available at http://journals.ums.ac.id/index.php/humaniora

Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora

Published by *Muhammadiyah University Press*(MUP)
**Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia**

PRINTED ISSN 1411-5190
ONLINE ISSN 2541-4496

***Vol. 27 No. 1, February 2026***
***Page 24-33***

# THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS

**Nino Indiyati Naida[1], Indri Astutik[2]**
University of Muhammadiyah Jember, Indonesia

**DOI: 10.23917/humaniora.v27i1.11843**

Received: July 12th, 2025. Revised: December 16th, 2025. Accepted: December 17th, 2025
Available Online: February 02nd, 2026. Published Regulary: February, 2026

**Keywords**

TBLT
Speaking Skill
Communicative competence
Language pedagogy

**Corresponding Author**

***Indri Astutik***
*Universitas Muhammadiyah Jember*
*Indonesia*
*indri@unmuhjember.ac.id*

**Abstract**

*This study investigates the effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in enhancing students' speaking skills. The research is motivated by the observed deficiency in learners' practical speaking abilities, which limits their communicative competence in real-world interactions. TBLT is proposed as a dynamic instructional method aimed at fostering greater communicative fluency and learner confidence. A quantitative quasi-experimental design was employed, utilizing a pretest-posttest control group approach. Two classes were selected through random sampling: the experimental group received instruction via TBLT, while the control group followed conventional teaching methods. Homogeneity tests confirmed that both groups were statistically comparable, whereas normality tests revealed a non-normal distribution, prompting the use of the Mann-Whitney U test for analysis. The results yielded a significance value of 0.00 ($p < 0.05$), indicating a statistically significant improvement in the experimental group compared to the control group. These findings support the conclusion that Task-Based Language Teaching has a meaningful and positive impact on students' speaking proficiency*

## INTRODUCTION

Speaking ability is one of the important aspects in education, especially skills that need to be developed in the context of globalization which demands to be able to communicate well in a foreign language. Speaking needs to be mastered by all students of English as foreign language. Speaking is a skill that facilitates individuals to convey thoughts, ideas, feeling directly (Malihah, 2010), so that social and professional interactions are facilitated. It is become the topmost priority around the world due to the current demands of the 21st century skills (Rajendran & Md Yunus, 2021). Speaking takes place everywhere and has become part of our daily activities (Marleni et al., 2021). When people speak, they interact and use the language to express their feelings and thoughts.

Speaking ability is one of the most challenging skills that students find difficult to improve. The difficulties might affect students' ability to speak, particularly in a foreign language (Suparlan, 2021). Common issues such a lack of confidence,

insufficient practice and the fear of making mistakes often contribute to these struggles. These obstacles hinder their ability to communicate effectively and cause them to lose motivation to consistently hone their foreign language skills.

Beside the common issues above, in many educational contexts, the teaching often focuses on the grammar and vocabulary aspects of learning rather than intensive speaking skills, which is consider one of factors that make them less prepared to communicate in real-life situations (Suparlan, 2021). If This focuses or puts more on the grammar and vocabulary rather than speaking practice, it can be affect that students that have a good theoretical understanding of the language, but lack of practical skills needed to express themselves clearly and spontaneously in everyday interactions. This phenomenon has an impact on students' ability to master important aspects of speaking, namely fluency, accuracy, pronunciation.

Instead of focusing on English component such as grammar and vocabulary, the teacher should give more opportunities for the students to practice about element of speaking such as fluency, accuracy and pronunciation. The first aspect is fluency. Fluency is focusses on the fluidity of speech and is operationalized through temporal measures such as speech rate, hesitations, and pausing (Bøhn, 2015). One of the ways to improve fluency is using tongue twister. Tongue twisters help learners to speak fluently and how to process the language (Zahra & Ferial, 2022). In addition, Bot (1996, p. 529) in Shahini & Shahamirian, (2021) "two productive skills, speaking and writing are plays a direct role in enhancing fluency by turning declarative knowledge into procedural knowledge".

