2004: 208) showed that level of difficulty in teaching writing through TBLT. It means, due to TBLT involves activities in teaching and learning process, the senior high level of students may write narrative text based on the activities.

As the syllabus of the first grade English teaching in the SMAN 2 Bantaeng, it shows that the teachers teach the students about those types of writing use inquiry method as the teaching and learning process runs conventionally, and never apply TBLT approach. Therefore, the researcher applied TBLT approach through writing skill. Students were able to face, feel, and do the tasks by themselves. The researcher believes that by doing tasks the learner can write about the tasks more expressively. By taking involved to some kinds of activities, learners also can improve their knowledge and experience, especially in writing narrative text. Then, the researcher also investigated the students' interest to see their psychological attitudes that could reasonably be interpreted as measurements on a proper of applying TBLT.

Based on the previous explanation, there questions appear concerning with the implementation of TBLT I writing narrative text in that school. Regarding to these research questions, the researcher formulated some research questions as follows:

“Does the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching approach improve students' ability in writing narrative text?”

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Task-Based Language Teaching

TBLT has been proposed by many experts as one of the ways in Teaching English. It is an approach of teaching which focuses on task activity, provides contexts to activate learning acquisition process, and promotes language learning. The task is organized as a series of activities in classroom.

Pedagogically, TBLT has strengthened the principles and practices (Nunan, 2004: 1), : 1) a needs-based approach to content selection; 2) an emphasis on learning to communicate through interaction in the target language; 3) the introduction of 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 experiences as important contributing elements to classroom learning; and 6) the linking of classroom language learning with language use outside the classroom.

The definition of task that would be sensible for the purpose of this study is the re-revised version of Nunan's definition (2004: 4):

“A pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right with a beginning, middle and an end.”

Clarifying his definition, he argues that although many other proposals emphasize that pedagogical tasks involve communicative language use in which the user's attention is

focused on meaning, it does not mean that grammatical form is not important. He asserts that his definition refers to the deployment of grammatical knowledge to express meaning, highlighting the fact that meaning and form are highly interrelated, and that grammar exists to enable the language user to express different communicative meanings.

Willis's in Oxford (2006: 18) explain the three phases in 'A Framework for Task-Based Learning' is summarized as follows:

I. Pre-task

The teacher introduces the topic and gives the students clear instructions on what they have to do at the task stage in order to create the students' interest. The teacher might help the students to recall or activate topic-related words, phrases, and target sentences that may be useful for the task. In this stage, the teacher can also give the students a clear model of what will be expected from them in doing the task. The model provided can be in the form of video or audio recording of people doing the task, text or picture related to the task topic. The students can take notes and spend time preparing the task.

II. Cycle task

The cycle task consists of the task plus planning and report sub-phases. During the task phase, the students perform the task by working in pairs or groups and using whatever linguistic resources they possess to achieve the goals of the task. The teacher monitors and offers encouragement. Having completed the task, the students prepare either a written or oral report about what happened during the task. The students may work with the teacher to improve their language while planning their reports. They then practice what they are going to say or write.

III. Post-task

This final phase is the language focus stage. Here the focus returns to the teacher who reviews and analyses what happened in the task, in regards to language. It may include language forms the students were using, problems that the students had, and perhaps forms that need to be covered more or were not used enough.

Then, the teacher may select language areas to be practiced based upon the needs of the students and what emerged from the task and report phases. The students do practice activities to increase their confidence and make a note of useful language. This practice is the opportunity for the teacher to emphasize the key language.

2. The Concept of Writing

Teaching writing is important for the students. Teaching writing is intended to encourage the students to express the ideas and thoughts in the written form. The students need to know how to write letters, reports, an essay, the story and so on. Nunan (1989: 36) stated that writing includes the control of content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, punctuation, spelling, and letter formation. The process approach to writing instruction is needed by the students. The students will not be confused if there are some instruction in teaching writing.

3. Narrative Text

The basic purpose of narrative is to entertain, to gain and hold a readers' interest. However narratives can also be written to teach or inform, to change attitudes/social opinions for example soap operas and television dramas that are used to raise topical issues. Narratives sequence people/characters in time and place but differ from recounts in that through the sequencing, the stories set up one or more problems, which must eventually find a way to be resolved. Narrative is a telling of some true or fictitious event or connected sequence of events. A narrative consists of a set of events in a process of narration, in which the events are selected and arranged in a particular order. The category of narratives includes both the shortest of events or a brief news item and the longest historical or biographical works, diaries as well as novels, short stories, and other fictional forms.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applied quasi experimental method in which two groups were involved. They are experimental group and control group. Gay (2006: 234) stated that the experimental group got a treatment while the control group was treated as usual. The experimental group was treated by using TBLT approach and the control group was treated by using inquiry method/approach. Both groups were given pretest and posttest. The pretest was administered before the treatment to assess students' prior writing skill and the posttest was administered to measure treatment affects. The population of the research was the first year students (class X) of SMAN 2 Bantaeng. It consisted of seven classes. Each class had 33 students; so that the total number of students was 231. This research employed cluster random sampling technique means that from seven classes of population, the researcher chose randomly two classes as sample by lottery. The sample consisted of 66 students, 33 students as experimental group and 33 students as control group. The data were analyzed by using inferential and descriptive statistics for the students' writings through SPSS 20.

