Task-based instructions: Comparison of pre tasks between planning time and doing similar tasks in improving the students' speaking performance

Desti Mulya Sari S., Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Mahpul Mahpul

FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No. 1, Bandarlampung,

Indonesia[1,2,3]

[1]Correspondence: dez_ukh_te@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The current research focuses on the analysis of the implementation of task-based language teaching especially in the pre-task phase to investigate which task result is better between *doing similar task* and *strategic planning*in improving students' speaking achievement in term of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. Two alternatives of pre-task phase were compared, that is *doing similar task* and *strategic planning*. The research involved two classes at SMKN 8 Bandar Lampung in the 2019/2020 academic year. The experimental classes were XI Multi Media (*doing similar task*) and XI PerbankanSyariah (*strategic planning*), each consisting of 32 and 31students.The researcher used random assignment post-test design to measure both control class' and experimental class' achievement. Based on the results, it is reported that:(1) there was significant difference on the students' speaking achievement in term of complexity after having *strategic planning* task; (2) there was no significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy and fluency before and after the implementation of *strategic planning* task; (3) there was significant difference in the students' speaking achievement in term complexity and fluency after the use of *doing similar task*; and (4) there isno significant difference in the students' speaking accuracy before and after getting the treatment of *doing similar task*. So, it concludes that doing similar task is better than strategic planning in improving students' speaking achievement in terms of complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Keywords: Speaking, Task, Doing Similar Task, Strategic Planning

I. INTRODUCTION

Language plays an important role in human communication. In the context of learning English, getting success in speaking becomes an essential target for learners (Nurdiana, 2017). In fact, many students—including college students—have difficulties in speaking English properly even when they just have to use simple sentences. They have been struggling to learn English since they generally see English at school as a complicated subject.

In second language acquisition (SLA) researchers and language teachers both seek to get samples of language use from learners. Such samples, it is believed, provide evidence for learners' ability to use their L2 knowledge in real-time communication. In other words, learning a second language gives students the chance to use their knowledge of the second language for effective communication. Teachers recognize that unless learners are given the opportunity to experience such samples, they may not succeed in developing the kind of L2 proficiency needed to communicate fluently and effectively. Then, the question arises as to how these samples of meaning-focused language can be elicited. The means that both have employed are called 'tasks'.

A task is defined as an activity that necessarily involves language (Richards, Platt, and Weber, 1985; Nunan, 1989in Ellis, 2003). Tasks serve as a practice for students to learn effectivelyand improve their communication skills. Breen (1989) in Ellis (2003) saysthat "a task can be a brief practice exercise or a more complex work-plan that requires spontaneous communication of meaning". Since tasks in classroom situations are usually mandatory learning activities, students will get involved whether they want it or not.

The pre-task section gives students the time to spontaneously prepare themselves to perform the main task. The purpose of pre-task phase, according to Ellis (2003), is to prepare students to perform the task, in such a way that it will promote language acquisition. Pre-task takes an important role to be the intro for all students not only in activating their own schemata but also their eagerness. Lee (2000)in Ellis (2003) asserts the importance of framing the task to be performed and arguesthat one way of doing this is to provide an advance organizer of what the students will be required to do and the nature of the outcome they will arrive at.

This research analyzes the implementation of task-based language teaching, specifically in the pre-task phase to investigate which task result is better between *doing similar task* and *strategic planning* in term of complexity, accuracy, and fluency. The material was designed and modified based on the English textbook for grade eleven in order to ensure that it suits the students' learning level.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

In this research, the researcher applied true experimental design, a research design in which an experimental group of participants have received the special treatment and the other group have received a certain treatment. The researcher also has taken two classes as sample of this research consisting of an experimental class and a control class. Subject of those two groups were chosen randomly. At the end of the experiment those two groups were given the same test (Setiyadi,2006).

```
K1      X       T1
K2      O       T1
```

where
K1:   experimental class
K2:   control class
X: treatment (usingsimilar task)
O: treatment (using strategic planning)

(Setiyadi, 2006)

The researcher used random assignment post-test design to measure both control class' and experimental class' achievement. The treatment was done to the control class by using strategic planning and experimental class by using doing similar task. Then the post-test was conducted to both classes after the treatment to know the students' speaking achievement.