The second is accuracy. Afifah and Devana, (2020) state accuracy as a sign of a person's level of communication proficiency. It is when the person is able to speak quickly and automatically. In other words, the speaker needs to pay attention to the accuracy of grammar and language features that are good and correct as output in conversation. According to Desnita and Safitri (2022), one of the techniques that can be used to teach speaking is the Round Robin technique. Round Robin technique is a technique used in teaching speaking to improve students' performance in terms of fluency and accuracy. This technique is more easily applied in the classroom, in the round-robin technique, students have to construct their own sentences based on the question (Nhac, 2021). Another technique is using Corrective Feedback. According to Chehr Azad et al. (2018) learners' specific spoken accuracy is able to be improved with the provision of Corrective Feedback. This helps them to restructure the interlanguage grammar and initiates the learning process (Nhac, 2021).

The third aspect is pronunciation. Pronunciation is understood as the way in which sound or a group of sound is produced. Pronunciation also includes the intonation, rhythm, emphasis, and pauses of the speaker's utterance (Tesnim, 2019). According to Nicky (2016), competence in pronunciation is related to speaking, listening and reading. Bad pronunciation can have a bad effect on those skills. One of the way to practice pronunciation is phonetics which is closely related to pronunciation and has a concern with the sound articulation, the system of human language system regarding the place to put the sounds and manner, to take the positions of sounds (Ebrahimi, 2010). Another technique is using Tongue Twister. Thus, the researcher proposed a way to solve the students' problems using Tongue Twister. Tongue twisters are useful in learning pronunciation, and it is very helpful to improve students' pronunciation, not only practicing and pronouncing words, but also developing memory skill as well (Lutfiani & Astutik, 2017). Therefore, teacher needs to prepare an appropriate method to improve students' speaking skills, rather than merely focusing on the theoretical explanation of speaking. One of the methods is Task Based Language Teaching. The task-based language teaching (TBLT) approach is described as a communicative methodology for language teaching and learning that primarily sees language as a means of communication rather than an object of study (Lloret, 2017).

Task-based is a communicative approach for the teaching of languages which takes task design as essential in the development of instructional units (Rodríguez-Peñarroja, 2022). TBLT rests on the principle that effective language learning occurs when students participate in communicative task assignment. In this regard, the integration of communicative task assignment into the learning process is considered an effective approach to enhance students' language proficiency, particularly in speaking skill (Hendriani, 2014). TBLT is student-centered and students are actively involved in activities that stimulate the real world, so that they are encouraged to be better prepared to face situations in the real world. Additionally, Hassan et al (2021) find that task-based learning develops students' English speaking skills.

Furthermore, TBLT's notable advantages have made it regarded as an effective teaching strategy classroom setting. Further, this TBLT can improve students' motivation, confidence, teamwork, and learning competencies (Azmy & Nanda, 2024). TBLT itself can be called Task-based if the task adheres to the principle of TBLT principles. According to Nunan in (Sholeh, 2021) some principles are as follows; (1) scaffolding is giving learners the right amount of support when they need it, then slowly removing that help as they become more independent, (2) task chain is designing tasks that are connected in a logical sequence, each one builds on the previous one, (3) recycling is using the same vocabulary, grammar, or topics multiple times in different contexts, (4) organic learning is letting learning happen naturally, based on students' needs, interests, and the real communication that takes place, (5) active learning is learners are actively involved talking, thinking, solving problems, not just listening or memorizing, (6) combination is use a mix of different language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) and teaching techniques, (7) reflection, encourage students to think about what they did, what they learned, and how they can improve, (8) copying to creation is start by imitating models, then move toward creating original language.

TBLT has key elements, one of them is activity task that require the use of authentic language so as to support real communication (Ha et al., 2021) TBLT also emphasize a focus on meaning rather than merely on language structures. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of authentic contexts, where tasks are designed to reflect real-world situations, thereby increasing the relevance and engagement for learners. Through task-based learning, students are provided with the chance to handle and share conversations in a formal academic setting because the skills and training, which they obtained in the classroom lessons, guide them efficiently Jassem in Hassan et al., (2021).

TBLT has many types of tasks, one of them is presentation. The types of tasks that involve students working together to complete the task and individual task is presentation. Presentation task to elaborate on the presentation task in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), this task typically involves students preparing and delivering a presentation on a particular topic. It is designed to encourage students to organize their thoughts, practice speaking in front of an audience, and use language in a structured way. This task can help students improve their fluency and confidence in speaking, as it mimics real-life situations where they might need to present ideas or information to others (Mulyadi et al., 2021).

