Speaking Skill Enhancement through Task-Based Approach at Intermediate Level: An Experimental Study

Syed Muhammad Hamza Gillani [1]

Abstract

This study examines the efficacy of task-based language teaching approach (TBLT) in improving the speaking skills of learners at intermediate level. In this study, 60 Intermediate level ESL students were divided into two equal groups, i.e. an experimental group and a control group. Data for this study were collected by administrating oral pre- and post-tests to both the groups. A pre-test was taken to check the spoken English ability of both the groups. Then the experimental group was treated with a task-based language teaching approach for a period of three months. The control group continued to receive lectures with traditional language teaching techniques. At the completion of the treatment, a post-test was taken from both the groups to compare and analyze the improvement in their spoken English ability. Data from the pre- and post-tests were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS. The t-tests were run to compare the improvement between groups and to analyze improvement within groups. The results revealed a significant improvement in the performance of experimental group as compared to the control group. The treatment tasks were helpful in developing the oral skills of the experimental group students. Findings of this study may inspire teachers teaching speaking to adapt some of the activities in the usual course book according to a more task-based approach, so that students can participate in oral practice of language actively and in turn help them improve their speaking abilities.

Keywords: Speaking Skill, Task-based approach, Experimental Study, Control Group, Experimental Group

1. Introduction

Language learning is a lifelong active process that begins at the time of birth of a person and continues throughout life. A language classroom offers the ideal settings for acquiring a second or foreign language. Language classrooms serve primarily to assist language learners

[1]Lecturer in English, Cadet College, Muzaffarabad

in the learning process by taking them under their influence. Language learning environment has some significant factors involved in language learning among which one is 'Instructional Tasks' (Chapelle, 2009). Type of tasks used in instruction may constructively affect the performance of the learners. Therefore, such tasks are designed by a course designer that fortify a language learning culture by providing learners sufficient chances to get themselves involved in the communication process and to appreciate their attempts to speak clearly and persuasively. Among multiple language teaching designs that promote this language learning culture, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers several opportunities to improvise meaningful and effective activities that promote communicative language use in the language classroom (Subrahmanyam Vellanki & Bandu, 2021).

Due to a significant international importance, English language owns an incredible value. Therefore, in the Azad State of Jammu and Kashmir, all educational institutions of both sectors i.e., Public and Private, English language has been granted the status of secondary language. The supreme aspiration of every English language learner is the proficiency in speaking English. Though in the development of learners, speaking plays a considerable role, yet ESL learners face a number of confrontations while speaking English (Derwing et al., 2002).

Social environment and cultural norms of Azad State of Jammu and Kashmir strongly encourage native and national languages. Moreover, classrooms have a conventional nature where focus is mainly adjusted to cover the syllabus even from initial standards of educational set up. Such methodologies have been adopted in the syllabus that promote all activities except speaking and in particular, English speaking is encouraged nowhere. Additionally, there is absence of any appropriate platform through which learners could speak in front of the audience. In consequence, local learners have a restricted exposure to English where they could only read, write, and listen to English whereas they are cautious and unsettled when it comes to speaking English (Goldenberg, 2011).

Intermediate level ESL Learners in the Azad State of Jammu and Kashmir feel reluctant while speaking English proficiently. It is always an uphill battle to learn second language as L1 patterns have already been developed in the mind of learners. In learning, a number of elements including psychological, linguistic, and social ones can create problems.

English language speaking abilities of any ESL learner can be negatively affected by all these hurdles (Liton, 2016).

Usually, students are not trained to make use of specific language structures while they are involved in this meticulous and meaningful educational process. They are instead urged to build and use the target language independently, with the instructor's support but without any instant criticism. The primary role of the instructor is to monitor, assess, and open the task-based communication route (Coultas & Booth, 2019).

The term "task-based language teaching" (TBLT) refers to a methodology that gives students a learning environment where they are required to use the target language in communicative tasks and where the ability to use language effectively is valued more highly than merely producing the correct grammar structures (Jeon & Hahn, 2006). This is how TBLT is viewed as a Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) paradigm that emphasizes meaningful and authentic communication in the target language as the crucial element of language acquisition (Brandl, 2008).

Task Based Language Teaching is an effective language teaching methodology as it develops the purpose-driven communicative language learning (Malmir et al., 2011). Communicative language learning involves the implementation of real-world tasks (Knutson, 1997). In order to achieve a clearly defined outcome, tasks enable learners to use authentic and productive language. Despite students do not have any previous practice or training in acquiring useful language structures to accomplish the tasks, yet many tasks need learners to use language creatively. It creates a situation in which students must understand meaning and produce helpful words in order to accomplish these tasks.

1.1 Research Questions

The study investigates and presents responses to the following research questions:

1. How does task-based language instruction enhance the ability to communicate the target language?
2. To what extent do the results of the pre- and post-tests represent any variations in the performance of the experimental and control groups' English language speech skills?

2. Research Methodology

The effectiveness of task-based teaching in improving the speaking skills of intermediate-level pupils is examined in this research. This chapter includes details on the study's subjects, tools used, data gathering techniques, and data analysis processes.

2.1 Participants

Participants included 60 intermediate-level learners. They were divided into two groups of 30 each. With 30 learners, one group served as experimental group, while the other served as control group. All of the student participants shared a comparable school setting and had spent the previous four years being exposed to the English language to a similar extent. Their degrees of language ability were therefore similar.

2.2 Instruments

A test-based approach was implied to collect data in this study. This approach comprised the implementation of a pre-test and a post-test. Prior to the implementation of task-based language teaching techniques, a pre-test was administrated among the participants of the study. This was a test of their spoken English competence. All the participants belonging to both experimental and control group were given this test.

