Pulchra Lingua: A Journal of Language Study, Literature, & Linguistics, 3(2), 2024
https://doi.org/10.58989/plj.v3i2.41

Implementing Task-Based Learning (TBL) to Develop Speaking Skill

Feny Nur Adzani [a], Mochtar Marhum[b], Anjar Kusuma Dewi[c], Muhammad Arid[d]

[a,b,c,d]Tadulako University Palu, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine whether the Task-based Learning (TBL) strategy can improve the speaking skills of 11th-grade students at MAN 2 Palu City. Using quantitative methods with a quasi-experimental design, the study involved 428 students as the population. The sample was selected purposively, with XI MIPA 1 serving as the experimental group and XI MIPA 3 as the control group. The research instrument consisted of pre-tests and post-tests. The results indicate a significant improvement in students' speaking skills after implementing TBL, as the t-value (4.092) exceeded the t-critical value (1.996) at a significance level of 0.05 with *df*=67. The hypothesis was accepted, confirming that TBL is effective in enhancing students' speaking abilities. Thus, this strategy can be applied as a teaching approach to foster speaking skill development.

KEYWORDS

Task-based Learning (TBL);
Speaking skill;
Teaching speaking.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah strategi Task-based Learning (TBL) dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa kelas XI Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2. Menggunakan metode kuantitatif dengan desain kuasi eksperimen, penelitian ini melibatkan 428 siswa sebagai populasi. Sampel dipilih secara purposive, dengan XI MIPA 1 sebagai kelas eksperimen dan XI MIPA 3 sebagai kelas kontrol. Instrumen penelitian berupa tes pre-test dan post-test. Hasil menunjukkan adanya peningkatan signifikan kemampuan berbicara siswa setelah penerapan TBL, dengan nilai t-hitung (4,092) lebih tinggi dari t-tabel (1,996) pada tingkat signifikansi 0,05 dan *df*=67. Hipotesis diterima, membuktikan bahwa TBL efektif meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa. Oleh karena itu, strategi ini dapat digunakan sebagai pendekatan pembelajaran untuk mengembangkan keterampilan berbicara.

KATAKUNCI

Task-based Learning (TBL);
Kemampuan Berbicara;
Pengajaran Berbicara.

Contact
Feny Nur Adzani
feny.azani@gmail.com
Tadulako University Palu, Indonesia

How to cite:
Adzani, F. N, Marhum, M., Dewi, A. K., Arid, M. (2024). Implementing Task-Based Learning (TBL) to Develop Speaking Skill. *Pulchra Lingua: A Journal of Language Study, Literature, & Linguistics*, 3(2), 97-109. https://doi.org/10.58989/plj.v3i2.41

1. Introduction

English is a language used as a means of communication and as an international medium for interacting with people worldwide. According to Ghiabi (2014), English has become a vital language for communication, used by many people across the globe, even in regions with diverse native languages. Language skills are divided into four primary areas that students must master: Listening, Writing, Speaking, and Reading.

Speaking is a key way for individuals to communicate with others, making it one of the most essential aspects of human interaction. Through speaking, we share ideas, make requests, present arguments, provide information, and express opinions.

The development of students' speaking abilities depends on internal and external factors. Internal factors include confidence and motivation. According to Moon (2000), motivation stems from engaging in meaningful language activities that reflect real-life communication. Moon (2000) also emphasizes that students should see the practical value of the language they are learning, recognizing it as a tool for expressing needs, ideas, and opinions both inside and outside the classroom.

External factors, such as teaching methods and the environment, also play a role. One major obstacle to improving speaking skills is the environment, where daily conversations often rely on native languages rather than English, limiting opportunities for students to practice fluency.

Many students struggle to speak fluently in public, often feeling afraid or lacking confidence when speaking English in class. They worry about making grammatical mistakes or running out of vocabulary, which causes them to stop abruptly. This is often due to limited opportunities to use English in conversations with peers. Teachers, therefore, play a critical role in introducing effective learning techniques, especially in teaching speaking skills.

