THE EFFECT OF CONTENT-BASED INSTRUCTION AND TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING ON THE SECOND SEMESTER STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL AND STUDENTS' SPEAKING MOTIVATION OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY INDRAGIRI

Ayu Raina Mufida, Mukhaiyar, Desmawati Radjab
Language Education Program, State University of Padang
ayurainamufidasyuhada@yahoo.com

Abstrak: *Keterampilan berbicara merupakan salah satu aspek penting dalam pembelajaran bahasa. Namun pada kenyataannya, terdapat masalah dalam proses belajar dan mengajarnya. Sebagian guru bahasa Inggris masih mengalami kesulitan dalam proses pengajaran speaking. Guru-guru menemukan masalah serius terkait dengan keterampilan berbicara siswa. Artikel ini terkait dengan penelitian eksperimen yang bertujuan untuk menginvestigasi sejauh mana efek dari metode pengajaran Content Based Instruction (CBI) dan Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) dalam memperbaiki keterampilan berbicara serta motivasi berbicara pada siswa. Penelitian ini bersifat eksperimental dan dilakukan terhadap 60 siswa pada semester kedua di Departemen Bahasa Inggris Universitas Islam Indragiri. Pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan metode angket dan test speaking pada siswa dan kemudian dianalisis dengan t-test. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa metode Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) dan Content-Based Instruction (CBI) memberikan efek yang sama terhadap keterampilan berbicara siswa dan metode pengajaran speaking dengan menggunakan metode Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) dan Content-Based Instruction (CBI) memberikan efek yang berbeda terhadap motivasi berbicara siswa.*

Keywords : *Content Based Intruction (CBI), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), Speaking Skill, and Speaking Motivation.*

Introduction

Speaking is one of the important skills in language learning. It is a productive skill where the learners should have the ability to communicate their ideas, thoughts, feelings and being able to respond messages with other. It means all the language learners should be able to speak English in order to communicate each other. According to Richard (2002) speaking is an important goal for many language learners. Therefore, it also becomes the important role for the English teachers who are aiming to improve their students' ability to speak effectively and communicatively to find relevant instructions and ways to provide support for learners with various kinds of learning styles so that they can learn in the ways which suit them best.

Based on the observation in Islamic University of Indragiri, especially at the second semester students of English Department, the researcher found that the students still had problems in their speaking. They

were not responding actively in speaking exercise. Even though the lectures had applied some instructions in teaching speaking the participation in the classroom was very poor. Based on these facts, the researcher realizes that it is serious problems that should be solved because speaking skill is very important in language learning.

Based on these facts, the researcher realizes that it is serious problems that should be solved because speaking skill is very important in language learning. Then, the researcher interviewed some students in order to find out their problems in speaking. Based on the result of the interview to the some students in Islamic University of Indragiri especially at the second semester students English department, the researcher found that there are some problems related to students speaking skill: (1) they had problem to master some components of speaking skills (2) they were not motivated and braved enough to speak English (3) they had unfavorable condition to speak English. (4) In addition, the researcher found that the lectures used the same teaching method almost all over teaching and learning process.

Content-Based Instruction is one of the effective teaching methods to teaching English as a foreign language because with Content-Based Instruction, students can develop their language skills as well as gain access to new concepts through meaningful content. There are some experts define Content-Based Instruction. Krahnke (1987) defines Content-Based Instruction as:

> It is the teaching of content or information in the language being learned with little or no direct or explicit effort to teach the language itself separately from the content being taught.

This teaching approach is considered as an effective and realistic teaching method in terms of combining language and content learning. Also, Crandall (1990) sates that CBI can be used in various ways de-pending on the skills being taught and includes not only traditional teaching methods such as grammar-based instruction or vocabulary development but also contemporary approaches such as communicative language teaching and humanistic methods.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) refers to an approach based on the use of tasks as the core unit of planning and instruction in language teaching. Willis (1996) presents it as a logical development of Communicative Language Teaching. The logical consideration as follows:

a) Activities that involve real communication are essential for language learning
b) Activities in which language is used for carrying out meaningful tasks promote learning
c) Language that is meaningful to the learner supports the learning process.

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) engaging learners in task works provides a better context for the activation of learning process than form-focus activities, and hence ultimately provides better opportunities for language learning to take place.

According to Richards and Rodgers (2001) Task-Based Language Teaching proposes the notion of task as a central unit of palling and teaching. TBLT is an activity or goal

that is carried out using language, such as finding a solution to a puzzle, reading a map and giving directions, making a telephone call, writing a letter, or reading a set of instruction and assembling a toy.