FINDINGS

1. The Improvement on the Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) toward Students' Writing Ability

Table 1. Frequency and rate percentage of students' score in pretest of experimental and control group

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	86-100	-	0%	-	0%
Good	71-85	-	0%	-	0%
Average	56-70	-	0%	-	0%
Poor	41-55	8	24.24%	1	3.03%
Very poor	0-40	25	75.76%	32	96.97%
Total		33	100%	33	100%

Based on the data shown in table above, the students' writing in pretest of experimental group, none or 0% of the students is in average, good, and very good classification. There are 8 or 24.24% students classified as poor. There are 25 or 75.76% of students classified as very poor. In the pretest of the control group, none or 0% of the students is classified as average, good and very good. There is 1 or 3.03% of the students classified as poor. There are 32 students or 96.97% classified as very poor.

Table 2. The difference of mean score between pretest of experimental and control group in the five writing components

Writing component s	Mean score				Difference	Sig.(2-Tailed)
	Experimenta l	Classificatio n	Contro l	Classificatio n		
Content	38.75	Poor	36.90	Poor	1.85	0.375
Organizatio n	39.42	Poor	37.06	Poor	2.36	0.279
Vocabulary	40.30	Poor	35.75	Poor	4.55	0.053
Grammar	34.51	Poor	33.36	Poor	1.15	0.521
Mechanics	33.67	Poor	32.21	Poor	1.46	0.429
Average	186.65		175.28		11.37	> 0.05

Based on the data in table above, the mean score of all components of experimental and control group in pretest are different and not significant. It is proved by the mean score of writing content in experimental group is 38.75 and control group is 36.90. Based on the writing assessment rubric, the content's mean score was classified as poor because the main idea was not clear or accurate, the opinion was weak, getting limited supports of ideas, quite not relevant, lack of developing ideas, and non-fluent expressed. The organization's mean score of experimental group is 39.42 and the control group's organization is 37.06. These scores were classified as poor organization because the ideas were disconnected, lack of logical sequencing, inadequate loosely organized, and some ideas were confusing. The mean score of vocabulary of experimental group is 40.30 and the control group's vocabulary mean score is 35.75. These scores were classified as poor writing vocabulary because they were using confusing words, idioms, word form, and almost more than a half words of paragraphs were not appropriate and were not using effective words. The mean score of grammar of experimental group is 34.51 and the control group's grammar is 33.36. These score were classified as poor grammar because they had many errors, poor control of structure, and more than a half structure of the paragraphs were incorrect grammar. The mean score of mechanics of experimental group is 33.67 and the control group's mechanics is 32.21. They were classified as poor mechanics writing because there were more than half errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization.

The average mean score of experimental group is 186.65 and the average mean score of control group is 175.28 with the different range is 11.37. All components of writing have no significant different which are proved by P-value or Sig.(2-tailed) of content 0.375, organization 0.279, vocabulary 0.053, grammar 0.521, and mechanics 0.429, which are higher than α (5% or 0.05). These data clearly show that both groups have relatively the same prior knowledge. Since the probability value of pretest is higher than $\alpha=0.05$, it means the difference of the prior knowledge of the students was statistically not significant.

Table 3. The Rate Percentage and Frequency of Students' Score in Posttest

Classification	Score	Experimental group		Control group	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Very good	0-40	-	0%	-	0%
Good	41-55	6	18.18%	-	0%
Average	56-70	18	54.55%	-	0%
Poor	71-85	8	24.24%	10	30.30%
Very poor	86-100	1	3.03%	23	69.7%
Total		33	100%	33	100%

The data in the table above shows the result in posttest of experimental group and control group. In the experimental group, there is none or 0% of students' score classified as very good. There are 6 students or 18.18% classified as good. There are 18 or 54.55% students classified as average. There is 1 or 3.03% student classified as very poor in writing narrative text. In the control group, there is none or 0% of students classified as very good, good, and even average. There are 23 students or 69.70% classified as poor. There are 10 or 30.30% students classified as poor.

Table 4. The difference of mean score of posttest between experimental group and control group in five components of writing

Writing components	Mean score				Difference	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Experimental	Classification	Control	Classification		
Content	61.57	Average	40.12	Poor	21.45	0.000
Organization	60.18	Average	40.60	Poor	19.58	0.000
Vocabulary	61.82	Average	38.39	Poor	23.43	0.000
Grammar	56.12	Average	37.03	Poor	19.09	0.000
Mechanics	54.85	Average	34.97	Poor	19.88	0.000
Average	249.54		191.11		103.43	< 0.05

From the table, it reveals the mean score in posttest of experimental group and control group in five components of writing. It also shows the different mean score of both groups after giving different treatment. The mean score in content of experimental group is 61.57. It was classified as average content because the main ideas were rather clearly stated, getting enough supporting ideas, quite comprehensible, quite relevant, generally developed the ideas, and sufficiently expressed. Otherwise, the mean score of content in control group is 40.12. It was still classified as poor content because the ideas were still not clear or accurate and the changes of opinion were still weak.

