TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING AND EFL SPEAKING DEVELOPMENT: EVIDENCE FROM A SECONDARY ISLAMIC-SCHOOL CLASSROOM

Chairi Usrina Putri
Universitas Islam negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia
220203012@student.ar-raniry.ac.id

Safrul Muluk
Universitas Islam negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia
safrul.muluk@ar-raniry.ac.id

Fatayatul Hanani Safrul
Universitas Islam negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia
230203165@student.ar-raniry.ac.id

Abstract
Speaking is a central component of communicative competence, yet English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners often experience limited opportunities to use English meaningfully in classroom interaction. This study investigated the contribution of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to EFL learners' speaking performance and explored learners' perceptions of task-based instruction. The study employed a quantitative quasi-experimental approach using a one-group pre-test-post-test design. Thirty-two students from one intact science class at MAS Ruhul Islam Anak Bangsa participated in the study. The treatment was implemented through six task-based meetings that incorporated discussions, role plays, information-gap activities, and problem-solving tasks within pre-task, task-cycle, and post-task stages. Data were collected using pre- and post-speaking tests assessing fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension, along with a 20-item Likert-scale perception questionnaire and three open-ended questions. The findings showed statistically significant within-group improvement in speaking performance following the six-meeting task-based intervention, with a large standardized effect (r = .86). Pronunciation and fluency showed the largest descriptive gains. Students also reported highly positive perceptions of task-based instruction, particularly regarding vocabulary development, lesson interest, and collaborative learning. The findings suggest that TBLT provided a productive instructional context for speaking practice; however, because the study employed a one-group pre-test-post-test design, the observed gains cannot be attributed exclusively to TBLT. The study contributes context-specific evidence from an Islamic-school EFL setting and highlights the importance of scaffolding, interaction, and feedback in task-based speaking instruction.

Keywords: Task-Based Language Teaching, speaking skills, EFL learners, speaking performance, learner perceptions

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is one of the most important skills in English language learning because it enables learners to express ideas, exchange information, and communicate effectively in real-life situations. In an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, speaking ability is a visible expression of communicative competence: learners are expected not only to understand linguistic forms but also to use English actively. However, speaking remains difficult for many learners because successful oral communication requires simultaneous control of vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency,

comprehension, and confidence. In the Acehnese EFL context, Habiburrahim et al.[1] reported that anxiety, low self-confidence, lack of competence, and fear of making mistakes could inhibit students' speaking performance. Muluk et al.[2] likewise identified low confidence, restricted vocabulary, and classroom-management challenges as important concerns in EFL speaking classes. More recent evidence from an Indonesian EFL context further suggests that the instructional environment can shape students' speaking development and affective experiences [3].

These difficulties indicate that speaking instruction needs to provide frequent and meaningful opportunities for students to use English. In teacher-centred classrooms, learners may receive extensive explanations of grammar and vocabulary while having relatively little time to negotiate meaning, express opinions, or solve problems through oral communication. A communicative learning environment is therefore needed in which learners become active participants and English functions as a tool for achieving a purpose rather than only as an object of study.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) offers such an orientation. TBLT organizes learning around meaningful tasks that require learners to use the target language to exchange information, solve problems, express ideas, and reach communicative outcomes. The approach develops from the communicative tradition and places purposeful language use at the centre of classroom activity. Sholeh[4] explains that task-based learning emphasizes practical and meaningful activities, while Mudinillah, Rahmi, and Taro[5] describe TBLT as an approach that promotes authentic communication and active learner participation. In this sense, TBLT is compatible with Communicative Language Teaching because both prioritize meaningful interaction over isolated practice of language forms. Crookes and Ziegler[6] similarly note the close relationship between communicative pedagogy and task-based instruction.

The study's theoretical rationale draws on interaction- and production-oriented accounts of second-language development, which offer complementary explanations for why task-based instruction may support speaking development. From an interaction perspective, communicative tasks require learners to exchange information, clarify meaning, respond to interlocutors, and modify their language when communication becomes difficult. These interactional processes create opportunities for learners to notice gaps between their intended meaning and available linguistic resources. From a production-oriented perspective, tasks require learners to formulate and articulate meaning in real time, thereby increasing opportunities for spoken output and encouraging greater attention to linguistic form. The post-task stage further provides opportunities for teacher feedback, reflection, and modification of earlier production.