The pre-test consisted of presentations on various topics related to the daily life activities of the participants. Each participant was given 3-5 minutes to speak on the selected topic. The subjects' speaking English skills were assessed based on the efficacy of their communication during general explanation, delivery, language use, and topic growth. Their presentations were examined and graded by two different scorers working as English language teachers at Cadet College Muzaffarabad. The aim of taking the same pre-test from both the groups was to compare and analyze their spoken English abilities.

Post-test oral talks made up the second data gathering tool. During these conversations, participants' individual spoken language abilities were again graded. Similar to the pre-test, the post-test was also administrated among all the participants of both experimental and control group. These interviews were again recorded by the researcher. The same two scorers who judged the pre-test, again analyzed and graded the individual oral performances of each participant. The purpose of this conversation-based post-test was to determine whether learners' English

communication abilities had improved as a result of the task-based teaching that had been incorporated into their spoken language courses.

The pre- and post-treatment exams included oral tasks created in line with the normal activities and subjects the participants were studying in their regular classes. The normal TOEFL independent speaking rubrics were used to score the oral exams.

At the end of the study, the researcher also conducted a focus group interview with 8 participants from the experimental group. The purpose behind conducting this interview was to get participants' detailed reviews, perceptions and feelings about their novel experience of being taught English language through task-based language teaching techniques (TBLT). The data from this focus group interview proved very much helpful for the researcher to develop an understanding of the participants' attitudes towards task-based instructions. The post-test was conducted after two days of the completion of task-based language teaching techniques (TBLT). The two teachers observed each interview and again graded the performances of all the participants by using the same standard TOEFL independent speaking rubrics. Raters then compared their scores and if in case there happened to be a difference of more than 20 points between their ratings for a same participant, they negotiated a common score for him after reconsidering and thoroughly examining his performance. Since there were 60 participants, the oral presentations were held in groups of 15 participants each day. The raters listened to all the 60 participants and were unaware whether individual 60 participants came from the control or experimental groups. The whole of the oral presentations lasted for one and a half hour on each of the four days.

Task-based language teaching treatment included different communicative learning techniques such as cooperative learning, pre-task conversation analysis, role-play, turn taking, pair work, group work, presentations, story completion, picture description, topic discussions, ordering and sorting, real world problem solving, information gap, and some other oral techniques. The experimental group received this treatment 2 hours a week inside their classrooms for two months and twenty days, i.e. 26 credit hours in total. The control group was treated with traditional English teaching methodologies for the same period of time. The details of the tasks designed by the researcher in the treatment of the experimental group are given below in the table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Tasks in the treatment of experimental group

Sr. No.	Tasks	Purpose	Description
1.	**Pre-task elaboration**	**Ordering in a cafeteria** To enable the students to understand and convey the meanings of specific vocabulary items used in a particular context, i.e., cafeteria.	This is an introductory task used before the main task (ordering food in a cafeteria). In this task, a comprehendible context is created for the students to understand the meanings of words and their implications. After developing an understanding of the required words, they are supposed to perform the desired meaningful conversation.
2.	**Ordering and sorting (Willis)**	**Ordering in a cafeteria** To enable the students to understand, sort out, reorganize and use a jumbled conversation in a more meaningful way.	For this task, students are provided a disjointed example of a conversation between a client and a restaurant manager. They must first recognise the sentences that pertain to either the client or the boss and arrange them in a coherent dialogue. They finally order and accept their meal using those phrases.
3.	**Real-world role-play (Nunan)**	**Ordering in a cafeteria** This task focuses on real life rehearsal of the participants on the given topic. It also aims at improving their fluency while using the target expressions.	During this task, learners work in pairs to create a real-world scenario inside the classroom. After thoroughly understanding the use of targeted expressions, learners develop and role-play similar conversations in pairs with their partners.

4.	**Problem solving (Willis)**	**Free theme** Through this task, the problem-solving skills of the learners are fostered. They prepare their own contexts and learn to use previously practiced structures in the newly developed contexts.	During this task, a list comprising multiple choice questions is given to the learners. This list reminds them of the structures they have used previously. They are also provided with some situation cards to follow, organize and practice their own conversations in pairs and groups.
5.	**Pre-task elaboration**	**Making requests** This task enables the learners to find and understand target language structures from given sample conversations.	In this task, learners are given two different sample conversations. They are expected to thoroughly examine those conversations and find required language structures. Then they are supposed to discuss, develop and practice their own similar structures as provided in the sample conversations.
6.	**Real-world role-play (Nunan)**	**Making requests** To enable the students to follow certain linked structures and to offer and refuse something politely.	During this task, students are divided into pairs and are provided situation cards. After this, they are expected to define their roles, design a dialogue and perform the conversation in front of the class.
7.	**Information gap (Willis)**	**Giving directions** To enable the students to rehearse how to	All the students are divided into pairs and each pair is given two maps. Since it is an information gap activity, one member of each pair has an

		request for something and how to give directions to make others do something.	information that the other member of that pair lacks. Student A asks for the information and student B gives the direction that he follows. By following the directions of student B, student A tracks down the place on his map.
8.	**Pre-task conversation analysis**	**Giving directions** To make the students aware of the different functions performed by different target language structures.	Students are provided with different conversations in the target language. They are supposed to analyze those conversations according to a check list called 'request analysis'. This is to make them see whether certain target language structures or expressions are used in the conversation.
9.	**Real-world role-play (Nunan)**	**Giving directions** To make the students, rehearse the given target language structures through role playing.	Students are divided into groups and are given certain situations. They are asked to prepare and practice their own conversations relevant to the given situations. In this way, they use target language structures practiced during the analysis task.
10.	**Problem Solving (Willis)**	**Free theme** To promote a cooperative learning culture and to provide the learners an opportunity to negotiate for meaning. This task also helps in	Learners are divided into groups and each group is given a jumbled short story without any ending. They are expected to reorder the jumbled sentences, arrange those into a meaningful story and improvise a suitable ending for it.