Based on these facts, the researcher decides to do an experimental research entitled "The Effect of Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching on the Second Semester Students' Speaking Skill and Students' Speaking Motivation of English Department Islamic University Indragiri".

Methods

The type of the research was experimental research. The experimental design used is pretest-posttest control group design. Both groups are administered a pretest, each group receives a different treatment, and both groups are post tested at the end of the study. Posttest scores are compared to determine the effect of the treatment.

There are two groups involved in this research. The groups were experimental and control group. The experimental group was treated by using Content-Based Instruction and the control group was treated by using Task-Based Language Teaching. The design of the research is shown as follows:

Group 1   R   O1   X1
                          O2
Group 2   R   O1   X2
                          O2

Where:
O1   = Pre-test
O2   = Post-test
X1   = Treatment by Task Based Language Teaching
X2   =   Treatment by Content-Based Instruction

This research was conducted from March to April 2013 to two classes of the second semester students of English department Islamic University Indragiri academic year 2012/2013. The Population of this research was the second semester students of English department Islamic University Indragiri academic year 2012/2013.

Tabel 1. Population of the Research

No	Class	Number of Students
1	Class A	30
2	Class B	30
3	Class C	28
Total		**88**

The researcher analyzed the homogenity and normality of population. In this study, the large group is called population and individual selected is sample.

In this research, researcher used cluster random sampling because the students have been grouped into their classes according to their field of study. The processes were : (1) Three classes of field study was selected randomly, the researcher prepared three small pieces of papers with the name of each class according to their field of study and roll it, (2) she placed the small roller papers into a glass and shake them (3) she took two papers. The class which has been chosen was the sample of the research both experimental group and the control group.

In this experimental research, the researcher used oral interview and questionnaire of speaking motivation as the instrument of research. Both of instruments were assigned in pre-test and post-test. Before the test assigned, the researcher consulted the instruments to two validators. One

validator validated the speaking motivation questionnaire.

Gay and Airisian (2000) state that a test is designed to provide information about how well the test takers have learned what they have been taught. Achievement test is arranged by using some questions used to measure speaking skill. These questions are developed based on the indicators of speaking skill. The indicators as follows:

Tabel 2. List of interactional skill of speaking indicators

Variable	Features Indicators	Skill Indicators
Interactional skill	• Has a primarily social function • Reflects role relationships • Reflects speaker's identity • May be formal or casual • Uses conversational conventions • Reflects degrees of politeness • Employs many generic words • Uses conversational register • Is jointly constructed	• Opening and closing conversations • Choosing topics • Making small-talk • Joking • Recounting personal incidents and experiences • Turn-taking • Using adjacency pairs • Interrupting • Reacting to others • Using an appropriate style of speaking

Questionnaire is used to measure students speaking motivation. The indicators of speaking motivation are taken from Schmidt et al (1996). The indicators are (1) Intrinsic motivation (2) Extrinsic motivation (3) Attitude (4) Anxiety (5) Motivational strength.

Tabel 3. List of Speaking Motivation Questionnaire Indicators

Speaking Motivation	Indicators	Numbers
Schmidt et al (1996)	Intrinsic motivation	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Extrinsic motivation	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15
	Attitude	16, 17, 18, 19, 20
	Anxiety	21, 22, 23, 24, 25
	Motivational strength	26, 27, 28, 29, 30

The questionnaire was developed by using Likert Scales model which indicated:

Table 4: Likert scale of Possitive and Negative Questionnaire

Possitive Questionnaire		Negative Questionnaire	
Likert Scale	Score	Likert Scale	Score
• Strongly Agree	6	• Strongly Agree	1
• Agree	5	• Agree	2
• Slightly Agree	4	• Slightly Agree	3
• Slightly Disagree	3	• Slightly Disagree	4
• Disagree	2	• Disagree	5
• Strongly Disagree	1	• Strongly Disagree	6

The data was collected through some steps. First, the researcher prepared the speaking motivation questionnaire and speaking test. Both of them were consulted to validators. Before the test assign to both of the groups (control and experimental), the try out was done at Islamic University of Indragiri. The respondents of the try out were the students in class which did not involve in this study to know the tests valid and reliable.

Second, the researcher conducted pre test to both experimental and control group. The pre-test was carried out to determine the early background of students' speaking skills selected as the sample both experimental and control groups. The speaking test consisted of some questions related to students' speaking skills. Third, the researcher taught speaking at Islamic University of Indragiri to both control and experimental class until eight meetings.