These mechanisms provide a basis for understanding potential changes across different dimensions of speaking. Repeated opportunities for oral production and interaction may particularly support fluency and pronunciation because learners repeatedly formulate and articulate meaning. Negotiation of meaning and feedback may also highlight grammatical accuracy, while task preparation

[1] H. Habiburrahim, R. Risdaneva, G. Putri, S. Dahliana, and S. Muluk, "The Effects of Anxiety toward Acehnese Students' English-Speaking Ability," *The Qualitative Report* 25, no. 1 (2020): 254-270, https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.3639.
[2] S. Muluk, Nasriyanti, H. Habiburrahim, T. Zulfikar, S. Akmal, and M. S. Safrul, "Classroom Management in EFL Speaking Class: Strategies and Challenges," *Indonesian Journal of English Education* 8, no. 1 (2021): 127-146, https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i1.20146.
[3] Muluk, S., Habiburrahim, H., Dahliana, S., Zakaria, F., Azizah, & Safrul, M. S., "The impact of synchronous virtual flipped classroom on EFL students' speaking skill". *Studies in English Language and Education,* 12, No. 1: 362–379. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i1.34814
[4] M. B. Sholeh, "Implementation of Task-Based Learning in Teaching English in Indonesia: Benefits and Problems," *English Language Education Study Program Journal* 4, no. 2 (2021): 129-138.
[5] A. Mudinillah, S. N. Rahmi, and N. Taro, "Task-Based Language Teaching: A Systematic Review of Research and Applications," *Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies* 3, no. 2 (2024): 102-115, https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i2.1352.
[6] G. V. Crookes and N. Ziegler, "Critical Language Pedagogy and Task-Based Language Teaching: Reciprocal Relationship and Mutual Benefit," *Education Sciences* 11 (2021): Article 254, https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060254.

and interaction can increase opportunities for lexical retrieval and vocabulary use. Comprehension may develop through the need to understand peers' contributions and respond appropriately to task demands. Importantly, these mechanisms do not imply that all components should improve equally. Rather, the framework predicts differentiated development depending on the linguistic and interactional demands created by particular tasks.

The effectiveness of speaking-oriented instruction, however, also depends on how classroom interaction is organized and supported. In EFL speaking classrooms, effective management of speaking activities, classroom interaction, and discussion arrangements can shape learners' opportunities to participate, while limited vocabulary and low confidence may constrain their engagement in oral activities[7]. This perspective complements the interaction- and production-oriented rationale of TBLT by highlighting that opportunities for meaningful task-based interaction are partly contingent on the classroom conditions in which tasks are implemented.

The present study therefore uses TBLT not simply as an instructional technique but as a framework linking task-based interaction, learner production, collaborative meaning-making, and post-task feedback to multidimensional speaking development. Learner perceptions and open-ended responses are examined as complementary evidence of how students experienced these interactional and pedagogical processes.

Empirical studies have generally reported positive effects of task-based instruction on speaking. Recent evidence further illustrates how TBLT can be operationalized through authentic communicative activities in EFL classrooms. Maschuri reported that pre-service teachers implemented TBLT through role plays and problem-solving tasks, while also identifying learners' proficiency limitations, reluctance to speak publicly, and resource constraints as challenges requiring scaffolding and context-responsive classroom management. These findings reinforce the importance of designing task-based speaking activities that combine meaningful communication with appropriate instructional support.[8] Afifah and Devana[9] found that task-based learning improved students' speaking skills and provided opportunities for meaningful communication. Panduwangi[10] also reported improvements in speaking, particularly in fluency and accuracy. Khan, Wong, and Chen[11] describe TBLT as beneficial for speaking development because learners engage in purposeful communication and repeated language use. At the same time, TBLT is not automatically successful in every classroom. Teacher preparation, task complexity, learner readiness, vocabulary limitations, and anxiety can influence how effectively students participate in tasks [12]. These concerns make it important to examine both measurable speaking performance and learners' experiences during task-based instruction.