		enhancing creative thinking skills of the learners.	
11.	**Picture description (Kayi)**	**Free Theme** To enable the learners use target language vocabulary and structures to express their views about the visual world.	This task is based on several pictures displayed in the classroom using the audio-visual aids (AV aids). Students are asked to describe on their own the situations they see in the sequential pictures on the screen.
12.	**Scavenger hunt**	**Free Theme** To enable the learners practice problem solving in a tangible manner and to help them act-out using various target language forms they learnt in the previous tasks.	It is a mingling activity that promotes cooperation between the learners. They are given instructions written on a sheet by the instructor and are supposed to interact with other participants to discuss and find out the required answers. Then they are asked to explain their responses orally.
13.	**Talk-show interview**	**Free Theme** To make the learners confident enough to use the target language structures in their everyday conversations.	During this task learners work in pairs. They practice a few questions given by the instructor and ask their partners to answer those using the target language structures.

The researcher designed and planned all above-mentioned tasks with the cooperation of the class teacher. In light of the task-based language teaching approach, experimental group participants practiced one task during every class hour.

After concluding the treatment, post-treatment individual oral interviews of the participants were conducted. A similar strategy as followed in the pre-treatment tests was adopted during the post-treatment tests. Learners took the oral discussion tests individually after their courses in the afternoon as they did in the pre-test oral discussions. 15 participants took the post-test interviews each day. The post-test interviews went on for 4-5 minutes each, for about 80-90 span on each of the four days, as they took pre-test oral presentations.

3. Data Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 20.0 for Windows, was used to perform a descriptive statistical analysis on the information gathered during the pre- and post-treatment tests to look for differences in participant performance between the experimental group and the control group. Analysis of the test findings' variance in terms of maximum, lowest, mean score, and standard deviation was done for both the experimental group and the control group. (SD). A separate sample t-test was then used to evaluate the subjects' results before and after the treatment. A paired sample t-test was used to assess the differences between the pre-test and post-test results of the subjects in both groups (CG and EG). The purpose of this research is to determine whether task-based language teaching (TBLT) improves the speech abilities of middle level pupils in language classes.

Sixty intermediate-level Cadet College Muzaffarabad pupils were chosen as research subjects. Their normal classrooms served as the site of this research. The subjects were split into two equally sized groups, each with 30 pupils. Pre-engineering class was designated the control group, and pre-medical class was chosen as the study group. During their weekly speaking lessons, the experimental group received two hours of task-based drills and assignments. The objectives for the study were created by the scholar himself, and they were carried out with the aid of two language instructors from Cadet College Muzaffarabad.

The findings of this chapter explain the effectiveness of task-based language teaching methods at Cadet College Muzaffarabad in enhancing students' intermediate spoken English language proficiency. Quantitative information gathered during the study is covered by the data analysis.

The details of the average scores of experimental group participants during pre-treatment oral tests are given in the following Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Pre-treatment average test scores of experimental group participants

Sr No	Participants	Total Score	Obtained Score				
			General Description	Delivery	Language Use	Topic Development	Total
1	P-EG01	100	18	22	18	20	78
2	P-EG02	100	16	20	15	18	69
3	P-EG03	100	14	15	12	14	56
4	P-EG04	100	15	16	14	14	59
5	P-EG05	100	16	15	17	15	63
6	P-EG06	100	16	15	18	15	64
7	P-EG07	100	12	10	12	12	46
8	P-EG08	100	18	20	16	18	72
9	P-EG09	100	10	14	12	10	47
10	P-EG10	100	12	14	14	12	52
11	P-EG11	100	14	15	16	15	60
12	P-EG12	100	10	8	10	8	36
13	P-EG13	100	12	10	8	8	38
14	P-EG14	100	12	10	10	12	44
15	P-EG15	100	14	15	16	16	61
16	P-EG16	100	18	20	22	20	80
17	P-EG17	100	10	8	12	11	41
18	P-EG18	100	12	10	14	12	48
19	P-EG19	100	10	12	8	12	42
20	P-EG20	100	16	18	15	17	66
21	P-EG21	100	10	12	10	11	43
22	P-EG22	100	8	12	10	8	38
23	P-EG23	100	10	8	10	8	36
24	P-EG24	100	8	10	12	8	38
25	P-EG25	100	14	16	16	14	60
26	P-EG26	100	16	15	15	17	63
27	P-EG27	100	10	12	8	10	40
28	P-EG28	100	8	10	8	8	34
29	P-EG29	100	8	10	6	10	34
30	P-EG30	100	10	8	12	10	40

The pre-test results for the 30 members of the control group are presented in a straightforward and well-organized manner in Table 3.1.