According to the curriculum, students are expected to become faithful, productive, creative, innovative, and effective individuals and citizens. The curriculum also allows students to learn according to their interests, personal abilities, and learning styles. In learning English, particularly speaking skills, various techniques can be used to enhance students' abilities.

This research aims to apply Task-Based Learning (TBL) to determine whether it can help students improve their speaking skills. The researcher is interested in using the TBL method because it emphasizes practical tasks that help students develop applicable skills for real-life situations, increase motivation, and enhance engagement in learning.

Willis (1996) proposed that TBL involves a series of activities designed for learners to achieve a communicative purpose and a specific outcome. Additionally, Beaulieu & Fortier (2024) stated that TBL is an approach to teaching speaking, where teachers guide students through tasks that simulate authentic, real-life situations.

2. Method

The researcher employed a quasi-experimental research design for this study, aiming to establish a relationship between an independent and a dependent variable. This design allowed the researcher to modify conditions during the teaching and learning process. Two classes were involved: an experimental class and a control class. Both classes participated in pre-tests and post-tests. However, the experimental class received Task-Based Learning (TBL) as part of the treatment, while the control class followed conventional materials. A post-treatment test was administered to evaluate whether Task-Based Learning (TBL) effectively improved the speaking skills of 11th-grade students at Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2 during the treatment period. The research design used in this study is based on Arikunto's 2013 framework:

$$\sum x = \frac{x}{n} \times 100$$

Where: $\sum$ = Individual score
x = obtained score
n = maximum score
100 = Constant score

Secondly, the researcher calculated the mean scores of the experimental and control groups using the formula provided by Arikunto (2013).

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

Where: M = Average score
$\sum$x = Total score
N = Number of students

The researcher analyzed the score deviations and squared deviations. To do this, the formula from Arikunto (2013) was applied as follows:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}$$

$$\sum y^2 = \sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}$$

$\sum$ x^2 = Deviation score of experimental class
$\sum$ y^2 = Deviation score of control class

Finally, to determine the significant difference between the results of the experimental and control groups, the researcher calculated the t-value using the t-test formula proposed by Arikunto (2013) as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\sum x^2 + \sum y^2}{n_x + n_y - 2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{n_x} + \frac{1}{n_y}\right]}}$$

t = the value of t-counted
Mx = Mean of experimental class
My = Mean of the control class
$\sum x^2$ = sum square deviation of experimental class
$\sum y^2$ = sum square deviation of control class
n_x = number of students of experimental class
n_y = number of students of control class
2 = constant number

The study involved 11th-grade students from Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2. The sample consisted of two classes: Class XI of First Mathematics and Natural Sciences program, with 34 students, and Class XI of Third Mathematics and Natural Sciences program, with 36 students. The sampling method used was purposive sampling, based on recommendations from the English teacher at Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2. The teacher identified students in both classes as facing similar challenges in reading skills. Consequently, Class XI of Third Mathematics and Natural Sciences program was selected as the control group, where the authentic material method was applied, and Class XI of First Mathematics and Natural Sciences program was designated as the experimental group, where the conventional method was implemented.

A variable is a characteristic or trait of an individual or organization that a researcher can measure or observe, varying among the individuals or organizations being studied. In this research, the independent and dependent variables were manipulated or measured to explore cause-and-effect relationships.

> "An independent variable is a characteristic or trait that influences or affects the outcome, known as the dependent variable."
>
> (Creswell, 2014)

In this study, the independent variable represents the cause, and its value is unaffected by other variables.

> "A dependent variable is a characteristic or attribute that depends on or is influenced by the independent variable."
>
> (Creswell, 2014)

The dependent variable represents the effect, with its value changing in response to alterations in the independent variable.