Several gaps motivated the present study. First, previous research has often discussed overall speaking achievement, while less attention has been given to changes across specific components of speaking such as fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension. Second, some studies have focused mainly on learners' perceptions or qualitative experiences rather than direct pre-

[7] Muluk, S., Nasriyanti, Habiburrahim, H., Zulfikar, T., Akmal, S., & Safrul, M. S., "*Classroom management in EFL speaking class: Strategies and challenges*". *Indonesian Journal of English Education,* 8, No. 1 ((2021): 127–146, https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i1.20146

[8] Maschuri, D.,"Pre-Service Teachers' Experience in Thai EFL Classrooms,*" Journal of Innovation in English Education and Language Teaching*, 2, No. 1 (2025): 15–25, https://doi.org/10.63228/t6bkhc68

[9] N. Afifah and T. Devana, "Speaking Skill through Task Based Learning in English Foreign Language Classroom," *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching)* 7, no. 2 (2020): 135-144, https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i2.3109.

[10] M. Panduwangi, "The Effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching to Improve Students' Speaking Skills," *Journal of Applied Studies in Language* 5, no. 1 (2021): 205-214.

[11] A. Khan, S. Wong, and M. Chen, "The Role of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills in English as a Second Language," *Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning* 1, no. 1 (2023): 45-52, https://doi.org/10.62583/rseltl.v1i1.7.

[12] S. Hasnain and S. Halder, "Exploring the Impediments for Successful Implementation of the Task-Based Language Teaching Approach"; A. Khan, S. Wong, and M. Chen, "The Role of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills in English as a Second Language," 45-52.

test and post-test measurement. Third, research on speaking in Aceh has frequently involved university learners, leaving less evidence from senior-secondary Islamic-school contexts. The present study addresses these gaps by combining performance-based speaking assessment with learner-perception data in a classroom implementation of TBLT.

Rather than treating speaking proficiency as a single undifferentiated outcome, this study conceptualizes speaking development as multidimensional, involving fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension. This perspective is theoretically relevant to TBLT because communicative tasks simultaneously require learners to produce comprehensible language, retrieve lexical resources, negotiate meaning, monitor linguistic form, and sustain interaction. Consequently, different speaking components may respond differently to task-based practice rather than improving at the same rate. The study therefore moves beyond a simple pre-test/post-test account of overall speaking achievement by examining the pattern of change across individual speaking dimensions and relating these changes to learners' reported classroom experiences.

The study also contributes contextual and methodological value. First, it provides evidence from a senior-secondary Islamic-school EFL context in Aceh, a setting that remains less represented in research on task-based speaking instruction than university-level EFL contexts. Second, it triangulates performance-based evidence with students' perceptions and open-ended responses, allowing quantitative changes in speaking performance to be interpreted alongside learners' accounts of participation, difficulties, and perceived affordances of task-based activities. This contextual contribution is particularly relevant to English language education in Islamic educational settings, where English instruction may need to remain responsive to learners' cultural and religious identities while maintaining communicative and linguistic objectives. Chamisah (2025) emphasizes the importance of culturally responsive pedagogy, appropriate instructional strategies, and teacher preparation in integrating English language learning with Islamic educational contexts [13]. Such contextual considerations provide an important backdrop for examining how task-based speaking instruction operates in an Islamic-school setting. The contribution is therefore not a claim that TBLT alone caused the observed gains, but an examination of how speaking performance and learner experience changed during a structured period of task-based instruction.

The study was guided by two questions: (1) How does TBLT influence specific aspects of speaking performance, including fluency and accuracy? and (2) What are EFL learners' perceptions of the use of TBLT in developing their speaking skills?

By addressing both performance and perception, the study aims to provide a more comprehensive account of how task-based instruction functions in an EFL speaking classroom.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental one-group pre-test-post-test design. The same group of learners completed a speaking pre-test, participated in TBLT treatment, and then completed a speaking post-test. The design was selected to identify changes in speaking performance following the classroom intervention. Because the study had no randomly assigned control group, it measured within-group improvement rather than establishing a definitive causal effect.

The study was conducted at MAS Ruhul Islam Anak Bangsa. The sample consisted of 32 EFL learners from one purposively selected intact science class. Random assignment was not used because the research was classroom-based and involved an existing class. All participants in the selected class received the same TBLT treatment. The use of an intact class was also compatible with the

[13] Chamisah. "Integrating Islamic Values into English Curriculum Development: A Descriptive Qualitative Literature Review in State Islamic Higher Education", *Journal of Education, Pedagogy and Teacher Training*, 2, No. 1 (2025): 1–11.

collaborative nature of TBLT, which requires learners to interact with classmates during task completion.