Each of the four TOFEL speaking criteria, which include broad summary, delivery, language use, and subject growth, receives 25 out of a possible 100 points. Depending on the degree of spoken English ability of each participant, the findings in the table vary from 34 to 80. The details of the average scores of control group participants during pre-treatment oral tests are given in the following Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Pre-treatment average test scores of control group participants

Sr No	Participants	Total Score	Obtained Score				
			General Description	Delivery	Language Use	Topic Development	Total
1	P-CG1	100	15	16	16	17	64
2	P-CG2	100	16	18	16	16	66
3	P-CG3	100	16	18	20	18	72
4	P-CG4	100	10	8	12	10	40
5	P- CG5	100	14	16	14	16	60
6	P-CG6	100	18	18	20	16	72
7	P-CG7	100	16	18	16	20	70
8	P-CG8	100	14	16	14	16	60
9	P-CG9	100	18	16	20	16	70
10	P-CG10	100	10	12	14	12	48
11	P-CG11	100	14	16	15	15	60
12	P-CG12	100	12	14	16	12	54
13	P-CG13	100	10	8	12	8	38
14	P-CG14	100	12	12	14	10	48
15	P-CG15	100	10	12	14	12	48
16	P-CG16	100	14	12	16	14	56
17	P-CG17	100	12	14	12	16	54
18	P-CG18	100	12	15	15	14	56
19	P-CG19	100	10	12	14	12	48
20	P-CG20	100	10	14	12	10	46
21	P-CG21	100	12	10	14	12	48
22	P-CG22	100	12	10	12	14	48
23	P-CG23	100	8	10	8	10	36
24	P-CG24	100	12	14	12	10	48
25	P-CG25	100	10	12	14	14	50
26	P-CG26	100	12	10	8	10	40
27	P-CG27	100	10	8	6	10	34
28	P-CG28	100	12	10	14	10	46
29	P-CG29	100	10	12	8	10	40
30	P-CG30	100	14	18	16	16	64

Table 3.2 contains the average pre-test scores of 30 control group participants. Similar to Table 4.1, each participant's scores are calculated out of 100 possible points, with 25 points awarded for general summary, delivery, language use, and subject growth. The results for each individual vary. Depending on how well each person in the control group spoke English, the range of typical values in the chart goes from 34 to 72.

After giving the participants the task-based therapy, the researcher set up a post-treatment exam. The same two raters who scored each participant's performance on the pre-test also administered the post-test to each participant in both categories, just like they did for the pre-test. A quick chat with each subject served as the post-test. The two raters each independently evaluated each interview using the same standard TOEFL speaking rubrics, which included broad description, delivery, language use, and subject growth. As done during the pr-tests, raters again compared the individual scores of the participants and if they again differed by more than 20 points, the raters again negotiated a mutual score through a detailed analysis of their interviews. The details of the average scores of experimental group participants during post-treatment oral interviews are given in the following Table 3.3.

Table 3.3: Post-treatment average test scores of experimental group participants

Sr No	Participants	Total Score	Obtained Score				
			General Description	Delivery	Language Use	Topic Development	Total
1	P-EG01	100	18	22	18	20	86
2	P-EG02	100	16	20	15	18	75
3	P-EG03	100	14	15	12	14	64
4	P-EG04	100	15	16	14	14	68
5	P-EG05	100	16	15	17	15	70
6	P-EG06	100	16	15	18	15	76
7	P-EG07	100	12	10	12	12	56
8	P-EG08	100	18	20	16	18	74
9	P-EG09	100	10	14	12	10	52
10	P-EG10	100	12	14	14	12	58
11	P-EG11	100	14	15	16	15	75
12	P-EG12	100	10	8	10	8	40
13	P-EG13	100	12	10	8	8	38

14	P-EG14	100	12	10	10	12	52
15	P-EG15	100	14	15	16	16	70
16	P-EG16	100	18	20	22	20	84
17	P-EG17	100	10	8	12	11	45
18	P-EG18	100	12	10	14	12	60
19	P-EG19	100	10	12	8	12	48
20	P-EG20	100	16	18	15	17	74
21	P-EG21	100	10	12	10	11	40
22	P-EG22	100	8	12	10	8	44
23	P-EG23	100	10	8	10	8	36
24	P-EG24	100	8	10	12	8	44
25	P-EG25	100	14	16	16	14	74
26	P-EG26	100	16	15	15	17	76
27	P-EG27	100	10	12	8	10	50
28	P-EG28	100	8	10	8	8	34
29	P-EG29	100	8	10	6	10	32
30	P-EG30	100	10	8	12	10	46

Table 3.3 contains the average post-test scores of 30 experimental group participants. Similar to the pre-test, the scores are calculated using a 100-point scale, with 25 points awarded for each of the following categories: broad summary, speech, language use, and subject growth. For each individual, scores are different. Depending on how much each person in the experimental group improved their spoken English proficiency, the typical ratings in the table vary from 32 to 86. The average post-test scores for the 30 individuals in the experimental group are organized in Table 4.3, making it simple to compare them to the pre-test results and analyse the impact of the TBLT therapy on the experimental group. The details of the average scores of control group participants during post-treatment oral interviews are given in the following Table 3.4.

Table 3.4: Post-treatment average test scores of control group participants

Sr No	Participants	Total Score	Obtained Score				
			General Description	Delivery	Language Use	Topic Development	Total
1	P-CG1	100	18	16	18	18	70
2	P-CG2	100	16	18	16	16	66
3	P-CG3	100	16	18	20	18	76
4	P-CG4	100	10	8	12	10	42
5	P- CG5	100	14	16	14	16	60

6	P-CG6	100	18	18	20	16	75
7	P-CG7	100	16	18	16	20	72
8	P-CG8	100	14	16	14	16	56
9	P-CG9	100	18	16	20	16	72
10	P-CG10	100	10	12	14	12	56
11	P-CG11	100	14	16	15	15	62
12	P-CG12	100	12	14	16	12	50
13	P-CG13	100	10	8	12	8	40
14	P-CG14	100	12	12	14	10	56
15	P-CG15	100	10	12	14	12	54
16	P-CG16	100	14	12	16	14	60
17	P-CG17	100	12	14	12	16	58
18	P-CG18	100	12	15	15	14	60
19	P-CG19	100	10	12	14	12	46
20	P-CG20	100	10	14	12	10	42
21	P-CG21	100	12	10	14	12	54
22	P-CG22	100	12	10	12	14	50
23	P-CG23	100	8	10	8	10	36
24	P-CG24	100	12	14	12	10	50
25	P-CG25	100	10	12	14	14	56
26	P-CG26	100	12	10	8	10	40
27	P-CG27	100	10	8	6	10	34
28	P-CG28	100	12	10	14	10	50
29	P-CG29	100	10	12	8	10	46
30	P-CG30	100	16	20	16	18	70