The mean score of organization of experimental group is 60.18. It was classified as average organization because the ideas were generally organized, few ideas were adequate coherent, mostly relevant to the outline, and the ideas were in some logical sequencing. The mean score of organization of control group is 40.60. It was still classified as poor classification because the ideas were still disconnected, lack of logical sequencing, loosely organized, and some ideas were confusing.

The mean score of vocabulary in experimental group is 61.82. It was classified as average vocabulary because it was using good word choice (dictions), idioms, word forms, and a half of words of paragraphs were not appropriate. The mean score of vocabulary in control group is 38.39. It was still classified as poor classification because it was still using confusing words, idioms, word form, and almost more than a half words of paragraphs were not appropriate and were not using effective words.

The mean score of experimental group's grammar in posttest is 56.12. It was classified as average grammar because it was found some errors of structure in the students' writing. The mean score of grammar of control group is 37.03. It was still classified as poor grammar because it still had many errors in structure and incorrect grammar used. The mean score of mechanics of experimental group is 54.85. It was classified as average mechanics used because it was found fair number of spelling, punctuation errors, and capitalization errors. The mean score of mechanics of control group is 34.97. It was still classified as poor mechanics because it was still found more than half errors in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization in the students' writing in posttest.

The data in the table 8 above also shows that the mean score in posttest of experimental group' and control group in five components of writing is different in the range of 103.43 points. The total mean score of experimental group is 249.54 and the total mean score of control group is 191.11. It means that the mean score of posttest in experimental group is higher than the control group. The data also showed that the probability value or Sig.(2-tailed) of all components of writing was lower than α ($0.000 < 0.05$). It means that both groups are significantly different. Since the probability value of pretest is lower than $\alpha=0.05$, it means the difference of the students' knowledge is statistically significant. There is a

significant difference between the posttest of the students of both groups after treatment by TBLT and non-TBLT.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Based on the findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher put forward the following conclusions:

1. The implementation of TBLT improved the students' ability in writing narrative text. It was proved by the probability value of mean scores of the students' writings in both groups after the treatment was $0.000 < 0.05$ which means there was a significant different, and the experimental group's mean score was higher than control group's ($38.51 < 58.97$).
2. The students are interested in the implementation of TBLT in writing narrative text. It was proved by the result of the questionnaire's mean score is 82. It is classified as interested.

There are several suggestions that might be useful for the teacher and further researcher. For teacher, first, it is suggested to use or imply the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in their class teaching because it can improve the students' ability especially in writing. Second, the teacher has to design interesting activities for the task so that it enables students to be creative and motivating them to learn. Third, the teacher also has to recreate the students' course book in order to match with students' need and context, and fourth, the teacher also should consider and use the other approaches/methods in his/her classroom.

For further researchers who will conduct similar study, there are also some suggestions. First, TBLT can be implemented in other skills such as listening, speaking, and reading. Second, TBLT can be applied in teaching other texts such as descriptive, expository, or persuasive. Third, TBLT can be applied in elementary school, junior high school and also in university level.

REFERENCES

- Acar, Ahmed. 2006. *Models, Norms and Goals for English as an International Language Pedagogy and Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning*. Retrieved on February 17th 2013 (Asian EFL Journal Vol. 8. Number. 3: 174-191) from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Ellis, Rod. 2008. *The Methodology of Task-Based Teaching*. Retrieved on 11th June 2012 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Gay, L.R., Geoffrey E. Mills, and Peter Airasian. 2006. *Education Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. Eighth Edition. Ohio: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall Publishing.
- Husain, Djariah. 2011. *Fostering Autonomous Learning Inside and Outside the Classroom in Language Learning*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM.
- Jabu, Baso. 2008. *English Language Testing*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM
- McLeod, Saul. 2008. *Likert Scale*. An article retrieved on February 17th 2013 from <http://www.simplypsychology.org/likert-scale.html>
- Nariswariatmojo, Saptawulan Hening. 2012. *Factors which Affect Language Learning and Language Learning Process*. An article retrieved on 17th February 2013 from <https://theauzty.wordpress.com>

- Nunan, David. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2004. *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2006. *Task-Based Language Teaching in The Asia Context: defining 'Task'*. Retrieved on 17th February 2013 from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Oxford, Rebecca. 2006. *Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning: An Overview*. Retrieved on 17th February 2013 (Asian EFL Journal Vol. 8. Number. 3: 94-121) from <http://www.asian-efl-journal.com>
- Richards, Jack C. and Theodore S. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weigle, Sara Cushing. 2002. *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.