Fourth, the researcher distributed both of instruments in post-post to control and experiment class. Fifth, the researcher collected students' answers sheet. Fifth, the result of students' score in control and experimental classes was compared, in order to find out whether the Content-

Based Instruction is effective or not in teaching speaking. Finally, the score of the test given is used as the data of this result.

Normality Testing was analyzed by Lilliefors test. According to Sudjana (1990) Lilliefors testing is used if the number of sample (n) is equal to or smaller than 30. Therefore the lilliefors testing is used because of the number of each class is different.

Homogenity testing was conducted to see whether the data in both of treatment groups were homogeny or not. This homogenity was analyzed by Barlett test. This research was done homogenity variants by testing homogenity of three cells group experiments design.

Level of achievement was conducted to observe how far the achievement Improving which students can achieve after the students were taught with TBLT and CBI method.

The formula which were used to compute Level of Achievement (LOA) were :

$$LOA_{Pretest} = \frac{\sum X_{Pretest}}{\sum X_{Max\ Pretest}} \times 100\%$$

$$LOA_{Posttest} = \frac{\sum X_{Posttest}}{\sum X_{max\ Posttest}} \times 100\%$$

$$\% \text{ Improving } LOA = \frac{LOA_{Posttest} - LOA_{Pretest}}{LOA_{Pretest}} \times 100\%$$

Where, LOA = Level of Achievement ; X = Test Speaking Score

Level of motivation was conducted to observe how far the motivation Improving which students can achieve after the students were taught with TBLT and CBI method

The formula which were used to compute Level of Motivation (LOM) were :

$$LOM_{Pretest} = \frac{\sum X_{Pretest}}{\sum X_{Max\ Pretest}} \times 100\%$$

$$LOM_{Posttest} = \frac{\sum X_{Posttest}}{\sum X_{max\ Posttest}} \times 100\%$$

$$\% \text{ Improving } LOM = \frac{LOM_{Posttest} - LOM_{Pretest}}{LOM_{Pretest}} \times 100\%$$

Where, LOM = Level of Motivation ; X = Questionnaire Test.

The hypotheses are formulated follows:
1. The first hypotheses

   Ho   Teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction gives different effect on students' speaking skill than teaching speaking by using Task-Based Language Teaching

   Ha   Teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction gives the same effect on students' speaking skill as teaching speaking by using Task-Based Language Teaching.

The statistics hypothesis could be written as follow:

   Ho   : $\mu\ A_1 \neq \mu\ A_2$
   H$_a$: $\mu\ A_1 = \mu\ A_2$

2. The second hypotheses

   Ho   Content-Based Instruction gives different effect on students' speaking motivation than Task-Based Language Teaching.

   Ha   Content-Based Instruction gives the same effect on students' speaking motivation as Task-Based Language Teaching.

The statistics hypothesis could be written as follow:

$$H_o \quad : \mu\, A_1 \neq \mu\, A_2$$
$$H_a \quad : \mu\, A_1 = \mu\, A_2$$

The next step is to do a t-test. The formula is follow:

$$t = \frac{X_2 - X_1}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1-1).S_1^2 + (n_2-1).S_2^2}{n_1+n_2-2}\left(\frac{1}{n_1}+\frac{1}{n_2}\right)}} \text{, Sudjana}$$

(1990)

Where:

X_1 : Mean of sample 1
S_{12} : Variance of sample 1
X_2 : Mean of sample 2
S_{22} : Variance of sample 2
$S1$: Deviation standard of sample 1
n_1 : Number of sample 1
S_2 : Deviation standard of sample 2
$n2$: Number of sample 2

Findings And Discussion

     The first hypotheses was tested based on speaking test data. The hypothesis was tested by using t test with significant level $\propto$: 0.05. The value of t score was compared with the value of t table. From the data analysis, it was found that there is no differences on the students' speaking skill between those who taught by using TBLT and CBI after having the treatments. For further description, it can be seen in the table below:

Table 5: The Summary of First Hypothesis

No	Category	Methods		
		Parameters	TBLT	CBI
1	Data	N		
			30	30
		X	23.63	24.10
		S^2	5,96	5,75
2	Value of t	0.75		
3	t table	1.672		
4	Conclusion	Not significantly different		

     The table above shows that t table at level significance $\propto$: 0.05 of 58 is 1.672 while t score was 0.75. The criteria of accepting Ha is the value of t is located between − 1.672 and 1.672. If t is bigger than 1.672 hence accepting Ho.

