

A Critical Review on the Discussion of Developing Speaking Skills Through Task-Based Material

Ika Handayani^{1,a)}, Ilza Mayuni^{2,b)}, Zuriyati Koto^{3,c)}

¹ Universitas Negeri Jakarta-Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa Banten,

² Universitas Negeri Jakarta

³ Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Email: ^{a)} IkaHandayani_9906920011@mhs.unj.ac.id, ^{b)} ilza.mayuni@unj.ac.id, ^{c)} zuriyati.pbaunj@gmail.com

Abstract

This study is aimed to review critically on the discussion of Developing Speaking Skills Through Task Based Materials by relating those findings with the theories and books and articles in reputed journal. This review elaborated on the strengths and the weaknesses of the article content. The source data were from whole content of the article that discussed about processing action on improving speaking through the implementation of Task Based Material. The method used in this study is Systemic Literature Review to identify, study, evaluate, and interpret the research about interesting phenomenon with certain relevant research. Every data is linked to studies which have the same discussion either from theories, books and relevant articles published in reputed journal. The data is analyzed using Content analysis is used to analyze the content of the article as the main data. The findings showed that there were not discussed clearly about abstract information; moves organization in introduction; lack of current and relevant studies and theories; unsystematic findings related to the proposed research questions; and the term used in the article. Hopefully this review can help the teacher/lecturer of English of EFL and the lecturers of Speaking to vary their teaching by implementing task based language teaching in speaking class in the detail and clear steps of action. By showing more and current studies related to the issue undertaken, it will enrich discussion of the implementation of certain strategy or methods and brighten the discussion of teaching and learning speaking.

Keywords: *speaking skills, task based materials, critical review*

Introduction

This article is aimed to have critical review on certain discussion in the teaching and learning speaking including the strengths (things that could enrich the teaching and learning of English speaking skill and develop knowledge and

references academically) and the weaknesses (things that have not discussed further and explored well) of the discussion in the article entitled: Developing Speaking Skills Through Task Based Materials (Masuram and Sripada 2020). The technique of analyzing data was content analysis that focused on whole content of the article. Then the result of the critical review is discussed in the findings and implication. Each finding are supported by relevant theories and articles from the books and reputed journals that elaborated current issue in the teaching and learning English speaking.

This review has a basic purpose to promote creative and innovative way in teaching English Speaking skill, so that the readers either as teachers, students or researchers are also asked to be more critical in finding current and relevant studies to support literature review and findings of the research or study about English speaking skills. Hopefully, what have been discussed in this article could be insightful knowledge and references to the academic world.

Mastering speaking skill is still challenging issue for students who learn either English in EFL or ESL classes. Since it is one of productive skills, so the learners so be implemented in should consider the language they produce both in conveying ideas, feelings or thought and responding toward ones' utterances and expressions directly. In speaking, consideration of being interactive and responsive are dominated when speakers have their taking in turn (Thornbury 2005). In the context of the teaching and learning English, many students have focus on reaching the goal, it is being success in mastering oral proficiency (Dincer 2017). In short, speaking is urgent to be learned and interesting to be discussed in the context of teaching and learning English.

Task based language teaching is not a new approach in the teaching language methodology . Since it is introduced to the educational field, teachers and leacturers as the educational practioners have implemented this approach either focus on the teaching, learning and the material development and it is still interesting to be discussed about. The researcher has found some discussions about task based teaching in reputed journal like scopus and Sinta. One was conducted in 2003 conducted by Carless under the tittle Factors in the Implementation of Task-Based Teaching in Primary Schools (Carless 2003). The focus of the research were the teacher's beliefs, teacher's understanding, the syllabus

time available, the textbook and the topics, preparation and the available resources, and the language proficiency of the students. There are also many researchers have talked and shared their findings of the research both exploring theoretically and practically. Those research focused on Task based teaching language: (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011); (Marzban and Mokhberi 2012); (Najjari 2014). Research that focused on Theories, findings and discussions on Task Based Materials: (Dempsey and Mathiassen 2006), (Harper and Widodo 2020); (Suhandoko 2019); (Wijayatiningsih, Lestariningsih, and Agustina 2020); (Yundayani and Sri Ardiasih 2021); (Yundayani, Kardijan, and Herawan 2019). Some books are also can be insightful input to develop the ideas and supporting arguments for further research: (Nunan 2010) and (Hawkes 2019). So, this critical review focused on the strengths and weaknesses of its whole content and discussion and the link to relevant studies/ issues. All articles are published in reputed journals (Sinta and Scopus) published by SAGE, Elsevier, Tailor and Francis, Routledge, Cambridge, and Wiley.