The typical post-test results for 30 members of the control group are shown in Table 3.4. Each participant's results are different and evaluated again out of a total of 100 marks. The average scores in the table vary from a minimum of 34 to a maximum of 76, depending on the level of improvement in spoken English proficiency of each participant in the control group after receiving the traditional language teaching treatment for the specified time. Table 3.4 provides a clear representation of the average post-test scores for the 30 control group participants, which can be compared both to the experimental group's post-test scores and also to their own pre-test scores. These statistics can also be used to assess and compare the effectiveness of the TBLT treatment on experimental group’s spoken language proficiency as compared to the effectiveness of traditional language teaching methodologies on control group’s performance. This conversation-based post-test was designed to determine whether task-based training in the speaking classroom improved students'

English communication abilities or if more conventional language teaching methods were more successful.

The disparity between the experimental group's and the control group's oral test scores before and after treatment was analysed in terms of maximum, lowest, mean score, and standard deviation. (SD). Three group t-tests were used to analyse data from pre- and post-treatment examinations. To investigate intra-group (within group) comparisons, two paired sample t-tests were calculated, and one independent sample t-test looked at inter-group (between group) comparisons.

3.1 Intra-Group Comparisons

To compare the effects of conventional language teaching on the control group and TBLT on the experimental group, intra-group analyses were conducted. To accomplish this, a thorough intra-group analysis of pre- and post-treatment test findings for both groups was done.

3.1.1 Intra-group comparison of Experimental Group

The accompanying Table 3.5 provides a comparison of each participant's results in the experimental group before and after the TBLT therapy.

Table 3.5: Intra-group comparison of experimental group participants

Sr. No.	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental	Difference
P-EG01	78	86	8
P-EG02	69	75	6
P-EG03	56	64	8
P-EG04	59	68	9
P-EG05	63	70	7
P-EG06	64	76	12
P-EG07	46	56	10
P-EG08	72	74	2
P-EG09	47	52	5
P-EG10	52	58	6
P-EG11	60	75	15
P-EG12	36	40	4
P-EG13	38	38	0
P-EG14	44	52	8
P-EG15	61	70	9
P-EG16	80	84	4
P-EG17	41	45	4

P-EG18	48	60	12
P-EG19	42	48	6
P-EG20	66	74	8
P-EG21	43	40	-3
P-EG22	38	44	6
P-EG23	36	36	0
P-EG24	38	44	6
P-EG25	60	74	14
P-EG26	63	76	13
P-EG27	40	50	10
P-EG28	34	34	0
P-EG29	34	32	-2
P-EG30	40	46	6

Pre-test and post-test results for 30 members of the study group are compared within each group in Table 3.5. The participant number, pre-experimental score, post-experimental score, and score differential sections are all included in the chart. Each row depicts the data for one participant, with the first column containing the person's unique identification number, the second containing the pre-test score, the third containing the post-test score, and the fourth containing the difference in score.

The majority of subjects in the experimental group demonstrated progress between their pre-test and post-test results. Only a few participants—possibly two—exhibited a fall or negative score change, which denotes a drop in score from pre- to post-test. The experimental group's pre- and post-test findings are compared in a clear and understandable manner in Table 4.5, demonstrating the efficacy of the TBLT therapy they got in enhancing their spoken English proficiency.

A paired samples t-test was used to calculate each participant's individual results in the control group. The specifics of the intra-group pre- and post-treatment exam outcomes comparison for the experimental groups are provided in the accompanying Table 3.6.

Table 3.6: Paired samples test results for experimental group

		Paired Differences					T	def.	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-experimental Post-experimental	-6.43333	4.58396	.83691	-8.14501	-4.72166	-7.687	29	.000

Table 3.6 shows that t=-7.687, with degree of freedom 29 and p value (sig) 0.00. This implies that we reject the null hypothesis H_o and conclude that there is a significant difference between pre-experimental and post-experimental results. Mean difference between the result scores of experimental group's participants is 6.433. This also implies that experimental group participants have shown significant improvement in their post-test scores as compared to pre-test scores. From the analysis of paired samples t-test results for experimental group, we can conclude that Task-Based Language Treatment imparted positive results on the spoken English language skills of the experimental group participants and they showed considerable improvement in their post-test results.

3.1.2 Intra-group comparison of Control Group

A comparison in the performances of each of the control group's participant during pre- and post-treatment tests is given in the following Table 3.7.

Table 3.7: Intra-group comparison of control group's participants

Sr. No.	Pre-experimental	Post-experimental	Difference
P-CG1	64	70	6
P-CG2	66	66	0
P-CG3	72	76	4
P-CG4	40	42	2
P- CG5	60	60	0
P-CG6	72	75	3
P-CG7	70	72	2
P-CG8	60	56	-4
P-CG9	70	72	2
P-CG10	48	56	8
P-CG11	60	62	2
P-CG12	54	50	-4

P-CG13	38	40	2
P-CG14	48	56	8
P-CG15	48	54	6
P-CG16	56	60	4
P-CG17	54	58	4
P-CG18	56	60	4
P-CG19	48	46	-2
P-CG20	46	42	-4
P-CG21	48	54	6
P-CG22	48	50	2
P-CG23	36	36	0
P-CG24	48	50	2
P-CG25	50	56	6
P-CG26	40	40	0
P-CG27	34	34	0
P-CG28	46	50	4
P-CG29	40	46	6
P-CG30	64	70	6

The intra-group analysis of pre-test and post-test results for 30 members of the control group is shown in Table 3.7. It has sections for participant number, pre-control score, post-control score, and score differential, just like Table 4.5. Each row represents one participant's data, with the first column indicating their unique identifier number, the second column indicating their pre-test score, the third column indicating their post-test score, and the fourth column indicating their score change. The majority of participants in the control group also showed improvement in their post-test scores compared to their pre-test scores, with a maximum of 26 participants showing an increase in their score. However, a small number of participants, likely four, showed a decline or negative score change, indicating a decrease in their score from pre-test to post-test.