     Thus, based on these results, it was concluded teaching speaking by using TLBT give the same effect than teaching speaking by using CBI. It means that Ha is accepted ; There is no differences effect on the students' speaking skill between those who taught by using TLBT and CBI.

     The second hypotheses was tested based on questionnaire data. The hypothesis was tested by using t test with significant level $\propto$: 0.05. The value of t score was compared with the value of t table. From the data analysis, it was found that there is differences on the students' motivation between those who taught by using TBLT and CBI after having the treatments based on TBLT and CBI theories toward student's speaking motivation. For further description, it can be seen in the table below:

Table 6: The Summary of Second Hypothesis

No	Category	Methods		
		Parameters	TBLT	CBI
1	Data	N		
			30	30
		X	5.29	5.52
		S^2	1.33	0.94
2	Value of t	4.69		
3	t table	1.648		
4	Conclusion	Significantly different		

     The table above shows that t table at level significance $\propto$: 0.05 of 888 is 1.648 while t score was 4.69. The criteria of accepting Ha is the value of t is located between − 1.648 and 1.648.

If *t* is bigger than 1.648 hence accepting Ho.

Thus, based on these results, it was concluded teaching speaking by using TLBT gives the different effect than teaching speaking by using CBI. It means that Ha is rejected; There is the same effect on the students' motivation between those who taught by using TBLT and CBI.

Based on statistical analysis of the hypotheses testing, it was found that teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching gave the same effect on students' speaking skill. Then, teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching gave the different effect on students' speaking motivation. Therefore, there are two findings which would be discussed here:

The first finding showed that teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching gave the same effect on students' speaking skill. It showed that mean score of speaking skill at CBI class was similar to students' mean score in TBLT class. This is in line with Richards &Rodgers (2001) who state that CBI and TBLT are considered as Communicative Language Teaching. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) claimed that the goal of language teaching is to develop "Communicative Competence" in learners and paid attention to all of the four skills. Therefore, based on this theory, it is obvious that CBI and TBLT had proved that it gave a significant effect toward students' achievement in speaking skill.

Besides, the CBI and TBLT are not only helping the students to understand the concept of the material presented by the English teacher, but also as the way to integrate and apply knowledge and skill in all subject, included speaking skill. In other words, CBI and TBLT provide students with an opportunity to practice skills or learn content presented by the teacher.

Moreover, the elements of CBI such as presentation, practice and production and the elements of TBLT such as pre task, task, planning, report, analysis and practice are also believed as a trigger for students to be successful in speaking skill. For instance in CBI class, the students can develop their language skills as well as gain access to new concepts through meaningful content. It means that Content-Based Instruction is one of the effective ways in developing the language skill by integrating both language and content in instructional context. It is consistent with the theory proposed by Krashen (1982) define CBI as:

> Content Based Instruction is the learning method to the language through academic content, engaging in activities, developing proficiency in academic discourse, and fostering the development of effective learning strategies.

Besides, in TBLT class the activities of language learning involve the students in real communication that support their process of learning. Here, the activities focus on the interactive process where the students involve in a meaningful context. Speaking and trying to communicate with others through the spoken language drawing on the learner's available linguistic and communicative resources are considered the basis for language acquisition in TBLT.

Both CBI and TBLT gave significant effect on students' speaking skill. Here, the performance of low ability students can be improved because these students receive more elaborated explanation from the content and the task used in teaching and learning process. Through CBI and TBLT which emphasized on group work, the students can discuss, share their knowledge and idea with their friends in order to improve their speaking skill without afraid of making mistake.

In line with Harmer (2001) notes that the students' speaking activities in the classroom refers to the communicative approach. CBI and TBLT are considered as Communicative Language Teaching. Here, both in CBI and TBLT class, the activities must be design based on communicative language teaching which maintaining at communicative purposes. Actually there are some characteristics of communicative activities which are stated by Harmer (2001). Actually, the students speaking activities have to refer to communicative activities because they will help the students to master the skill well. In communicative activities such as in CBI and TBLT class, the students have desire to communicate about something, their purpose must be clear. Then, they have to focus on content of what they are saying. They should use variety of language rather than just one language structure. The teachers will not intervene to stop students' activities. So, the communicative activities above create real communication situations. It is clear that CBI and TBLT gave significant effect on students' speaking skill.