Table 1. Scoring System of the Tests

ASPECT	SCORE	DESCRIPTIONS
Pronunciation	4	Easy to understand.
	3	There are pronunciation issues that require the listener's full concentration and occasional misunderstanding.
	2	Difficult to understand due to pronunciation problems, often asked to repeat.
	1	Serious pronunciation problems that cannot be understood.
Grammar	4	Occasionally makes grammatical errors but does not affect meaning
	3	Often makes grammatical errors that affect meaning
	2	Many grammatical errors that hinder meaning and frequent rearrangement of sentences
	1	Grammatical errors are so severe that they are difficult to understand
Vocabulary	4	Occasionally uses inappropriate vocabulary
	3	Frequent use of inappropriate vocabulary, conversations are limited due to limited vocabulary
	2	Uses vocabulary incorrectly and has limited vocabulary making it difficult to understand.
	1	Vocabulary is so limited that conversation is not possible
Fluency	4	Fluency appears slightly impaired by language issues
	3	Fluency is somewhat impaired by language problems
	2	Frequent hesitations and halts due to language limitations
	1	Speech is disjointed and halting making conversation impossible
Comprehension	4	Understand almost everything, although there is repetition in certain parts
	3	Understands most of what is said when speech is somewhat slowed down despite repetition
	2	It's hard to follow what is being said.
	1	Unable to understand even simple conversations

The post-test was conducted to assess students' speaking abilities after being taught using the Task-Based Learning (TBL) technique. The structure and difficulty level of the post-test were identical to those of the pre-test, as both aimed to measure students' speaking abilities following the application of the TBL technique.

During the treatment, the tasks included communicative activities such as role-playing and presentation projects. In the role-playing task, students were given opportunities to discuss relevant topics and activities they encounter in real-life situations. For the presentation project, students selected topics from posters provided to them and presented their ideas in front of the class. Each student had 2 minutes to deliver their presentation during the treatment sessions.

3. Results and Discussion

The researcher administered the pre-test to both the experimental and control classes on April 23, 2024. Individual student scores were calculated using the formula outlined in Chapter III. The pre-test and post-test served as research instruments for this study. The pre-test results were used to assess students' speaking abilities before the treatment, while the post-test results measured their speaking skills after the treatment. The researcher then analyzed the results to determine whether there was a significant difference in the students' speaking skills.

Table 2. The result of pre-tests of the Experimental Group

No.	Initials	P	G	V	F	C	Raw Score	Max Score	Obtained Score
1	AND	3	2	2	2	3	12	20	60
2	AJ	2	2	3	2	2	11	20	55
3	AQF	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
4	ARDM	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
5	A	1	2	2	1	1	7	20	35
6	AAZ	2	3	2	2	3	12	20	60
7	AAW	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
8	EDP	2	2	2	1	2	9	20	45
9	FA	2	2	2	3	3	12	20	60
10	FA	3	3	4	3	4	17	20	85
11	FF	2	2	1	1	1	7	20	35
12	FDEK	1	1	2	3	3	10	20	50
13	MDS	1	2	2	1	2	8	20	40
14	MAF	2	1	2	2	1	8	20	40
15	M	2	1	2	2	2	9	20	45
16	MN	2	2	2	2	1	9	20	45
17	NCF	3	3	2	2	2	12	20	60
18	NE	1	2	2	1	2	8	20	40
19	NH	3	2	3	3	2	13	20	65
20	NP	2	3	2	3	3	13	20	65
21	NRM	2	1	2	1	2	8	20	40
22	NGMS	2	1	2	1	2	8	20	40
23	PSJB	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
24	RV	1	2	1	1	2	7	20	35
25	RKAM	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
26	R	1	2	2	2	3	10	20	50
27	RA	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
28	RH	1	2	2	2	2	9	20	45
29	SN	2	2	2	2	3	11	20	55
30	SNA	1	2	2	2	2	9	20	45
31	SRHD	1	2	2	1	2	8	20	40
32	SSNA	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
33	TS	3	2	2	2	3	12	20	60
Total									1670

Based on the table, the highest score recorded was 85, and the lowest was 35. According to the school's passing grade criteria, only 2 students passed the pre-test, while 31 students did not meet the required standard.