Literature Review

Speaking is one of English skills that must be learned and mastered by EFL learners. Teaching speaking to EFL learners means helping the students develop specific sets of interactional and communication skills, because spoken communication take in a real time (Hinkel 2018); (Leonard and Shea 2017);(Roever and Kasper 2018) . Speaking requires the development of speech processing and oral production skills which almost always include accurate pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary as well as information sequencing and discourse organization (Halimah, Lustyantie, and Ali I 2018); (Menggo et al. 2019);

In recent years, teaching English speaking to higher educational students, university students, the main role is leading the students to construct the learning assumptions that seek to improve students autonomy, motivations and achievement. Teacher/lecturer form the students have self determined learning by putting learners in control of their own learning, moving beyond the development of knowledge and skill, and instead of focusing on the capability, that is the ability to integrate and effectively apply a new knowledge and skills in unanticipated situations (Stoszkowski and Mccarthy 2019); (Ekoç 2020); (Lumettu and Runtuwene

2018) . Dincer added that speaking English fluently can bring forward people in their career because it can make them speak clearly while delivering information and materials (Bustari, Samad, and Achmad 2017); . Therefore, people will not have any misunderstanding in communication while working on their jobs (Dincer 2017); Discussion on teaching speaking, hopefully the learners of speaking skill will earn much knowledge, have many experiences, decide smart steps in solving the problems, having mutual collaboration, skillful in communicating the feeling, thoughts and argument/ ideas by exploring and empowering information and technology as digital or printed sources (Lestari 2019); (Bustari, Samad, and Achmad 2017b); (Noviyenty 2018).

Since the 1980s, task-based language instruction has gotten increased attention in the field of foreign language education. It examines learner as a communicative tool since it is a learner-centered approach. The task-based approach strives to provide chances for learners to speak and write in natural, practical, and functional ways through learning activities that engage learners in the natural, practical, and functional use of language for meaningful objectives (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011). The characteristics of task based language teaching based on Swan (2005) emphasizes on:

- Instructed language learning should mainly contain natural language use and the activities are related to meaning rather than knowledge
- Instruction should support students' centered learning that teacher centered leaning
- Promoting the internationalization of formal linguistic elements while keeping the perceived benefits of natural approach
- Focus on the form that will attract students' attention to linguistic components and **emerge it to the main focus on meaning or communication** ((Marzban and Mokhberi 2012)
- Providing communicative tasks in certain device
- There is pre task and post task of language study to internalize the formal communication (Hawkes 2019)
- Requiring passive formal instruction and practice isolated from communicative works (Swan in Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011)'; (Najjari 2014).

Language learning is a developmental process that enhances communication and social interaction rather than a product internalized by practicing language items, and learners master the target language more powerfully when exposed to meaningful task based activities in a natural way. In short, task is the core unit of instructional materials in language teaching (Richard and Rodgers 2001). The task based language teaching is a teaching approach that employing tasks as its main paedagogical tools to structure language teaching (Nunan 2010).

Regarding to the Task based language teaching materials, Tasks are the key word in developing materials. Ellis (2009) in Harper and Widodo (2018) stated that the material development consist of: (1) the primary focus should be on the meaning; (2) There should be kind of gap to express the opinion or to infer the meaning); (3) complete activity between linguistic and non linguistic ones; (4) Clearly define to the outcomes rather than the use of language; (5) Focus on the comprehension of the task (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011); (Wijayatiningsih et al. 2020). While Long and Crookes (1993) in Sundari proposed how to design and develop task based design: a comprehensive needs analysis, diagnosis of learner' needs, identification of target tasks learners, the classification of the task types, selection of paedagogical tasks for the classroom, sequencing of paedagogical tasks (Sundari, Febriyanti, and Saragih 2018), (Dempsey and Mathiassen 2006); (Suhandoko 2019).