The successful of students in academic achievement in term of speaking skill is also determined by the syllabus design. Both syllabuses in CBI and TBLT were designed based on the students' needs. For example in CBI class, the syllabus was designed based on language learning goals. It is organized based on specific topics and subtopics. While in TBLT class, the syllabus was design based on the specific the tasks that should be carried out by learners within a program.

Another aspect which also contributed to success of students' speaking skill in CBI and TBLT class was the role of material. The material in CBI and TBLT class was authentic and taken from various sources. For example in CBI and TBLT class, the students were given the material from various sources such as newspapers, articles, and any other media. It is consistent with the theory proposed by Richards and Rodgers (2011) who state that it is recommended that a rich variety of materials types be identified and used with the central concern being the notion that the materials should be authentic.

The second finding showed that teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction and Task-Based Language Teaching gave the different effect on students' speaking motivation. It showed that mean score of speaking motivation at CBI class was higher than students' mean score in TBLT class. It means that the CBI method can make students became more motivated than TBLT method. CBI provides the students with wide opportunities to participate in all learning activities. In CBI class, the students and the teacher participate together in selecting topics and themes

they used in teaching and learning process. For example in CBI class, the students can relate some contents to their own experience. They discussed some topics in the classroom. The students are very motivated and participate actively during teaching and learning process because of the topics of the material are interesting and enjoying for them.

Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is better than Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) on students' speaking motivation because in CBI the student learn about the subject using the language they are trying to learn, rather than their native language, as a tool for developing their linguistic ability in the target language. This reason closely related to Peachey (2005) who stated that the focus of a CBI lesson is on the topic or subject matter. This could be anything that interests students. They learn about this subject using the language they are trying to learn, rather than their native language, as a tool for developing their linguistic ability in the target language. This is thought to be a more natural way of developing language ability and improve their motivation in language learning especially in speaking class.

Moreover, CBI and TBLT gave the different effect on the students' speaking motivation because there are some factors affecting their motivation such as intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, attitude, anxiety and also motivational strength. These factors gave the different effect on CBI and TBLT class.

Another thing which also contributed to the students' speaking motivation was the role of teacher. In CBI classroom, the teacher also provides students with great opportunity to get involved among students through group work and discussion session. These strategies enable students to have a chance to participate actively is not only in their group but also in whole class. Then, related to students' preparedness, the CBI activity also has individual quiz for each student. The individual quiz is also considered as a contributor to make students well prepared and motivated in following classroom activities. The individual quiz in CBI class emphasizes on students' preparedness and their motivation because the score of individual quiz will determine the group score. If the group members fail to prepare themselves to take individual quiz, it will make the group member fail to have highest group reward. In short, quiz in CBI activity has contributed to students' preparedness and enhance their motivation in speaking class.

Compare to the students in control class taught by using TBLT, the researcher found that the students were not motivated enough in teaching and learning process. These facts happened because the students were not challenging in speaking practice. Most of the activities in TBLT class only focus on the role play task. The student did the same task and did not have many chances to communicate to the whole class because they should memorize the dialogue in role play task. During the research, the researcher found the weaknesses of TBLT in improving students' speaking motivation. First, teaching and learning process was dominated by the group performance in role play task. The students did not have the chance to communicate to the all class members because they only focus on their performance. Second, in TBLT

class the teacher cannot control the whole class. While some students performed in their task, some other students were busy with their own activities.

Based on the discussion above, it could be concluded that CBI and TBLT gave the same effect on students' speaking skill and different effect on students' speaking motivation.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings above, it could be concluded that:

1. Teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) gave the same effect on students' speaking skill. It can be seen from the mean score both of experimental class and control class. The students' mean score of experimental class who were taught by Content-Based Instruction (CBI) was the same as the students' mean score who taught by Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). It means that both Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching are equally significant in improving students' speaking skill.
2. Teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) gave different effect on students' speaking motivation. The finding showed that the mean score of students' speaking motivation who were taught by using Content-Based Instruction (CBI) was significantly better than the mean score of control class students who were taught by Task-Based

Language Teaching (TBLT). Students' mean score of experiment class was higher than students' speaking motivation mean score of control class. It means that teaching speaking by using Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is better than teaching speaking by using Task-Based Language Teaching on students' speaking motivation.

Suggestion

Based on the research findings and conclusions above, the researcher would like to propose following suggestions:

1. English teacher at Islamic University Indragiri are suggested to use Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as an alternative teaching method in teaching speaking especially if the material focuses on skill development.
2. English teacher at Islamic University Indragiri are suggested to implement Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as variation of teaching method in order to improve students' speaking skill and students' speaking motivation.
3. Other researchers who are interested in carrying out a research in using Task-Based language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-Based Instruction (CBI) are suggested to conduct these research findings in order to have better results.