The treatment was implemented through six meetings. Classroom activities were organized around three general TBLT stages. In the pre-task stage, the teacher introduced the topic, explained the purpose of the task, activated relevant background knowledge, and provided necessary vocabulary or language support. In the task-cycle stage, students used English to complete communicative activities, including discussions, role plays, information-gap activities, and problem-solving tasks. In the post-task stage, learners reflected on their performance and received feedback intended to improve language use. Across these stages, students were encouraged to use English to communicate ideas and reach task outcomes rather than merely reproduce isolated grammatical forms.

Two main data sources were used. The primary instrument was a speaking test administered before and after the treatment. Students completed individual speaking tasks, and their performance was evaluated using the same analytical rubric in both assessments. The rubric contained five components: fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension. Each component was scored from 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent), producing a total possible speaking score from 5 to 20. To improve scoring consistency, performances were assessed independently by two raters using the same rubric, and the final score was obtained from the average of the two ratings.

Two raters independently evaluated all speaking performances using the same analytical rubric, and the final score was calculated as the mean of their ratings. Although this procedure was intended to reduce individual scorer bias, the study did not calculate a formal inter-rater reliability coefficient such as an intraclass correlation coefficient. Accordingly, the averaging procedure should not be interpreted as statistical evidence of inter-rater reliability. Future studies should report ICC estimates and confidence intervals to provide a more rigorous assessment of scoring consistency.

The second instrument was a student-perception questionnaire administered after the post-test. It contained 20 closed-ended statements using a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), together with three open-ended questions about students' experiences, difficulties, and suggestions. Mean scores were interpreted as very positive (4.21-5.00), positive (3.41-4.20), neutral (2.61-3.40), negative (1.81-2.60), or very negative (1.00-1.80). The questionnaire served as supporting evidence rather than the primary measure of speaking improvement. The speaking assessment, analytical rubric, and perception questionnaire were reviewed for content relevance and alignment with the study objectives by the research supervisor and an experienced English teacher.

The review focused on the correspondence between the speaking criteria and the construct of oral communicative performance, the clarity and appropriateness of the rubric descriptors, the relevance and comprehensibility of the questionnaire items, and the instruments' suitability for the participants' educational level. Revisions were made where wording or scoring descriptions required clarification. Because the study did not employ factor analysis or a formal content-validity index, validity is interpreted primarily as evidence of content alignment and expert review rather than as evidence of construct validity based on psychometric modelling.

Questionnaire responses were summarized using item means and descriptive interpretation. The three open-ended questions were analysed thematically. Responses were first read repeatedly to identify recurring ideas, then grouped into provisional categories on perceived benefits, difficulties, and suggestions for improvement. Similar categories were then consolidated into broader themes representing (1) opportunities for communicative practice, (2) collaborative and engaging learning experiences, (3) continuing linguistic and affective difficulties, and (4) requests for additional scaffolding and feedback. The qualitative analysis contextualized the quantitative findings rather than generating independent claims about the prevalence of particular experiences.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Students' Overall Speaking Performance

The descriptive results showed a clear increase in students' speaking scores after implementing TBLT. Table 1 summarizes the distribution of pre-test and post-test scores.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Students' Speaking Scores

Test	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Pre-test	32	7	19	10.78	2.31
Post-test	32	11	20	14.69	1.91

The mean score increased from 10.78 on the pre-test to 14.69 on the post-test, an improvement of 3.91 points. The minimum score also rose from 7 to 11, while the maximum increased from 19 to 20. These results indicate that improvement was not limited to students who began with relatively strong speaking performance; gains were also visible among students with lower initial scores. The lower post-test standard deviation (1.91 compared with 2.31) suggests a somewhat more compact distribution of scores after the treatment.