Overall, the table demonstrates that the experimental group had a greater proportion of participants who experienced favorable score changes than the control group, which experienced less growth in their scores. The chart shows the efficacy (or lack thereof) of the conventional language teaching methods therapy in contrast to the experimental group by clearly and efficiently comparing pre-test and post-test results for the control group. Using a paired samples t-test, individual ratings for individuals in the control group were also calculated. The accompanying

Table 4.8 provides more information on the comparison of the control group's intra-group pre- and post-treatment test findings.

Table 3.8: Paired samples test results for control group

		Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pre-control Post-control	-2.50000	3.35024	.61167	-3.75100	-1.24900	-4.087	29	.000

Table 3.8 shows that t=-4.087, with degree of freedom 29 and p value (sig) 0.00. As a consequence, we must infer that there is a substantial difference between the pre-control and post-control results and once again reject the null hypothesis Ho for the control group. The individuals in the control group's result ratings vary by a mean of 4.087. This suggests that individuals in the control group have also demonstrated improvement in their post-test results when compared to their pre-test scores. The detailed analysis of paired samples t-test results for control group reveals that traditional language teaching treatment also helped the control group participants to improve their spoken English language skills and they showed some improvement in their post-test results.

3.2 Inter-Group Comparison

Finding out the variations between the results of the TBLT treatment applied to the experimental group and the conventional language instruction treatment applied to the control group was the goal of the inter-group comparison. To achieve this goal, a comprehensive inter-group study of the outcomes from the pre- and post-treatment sessions for both groups was conducted. The accompanying Table 3.9 provides a comparison of the variations in the participants' individual results in the two categories.

Table 3.9: Inter-group comparison of experimental and control group

Sr. No.	Experimental Group	Control Group
1	8	6
2	6	0
3	8	4
4	9	2
5	7	0
6	12	3
7	10	2
8	2	-4
9	5	2
10	6	8
11	15	2
12	4	-4
13	0	2
14	8	8
15	9	6
16	4	4
17	4	4
18	12	4
19	6	-2
20	8	-4
21	-3	6
22	6	2
23	0	0
24	6	2
25	14	6
26	13	0
27	10	0
28	0	4
29	-2	6
30	6	6

Table 3.9 contains an inter-group comparison of the differences in the individual pre- post-test performances of both the experimental and control group participants. The table includes three columns: the first column lists the serial number, the second column shows the difference in scores for the experimental group participants (post-test score minus pre-test score), and the third column shows the difference in scores for the control group participants. Each row of the table represents two

participants' (one from experimental group and one from control group) data, with the first column indicating their unique serial number. The second and third columns show the difference in the participants' score between the pre-test and post-test, with positive values indicating an improvement in the participants' scores and negative values indicating a decline.

Table 3.9 reveals that the maximum improvement shown by any experimental group's participant is 15 points and that for any control group's participant is 8. In case of experimental group, only 3 participants showed no change in their scores before and after receiving the TBLT treatment while in case of control group, 5 participants displayed no change in their pre-and post-test performances. Similarly, compared to their pre-test scores, only 2 individuals in the experimental group and 4 in the control group exhibited a decrease in their post-test scores. The overall differences in the performances of experimental and control group participants were computed using an independent samples t-test. The following Table 4.10 provides specifics on the comparison of the test findings from both groups' pre- and post-treatment tests.

Table 3.10 Inter-Group Statistics for Experimental and Control Groups

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Difference	Exp	30	6.4333	4.58396	.83691
	Con	30	2.5000	3.35024	.61167

Table 3.10 shows that the mean value for the difference in the performance of experimental group is 6.4333 and for control group, it is 2.5000. The overall mean pre-test score before the treatment for experimental group participants was 51.6 and that for control group was 52.8. At the end of the study, experimental group's participants ended up with a mean score of 58.0 in their post test results while control group's participants completed the study with a mean score of 55.3. The detailed statistical analysis computed via independent samples t-test for the difference in performances of participants belonging to both experimental and control group are given in the following Table 3.11.

Table 3.11: Independent samples test results for both groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Difference	Equal variances assumed	1.86	.178	3.8	58	.000	3.93333	1.03661	1.85833	6.00833
	Equal variances not assumed			3.8	53	.000	3.93333	1.03661	1.85425	6.01241

Table 3.11 shows that t=3.794 and p value (sig) is 0.178. The results of the independent sample t-test show that the experimental group improved more significantly than the control group did on the post-test. We once more deny the null hypothesis Ho and come to the conclusion that there is a notable difference between the performances of the experimental and control groups, prior to and following the application of conventional language instruction methods and the TBLT treatment, respectively.

Finally, the comparison shows that experimental group's improvement was significant as compared to control group. Task-based language treatment imparted positive effects on experimental group's performance and their post-test results showed improvement at a significant level. It becomes clear that the control group also benefits from conventional language training methods, albeit not significantly, if we take into account the significance level of the improvement of the control group.