Table 3. The Result of Pre-test of the Control Group

No.	Initials	P	G	V	F	C	Raw Score	Max Score	Obtained Score
1	AK	3	2	2	2	3	12	20	60
2	AI	2	1	2	2	2	9	20	45
3	AC	2	2	2	2	3	11	20	55
4	CA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
5	CA	2	1	1	2	2	8	20	40
6	CS	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
7	DP	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
8	EM	2	1	2	1	2	8	20	40
9	FA	2	1	2	2	3	10	20	50
10	FM	1	2	2	1	1	7	20	35
11	FF	1	2	2	1	2	8	20	40
12	FA	1	1	1	1	1	5	20	25
13	IN	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
14	KK	3	2	3	2	3	13	20	65
15	MA	3	2	2	2	3	12	20	60
16	MR	2	1	2	2	1	8	20	40
17	MA	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
18	MH	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
19	MA	2	1	2	2	1	8	20	40
20	MF	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
21	MR	1	2	2	2	2	9	20	45
22	MS	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
23	NN	2	1	1	2	2	8	20	40
24	NA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
25	PD	2	1	2	1	2	8	20	40
26	RP	2	1	2	2	1	8	20	40
27	RR	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
28	RK	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
29	RH	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
30	RS	2	2	2	1	2	9	20	45
31	SN	1	1	2	1	1	6	20	30
32	SF	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
33	SJ	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
34	VH	1	1	1	1	1	5	20	25
35	YA	1	1	1	1	1	5	20	25
36	SS	3	2	2	3	2	12	20	60
Total									1800
Mean									50

In contrast, the results for the control group are as follows. Based on the table below, the highest score was 75, and the lowest was 25. Referring to the school's passing grade, only 4 students passed the pre-test, while 32 students did not meet the required standard. From the table above, the highest score for both groups was 56. After calculating the total scores of the students, the researcher determined the mean score using the formula below:

$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$
$$= \frac{1670}{33}$$
$$= 50.61$$

$$M = \frac{\sum y}{N}$$
$$= \frac{1800}{36}$$
$$= 50$$

The researcher identified a difference in the mean scores between the experimental and control groups after analyzing the results. The experimental group achieved a mean score of 50.61, while the control group scored 50. This indicates that the control group's average was slightly higher than that of the experimental group. However, the difference is not statistically significant, suggesting that both groups possessed similar levels of knowledge, although the control group showed slightly better performance. This conclusion is supported by the highest scores and the generally higher scores of other students in the control group compared to the experimental group. After completing the teaching and learning process in the experimental group, the researcher administered a final test (post-test) to both groups. The post-test was conducted on June 4, 2024. The results are presented in the table below:

Table 4. The Result of Post-test of the Experimental Group

No.	Initials	P	G	V	F	C	Raw Score	Max Score	Obtained Score
1	AND	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
2	AJ	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
3	AQF	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
4	ARDM	3	4	4	3	4	18	20	90
5	A	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
6	AAZ	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
7	AAW	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
8	EDP	3	2	3	2	3	13	20	65
9	FA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
10	FA	3	4	4	3	4	18	20	90
11	FF	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
12	FDEK	2	2	3	3	3	13	20	65
13	MDS	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
14	MAF	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
15	M	2	2	2	3	3	12	20	60
16	MN	3	2	3	3	3	14	20	70
17	NCF	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
18	NE	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
19	NH	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
20	NP	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
21	NRM	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
22	NGMS	3	3	3	3	4	16	20	80
23	PSJB	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
24	RV	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
25	RKAM	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
26	R	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
27	RA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
28	RH	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
29	SN	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
30	SNA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
31	SRHD	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
32	SSNA	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
33	TS	3	3	3	3	4	16	20	80
Total									2420
Mean									73.33

The first table presents the post-test results for the experimental group. The highest score was 90, and the lowest score was 60. According to the school's passing grade, 26 students passed the post-test, while 7 students did not meet the passing criteria.