Reviewing the article is challenging choice to do as the researcher. Furthermore, it needs deep reading and empiric supporting data in terms of relevant studies as references. In writing critique, the researcher or writer will analyze, examine, or investigate with the underlying assumption by exploring critical thinking, creative thinking and critical eyes (Swales and Feak 2008). They also provided eight questions to be considered in critisizing the journal articles while reading and writing the articles. Those are (1) who is the audience; (2) what is the purpose of the article; (3) what research questions are being addressed kin the article; (4) What coclusion does the author draw from the research; (5) What kind of evidence is offered in support of the conclusion, how good is the evidence; (6) are the coclusion valid based on the evidence and why ; (7)Are there any important assumpsion underlying the article; (8) does the research make an original contribution to the field? Why?.

Method

This critical review article used qualitative method by implementing Systemic Literature Review to have deep and further discussion on this topic. Definition of SLR. Systematic Literature Review is a term used to refer to a particular research methodology or research and development carried out to collect and evaluate research related to the focus of a particular topic . Purpose of SLR research is carried out for various purposes, including identifying, reviewing, evaluating, and interpreting all available research with topic areas of interest to phenomena, with certain relevant research questions (Triandini et al. 2019). SLR used to elaborate the discussion on the article “Developing Speaking Skills Through Task Based Materials” ((Masuram and Sripada 2020). The data analyzed through content analysis which focused on the main data the content of the research article. The finding data then elaborated and confirmed them to theories in the books, previous relevant studies discussed in the articles published in Scopus(Sage, Elsevier, Routledge, Tailor and Francis, Cambridge) and Sinta.

Fndings and Interpretations

Researcher found that there were three points to be discussed futher elaborated deeply. The researcher exploring the strengths and weaknesses started from the abstract, introduction moves (by Swalles) , theories, findings and conclusion.

A. Findings and Interpretation Description

B. Abstract

2.1. Language

The first sentence in the abstrack is generalization of English as global language which is used to communicate internationally. It's statement attracted readers to find the reason that speaking English is urgent to be learned if ones want to communicate globally. However, it will be more enlighting if the word or the term communication skills in the four opening sentences in abstract, specified whether the communication skill in the discussion is an oral communication skill or speaking skills as it is stated by Swalles and Feak that some terms in certain field has

different meaning in other fields depending on the field of study (Swales and Feak 2008). So, the writer of academic or scientific paper should significantly focus on the right term based on the education field, speaking skills refers to oral communication skills and writing skills refers to written communication skills. The writer of that article keep using the term/ diction communication skill rather than using speaking skill.

2.2. Content of the Abstract

The abstract has successfully informed the reasons why this study should be conducted by stating “spoken English is a gateway to improve and achieve success in career of the students and it is taught as compulsory subject in India as well as countries”. Things that are not clear yet: telling the participant of the research whether secondary schools, high schools or university students. It was only stated the place of the research was in India. The method was not stated clearly. Instead of stating certain method like whether it was action research or case study or experimental study, the researcher’s wrote design of the research which was separated into two phases: “ pre intervention stage and intervention stage. If it an action research, so the data could be collected through test, questionnaire, observation, interview and documentation sin action research is one of mix method (Aristy, Hadiansyah, and Apsari 2019). The researcher only mentioned instrument to collect the data (questionnaire for teachers and students) but has not stated the data analysis used in this research. If it is an action research, so it use Miles and Hubberman design of anlysis: data reduction, data display and data verification(Matthew B. Miles 2014). The resaerch objectives and the finding at the closing statement of the abstract is different. It informed the objectives of the research: “ Students should use correct pronunciation and intonation, speaking coherently on certain topic”. In the closing statement the objective of research was students were able to communicate confidently and fluently. Those goals were different from the first statement of the research objectives: There was inconsintence terms used by the researchers.

C. Introduction Moves and Lierature Review

In the introduction, the researchers wrote Speaking in second language, speaking as productive skills. The researchers go directly to put all theories related to the research such as : Speaking (Sub Skills of Speaking; Essential Elements of Speaking; Function of Speaking); Task Based Language Teaching (Input and Material Used for Task; Framework for Task Based Instruction, Role of Task in Developing Speaking; Principles of Task Based Materials Development, Roles of Materials); and Approaches adapted for The Materials Design. It would have been better if the researcher inform their introduction with these points: Introduction explores the general purpose of the study, exposes significant study either practically or theoretically, has well and clear organization, establishes territory and niche, and whether it occupies the niche (Swales and Feak 2008); (McMillan and Wergin 2010).