Overcoming the problem of low speaking ability, using the presentation task method is effective to meet the needs of students because the presentation method is focused on communicative and critical thinking (Thalib & Marsh, 2020). Besides being communicative, presentations are also designed to present information, respond to interlocutors and practice listening skills. In the task presentation, students learn to convey their ideas in a clear and structured manner which is an important skill in speaking. By doing the presentations, students are given the opportunity to practice speaking in a supportive environment. They can improve their pronunciation, expand their vocabulary and learn to organize their ideas logically. It also encourages feedback

which is a form of evaluation of the process of improving speaking skills. They can do exercises in every learning to achieve speaking ability (Mulyadi et al., 2021)

Despite the growing body of research supporting the effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in developing speaking skills, relatively limited attention has been given to the role of task type in shaping learning outcomes. Most previous studies have implemented TBLT through dialogue–monologue and storytelling activities, which tend to focus on short, transactional forms of oral interaction. Addressing this gap, the present study introduces presentation-based tasks as the primary form of task implementation within the TBLT framework. By requiring students to organize ideas, engage in sustained oral production, and interact with peers in a more structured communicative context, this approach extends the application of TBLT to more complex speaking tasks. Accordingly, this study was guided by the following research question: Is there a significant difference in students' speaking skills between those taught using TBLT and those taught using traditional teaching method?

## METHOD

This research employed a quasi-experimental design with a pre-test and post-test control group to investigate the **e**ffectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in improving students' speaking skills. The study involved two **c**lasses of eleventh-grade students from a senior high school during the academic year 2024/2025. One class was assigned as the experimental group, which received instruction using TBLT method, while the other class served as the control group and was taught through conventional method. The sample was selected purposively based on the similarity of students' academic background and English proficiency to ensure comparable conditions for both groups.

To collect data, the researcher administered a speaking test that required students to deliver oral presentations explaining the moral values of narrative texts. The test was designed to assess several speaking components, including accuracy, vocabulary use, grammatical, flu**e**ncy, pronunciation. A structured scoring rubric was used to ensure consistent evaluation across all participants. The same assessment criteria were applied during both the pre-test and post-test. In addition, a standar**d**ized speaking prompt was provided to guided students**'** responses and maintain uniformity in task delivery.

Data collection was carried out in three phases: a pre-test to gauge students' initial speaking abilities, a treatment phase during which experimental group engaged in TBLT activities, and a post-test to measure progress. While the **e**xperimental group participated in collaborative learning tasks with individual evaluations, the control group continued with conventional, textbook-centered instruction. All students**'** presentations were recorded to allow for accurate and fair assessment.

The data collected in this study were quantitative in nature and consisted of numerical scores obtained from speaking tests. Statistical analyses included both descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations, and inferential statistics. Prior to hypothesis testing, the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance were examined using the Shapiro–Wilk test and Levene's test, respectively. The results indicated that the data did not fully meet the assumption of normality; therefore, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed to compare the speaking performance of the experimental and control groups. This analysis aimed to determine whether Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) significantly enhanced students' speaking skills compared to traditional teaching methods.

## RESULT

In this section presents the results of the T-test analysis to measure the difference between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental and control groups. Before testing the hypothesis, a normality and homogeneity test was conducted.

1. Normality Test

To ascertain if the data from the experimental and control groups' pre-test and post-test scores were regularly distributed, the normality test was performed. The test's results are shown in the table that follows. To make sure that ensuing parametric statistical analyses are appropriate, this test is crucial. Pre-test post-test normality control experimental.

**Table 1 Results of the Normality Test for the Experimental and Control Group Pre-tests**

| | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Group | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Score | Experimental | .092 | 32 | .200* | .964 | 32 | .353 |
| | Control | .153 | 29 | .079 | .949 | 29 | .172 |

Based on Table 1, which presents the results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test, the significance values for the experimental and control groups on the pre-test were 0.353 and 0.172, respectively, both of which were greater than 0.05. This result indicated that the pre-test data in both the experimental and control groups were normally distributed. Therefore, because the normality assumption was met, a t-test was employed for data analysis.