4. Conclusion

For the purpose of gathering data, both groups underwent a pre-test prior to the start of task-based language therapy and a post-test following the conclusion of the programme. The TOEFL standard speaking rubrics, which include broad description, delivery, language use, and subject growth, were used by two qualified raters to assess the participants'

speaking abilities during the speaking assessments. The exams were taped and typed, and IBM SPSS 20 software was used to analyse the test results. For the purposes of comparing the outcomes from the pre- and post-tests within each group and between groups, paired and independent sample t-tests were used to analyse the data.

To address the research questions examining the effectiveness of task-based language teaching in the study and to assess any differences between the performance of the experimental and control groups' English language speaking abilities, the results of pre- and post-treatment tests were compared. The learner-centered nature of TBLT, which emphasises the development of communicative skill among learners through relevant and authentic activities that mimic real-world scenarios, provides the solution to this query. It places a focus on the language's use in genuine and significant situations. The activities in TBLT are created to mimic real-world scenarios, creating a setting that fosters the growth of learners' speaking abilities. This research indicates that TBLT is a successful strategy for improving language learners' speaking abilities. The character of TBLT, which emphasises the use of the language in real-world situations, can be credited with the experimental group's speaking abilities significantly improving. In the TBLT program, the students worked on activities that needed them to use the language for a particular reason, like delivering presentations, role-playing, taking part in debates, working in pairs, or doing group or pair projects. This produced a situational setting that encouraged the growth of the trainees' speaking abilities.

To address the second question, quantitative data was gathered and analysed. Using independent and paired group t-tests, the quantifiable data gathered from the pre-test and post-test were examined. The outcomes demonstrated that following TBLT therapy, the experimental group considerably beat the control group in terms of speaking proficiency. While the mean values of the control group rose from 52.8 to 55.3, those of the experimental group climbed from 51.6 to 58.0. A clear and organized picture of the efficacy of the therapy given in raising the participants' spoken English fluency level was provided by a comparison of the results between the experimental and control groups, as shown in Table 4.9. In comparison to the control group, the experimental group's score differences were noticeably larger. This indicates that the TBLT therapy was successful in enhancing their ability to communicate in spoken English. The control group, in contrast, displayed a less substantial

disparity in scores and twice as many negative values as the experimental group. This indicates that, in comparison to the task-based language teaching treatment given to the experimental group, the conventional language teaching treatment was not very successful in raising the scores of the individuals in the control group.

The inter-group data for the two groups listed in Table 4.10 revealed that the experimental group's mean performance differential was 6.4333 while the control group's was only 2.5000. The t-test findings displayed in Table 4.11 indicated that there was a significant difference between the mean values of the experimental group and the control group. The nature of TBLT, which is intended to mimic real-life circumstances and create a setting that fosters the development of learners' speaking skills, can be credited for the increase in the experimental group's speaking proficiency. The activities in TBLT force students to use the language in real-world situations, which improves their verbal intricacy, accuracy, and fluency. The results of the experimental group on the post-test can be interpreted as proof of the success of TBLT in fostering these facets of speaking ability. The results of this research show that TBLT was more successful than conventional language instruction at enhancing English language learners' speaking abilities. The pre-tests served as a benchmark for the subjects' speaking proficiency, and the post-tests assessed how well the TBLT therapy had improved speaking proficiency. The experimental and control groups performed significantly differently on the pre-test and post-test, showing that the TBLT therapy had a beneficial effect on the subjects' speaking ability.

The study's results are in line with earlier studies that have demonstrated the value of TBL`T in improving language trainees' speech abilities. It has been demonstrated that TBLT is a successful strategy for fostering linguistic proficiency, motivation, and involvement in learners. (Doughty & Long, 2003). For instance, research by Willis and Willis (2007) revealed that TBLT was successful in enhancing Japanese English language trainees' speaking abilities. The results of this study are also consistent with earlier research that has demonstrated that TBLT is more successful at fostering speech proficiency than conventional language training methods. For instance, research by Gonçalves and Carvalho (2018) revealed that TBLT was successful in enhancing the speaking abilities of Brazilian Portuguese language trainees.

References

Al-Adham, N. E. (2006). The Effect of a Communicative Task-Based Instruction on the Development of Basic Stage Students' Oral Communication Skills in Jordan. *Unpublished Master Thesis, Amman Arab University for Higher Studies, Amman, Jordan*.

Al-Tamimi, N. O., Abudllah, N., & Bin-Hady, W. R. A. (2020). Teaching speaking skill to EFL college students through task-based approach: problems and improvement. *British Journal of English Linguistics*, *8*(2), 113–130.

Al Hosni, S. (2014). Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, *2*(6), 22–30.

Al Nakhalah, A. M. M. (2016). Problems and difficulties of speaking that encounter English language students at Al Quds Open University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*, *5*(12), 96–101.

Ali, M. M., Khizar, N. U., Yaqub, H., Afzaal, J., & Shahid, A. (2020). Investigating speaking skills problems of Pakistani learners in ESL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *9*(4), 62–70.

Boonkit, K. (2010). Enhancing the development of speaking skills for non-native speakers of English. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 1305–1309.

Brandl, K. (2008). Communicative language teaching in action. *Upper Saddle River, NJ*.

Butler, Y. G. (2011). The implementation of communicative and task-based language teaching in the Asia-Pacific region. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 36–57.

Butzkamm, W. (2003). We only learn language once. The role of the mother tongue in FL classrooms: death of a dogma. *Language Learning Journal*, *28*(1), 29–39.

Ceyhan-Bingöl, Z., & Özkan, Y. (2019). EFL instructors' perceptions and practices on English as a lingua franca (ELF). *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *19*(2), 86–102.

Chambers, F. (1991). Promoting use of the target language in the classroom. *Language Learning Journal*, *4*(1), 27–31.