Improvement across Speaking Components

A component-level analysis was conducted to identify which aspects of speaking developed after the treatment. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Improvement of Speaking Components

Speaking Component	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Improvement
Fluency	2.16	3.00	0.84
Accuracy	2.09	2.88	0.78
Pronunciation	2.16	3.06	0.91
Vocabulary	2.38	3.09	0.72
Comprehension	1.94	2.66	0.72

All five speaking components increased from pre-test to post-test, but the magnitude of change was not uniform. Pronunciation showed the largest mean gain (0.91), followed by fluency (0.84) and accuracy (0.78), whereas vocabulary and comprehension showed comparatively smaller gains (0.72 each). This pattern is theoretically meaningful because the task cycle required learners to repeatedly formulate and articulate spoken messages, respond to interlocutors, and make their meanings comprehensible. Such repeated oral production may provide particularly frequent practice for pronunciation and fluency, which depend substantially on real-time speech production.

The comparatively strong gain in accuracy is also noteworthy. Although TBLT emphasizes meaning-focused communication, the present implementation incorporated pre-task language support and post-task feedback. These stages may have created opportunities for learners to attend to grammatical form after or alongside meaning-focused interaction. Thus, the observed increase in accuracy is consistent with a task sequence in which communicative activity is followed by opportunities for reflection and language-focused feedback rather than with a purely meaning-only approach.

Vocabulary and comprehension demonstrated the same numerical gain (0.72), but these components may involve somewhat different processes. Vocabulary development may have been supported by pre-task preparation and repeated lexical retrieval during discussions, role plays, information-gap activities, and problem-solving tasks. Comprehension, in contrast, depended on learners' ability to understand peers and respond appropriately during interaction. The smaller gains in these two components suggest that meaningful interaction alone may not produce equally strong development across all dimensions of speaking and reinforce the importance of explicit lexical preparation and comprehension-oriented task support.

Because the study does not include component-level inferential tests or standardized effect-size estimates, these differences should be interpreted as descriptive patterns rather than evidence that TBLT was statistically more effective for pronunciation than for the other components. Nevertheless, the component profile provides a more nuanced picture than the overall score and suggests that the interactional and feedback characteristics of the task cycle may have different implications for different dimensions of oral performance.

Normality and Hypothesis Testing

Before comparing pre-test and post-test scores inferentially, a Shapiro-Wilk test was conducted. Both distributions produced significance values below .05, indicating that the normality assumption was not satisfied.

Table 3. Shapiro-Wilk Tests of Normality

Test	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test	0.884	32	0.002
Post-test	0.802	32	0.000

Because the data were not normally distributed, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test was used to compare the related pre-test and post-test scores. Table 4 presents the result.

Table 4. Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test

Comparison	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Post-test - Pre-test	-4.876	0.000

The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test yielded $Z = -4.876$, $p < .001$, indicating a statistically significant difference between pre-test and post-test speaking scores. The corresponding effect size, calculated as $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$, was $r = -.86$ (absolute $r = .86$), indicating a very large magnitude of change. Thus, the results provide evidence of a statistically significant and substantively large within-group improvement in speaking performance across the measurement period. However, because the study used a single-group pre-test-post-test design, this effect size reflects the magnitude of the observed within-group change rather than an estimate of TBLT's unique causal effect.

Students' Perceptions of TBLT

The perception questionnaire complemented the speaking-test results by describing how students experienced the task-based lessons. All 20 statements were interpreted in the very positive range, and the overall mean was approximately 4.48 out of 5. Table 5 presents the item-level results.

Table 5. Students' Perceptions of Task-Based Language Teaching

No.	Statement	Mean	Interpretation
1	I enjoy learning English through TBLT.	4.59	Very Positive
2	TBLT makes English speaking lessons more interesting.	4.63	Very Positive
3	TBLT motivates me to participate actively.	4.41	Very Positive
4	I feel more enthusiastic when TBLT is used.	4.38	Very Positive
5	TBLT increases my confidence in speaking English.	4.22	Very Positive
6	I am less afraid of making mistakes.	4.25	Very Positive
7	I feel comfortable expressing my ideas.	4.25	Very Positive
8	TBLT helps me speak confidently.	4.44	Very Positive
9	TBLT improves my speaking fluency.	4.53	Very Positive
10	TBLT improves my grammar accuracy.	4.41	Very Positive
11	TBLT enriches my vocabulary.	4.66	Very Positive