Table 5. The Result of Post-test of Control Group

No.	Initials	P	G	V	F	C	Raw Score	Max Score	Obtained Score
1	AK	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
2	AI	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
3	AC	2	3	3	3	3	14	20	70
4	CA	3	3	3	3	4	16	20	80
5	CA	2	3	3	3	2	13	20	65
6	CS	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
7	DP	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
8	EM	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
9	FA	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
10	FM	2	3	2	2	3	12	20	60
11	FF	2	3	3	2	2	12	20	60
12	FA	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
13	IN	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
14	KK	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
15	MA	3	2	3	2	3	13	20	65
16	MR	3	3	3	3	3	15	20	75
17	MA	3	2	2	3	3	13	20	65
18	MH	3	3	4	3	3	16	20	80
19	MA	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
20	MF	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
21	MR	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
22	MS	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
23	NN	2	2	3	2	2	11	20	55
24	NA	3	3	4	3	3	16	20	80
25	PD	2	2	3	2	2	11	20	55
26	RP	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
27	RR	2	2	3	2	3	12	20	60
28	RK	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
29	RH	2	3	3	2	3	13	20	65
30	RS	3	3	2	2	2	12	20	60
31	SN	2	2	3	2	2	11	20	55
32	SF	3	3	4	3	3	16	20	80
33	SJ	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
34	VH	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
35	YA	2	2	2	2	2	10	20	50
36	SS	3	2	3	3	2	13	20	65
Total									2285
Mean									63.47

The second table presents the post-test results for the control group. According to the school's passing grade, 26 students passed the post-test, while 7 students did not meet the passing criteria.

Experimental group Control group

$$Mx = \frac{\sum x}{N} \qquad My = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$= \frac{750}{33} \qquad = \frac{485}{36}$$

$$Mx = 22{,}72 \qquad My = 13{,}47$$

After comparing the results of the two groups, the researcher identified a difference in the mean scores between the experimental and control groups following the treatment. The experimental group achieved a mean score of 22.72, while the control group, which did not receive any treatment, had a mean score of 13.47.

3.1. Enhancing Speaking Skills Through Task-Based Learning

The purpose of this research is to determine whether the use of the Task-Based Learning (TBL) method can improve the speaking skills of Grade Eleven students at Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2. Before applying the treatment in the experimental and control classes, the pre-test results of both groups showed very low scores. As outlined in Chapter III, the teaching and learning process in this study consisted of three steps. First, the researcher administered a pre-test to assess the students' English-speaking abilities before receiving any treatment. Second, the treatment phase was conducted using the Task-Based Learning (TBL) method, where students engaged in conversations that mirrored real-life situations. Finally, a post-test was given to evaluate the students' speaking skills after the treatment.

This research focused on accuracy, fluency, and vocabulary, as these components were identified as areas where students faced challenges. To address these issues, the researcher implemented the TBL method to enhance the students' speaking skills. During the treatment, students were asked to create and perform conversations related to real-life scenarios. The researcher followed the procedures recommended by Willis (1996) for teaching skills through TBL.

The process began with selecting relevant tasks tailored to students' interests and needs. In the pre-task preparation stage, the teacher introduced the topic or task, provided examples of vocabulary and grammar related to the task, and prepared students for the activity. Students then completed the assigned tasks and presented their results to the class.

Before the treatment, students participated in a pre-test where they were asked to tell stories on predetermined topics in front of the class. Each student was given 1-2 minutes to present. During the treatment phase, communicative tasks such as role-play and presentation projects were used. For the role-play tasks, students discussed real-life topics and scenarios. In the presentation project, students selected topics from

posters provided by the teacher and presented them to the class. Each presentation lasted about two minutes.

A noticeable difference was observed before and after the application of the TBL method. Before the treatment, students struggled with pronunciation and often sounded unfamiliar with certain words. After the TBL intervention, students showed increased confidence and actively participated in discussions. They were more motivated to speak, as the tasks were directly related to their daily activities. This aligns with (Safitri et al., 2020) assertion that TBL emphasizes learning by doing, encouraging students to experience the language in practical contexts.

Task-Based Learning (TBL) has demonstrated its effectiveness as a teaching method for enhancing students' speaking skills Afifah & Devana (2020), particularly in educational settings where practical language use is a priority (Widia & Astawa, 2014). This approach focuses on organizing learning activities that mirror real-life situations, allowing students to engage with tasks that feel relevant and meaningful to their daily experiences (Khawa & Rizkiyah, 2022; Kosim et al., 2024). By immersing students in realistic scenarios, TBL not only enhances their ability to communicate but also helps them develop confidence in expressing themselves (Kołsut & Szumilas, 2023). Moreover, it fosters a deeper level of student engagement by creating a more interactive and dynamic learning environment (Shloul et al., 2024).