Introduction Move by Swales and Feak, rhetorical pattern in the Create Research Space Model, CARS model (Swales and Feak 2008) . The moves are: Move 1: Establishing a research Territory (showing general research and problematic discussion; reviewing items of previous research). Move 2: Establishing a niche (indicating gap in the previous research by extending previous knowledge. Move 3: occupying the Niche (Outlining purposes, listing research questions, announcing principal findings, stating value of present research, indicating the structure of research paper).

The Literature Review commonly becomes scaffolding to the findings of the research , whether the finding would give insightful, inspiring and current information, knowledge and experience for education field. The hot finding would be beneficial significantly either theoretically and practically. The literature reviews: theories and relevant studies written to support the findings were not yet taken currently. The latest year to support the ideas was in the year: 2010 and the oldest one was 1987. The concept either basic theories or relevant studies would have been somewhat more relevant if the researcher has more recent literature to support his views (Swales and Feak 2008).

Here are the recent relevant studies to support interesting and inspiring idea and theories in this article.. The first concept was Speaking: Sub Skills of Speaking; Essential Elements of Speaking; Function of Speaking (Leonard and Shea 2017); (Roever and Kasper 2018); (Menggo et al. 2019); (Noviyenty 2018); (Bangun 2018);

(Bustari et al. 2017b); (Lestari 2019); (Saeed Al-Sobhi and Preece 2018); (Lumettu and Runtuwene 2018); (Syarifudin 2019); and (Ekoç 2020). The second concept was Task Based Language Teaching: Input and Material Used for Task; Framework for Task Based Instruction, Role of Task in Developing Speaking; Principles of Task Based Materials Development, Roles of Materials could be more deeply explored by reading these relevant articles about those points (Hawkes 2019); (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011); (Najjari 2014) (Marzban and Mokhberi 2012). The third concept was Approaches adapted for The Materials Design could be elaborated by reading all the concept in these discussions of articles (Harper and Widodo 2020); (Dempsey and Mathiassen 2006); (Carless 2003); (Suhandoko 2019); (Wijayatiningsih et al. 2020); (Yundayani et al. 2019) and (Nunan 2010). In the literature review there was a theory from Nunan, However it was still the old one published in 2004, whereas there is the recent one that published in 2010. Things to be considered well, this article published in 2020, but the references have not the latest ones yet. So, this critical review has given informative and suggested references to support the ideas and views of the articles from reputed and current journals and recent books started from 2003 (telling the story of Task Based language Teaching implementation and theories) to 2021 (suggesting the steps in developing materials through task based materials

D. Findings

In the Finding session, the writer only informed that there was improvement on the students' quality in communication skill. Its surface meaning, it was in line with the aims of the research. However, Not all supporting data collecting techniques were explored and elaborated toward the result of the research either in description data qualitatively or quantitatively.

There was not information briefly of how significant is the students' speaking skill (in the data it was stated "students' communication skill"). There was neither displaying the result of the intervention through tables nor statistic data that proven there was improvement or development after treatment by calculating the pre test or post test. It was reported that improvement could be proven on the quality of the students' communication skill community. However, it was not briefly explained what kind of quality and how that quality was measured. The interpretation of how was

the data from observation, interview, questioner, learner's diary were not available discussed in the findings. In short, the data which were collected through qualitative and quantitative (test) technique were not displayed and elaborated. It will be better if there is information about how is data collected and analyzed. Then the researcher also has to inform the descriptive of the result through displayed diagram or tables (Cresswell 2018)

Things that should be more critical is the research objective related to this findings. It was informed the objectives of the research: " Students should use correct pronunciation and intonation, speaking coherently on certain topic". The research forgot to make intonation as one of skills in mastering pronunciation Intonation is one of prosodic features in Pronunciation (van Maastricht et al. 2020); (Yangklang 2013). Another goal of this study was students could "speak coherently" rather than "speaking communicatively" as they started their statement in the early abstract, to speak commucatively and interactively (Demir, Yurtsever, and Çimenli 2015) and to focus on fluency, accuracy and complexity However the abstract was closed by informing the findings: students' development after having those two phases: having communicate confidently and friendly: students were able to communicate confidently and fluently. Those goals were different from the first statement of the research objectives: students could sspeak in correct pronunciation, intoonation and to speak coherently. There was inconsintence terms used by the researchers.