Population and sample
The researcher used two classes as the sample of the research, one class as an experimental class and another class as a control class. This is a true experiment builds in post-tests and experimental and control groups. Further to this, a process of randomization was applied to the selection of the control and experimental groups to ensure that members of the two groups were alike in their skills and capacities before the intervention takes place. It means the researcher could choose the experimental class and the control class randomly.

In this research, the population is the eleventh-grade students of SMKN 8 Bandar Lampung. There were 8 classes consisting of 32 to 38 students in each class at the eleventh grade. The sample of this research is one class taken by the researcher as the experimental class, that is, XI Multimedia 2. That class consisted of 32 students. In addition, the researcher takes another class as the control class, that is, XI PerbankanSyariah consisting of 32 students as well. Both of the classes were chosen by using random sampling so that all the second-year classes got the same chance to be the sample to avoid subjectivity.The treatment was conducted three times.Those tests were used to find if there is a significant difference in students' speaking after being taught through strategic planning (control class) and after being taught through doing similar task (experimental class).

Research instrument
The researcher used the oral test as the instrument in this research to measure the students' speaking ability. In addition, the researcher has given a topic related in oral communication.

Validity
In this study, the research used content validity and construct validity.
1)   Content validity
Content validity emphasizes on the equivalent between the material that would be given and the items tested. Simply, the items on the test must represented the material that would be taught. In getting the content validity of speaking test, the researcher arranged the materials based on the basic competence in syllabus taken from Curriculum 2013 for eleventh grade of senior high school students.

2) Construct validity

It investigates the research instrument appropriateness to the research object. Since the research needed the data of speaking score, the instrument must truly examine the students' ability in speaking. Shohamy (1985) in Simmamora (2018) says that the construct validity is concerned whether the task is actually in line with the theory or not. Related to this research, the test items should involve the three aspects of speaking such as vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, accuracy, and achievement. The researcher puts some following points in the instrument based on the five aspects of speaking.

Reliability

In measuring the reliability of speaking test, inter-rater reliability is the most appropriate way. A research instrument must have the consistency in giving the result. This reliability is used when test score independently estimated by two or more judges or rater.In achieving the reliability of the posttest of speaking, inter-rater is used in this study. The first rater is the English teacher of SMKN 8 Bandar Lampung and the second rater is the researcher. All of them discuss and put in mind of the speaking criteria in order to obtain the reliable result of the test(Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 206 in Simmamora, 2018). In this case the researcher also uses the following standard of reliability:

r values	Reliability
0.8000 – 1.0000	very high
0.6000 – 0.7900	High
0.4000 – 0.5900	Medium
0.2000 – 0.3900	Low
0.0000 – 0.1900	very low

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
4.1 Research Results
The result of this research consisted of result of students' speaking complexity, accuracy and fluency in strategic planning task and result of students' speaking complexity, accuracy, fluency in doing similar task.

This research analyzed complexity in terms of lexical complexity. Syntactical complexity can be measured by means of the total number of clauses per AS unit and by a subordination index: the ratio of subordinate clauses per total number of clauses. However, this research just measured lexical complexity by means of calculating the lexical complexity by calculating the ratio of lexical words to function words (Gilabert, 2005) in Nurdiana (2017).

In addition, this research analyzed complexity in terms of lexical complexity. It was measured by calculating the percentage of lexical words to total number of words Mahpul, (2014: 68) in Nurdiana (2017).