No.	Statement	Mean	Interpretation
12	TBLT improves my pronunciation.	4.59	Very Positive
13	TBLT encourages communication with classmates.	4.59	Very Positive
14	Group tasks help me learn.	4.56	Very Positive
15	I enjoy pair and group discussions.	4.59	Very Positive
16	TBLT creates a supportive classroom.	4.47	Very Positive
17	TBLT is more effective than traditional teaching.	4.50	Very Positive
18	I want my teacher to continue using TBLT.	4.25	Very Positive
19	TBLT helps me become an active learner.	4.44	Very Positive
20	Overall, I am satisfied with TBLT.	4.53	Very Positive

The highest item mean concerned vocabulary enrichment (M = 4.66), followed by the view that TBLT made speaking lessons more interesting (M = 4.63). Students also reported strong perceptions of pronunciation improvement, communication with classmates, enjoyment of pair and group discussions, and overall satisfaction. These ratings indicate that the approach was valued not only for skill development but also for its effect on classroom participation and learning atmosphere.

The open-ended responses provided a more differentiated account of students' experiences than the closed-ended questionnaire. Three broad patterns emerged: perceived affordances of task-based interaction, continuing linguistic and affective difficulties, and requests for additional instructional support. First, students consistently valued opportunities to practise English through conversations, pair and group activities, role plays, and other communicative tasks. These responses suggest that the perceived value of TBLT was closely connected to increased opportunities to use English for communicative purposes rather than simply to complete language exercises.

Second, the responses also revealed that positive engagement did not eliminate learners' difficulties. Students continued to mention limited vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, pronunciation, and nervousness when speaking in front of classmates. This contrast matters because it suggests that learners could perceive the classroom environment positively while still facing substantial linguistic and affective constraints. From the learners' perspective, TBLT therefore seems to create opportunities for participation without necessarily removing the barriers that make oral production difficult.

Third, students' suggestions centered on the need for continued scaffolding. They requested more opportunities to speak, everyday-life topics, vocabulary preparation before tasks, teacher feedback after speaking activities, and additional pair and group work. These suggestions closely align with the implemented task cycle and indicate that learners valued communicative tasks most when accompanied by preparation and support. The qualitative responses therefore complement the quantitative findings by suggesting that the perceived usefulness of TBLT was associated not simply with task completion but with the combination of meaningful interaction, preparation, collaboration, and feedback.

Because the open-ended responses were reviewed thematically rather than subjected to formal qualitative coding procedures with multiple coders, these themes should be regarded as interpretive patterns rather than claims about their prevalence in the wider EFL population.

Discussion

Taken together, the findings show a substantial within-group increase in speaking performance during the period in which TBLT was implemented, accompanied by highly positive learner perceptions. The increase from a mean of 10.78 to 14.69 indicates that students performed better on the speaking assessment after the six-meeting instructional period. The intervention's structure provides a plausible pedagogical explanation for this change: discussions, role plays, information-gap activities, and problem-solving tasks required learners to use English to exchange information and

achieve communicative goals. These activities may therefore have increased opportunities for meaningful oral production. Nevertheless, the present design does not permit the improvement to be attributed uniquely to TBLT because maturation, repeated testing, classroom exposure, teacher effects, or other uncontrolled factors may also have contributed to the observed change.

The component results add detail to the overall score increase. Pronunciation improved most, followed by fluency. Repeated spoken interaction may help learners become more comfortable producing English sounds and maintaining oral output because the same communicative resources are used across multiple task situations. Accuracy also improved, indicating that a meaning-focused approach did not prevent development of more appropriate language forms. The post-task feedback stage likely provided opportunities for learners to notice errors and refine their production. Vocabulary and comprehension also increased, which is consistent with students' questionnaire responses: vocabulary enrichment received the highest perception score, and learners reported that interaction with classmates supported their learning.

The results broadly support earlier research. Afifah and Devana[14] reported that task-based learning improved speaking by giving learners opportunities to communicate through meaningful tasks. Panduwangi[15] likewise found positive development in speaking, especially fluency and accuracy. Khan et al.[16] emphasized that task-based activities can strengthen speaking because learners use English in purposeful interaction, while Saraiwang and Worawong[17] highlighted how communication and collaborative learning contribute to an active classroom environment. The present study extends these observations by showing improvement across five speaking components and by combining performance data with learners' perceptions in a school-based EFL setting.