This method also addresses common barriers to speaking, such as anxiety, lack of motivation, or unfamiliarity with conversational contexts, by encouraging active participation and promoting a hands-on, experiential learning process (Finn & Zimmer, 2012). Through this structured, task-oriented approach, TBL equips students with practical communication skills that are directly applicable to real-world interactions, making it a valuable tool for language development (Feng & Hong, 2022). The findings of this study confirm that TBL is an effective approach for teaching speaking skills to eleventh-grade students at Palu's State Islamic Senior High School 2, promoting an active and motivated classroom environment.

3. Conclusion

After discussing and analyzing the data, the researcher concludes that the Task-Based Learning (TBL) method can effectively improve the speaking skills of Grade Eleven students at MAN 2 Kota Palu. This conclusion is supported by the results of the study, which show that the students' mean score increased from 50.61 in the pre-test to 73.33 in the post-test. Additionally, the t-value calculated (t-counted = 4.092) is greater than the critical t-value (t-table = 1.996). These findings confirm that the hypothesis is accepted, demonstrating that students' speaking skills improved significantly following the implementation of the TBL method. The comparison of the two values further

reinforces that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, indicating that Task-Based Learning (TBL) is an effective approach to developing students' speaking skills.

References

1. Journals

Afifah, N., & Devana, T. (2020). Speaking Skill through Task Based Learning in English Foreign Language Classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i2.3109

Beaulieu, S., & Fortier, V. (2024). Addressing the L2 Learning Needs of Adults with Limited Education: Designing Input-Based Tasks for Form-Meaning Connections. *TASK: Journal on Task-Based Language Teaching and Learning*, *4*(1), 23–48. https://doi.org/10.1075/task.22012.bea

Feng, E., & Hong, G. (2022). Engagement Mediates the Relationship Between Emotion and Achievement of Chinese EFL Learners. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*(895594). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.895594

Ghiabi, S. (2014). Investigating the Effects of Story Retelling Technique as a Closed Task vs. Story Completion as an Open Task on EFL Learners' Speaking. *International Journal of English and Education*, *3*(3), 17–25. https://ijee.org/assets/docs/3.18202205.pdf

Khawa, D., & Rizkiyah, F. (2022). The Implementation of Task-Based Learning Strategy by Making Video Introduction to Improve Students' Speaking Skills. *Darussalam English Journal*, *2*(2), 199–220. https://doi.org/10.30739/dej.v2i2.1778

Kołsut, S., & Szumilas, M. (2023). Exploring Student Engagement in Task-Based and Communicative Language Classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688231188800

Kosim, N., Ardiansyah, A. A., Hikmah, H. S., & Atha, Y. A. S. (2024). The Use of The Task-Base Language Teaching (TBLT) Method to Improve Learning Outcomes of Arabic Language Skills. *Alibbaa': Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab*, *5*(2), 144–165. https://doi.org/10.19105/ajpba.v5i2.14804

Safitri, H., Rafli, Z., & Dewanti, R. (2020). Improving Students' Speaking Skills through Task-Based Learning: An Action Research at the English Department. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, *7*(6), 88–99.

Shloul, T. Al, Mazhar, T., Abbas, Q., Iqbal, M., Ghadi, Y. Y., Shahzad, T., Mallek, F., & Hamam, H. (2024). Role of Activity-Based Learning and Chatgpt on Students'

Performance in Education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *6*(100219), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100219

Widia, L., & Astawa, I. N. (2014). Improving Speaking Skill Through Task Based Learning Strategy at Seventh Grade Students of SMP Negeri 3 Baturiti in Academic Year 2012/2013. *Jurnal Santiaji Pendidikan*, *4*(1), 1–13.

2. Books

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. S. (2012). Student Engagement: What Is It? Why Does It Matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Student Engagement* (pp. 97–131). Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

Moon, J. (2000). *Children Learning English*. Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching.

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. Pearson.