Lexical Complexity

$$= \frac{LexicalWords}{TotalNumberofWords} \times 100\%$$

To measure fluency, this research implemented Speech Rate B in which the number of syllables generated from task performance, divided by the total number of seconds used to complete the task and multiplied by 60 (Mahpul, 2014: 70) in Nurdiana (2017).

$$Fluency = \frac{Number\ of\ Syllables}{Time\ in\ Seconds} \times 60$$

For Speech Rate B, repetitions, reformulations, false starts, and comments in the L1 are excluded from the calculation. Thus, the researcher only focused on the students' utterances in L2.

Regarding to accuracy, it was calculated by means of determining the percentage of error-free AS-units to number of AS-units (Mahpul, 2014: 69) in Nurdiana (2017). It is argued that it best represents the accuracy learner performance in terms of syntax, morphology, and native like lexical choice or word order.

$$Accuracy = \frac{Error - Free\ AS - Units}{Total\ Number\ of\ AS - Units} \times 100\%$$

4.1.1 Results of students in *strategic planning*

The research question points out to investigate whether there was any significant difference between the effect of strategic planning task on students' speaking achievement in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Complexity	Between Groups	.022	2	.011	3.641	.042
	Within Groups	.070	23	.003		
	Total	.092	25			
Accuracy	Between Groups	.006	2	.003	.599	.558
	Within Groups	.114	23	.005		
	Total	.120	25			
Fluency	Between Groups	.243	2	.122	1.016	.378
	Within Groups	2.753	23	.120		
	Total	2.997	25			

Descriptive statistics reported that there was significant difference between students' speaking achievement in term of complexity after having strategic planning task. Based on table below reports the results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,042<0,05. It indicated that there was a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in case of complexity. On other hand, related to accuracy and fluency the table reports that the

results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,558>0,05 for accuracy and 0,338>0,05 for fluency. It indicated that there was no a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in case of accuracy and fluency (see Appendix 19).

4.1.2   Results of students in *doing similar task*

The research question attempted to find out whether there was any significant difference between the effect of doing similar task on students' speaking achievement in terms of complexity, accuracy and fluency.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Complexity	Between Groups	.017	2	.009	18.199	.000
	Within Groups	.010	22	.000		
	Total	.028	24			
Accuracy	Between Groups	.006	2	.003	.679	.518
	Within Groups	.090	22	.004		
	Total	.096	24			
Fluency	Between Groups	.908	2	.454	9.302	.001
	Within Groups	1.074	22	.049		
	Total	1.982	24			

Descriptive statistics reported that there was significant difference between students' speaking achievement in term complexity and fluency after doing similar task. Based on table reports the results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,000<0,05. It indicated that there was a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in case of complexity. In addition, related to fluency the table above reports that the results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,001<0,05. It indicated that there was a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in case of fluency. On the contrary, it indicated that there was no a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in case of accuracy. It was shown from table above which reports the results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,518>0,05 (see Appendix 19).

4.2 Discussion
Results of this research reported that there was significant difference between students' speaking achievement in term of complexity after having strategic planning task. On other hand, related to accuracy and fluency the table above reports that the results of the ANOVA test sig tailed= 0,558>0,05 for accuracy and 0,338>0,05 for fluency. It indicated that there was no a significant difference between students before getting strategic planning task and after getting strategic planning task in case of accuracy and fluency.

The present research contrast with study which was conducted by Zahra Fallah and Rahmany (2015) which results indicated that strategic and rehearsal planning have statistically significant effect on fluency of the learners' performances. This study was aimed to investigate the impact of three types of task planning on the fluency of L2 learners' oral production. Planning was

operationalized at three levels: rehearsal, strategic and unpressured within-task planning. To this end, 40 students who were in four advanced classes with the same level, both male and female, were chosen from an English Language Institute in Hashtgerd, Iran. Four classes were randomly selected to work under three different planning condition and one class acted under no-planning condition. In order to collect the data, the presentation task was employed as the means of data collection. The participants in the first group were asked to perform the task two times with two-week interval between the two performances. The second experimental group received strategic planning with ten minutes of planning time. Whilst the participants in the third group began to speak immediately but took time as long as they like to performed their presentation. The participants in the no-planning group, were asked to perform their presentation immediately after reading each text within a limited time. Performance was assessed through speech rate (as a measure of fluency). The data collection procedure was carefully performed and the raw data was submitted to SPSS (version 19.0). Results indicated that strategic and rehearsal planning have statistically significant effect on fluency of the learners' performances.

