



---

**COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN CONTENT BASED AND TASK BASED INSTRUCTION IN TEACHING SPEAKING SKILL A CASE STUDY AT THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MADRASAH TSANAWIYAH DARUL ISHLAH IRENG LAUQ**

**Suparlan<sup>1</sup>, Mul Muliadi<sup>2</sup>**

Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Institut Pendidikan Nusantara Global, Praya, Indonesia<sup>1,2</sup>

---

**History Article**

**Article history:**

Received Mei 3, 2020  
Approved Juni 20, 2020

---

**Keywords:**

Content based instruction, task based instruction, teaching speaking skill.

**ABSTRACT**

This study propose to find out the different effect between Content Based Instruction and Task Based Instruction in teaching speaking skill. The population of the study is the second year students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq with totaling students 222 and consisting of 6 classes. 74 students are taken as the samples which are divided into two groups; i.e. "X" group and "Y" group consisting of 37 students for each group. To get the whole data needed, test instruments in the forms of post-test was employed. Having deeply analyzed the whole data it is found that the student's ability using Content Based Instruction method is higher than the students using Task Based Instruction method. This fact can also be seen from the mean score of "X" group which reaches 77, 18 and the means core of "Y" group which reaches 74, 59. This can also simply mean that the use of Content Based Instruction method and Task Based Instruction have different effect in teaching speaking skill in the second year students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq. Furthermore, Based on the statistical computation, interval confidence of 90%, 80% (0, 10 and 0, 20) t-test= 0,804 is lower than t-table=1,688 and 1,306. Which is automatically means that the both of them are not suitable for teaching spiking skill.

---

© 2020 Jurnal Ilmiah Global Education

---

\*Corresponding author email: [suparlan@nusantaraglobal.ac.id](mailto:suparlan@nusantaraglobal.ac.id)

---

**INTRODUCTION**

Chaney (1998:13) states speaking is the process of building and sharing meaning through the use of verbal and non-verbal symbols, in a variety of contexts. According to Rodgers in Laughlin (2001:4) CLT is an approach rather than method that aims to make communicative competence, the goal of language teaching and developer procedures for

the teaching of language skill that acknowledge the interdependency of language and communication. Light & Spada (1999:92) said that communicative, Content Based and Task Based Instructional environments also involve e learners whose goal is learning the language itself, but the style of instruction places the emphasis on interaction, conversation, and language use, rather than on learning about the language.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Is there any different effect between Content Based and Task Based instruction in teaching speaking skill at the second year students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq.

### **Purpose of the Study**

To find out the different effect between Content Based and Task Based Instruction in teaching speaking skill for the students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq.

### **Scope of the Study**

This study was focused on finding out the different effect between Content Based and Task Based Instruction in teaching speaking skill at the second year Students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq.

### **Significance of the Study**

The significances of study were divided into two parts namely: theoretically function and practically function.

- a. Theoretically function: the result of this study expected to give inspiration and also alternative way for the teachers to know how teach speaking some additional contribution to development of English teaching, especially in teaching speaking.
- b. Practically function: the result of this study can be used as means of improving the students' ability in teaching speaking.
- c. or the students in this study was expected can make the students more interesting, effectively to study English especially in speaking.
- d. For the teachers this study was expected give inspiration also alternative the way for the teachers to know how to teach speaking.

### **Definition of the Key Term**

a. Speaking. Speaking is the same with oral interaction which are convention always of speaking information, expressing our idea, and thought have in our mind, (Nunan, 1991:40).

b. Content-Based Instruction (CBI). Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is a method to the teaching of language in which students are taught their regular school subjects, such as Science, History, and Math, through the target language. (Nunan, 1999:304).

c. Task Based Instruction (TBI). Ellis (2003:16) definite that a pedagogical task in the following way;

A task is work plan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in term whether the corrector appropriate propositional content has been conveyed.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Design**

The writer would like to compare its results by using interview in order to know comparative study between content based and task based instruction in teaching speaking skill at Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq. The data analyzed by using descriptive analysis, besides that the writer grouped some related items of each part of the instrument research (interview) so every part showing different specification

### **Population and Sample**

#### **a. Population**

According to Sugiyono (2010), the population is the generalization which consists of objects and subjects that have a certain quantity and characteristics defined by writer to learn and then draw conclusion. Besides, Coolidge (2000:24) defines population as a theoretical group with the same character or characters. The population of this study is the second year students of Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq, class VIII (A, B, C, D, E, F) the total class is six class. Each class consist of 37 students such as VIII.A (37 students), VIII.B (37students), VIII.C (37students), VIII.D (37students), VIII.E (37 students), VIII.F (37 students).