Students' highly positive perceptions are important because participation is central to task-based instruction. Learners reported increased confidence, greater comfort in expressing ideas, and enjoyment of group work. These responses suggest that collaborative tasks may reduce psychological barriers that commonly affect EFL speaking. Habiburrahim et al.[18] identified fear of mistakes and low self-confidence as important sources of speaking anxiety. In the present study, pair and group tasks offered a supportive setting in which students could share responsibility for communication and practise repeatedly before or during performance.

Nevertheless, the open-ended responses show that TBLT did not remove all speaking difficulties. Vocabulary limitations, grammatical accuracy, pronunciation problems, and nervousness remained. These findings support the view that task-based instruction requires careful scaffolding rather than simply assigning communicative activities. Vocabulary preparation in the pre-task stage, clear task instructions, appropriate task difficulty, teacher monitoring, and constructive post-task feedback are therefore necessary. Hasnain and Halder[19] similarly note that successful TBLT depends on teachers' understanding of task design and classroom management. The students' own suggestions reinforce this point: they wanted relevant topics, language preparation, and feedback alongside opportunities for communication.

Several methodological limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the one-group pre-test-post-test design does not provide a counterfactual comparison, so the observed improvement cannot be attributed exclusively to TBLT. Alternative explanations include maturation,

[14] N. Afifah and T. Devana, "Speaking Skill through Task Based Learning in English Foreign Language Classroom," 135-144.
[15] M. Panduwangi, "The Effectiveness of Task-Based Language Teaching to Improve Students' Speaking Skills," 205-214.
[16] A. Khan, S. Wong, and M. Chen, "The Role of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Enhancing Students' Speaking Skills in English as a Second Language," 45-52.
[17] S. Saraiwang and K. Worawong, "The Use of Task-Based and Game-Based Learning in English Learning at Small Primary Schools in Nakhon Pathom, Thailand," 101-138.
[18] H. Habiburrahim et al., "The Effects of Anxiety toward Acehnese Students' English Speaking Ability," 254-270.
[19] S. Hasnain and S. Halder, "Exploring the Impediments for Successful Implementation of the Task-Based Language Teaching Approach."

repeated exposure to the speaking assessment, increased familiarity with the assessment format, teacher effects, and other classroom experiences occurring during the intervention period. Second, the sample consisted of 32 students from one intact science class at a single Islamic senior-secondary school, which limits the generalizability of the findings to other EFL populations and educational settings. Third, although two raters independently assessed speaking performance, formal inter-rater reliability coefficients were not calculated [revise if ICC is subsequently calculated]. Fourth, component-level results were interpreted descriptively because the available analysis did not provide separate inferential tests or standardized effect sizes for each component. Finally, the open-ended responses were analysed thematically to contextualize the quantitative findings but were not subjected to a more extensive qualitative validation procedure. Future studies should therefore employ comparison or control groups, larger and more diverse samples, repeated measurement, formal inter-rater reliability statistics, and more systematic qualitative analysis to strengthen causal inference and explain how particular task characteristics influence specific dimensions of speaking development.

CONCLUSION

This study examined changes in EFL learners' speaking performance and perceptions during a six-meeting implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in an Islamic senior-secondary school. Students' mean speaking score increased from 10.78 to 14.69, and the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test indicated a statistically significant within-group difference ($Z = -4.876$, $p < .001$), with a large effect size ($r = .86$). All five assessed components—fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, vocabulary, and comprehension—showed descriptive gains, with pronunciation and fluency demonstrating the largest increases.

The learner-perception findings complemented the performance results. Students reported highly positive experiences with TBLT, particularly regarding vocabulary development, lesson interest, communication with classmates, and collaborative activities. At the same time, open-ended responses indicated that vocabulary limitations, grammatical difficulties, pronunciation problems, and nervousness remained important challenges. Students therefore valued communicative tasks while also requesting vocabulary preparation, relevant topics, teacher feedback, and additional opportunities for pair and group interaction.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the implemented TBLT sequence provided a productive context for increased oral practice and positive learner engagement. The findings align with theoretical accounts that emphasize interaction, language production, collaboration, and post-task feedback as potentially important conditions for speaking development. However, the study's one-group pre-test-post-test design prevents strong causal attribution. The observed improvement should therefore be interpreted as change associated with the instructional period rather than definitive evidence of a unique TBLT effect. Future research using comparison groups, larger samples, formal inter-rater reliability estimates, component-level inferential analyses, and systematic qualitative coding would provide stronger evidence regarding the effectiveness and mechanisms of TBLT for multidimensional speaking development.