In line withdoing similar task, it is reported that there was significant difference between students' speaking achievement in term complexity and fluency after doing similar task but there was no a significant difference between students before getting treatment and after getting treatment in term of accuracy.As hypothesized, *doing similar task* clearly has an advantage over *strategic planning* in improving the students' speaking performance.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The analysis on the results has led this research to the some conclusions. Both *strategic planning* and *doing similar task* provide students with the opportunity to attain their complexity, as shown by a significant difference in the students' speaking performance in the aspect of complexity. The results also indicate that t-value of accuracy aspect is higher than that of t-table with two-tail significance of $p<0.05$.Both *strategic planning* and *doing similar task*result in no significant difference in term of accuracy.Thus, both phases still need some modification to stimulate students to produce their utterances accurately.

*Doing similar task*provides students with a more comfortable learning environment that allows students to overcome stress or fear and to speak or have discussions with others compared to *strategic planning*. Therefore, it is possible for them to produce utterances fluently. Furthermore, the students in both groups became motivated to do the tasks that they felt real and meaningful while having the opportunity to actively participate in completing the tasks.This is confirmed by the significant difference in the students' speaking performance in term of fluency. The result also shows that t-value of accuracy aspect is higher than that of t-table with two-tail significance of$p<0.05$.

REFERENCES

Al Aida, Y. (2018). Developing teaching materials based on task based instructions to enhance students' writing ability. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Arnoi, K.N. (2018). Teaching Listening through TBLT in Descriptive Text at the 1st Grade of SMA Al Kautsar Bandar Lampung. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Branden, K.V. (2016). The role of teachers in task-based language teaching. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 36: 164-181.

Craven, L. (2017). Measuring Language Performance: Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency Measures. Barcelona: American University of Sharjah.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Genc, Z.S. (2012). Effects of strategic planning on the accuracy of oral and written task in the performance of Turkish EFL learners. Turkey: Uludag University.

Hismanoglu, M., and Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based Language Teaching: What Every EFL Teacher Should Do. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 15: 46–52.

Iswari, K.D. (2017). The Effect of Task Based Language Teaching on Students' Speaking Achievement at the First Grade of SMAN 1 Bandar Lampung. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Lande, S. K., andAstuti, E.M. (2018). *Forward an English course for vacation school students Grade XI*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Mulya Sari, D., et al. (2013). The Implementation of Jigsaw Technique in English Speaking Class at the Second Grade Students of SMA. *Unpublished Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Nurdiana, N. (2017. Designing Divergent and Convergent Task for Promoting Students' Speaking Performance and Autonomy. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Rafie, Z. F., et al. (2015). The Differential Effects of Three Types of Task Planning on the Accuracy of L2 Oral Production. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6: 1297-1304.

Richard and Rodgers. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salimi, A., and Soghra, D. (2012). Task Complexity and Language Production Dilemmas (Robinson's Cognition Hypothesis vs. Skehan's Trade-off Model).*Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46: 643 – 652.

Salimi, A., et al. (2012). The Effect of Strategic Planning Time and Task Complexity on L2 Written Accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2: 2398-2406.

Sallem, C., et al. (2015). Developing Task Based English Teaching Materials for Business and Management Vocational School. Tanjungpura: Tanjungpura University.

Setiyadi, Ag. B. (2006). *MetodepenelitianuntukpengajaranbahasaAsing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.

Simamora, R.O. (2018). The Implementation of TBLT to Improve Students Ability at the 3rd Grade of SMP Widya Dharma Bandar Lampung. *Unpublished Master's Thesis. Department of English Education, Lampung University.*

Unila. (2010). Format penulisankaryailmiahUniversitas Lampung. Bandar Lampung: Unila Press.