Those findings would have been more inspiring and reasonables if all supporting theories, concept and findings written by the elaboration of the current literature since knowledge and science keeps developing every year even in minutes counting.

E. Conclusion

Another finding of this critical review, was in conclusion statement. The researcher concluded that by implementing task based material students have developed their speaking skills in terms of effective communication, being fluent and being accurate in pronunciation. Whike the primary concern of this article was making the students have correct pronunciation, and intonation, and speak coherently (abstract) and another different terms of research goal was the students

can communicate confidently and fluently (in the findings). Perhaps the researchers could be more consistence in adjusting the resaerach objectives and the terms used in their articles (Leonard and Shea 2017)

B. Matrix of Critical Review

No	Part of Articles	Critical Review	References
1	Abstract	<p>1.1. Language</p> <p>Strengths: Generalization of English as global language which is used to communicate internationally. It's statement attracted readers to find the reason that speaking English is urgent to be learned if ones want to communicate globally.</p> <p>Weakness: -The term "communication skills" in the discussion will be better to focus on the term "speaking skill" or "oral skill". -The writer of academic or scientific paper should significantly focus on the right term based on the education field, speaking skills refers to oral communication skills and writing skills refers to written communication skills.</p> <p>1.2. Content</p> <p>Strengts:The abstract has successfully informed the reasons why this study should be conducted by stating "spoken English is a gateway to improve and achieve success in career of the students and it is taught as compulsory subject in India as well as countries".</p> <p>Weakness: -Not telling the participant of the research whether secondary schools, high schools or university students. It</p>	<p>Swalles and Feak states that some terms in certain field has different meaning in other fields depending on the field of study (Swales and Feak 2008)</p> <p>If it an action research, so the data could be collected</p>

		<p>was only stated the place of the research was in India.</p> <p>-Not informed The method of research. Instead of stating certain method like whether it was action research or case study or experimental study, the researcher's wrote design of the research which was separated into two phases: " pre intervention stage and intervention stage.</p> <p>-Not any information about Data Analysis.</p> <p>-The research objectives and the finding at the closing statement of the abstract is different. It informed the objectives of the research: " Students should use correct pronunciation and intonation, speaking coherently on certain topic". In the closing statement the objective of research was students were able to communicate confidently and fluently. Those goals were different from the first statement of the research objectives: There was inconsistence terms used by the researchers.</p>	<p>through test, questionnaire, observation, interview and documentation sin action research is one of mix method (Aristy, Hadiansyah, and Apsari 2019)</p> <p>If it is an action research , so it use Miles and Hubbermen design of anlysis: data reduction, data display and data verification(Matthew B. Miles 2014).</p>
2	Introduction	<p>In the introduction, the researchers wrote Speaking in second language, speaking as productive skills. The researchers go directly to put all theories related to the resaech such as : Speaking (Sub Skills of Speaking; Essensial Elements of Speaking; Function of Speaking); Task Based Language Teaching (Input and Material Used for Task; Framework for Task Based Instruction, Role of Task in Developing Speaking; Principles of Task Based Materials Development,</p>	<p>Introduction Move by Swales and Feak (2008), rhetorical pattern)</p> <p>Move 1: Establishing a research Teritory (showing general research and problematic discussion; reevewing items of previous research)</p> <p>Move 2: Establishing a niche (indicating gap in the previous research by extending previous knowledge</p>