**Table 2 Results of the Normality Test for the Experimental Group Pre-test and Post-test**

| | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Score | Pretest | .092 | 32 | .200* | .964 | 32 | .353 |
| | Post Test | .209 | 36 | .000 | .834 | 36 | .000 |

Based on Table 2, which presents the results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test, the significance value for the experimental group's pre-test was 0.353, which was higher than 0.05, indicating that the pre-test data were normally distributed. In contrast, the significance value for the post-test was 0.000, which was lower than 0.05, indicating that the post-test data were not normally distributed. Therefore, because the normality assumption was not met for both datasets, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed for data analysis.

**Table 3 Results of the Normality Test for the Control Group Pre-test and Post-test**

| | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Test | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Score | Pretest | .153 | 29 | .079 | .949 | 29 | .172 |
| | Post Test | .127 | 32 | .002* | .970 | 32 | .005 |

Based on Table 3, which presents the results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test, the significance values for the control group were 0.172 for the pre-test and 0.005 for the post-test. The pre-test significance value was greater than 0.05, indicating that the pre-test data were normally distributed, whereas the post-test significance value was equal to 0.005, indicating that the post-test data did not meet the assumption of

normality. Therefore, the pre-test and post-test data of the control group did not fully follow a normal distribution.

**Table 4 Results of the Normality Test for the Experimental and Control Group Post-tests**

| | | Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a] | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Group | Statistic | df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Score | Experimental | .209 | 36 | .000 | .834 | 36 | .000 |
| | Control | .127 | 32 | .003* | .970 | 32 | .005 |

Based on the results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test, the significance values for the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups were 0.000 and 0.005, respectively, both of which were less than 0.05. This result indicated that the post-test data in both the experimental and control groups were not normally distributed. Therefore, due to the violation of the normality assumption, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed for data analysis.

2. Homogeneity Tests

The homogeneity test was conducted to determine whether the control and experimental groups were homogeneous. The data were considered homogeneous when the significance value was greater than 0.05. The results are presented in the table below.

**Table 5 Results of the Homogeneity Test for the Experimental Group**

| | Levene Statistic | | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Result | Based on Mean | .060 | 1 | 70 | .807 |
| | Based on Median | .081 | 1 | 70 | .777 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .081 | 1 | 68.798 | .777 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | .045 | 1 | 70 | .832 |

The homogeneity of variance for the control group was examined using Levene's test. The results showed that the significance values based on the mean (Sig. = 0.807), median (Sig. = 0.777), median with adjusted degrees of freedom (Sig. = 0.777), and trimmed mean (Sig. = 0.832) were all greater than 0.05. These findings indicated that the variances within the control group were homogeneous. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variance for the control group was met.

**Table 6 Results of the Homogeneity Test for the Control Group**

| | Levene Statistic | | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Result | Based on Mean | .057 | 1 | 62 | .812 |
| | Based on Median | .043 | 1 | 62 | .836 |
| | Based on Median and with adjusted df | .043 | 1 | 60.506 | .836 |
| | Based on trimmed mean | .066 | 1 | 62 | .798 |

The homogeneity of variance for the experimental group was examined using Levene's test. The results indicated that the significance values based on the mean (Sig. = 0.812), median (Sig. = 0.836), median with adjusted degrees of freedom (Sig. = 0.836), and trimmed mean (Sig. = 0.798) were all greater than 0.05. These results

showed that there was no significant variance difference within the experimental group. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variance for the experimental group was met.

Based on the results of the normality tests, which indicated that the post-test data of both the experimental and control groups were not normally distributed, the Mann–Whitney U test was employed. This test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups. As the assumption of normality required for parametric testing was violated, a nonparametric statistical procedure was considered appropriate.

**Table 7 Results of the T-Test for the Experimental and Control Group Pre-tests**

**Independent Samples Test**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| Var001 | Equal variances assumed | 4.210 | .045 | -.582 | 56 | .563 | -1.46552 | 2.51841 | -6.51049 | 3.57945 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -.582 | 48.196 | .563 | -1.46552 | 2.51841 | -6.52858 | 3.59755 |

The comparison between the control and experimental groups at the pretest stage showed no statistically significant difference ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that both groups were relatively equivalent in terms of initial ability prior to the intervention. The absence of a significant difference confirms that randomization was effective and that any subsequent differences could be attributed to the treatment rather than initial group disparities.