#### **b. Sample**

Sample is smaller number of observations taken from the total number making up population. The sampling technique that was used in this study was cluster random sampling technique to determine the X Group and Y Group taken as sample of this study. The writer takes some students which divided into two classes namely X Group and Y Group. Class VIIIA would be the X Group and class VIIIB would be Y Group and each class consists of 37 students as the sample of this study, so the totals were 74 students of this study.

### **Method of Collecting Data**

Heaton (1975:94) stated that sort-oral direct interview is more effective way to assess the student's oral production directly. The students were asked to perform their speaking abilities by delivering a short interview between them. The writer asked the several students to present prepared conversation based on the instruction given, if the students understand what to do and they can apply the instruction well, so the instrument has been valid and reliability. Each criteria then is rated into five scale of rating scores, it is

based on Haris (1969) scale rating scores. To score the students' speaking skill the writer classified the students score based on the following classification.

Table I. The Scoring and Guidelines for Analytical Scheme of the Students' Speaking Skill

No	Aspect	Indicators	Score
1	Fluency	Very hesitant and disjointed	1
		Sometimes hesitant, little natural flow of language.	2
		Ready responses, some evidence of an ability to sustain a conversation: little, if any, initiative.	3
		Answer without hesitation and extends responses	4
		Responds readily and shows some initiative, conversation sustained at a reasonable speed, language expressed fluently.	5
2	Grammar	There are not accurate structures observed at all	1
		The grammatical structures available to the	2
		Accurate structures observed at all.	
		There may be obvious or even basic mistakes, but the use of grammatical forms appropriate to the level is still adequate.	3
		The candidate's use of the grammatical form of the level is sufficient for all the tasks, although there may be errors.	4
		The grammatical forms of the level are accurately used for most of the best	5
3	Vocabulary	Vocabulary Occasional words which make little	1
		Vocabulary is not at all adequate for the situation.	2
		Vocabulary is very limited for the level, but is just sufficient to cover most of the subjects discussed.	3
		An adequate range of vocabulary is used to cover the entire subject discussed.	4

		A wide range of vocabulary appropriate for the level is well used.	5
4	Pronunciation	The language used makes comprehension almost impossible.	1
		Very poor articulation, virtually impossible to understand.	2
		Words are sufficiently well pronounced to be understood, even if there are a few mistakes.	3
		Good articulation but there may be some mistakes.	4
		Words are very well articulated and can easily be understood.	5
5	Comprehension	The subject cannot understand what they speak.	1
		The subject cannot speak intelligibly about the subjects.	2
		The candidate can speak about the subject in a basic way, but no more than that.	3
		The candidate has the ability to speak for sufficiently about the subject and can react adequately.	4
		The candidate shows the ability to speak more than adequately about the subjects, is clear, and can add personal views	5

(Haris, 1969)

### Method of Data Analysis

In this study, data means all of information that was directly gathered from the subjects. The techniques of data collection that the writer used was test.

### Speaking Test

The writer used post-test where it was given after doing the treatment. Post-test was aimed to know the result after the students was treated by using Content Based and Task Based instruction in teaching speaking skill at Madrasah Tsanawiyah Darul Ishlah Ireng Lauq.

### Data Analysis

1. Listing the students' final scores into a data table, meaning that the students' raw scores after changed into final score.
2. Calculating the students' mean score of the two groups.
3. Identifying the students' deviation standard of the two groups.

4. From the result of the students mean scores and standard deviation of the two groups, the writer continues to find out the significance of the two variables being investigated by comparing the two mean scores and its each standard deviation.

## RESEARCH FINDING

### Research Finding

Data of the study only used post- test. It has conducted to know the students' ability after treatment. The following tables present the students in two scores presented in two different tables, the first table was classified into "X" which students who tread by using Content Based and table two was classified into "Y" which students who tread by using text based.