REFERENCES

Afifah, N., & Devana, T. (2020). Speaking skill through task based learning in English foreign language classroom. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 7(2), 135-144. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v7i2.3109

Bukhori, B., & Irsyad, M. (2025). Manifesting community language learning activities in Islamic boarding school speaking program. Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 12(2), 170-183. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v12i2.28491

Butarbutar, R. (2021). Learner's perception of task difficulties in technology-mediated task-based language teaching. Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 9(1), 129-144. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v9i1.10079

Crookes, G. V., & Ziegler, N. (2021). Critical language pedagogy and task-based language teaching: Reciprocal relationship and mutual benefit. Education Sciences, 11, Article 254. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11060254

Diana, M., Renandya, W. A., & Dahliana, S. (2024). Researching factors and coping strategies of EFL students' speaking anxiety. Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities, 12(1), 250-271. https://doi.org/10.22373/ej.v12i1.22733

Habiburrahim, H., Risdaneva, R., Putri, G., Dahliana, S., & Muluk, S. (2020). The effects of anxiety toward Acehnese students' English speaking ability. The Qualitative Report, 25(1), 254-270. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2020.3639

Hasnain, S., & Halder, S. (2021). Exploring the impediments for successful implementation of the task-based language teaching approach: A review of studies on teachers' perceptions. The Language Learning Journal. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2021.1989015

Khan, A., Wong, S., & Chen, M. (2023). The role of task-based language teaching (TBLT) in enhancing students' speaking skills in English as a second language. Research Studies in English Language Teaching and Learning, 1(1), 45-52. https://doi.org/10.62583/rseltl.v1i1.7

Milon, M. R. K., Ishtiaq, M., Ali, T. M., & Imam, M. S. (2023). Unlocking fluency: Task-based language teaching (TBLT) in tertiary speaking classes - Insights from Bangladeshi teachers and students. ICRRD Journal, 4(4), 218-230. https://doi.org/10.53272/icrrd.v4i4.11

Mudinillah, A., Rahmi, S. N., & Taro, N. (2024). Task-based language teaching: A systematic review of research and applications. Lingeduca: Journal of Language and Education Studies, 3(2), 102-115. https://doi.org/10.70177/lingeduca.v3i2.1352

Muluk, S., Nasriyanti, Habiburrahim, Zulfikar, T., Akmal, S., & Safrul, M. S. (2021). Classroom management in EFL speaking class: Strategies and challenges. Indonesian Journal of English Education, 8(1), 127-146. https://doi.org/10.15408/ijee.v8i1.20146

Noroozi, M., & Taheri, S. (2022). Task-based language assessment: A compatible approach to assess the efficacy of task-based language teaching vs. present, practice, produce. Cogent Education, 9(1), Article 2105775. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2105775

Panduwangi, M. (2021). The effectiveness of task-based language teaching to improve students' speaking skills. Journal of Applied Studies in Language, 5(1), 205-214.

Saraiwang, S., & Worawong, K. (2023). The use of task-based and game-based learning in English learning at small primary schools in Nakhon Pathom, Thailand. PASAA, 67, 101-138.

Sholeh, M. B. (2021). Implementation of task-based learning in teaching English in Indonesia: Benefits and problems. English Language Education Study Program Journal, 4(2), 129-138.

Yolanda, R., Ratnasari, W., Saputra, M. A., & Putriani, Z. (2025). The effect of task-based learning on students' English-speaking fluency. Journal of Research in English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 1(2), 120-135. https://doi.org/10.65431/jrell.v1i2.24

Chamisah. (2025). Integrating Islamic Values into English Curriculum Development: A Descriptive Qualitative Literature Review in State Islamic Higher Education. Journal of Education, Pedagogy and Teacher Training, 2(1), 1–11.

Muluk, S., Habiburrahim, H., Dahliana, S., Zakaria, F., Azizah, & Safrul, M. S. (2025). The impact of synchronous virtual flipped classroom on EFL students' speaking skill. Studies in English Language and Education, 12(1), 362–379, https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v12i1.34814