**Table 8. Mann–Whitney U Test Results for the Pre-test and Post-test of the Experimental Group scores**

| | |
|---|---|
| Mann-Whitney U | 175.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 703.000 |
| Z | -4.948 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |

The Mann–Whitney U test revealed a significant difference between the experimental group's pre-test and post-test scores ($U = 175.000$, $Z = -4.948$, $p < 0.000$). This finding indicated a substantial improvement in students' performance following the treatment. Therefore, the result suggests that the intervention had a significant effect on the speaking skills of the experimental group.

**Table 9 Results of the Mann–Whitney U Test for the Control Group Pre-test and Post-test**

| | |
|---|---|
| Mann-Whitney U | 413.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 941.000 |
| Z | -.740 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .045 |

The Mann–Whitney U test indicated a statistically significant difference between the control group's pre-test and post-test scores ($U = 413.000$, $Z = -0.740$, $p = 0.045$). This result suggested that there was a measurable change in performance over time within the control group. However, given the absence of the experimental treatment, the observed improvement may be attributed to routine instructional activities or other external factors rather than to a specific intervention.

**Table 9 Results of the Mann–Whitney U Test for the Experimental and Control Group Post-tests**

| | |
|---|---|
| Mann-Whitney U | 112.000 |
| Wilcoxon W | 640.000 |
| Z | -5.734 |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |

The Mann–Whitney U test revealed a statistically significant difference between the post-test scores of the experimental and control groups ($U = 112.000$, $Z = -5.734$, $p < 0.000$). This result indicated that the students in the experimental group outperformed those in the control group on the post-test. Therefore, the finding suggests that the treatment had a significant effect on students' speaking skills compared to the conventional instruction received by the control group.

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicated that the use of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) had a significant effect on students' speaking skills. Data analysis showed that the experimental group, which implemented the TBLT method, demonstrated a more substantial increase in scores compared to the control group, which used traditional teaching methods. According to Hendriani (2014) TBLT rests on the principle that effective language learning occurs when students participate in communicative task assignment. In this regard, the integration of communicative task assignment into the learning process is considered an effective approach to enhance students' language proficiency, particularly in speaking skills.

The findings of this study indicated that the Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) method significantly enhanced students' speaking skills. This result aligns with Rashov (2024) a task is defined as a meaningful activity that requires students to use the target language to achieve a specific outcome. In addition, students showed improvements in fluency, pronunciation, and accuracy. In the process of implementing TBLT, students were not only trained to engage in real-life communication but also learned to develop and understand key components of speaking skills.

Nunan in Sholeh (2021) propose the following Task-based learning has 8 principles such as task chain is designing tasks that are connected in a logical sequence, each one builds on the previous one, recycling is use the same vocabulary, grammar, or topics multiple times in different contexts, organic learning is letting learning happen naturally, based on students' needs, interests, and the real communication that takes place, active learning is learners are actively involved-talking, thinking, solving problems, not just listening or memorizing, combination is use a mix of different language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) and teaching techniques, reflection is encourage students to think about what they did, what they learned, and how they can improve. This statement is consistent with the findings of the present study, which showed that TBLT provided students with opportunities to be actively involved in the learning process through task-based activities. In developing speaking skills, students were encouraged to think critically and collaborate with their peers to complete the assigned tasks, thereby increasing speaking interaction and engagement. Furthermore, students were given the freedom to manage tasks creatively through project-based learning activities, such as presentations, which also supported the development of other language skills, including writing and reading, within the implementation of TBLT.

In summary, TBLT has shown to be a successful method for teaching language, especially in improving students' ability to communicate and encouraging hands-on

learning. Although it has many benefits, its effectiveness depends on thoughtful preparation, suitable tasks choices, and teacher involvement. As language teaching progresses, TBL offers a hopeful alternative to conventional techniques by connecting classroom activities with the communication requirements of the real world. More research and training are essential to assist teachers in effectively applying TBL in different educational environments.

## CONCLUSION

This study found that students' speaking skills were significantly enhanced through the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). TBLT provided students with opportunities to generate ideas, engage in meaningful communication, and prepare for real-world interactions. In addition, TBLT fostered a lively and engaging learning atmosphere in which students could freely express themselves and actively explore their knowledge. The findings therefore indicate that TBLT is an effective instructional approach for enhancing students' speaking skills.