**Table1. Table of computing the student's individual obtained raw and final scores of X group (Content Based on Speaking Skill).**

NO	Students	Rs	Fs
1	AAM	80	80,0
2	AA	96	96,0
3	AR	76	76,0
4	AS	80	80,0
5	APU	88	88,0
6	AA	88	88,0
7	BPAU	72	72,0
8	BSS	84	84,0
9	BW	84	84,0
10	DAW	88	88,0
11	DA	68	68,0
12	DMIY	88	88,0
13	DL	80	80,0
14	DSA	84	84,0
15	IDL	68	68,0
16	IS	76	76,0
17	MCAG	84	84,0
18	MIF	72	72,0
19	MJAZ	60	60,0
20	MAS	68	68,0
21	M	88	88,0
22	MNIS	68	68,0
23	MSM	64	64,0
24	MA	84	84,0
25	MIA	72	72,0
26	N	68	68,0
27	NA	84	84,0
28	NOS	84	84,0
29	RW	64	64,0

30	RA	68	68,0
31	RA	84	84,0
32	RD	72	72,0
33	S	84	84,0
34	SP	44	44,0
35	SR	76	76,0
36	SW	84	84,0
37	WA	84	84,0
	<b>Total</b>	2856	2856
	<b>Mean Score</b>	77,18	77,18

(Haris, 1969).

**Table2. Table of computing the student's individual obtained raw and final scores of "Y" group (Task Based in speaking skill).**

NO	Students	Rs	Fs
1	ARA	88	88,0
2	AR	88	88,0
3	ADL	76	76,0
4	AAL	84	84,0
5	APE	72	72,0
6	AI	76	76,0
7	EE	80	80,0
8	FL	72	72,0
9	HF	64	64,0
10	IAY	68	68,0
11	IA	88	88,0
12	LH	84	84,0
13	MRP	84	84,0
14	MSAL	76	76,0
15	MS	72	72,0
16	MY	88	88,0
17	MHBS	56	56,0
18	MFI	64	64,0
19	MHS	84	84,0
20	MMM	60	60,0
21	MY	68	68,0
22	NU	84	84,0
23	NM	64	64,0
24	NA	84	84,0
25	NYA	68	68,0
26	N	64	64,0
27	RH	88	88,0
28	RNH	60	60,0
29	SNR	72	72,0
30	SA	88	88,0

31	SAN	84	84,0
32	SHP	56	56,0
33	SA	84	84,0
34	TS	56	56,0
35	WS	68	68,0
36	RA	60	60,0
37	ZN	88	88,0
	<b>Total</b>	2760	2760
	<b>Mean Score</b>	74.59	74.59

Note:

Rs= Raw Score

Fs= Final Score

Several formulas would be applied to find out the last result of t-test formula that need to compare its result to t-table to find out that was significance. Furthermore, the writer follows:

1. Calculating the students mean score of the two groups.

- Mean score of "X" group:

$$\sum X=2856$$

$$N = 37$$

The mean score of "X" group is, then = 77, 18

- Means score of "Y" group:

$$\sum Y=2760$$

$$N = 37$$

The mean score of "Y" group is, then = 59

2. Computing the students deviation scores from the mean of the two group Computing the deviation scores as well as computation of range is beneficially used to see how well a number of score are spread out, knowing the spread of score is very important since one purpose of testing is for the sake of placement of the students (Heaton: 170).

West (1982:228) defines this item as a score expressed as its distance from the mean. If score falls above the mean deviation is (+), its falls below the mean deviation score, on the other hand, it is (-) negative in this extent, it is interesting to note that the sum of the score deviation from the means equal to zero.

**Table 3: Table of computing the students' individual deviation scores from the mean of "X" group (Content Based in speaking skill).**

NO	STUDENTS	(X)	X-X	(X-X) <sup>2</sup>
1	AAM	80.0	2.82	7.95
2	AA	96.0	18.82	354.19
3	AR	76.0	-1.18	1.39
4	AS	80.0	2.82	7.95



5	APU	88.0	10.82	117.07
6	AA	88.0	10.82	117.07
7	BPAU	72.0	-5.18	26.83
8	BSS	84.0	6.82	46.51
9	BW	84.0	6.82	46.51
10	DAW	88.0	10.82	117.07
11	DA	68.0	-9.18	84.27
12	DMIY	88.0	10.82	117.07
13	DL	80.0	2.82	7.95
14	DSA	84.0	6.82	46.51
15	IDL	68.0	-9.18	84.27
16	IS	76.0	-1.18	1.39
17	MCAG	84.0	6.82	46.51
18	MIF	72.0	-5.18	26.83
19	MJAZ	60.0	-17.18	295.15
20	MAS	68.0	-9.18	84.27
21	M	88.0	10.82	117.07
22	MNIS	68.0	-9.18	84.27
23	MSM	64.0	-13.18	173.71
24	MA	84.0	6.82	46.51
25	MIA	72.0	-5.18	26.83
26	N	68.0	-9.18	84.27
27	NA	84.0	6.82	46.51
28	NOS	84.0	6.82	46.51
29	RW	64.0	-13.18	173.71
30	RA	68.0	-9.18	84.27
31	RA	84.0	6.82	46.51
32	RD	72.0	-5.18	26.83
33	S	84.0	6.82	46.51
34	SP	44.0	-33.18	1100.91
35	SR	76.0	-1.18	1.39
36	SW	84.0	6.82	46.51
37	WA	84.0	6.82	46.51
	<b>Total</b>	2856	0,34	3835.59
	<b>Mean Score</b>	77,18	0.009189	103.6646