Chapelle, C. A. (2009). The relationship between second language acquisition theory and computer-assisted language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*, 741–753.

Coultas, V., & Booth, P. (2019). Exploratory talk and Task-based

Learning: A case study of a student's learning journey on an MA (Education) English Language Teaching Course. *Changing English*, *26*(1), 30–47.

Crookes, G. V. (2013). *Critical ELT in action: Foundations, promises, praxis*. Routledge.

Derwing, T. M., Rossiter, M. J., & Munro, M. J. (2002). Teaching native speakers to listen to foreign-accented speech. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *23*(4), 245–259.

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

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Research Division, Ministry of Education Wellington, Australia.

Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(3), 221–246.

Erhan, H. I., Botta, D., Huang, A. T., & Woodbury, R. F. (2013). Peripheral Tools to Support Collaboration: Probing to Design Collaboration Through Role-Playing. *Conference on Computer-Aided Architectural Design Research in Asia (CAADRIA 2013), 241*, 250.

Fillmore, L. W. (1983). The language learner as an individual: Implications of research on individual differences for the ESL teacher. *On TESOL*, *82*, 157–173.

Finch, A. E. (2000). *A formative evaluation of a task-based EFL programme for Korean university students*. The University of Manchester (United Kingdom).

Gan, Z. (2012). Understanding L2 speaking problems: Implications for ESL curriculum development in a teacher training institution in Hong Kong. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *37*(1), 43–59.

García-Carbonell, A., Rising, B., Montero, B., & Watts, F. (2001). Simulation/gaming and the acquisition of communicative competence in another language. *Simulation & Gaming*, *32*(4), 481–491.

Goldenberg, C. (2011). Reading instruction for English language learners. In *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 684–710). Routledge.

González-Lloret, M. (2017). Technology for task-based language teaching. *The Handbook of Technology and Second Language Teaching and Learning*, 234–247.

Hussein, S. (2018). *Factors affecting the implementation of communicative language teaching in Libyan secondary schools*.

Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom).

Hyland, K. (2019). *Second language writing*. Cambridge university press.

Izadpanah, S. (2010). A study on task-based language teaching: From theory to practice. *US-China Foreign Language*, *8*(3), 47–56.

Jeon, I.-J., & Hahn, J. (2006). Exploring EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching: A case study of Korean secondary school classroom practice. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(1), 123–143.

Kamal, S. F. (2022). *The Effect of Native Speakers' Modeling on Social Media on Students' Speaking Skills*. Jakarta: FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.

Klapper, J. (2003). Taking communication to task? A critical review of recent trends in language teaching. *Language Learning Journal*, *27*(1), 33–42.

Knutson, E. M. (1997). Reading with a purpose: Communicative reading tasks for the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(1), 49–57.

Krieger, D. (2012). *Teaching ESL versus EFL: Principles and practices*.

Leaver, B. Lou, & Willis, J. R. (2004). *Task-based instruction in foreign language education: Practices and programs*. Georgetown University Press.

Liton, H. A. (2016). Harnessing the Barriers That Impact on Students' English Language Learning (ELL). *International Journal of Instruction*, *9*(2), 91–106.

Malmir, A., Sarem, S. N., & Ghasemi, A. (2011). The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) vs. Content-Based. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, *7*(6), 79–94.

Moussu, L. M. (2006). Native and Nonnative English-Speaking English as a Second Language Teachers: Student Attitudes, Teacher Self-Perceptions, and Intensive English Administrator Beliefs and Practices. *Online Submission*.

Mulyadi, D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., Singh, C. K. S., & Prastikawati, E. F. (2021). Effects of Technology Enhanced Task-Based Language Teaching on Learners' Listening Comprehension and Speaking Performance. *International Journal of Instruction*, *14*(3), 717–736.

Nget, S., Pansri, O., & Poohongthong, C. (2020). The effect of task-based instruction in improving the English speaking skills of ninth-graders. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *13*(2), 208–224.

Nodoushan, M. A. S. (2007). A Framework for Task-Oriented Language Instruction. *I-Manager's Journal on School Educational Technology*,

3(3), 5.
Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
Nunan, D. (2015). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: An introduction*. Routledge.
O'Sullivan, B. (2011). Language testing. In *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 259–273). Routledge.
Rababah, G. (2002). *Communication Problems Facing Arab Learners of English.*
Richards, J. C. (2001). Accuracy and fluency revisited. In *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 45–62). Routledge.
Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre Singapore.
Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 27–57.
Rojewski, J., Lee, I. H., & Gemici, S. (2012). Use of t-test and ANOVA in career-technical education research. *Career and Technical Education Research*, *37*(3), 263–275.
Scovel, T. (1978). The effect of affect on foreign language learning: A review of the anxiety research. *Language Learning*, *28*(1), 129–142.
Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, *37*(4), 556–569.
Subrahmanyam Vellanki, S., & Bandu, S. (2021). Engaging students online with technology-mediated task-based language teaching. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue on Covid*, *19*.
Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, *10*(4), 393–417.
Talaat, M., & Anwar, B. (2010). The Impact of Urdu-English Code-Switching on Pakistani English. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, *13*(1).
Van den Branden, K. (2006). Task-based language education: From theory to practice. *Language*, *53*(82), T35.
Vietnam, V. (2015). Factors affecting students' speaking performance at Le Thanh Hien high school. *Asian Journal of Educational Research Vol*, *3*(2), 8–23.
Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*.

Wright, K. L. (2019). Jerry Johns Promising Researcher Award Winner Supporting Language Learners' Writing in Science Classes: A Review of Research. *Educating for A Just Society*, 67.

Yang, S. C., & Chung, T. (2009). Experimental study of teaching critical thinking in civic education in Taiwanese junior high school. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *79*(1), 29–55.