		Roles of Materials); and Approaches adapted for The Materials Design.	Move 3: occupying the Niche (Outlining purposes, listing research questions, announcing principal findings, stating value of present research, indicating the structure of research paper) (McMillan and Wergin 2010).
3	Literature Review	<p>-The literature reviews: Theories and relevant studies written to support the findings were not yet taken currently. The latest year to support the ideas was in the year: 2010 and the oldest one was 1987.</p> <p>-Here are the recent relevant studies to support interesting and inspiring idea and theories in this article: In the literature review there was a theory from Nunan, However it was still the old one published in 2004, whereas there is the recent one that published in 2010. Things to be considered well, this article published in 2020, but the references have not the latest ones yet.</p> <p>-So, this critical review has given informative and suggested references to support the ideas and views of the articles from reputed and current journals and recent books started from 2003 (telling the story of Task Based language Teaching implementation and theories) to 2021 (suggesting the steps in developing materials through task based materials</p>	<p>The concept either basic theories or relevant studies would have been somewhat more relevant if the researcher has more recent literature to support his views (Swales and Feak 2008).</p> <p>-The first concept was Speaking: Sub Skills of Speaking; Essential Elements of Speaking (Leonard and Shea 2017); (Roever and Kasper 2018); (Menggo et al. 2019); (Noviyenty 2018); (Bangun 2018); (Bustari et al. 2017b); (Lestari 2019); (Saeed Al-Sobhi and Preece 2018); (Lumettu and Runtuwene 2018); (Syarifudin 2019); and (Ekoç 2020).</p> <p>-The second concept was Task Based Language Teaching: Input and Material Used for Task; Framework for Task Based Instruction, Role of Task in Developing Speaking; Principles of Task Based Materials Development,</p>

			<p>Roles of Materials could be more deeply explored by reading these relevant articles about those points (Hawkes 2019); (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu 2011); (Najjari 2014) (Marzban and Mokhberi 2012).</p> <p>-The third concept was Approaches adapted for The Materials Design could be elaborated by reading all the concept in these discussions of articles (Harper and Widodo 2020); (Dempsey and Mathiassen 2006); (Carless 2003); (Suhandoko 2019); (Wijayatiningsih et al. 2020); (Yundayani et al. 2019) and (Nunan 2010).</p>
3	Findings	<p>-In the Finding session, the writers only informed that there was improvement on the students' quality in communication skill. At glance, it seems that it was in line with the aims of the research. However, Not all supporting data collecting techniques were explored and elaborated to ward the result of the research either in description data qualitatively or quantitatively.</p> <p>-Not any information briefly of how significant is the students' speaking skill (in the data it was stated "students' communication skill").</p> <p>-No displayed result of the intervention through tables nor statistic data that proven there was improvement or</p>	

		<p>development after treatment by calculating the pre test or post test.</p> <p>Not briefly explanation of what kind of quality and how that quality was measured. The interpretation of how was the data from observation, interview, questioner, learner's diary were not available discussed in the findings.</p> <p>-In short, the data which were collected through qualitative and quantitative (test) technique were not displayed and elaborated.</p> <p>- Things that should be more critical is the research objective related to this findings. It was informed the objectives of the research: " Students should use correct pronunciation and intonation, speaking coherently on certain topic.</p> <p>-Another goal of this study was students could "speak coherently" rather than "speaking communicatively"</p> <p>-The abstract was closed by informing the findings: students' development after having those two phases: having communicate confidently and friendly: students were able to communicate confidently and fluently. Those goals were different from the first statement of the research objectives: students could speak in correct pronunciation, intoonation and to speak coherently. There was inconsintence terms used by the researchers.</p> <p>Those findings would have been more inspiring and reasonables if all supporting theories, concept and</p>	<p>.-The research forgot to make intonation as one of skills in mastering pronunciation Intonation is one of prosodic features in Pronunciation (van Maastricht et al. 2020); (Yangklang 2013).</p> <p>to speak commucatively and interactively (Demir et al. 2015) and to focus on fluency, accuracy and complexity</p>
--	--	---	--

		findings written by the elaboration of the current literature since knowledge and science keeps developing every year even in minutes counting.	
5	Conclusion	<p>-The researcher concluded that by implementing task based material students have developed their speaking skills in terms of effective communication, being fluent and being accurate in pronunciation.</p> <p>-While the primary concern of this article was making the students have correct pronunciation, and intonation, and speak coherently (abstract) and another different terms of research goal was the students can communicate confidently and fluently (in the findings).</p>	The writers could be more consistence in adjusting the research objectives and the terms used in their articles (Leonard and Shea 2017)

Conclusion and Suggestion

This critical review has got the points to be suggested based on the findings: the abstract content, Introduction moves which was blended and integrated to the discussion of literature review and the findings, the conclusion that showed different terms in showing the result related to the research objectives. The finding also was not elaborated well in displaying the data from qualitative and quantitative instruments. The data will be meaningful result if those data was explained in detail through tables or diagram to show significant improvement/ development. The references in the literature review was in discussion of relevant theories and concepts taken from the year of 1989 to 2007, whereas this article published in 2020. So this critical review has given informative and suggested references to support the ideas and views of the articles from reputed and current journals and recent books started from 2003 (telling the story of Task Based language Teaching implementation and theories) to 2021 (suggesting the steps in developing materials through task based materials). Hopefully it will be more insightful for the next

researcher to make this article for their supporting ideas and views as one of relevant references.