**Table 4: Table of computing the students' individual deviation scores from the mean of "Y" group (Task Based in speaking skill).**

NO	Students	(Y)	Y-Y	(Y <sub>2</sub> Y) <sup>2</sup>
1	ARA	88	13.41	179.82
2	AR	88	13.41	179.82
3	ADL	76	1.41	1.98
4	AAL	84	9.41	88.54
5	APE	72	-2.59	6.70
6	AI	76	1.41	1.98
7	EE	80	5.41	29.26

8	FL	72	-2.59	6.70
9	HF	64	-10.59	112.14
10	IAY	68	-6.59	43.42
11	IA	88	13.41	17.82
12	LH	84	9.41	88.54
13	MRP	84	9.41	88.54
14	MSAL	76	1.41	1.98
15	MS	72	-2.59	6.70
16	MY	88	13.41	179.82
17	MHBS	56	-18.59	345.58
18	MFI	64	-10.59	112.14
19	MIS	84	9.41	88.54
20	MMM	60	-14.59	212.86
21	MY	68	-6.59	43.42
22	NU	84	9.41	88.54
23	NM	64	-10.59	112.14
24	NA	84	9.41	88.54
25	NIA	68	-6.59	43.42
26	N	64	-10.59	112.14
27	RH	88	13.41	179.82
28	RNH	60	-14.59	212.86
29	SNR	72	-2.59	6.70
30	SA	88	13.41	179.82
31	SAN	84	9.41	88.54
32	SHP	56	-18.59	345.58
33	SA	84	9.41	88.54
34	TS	56	-18.59	345.58
35	WS	68	-6.59	43.42
36	RA	60	-14.59	212.86
37	ZN	88	13.41	179.82
	<b>Total</b>	2760	0.17	4164.62
	<b>Mean Score</b>	74.59	0.004595	112.5573

3. Standard deviation of the two groups.

In this case, the writer would calculate the students' standard deviation of the two groups.

4. Identifying the significant of the students mean and standard deviation of the two groups.

Results of the students mean scores and standard deviation of the two groups, the writer continues to the last computation of statistical analysis by finding out the significance of the two variables being investigated by comparing the two mean scores and it is standard deviation, to calculate the significance of the two variables by comparing them, especially for small sample.

Light & Spada said that communicative, Content Based and Task Based Instructional environments also involve learners whose goal is learning the language itself, but the style of instruction places the emphasis on interaction, conversation, and language use, rather than on learning about the language. According to Nunan that Content-Based

Instruction (CBI) is a method to the teaching of language in which students are taught their regular school subjects, such as Science, History, and Math, through the target language.

## CONCLUSION

Final conclusions of the research are as follow:

4.1 The writer found not lots of students have well in speaking.

4.2 It was found out that the t-test was 0,804 with t-table degree of freedom (df)=37 equals to 1,688 and 1,306 for both confident levels 90%, 80% (0,10 and 0,20).

4.3 Teaching English by using content based and task based instruction had different effect but both of them were not suitable for teaching speaking because it was shown from the result of t-test and t-table

## SUGESTION

Dear all of my supporters such as my beloved wife Sulmiatun, my close friend Jumadil, M.Pd., my parents, all of my friends, Mr. Per and so on. I would like to thank all of you who supported me in writing this journal.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Laughlin, James Mc. 2001. *A Task-Based Program in Korea*. SLLT. Vol.1. <http://www.mediateam.oilu.fi/publication/511>. Download on Tuesday, January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.
- [2]. Light, Patsy M – Nina Spada. 1999. *How Languages are Learned*. New York: Oxford.
- [3]. Nunan, David. 1999. *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Newbury House.
- [4]. Willis, Jane. 1996. *Task-based Language Learning*. Longman. <http://Languge.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/ub/tltjul/willis.html>. Download on Thursday, January 10<sup>th</sup> 2008.