However, this study was limited by the short duration of the treatment. As the intervention was implemented over a relatively brief period, the results reflect short-term improvements in students' speaking skills. Future research is recommended to apply TBLT over a longer period to examine its long-term effects on students' speaking development more comprehensively.

## REFERENCES

Afifah, N., & Devana, T. (2020). speaking skill through task based learning in English foreign language classroom. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, *7*(2), 135. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i2.3109

Azmy, K., & Nanda, D. W. (2024). Implementing task-based language teaching (TBLT) to enhance students' speaking, writing and reading skills: Is it possible? *Jurnal Ilmiah Didaktika: Media Ilmiah Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, *24*(2), 176. https://doi.org/10.22373/jid.v24i2.22730

Bøhn, H. (2015). Assessing spoken EFL without a common rating scale: Norwegian EFL teachers' conceptions of construct. *SAGE Open*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015621956

Chehr Azad, M. H., Farrokhi, F., & Zohrabi, M. (2018). Corrective feedback, spoken accuracy and fluency, and the trade-off hypothesis. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(2), 465–482. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11232a

Desnita, M., & Safitri, L. (2022). The effect of Round Robin Technique toward students' speaking performance at MTs. Muhammadiyah Pulau Punjung. *Journal of Educational Management and Strategy (JEMAST)*, *1*(1), 72–82.

Ebrahimi, P. (2010). On phonetics and phonology: A Broad-termed comparison and contrast between broad and narrow transcription. *ERIC*, 1–16. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED510914

Ha, N. D. N., Loc, N., & Tuyen, T. (2021). Task-based approach: An overview. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.46827/ejel.v7i1.4090

Hassan, I., Zamzam, I. A. M., Azmi, M. N. L., & Abdullah, A. T. H. (2021). Development of English speaking skills through task-based learning among primary school students in Malaysia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *11*(11), 1499–1506. https://doi.org/10.17507/TPLS.1111.20

Hendriani, S. (2014). Implementing task-based language teaching to overcome the problem of teaching speaking. *Ta'dib, 17*(1). 75-80.

Lloret, M. G. (2017). Technology for task - based language teaching. In S. Thorne, S. May (eds.), *Language, Education and Technology, Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. Springer International Publishing.

Lutfiani, D., & Astutik, I. (2017). Using tongue twister to improve students' pronunciation. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *2*(2), 110-115.

Malihah, N. (2010). The effectiveness of speaking instruction through task-based language teaching. *Register Journal*, *3*(1), 85–101. https://doi.org/10.18326/rgt.v3i1.85-101

Marleni, L., Sari, N., & Hardi, V. A. (2021). Improving the students' speaking skill by using Tik Tok application. *Lembaga Pengabdian, Dan Pahlawan, Universitas Tambusai, Tuanku*. https://staff.universitaspahlawan.ac.id/upload/riset/148-lampiran.pdf

Mulyadi, D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., Swaran Singh, C. K., & 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. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14342a

Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in english speaking lessons. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, *20*(10), 313–330. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17

Rajendran, T., & Md Yunus, M. (2021). A systematic literature review on the use of mobile-assisted language learning (MALL) for enhancing speaking skills among ESL and EFL learners. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *10*(1), 586–609. https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarped/v10-i1/8939

Rodríguez-Peñarroja, M. (2022). Integrating project-based learning, taskbased language teaching approach and Youtube in the ESP class: A study on students' motivation. *Teaching English with Technology*, *22*(1), 62–81.

Shahini, G., & Shahamirian, F. (2021). Ways of improving english speaking fluency via two productive skills of speaking and writing: What practical tips are suggested? *International Journal of Social Science Research (IJSSR)*, *3*(3), 58–76. http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijssr58Journalwebsite:http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijssrhttp://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijssr

Sholeh, M. B. (2021). Implementation of Task-based learning in teaching english in indonesia: benefits and problems. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL)*, *4*(2), 129. https://doi.org/10.20527/jetall.v4i2.9327

Suparlan, S. (2021). Factors contributing students' speaking anxiety. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, *9*(2), 160. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v9i2.3321

Tesnim, O. (2019). Oral corrective feedback and its impact on learners' speaking skills: Tunisian EFL students as a case study. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *7*(3), 138. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20190703.15