Note: This article was written based on the writer's thesis at Pasca Sarjana State University of Padang supervised by Prof. Dr. Mukhaiyar,M.Pd and Dr. Desmawati Radjab, M.Pd

References

Brinton, D.M., M.A Snow, and M. B. Wesche. 1989. *Content- Based Second language instruction.* New York: Newbury House.

Brown, H. Doughlas.2010. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices.* San Francisco: Pearson Education

Brown. 2004. *Language Assessment: Principle and Classroom Practices.* San Francisco: Pearson Education

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching.* Third Edition. Prentice Hall Regents.

Burgress, Peter. A. 1994. *"Achieving Accuracy in Oral Communication through Collaborative Learning". English Teaching Forum.* Number 3 July 1994.

Bygate, Martin. 2001. Speaking. In Ronal Carter, David Nunan (Eds.), The. *Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speaker of Other Languages* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Canale, M., & Swain. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistic, I*, 1-47.

Celce-Murcia, M. (ed). (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language,* 3 rd edition. Boston, MA: Heinle &Heinle.

Cohen, Andrew D. 1994. *Learning Style and Pedagogy in Post 16 Learning: Systematic and Critical Review.* London: Crowell Press Ltd.

Crookes, Graham; Schmidt, Richard W.' Motivation: reopening the research agenda.' Language Learning; v41 n4. 1991.

Gay, L. R and Peter, Airisian. 2009. *Educational Research: competencies for analysis and application (6th ed).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Crandall, J. (ed.) 1987. ESL through Content-Area Instruction: Mathematics, Science, Social Studies. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall.

Dimitracopoulo, I. (1990) Conversational Competence and Social Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feez, S. 1998. *Text-Based Syllabus Design.* Sydney: National Centre for English Teaching Research.

Gardner, Robert C., and Lambert, Wallace E. 1972. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning.* Newburg House.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Education Ltd.

Hedge, Tricia. (2008). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Kayi, Hayriye. 2006. "Teaching Speaking: Activities to Promote in Second Language "The Internet TESL Journal. Vol. XII, II. Retrieved on July 25itesl.org/article/kayi.teaching speaking.html.

Krashen, S.D., Long, M., & Scarcella, R. (1982) Age, rate, and eventual attainment in second language acquisition. In S. D. Krashen, R. Scarcella, & M.

Long (Eds.), *Child-adult differences in second language acquisition* (PP. 175201). Rowley, MA: Newburg House

Krahnke, K. 1987. *Approach to Syllabus Design for Foreign Language Teaching.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (1993). *How languages are learned.* NY: Oxford University Press.

Long, M., and G Crookes. 1993. Units of analysis in course design-the case for task. In G. Crookes and S. Gass (eds.), Task in a Pedagogical Context: Integrating Theory and Practice. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mohan, B. 1986. *Language and Content.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Norris, J., J. Brown, T. Hudson, and J. Yoshioka. 1998. *Designing Second Language Performance Assessments.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Notion, I. S. P and Newton, Jonathan. 2009. Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking. London: Rutledge.

Nunan, D. 1989. Designing Task for the Communicative Classroom. New York: Cambridge University Press.

O' Malley, J Michael and L. V. Pierece. 1996. Authentic Assessment for English Language Learners: Practical Approach for Teachers. Ontario: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Pica, T., R. Kanagy, and J. Falodun. 1993. Choosing and using communicative task for second language instruction. In G. Crookes and S. Gass (eds.) ,

Task-and Language Learning : Integrating Theory and Practice. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 9-34.

Richard, Jack. C. 1990. *The Language Teaching Matrix.* Washington D. C: Cambridge University Press.

Richard, J. C. and Rodgers, T.S. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richard, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (2002) *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 204-211.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78

Scarcella, R. C., Oxford, R. L. (1992). The tapestry of language learning: *The Individual in the Communicative Classroom.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Schmidt, R., Boraie, D., & Kassabgy, O. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connection in R. Oxford (Ed.) Language Learning Motivation Path Ways to New Century (pp 9-70). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Shumin, K. (2002). Factors to consider: Developing adult EFL students'. In J. C. Richards and W. A. Renandya (eds), *Methodology in Language Teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 204-211.

Skehan, P. 1996a. A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 17(1): 38-61.

Stoller, F. (1997) *"Project work: A means to promote language content"*. English Teaching Forum 35, 4: 2-9.