References

- Aristy, Ismi, Rega Hadiansyah, and Yanuarti Apsari. 2019. "USING THREE STEP-INTERVIEW TO IMPROVE STUDENT'S SPEAKING ABILITY." *PROJECT (Professional Journal of English Education)* 2(2). doi: 10.22460/project.v2i2.p175-180.
- Bangun, Betty Kasita. 2018. "Improving Students' Speaking Skill By Using Show And Tell Method: A Classroom Action Research." *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education* 2(1). doi: 10.22437/ijolte.v2i1.4517.
- Bustari, Ahmad, Iskandar Abdul Samad, and Diana Achmad. 2017a. "The Use of Podcasts in Improving Students' Speaking Skill." *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education)*. doi: 10.26486/jele.v3i2.256.
- Bustari, Ahmad, Iskandar Abdul Samad, and Diana Achmad. 2017b. "The Use of Podcasts in Improving Students' Speaking Skill." *JELE (Journal of English Language and Education)* 3(2):97. doi: 10.26486/jele.v3i2.256.
- Carless, David R. 2003. "Factors in the Implementation of Task-Based Teaching in Primary Schools." 31:485–500. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2003.03.002.
- Cresswell, John W. & J. Davi. Creswell. 2018. *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th Editio. Sage.
- Demir, Ayca, Ay egül Yurtsever, and Betül Çimenli. 2015. "The Relationship between Tertiary Level EFL Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Their Willingness to Use Communicative Activities in Speaking." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199:613–19. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.616.
- Dempsey, Patrick G., and Svend Erik Mathiassen. 2006. "On the Evolution of Task-Based Analysis of Manual Materials Handling, and Its Applicability in Contemporary Ergonomics." *Applied Ergonomics* 37(1 SPEC. ISS.):33–43. doi: 10.1016/j.apergo.2004.11.004.
- Dincer, A. 2017. "EFL Learners Beliefs about Speaking English and Being Good Speaker: A Mathapor Analysis." *Universal Journal of Education Research*. 104-112.
- Ekoç, Arzu. 2020. "Teaching Speaking with Works of Art in a Preparatory Class at University." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. doi: 10.1080/17501229.2020.1824232.
- Halimah, Ninuk Lustyantie, and Gufron Ali I. 2018. "Students' Perception on The Implementation of Oral Application in CLL Method in Teaching Speaking." *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies_ JEELS* 5(1):1–21.
- Harper, John, and Handoyo Puji Widodo. 2020. "Perceptual Mismatches in the Interpretation of Task-Based ELT Materials: A Micro-Evaluation of a Task-Based English Lesson." *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 14(2):114–32. doi: 10.1080/17501229.2018.1502773.
- Hawkes, Martin. 2019. "Book Review." *System* 81:211–13. doi: 10.1016/j.system.2019.01.011.
- Hinkel, E. L. I. 2018. "Teaching Speaking in Integrated-Skills Classes." doi:

- 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0256.
- Hismanoglu, Murat, and Sibel Hismanoglu. 2011. "Task-Based Language Teaching: What Every EFL Teacher Should Do." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15:46–52. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049.
- Leonard, Karen Ruth, and Christine E. Shea. 2017. "L2 Speaking Development During Study Abroad: Fluency, Accuracy, Complexity, and Underlying Cognitive Factors." *Modern Language Journal* 101(1):179–93. doi: 10.1111/modl.12382.
- Lestari, Novita. 2019. "Improving the Speaking Skill by Vlog (Video Blog) as Learning Media: The EFL Students Perspective." *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 9(1):915–25. doi: 10.6007/ijarbss/v9-i1/5490.
- Lumettu, A., and T. L. Runtuwene. 2018. "Developing the Students' English Speaking Ability Through Impromptu Speaking Method." in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. Vol. 953.
- van Maastricht, Lieke, Tim Zee, Emiel Krahmer, and Marc Swerts. 2020. "The Interplay of Prosodic Cues in the L2: How Intonation, Rhythm, and Speech Rate in Speech by Spanish Learners of Dutch Contribute to L1 Dutch Perceptions of Accentedness and Comprehensibility." *Speech Communication* (April). doi: 10.1016/j.specom.2020.04.003.
- Marzban, Amir, and Mehraein Mokhberi. 2012. "The Effect of Focus on Form Instruction on Intermediate EFL Learners' Grammar Learning in Task-Based Language Teaching." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46:5340–44. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.435.
- Masuram, Jyothi, and Pushpa Nagini Sripada. 2020. "ScienceDirect ScienceDirect." *Procedia Computer Science* 172(2019):60–65. doi: 10.1016/j.procs.2020.05.009.
- Matthew B. Miles, Michael Huberman. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook 2nd Edition*.
- McMillan, James H., and Jon F. Wergin. 2010. *Understanding and Evaluating Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Menggo, Sebastianus, Made I. Suastra, Made Budiarsa, and Ni Nyoman Padmadewi. 2019. "Needs Analysis of Academic-English Speaking Material in Promoting 21 St Century Skills." 12(2):739–54.
- Najjari, Rahim. 2014. "Implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching in Iran: Theoretical and Practical Considerations." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 98:1307–15. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.547.
- Noviyenty, Leffi. 2018. "Strategies in Learning and Techniques in Teaching English Speaking." *ENGLISH FRANCA : Academic Journal of English Language and Education* 2(1). doi: 10.29240/ef.v2i1.454.
- Nunan, David. 2010. "A Task-Based Approach to Materials Development." *Advances in Language and Literary Studies* 1(2). doi: 10.7575/aiac.all.v.1n.2p.135.
- Richard, C., and T. Rodgers. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Roever, Carsten, and Gabriele Kasper. 2018. "Speaking in Turns and Sequences: Interactional Competence as a Target Construct in Testing Speaking." *Language Testing* 35(3):331–55. doi: 10.1177/0265532218758128.
- Saeed Al-Sobhi, Bandar Mohammad, and Abdul Shakour Preece. 2018. "Teaching English Speaking Skills to the Arab Students in the Saudi School in Kuala

- Lumpur: Problems and Solutions.” *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies* 6(1). doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.6n.1p.1.
- Stoszkowski, John, and Liam Mccarthy. 2019. “Students’ Perceptions of the Learner Attributes Required for (and Resulting from) Heutagogical Learning.” (14).
- Suhandoko. 2019. “CLIL Oriented and Task Based EFL Materials Development.” *ELT Worldwide* 6(2).
- Sundari, Hanna, Rina Husnaini Febriyanti, and Gustaman Saragih. 2018. “Using Task-Based Materials in Teaching Writing for EFL Classes in Indonesia.” *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 7(3):119. doi: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.119.
- Swales, John M., and Christine B. Feak. 2008. *Academic Writing For Graduate Students*. Michigan USA: The University of Michigan Press.
- Syarifudin, Syarifudin. 2019. “AN INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL FOR ENHANCING EFL LEARNERS’ SPEAKING PROFICIENCY.” *EDULANGUE* 2(1). doi: 10.20414/edulangue.v2i1.922.
- Thornbury, Scott. 2005. *How to Teach Speaking*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Triandini, E., S. Jayanatha, A. Indrawan, G. W. Putra, and B. Iswara. 2019. “Metode Systematic Literature Review Untuk Identifikasi Platform Dan Metode Pengembangan Sistem Informasi Di Indonesia.” 1(2).
- Wijayatiningsih, Testiana Deni, Enny Dwi Lestariningsih, and Dwi Ampuni Agustina. 2020. “Designing Scientific Writing Materials Using Task Based Language Teaching.” *Lensa: Kajian Kebahasaan, Kesusastraan, Dan Budaya* 8(2). doi: 10.26714/lensa.8.2.2018.219-233.
- Yangklang, Warisara. 2013. “Improving English Stress and Intonation Pronunciation of the First Year Students of Nakhon Ratchasima Rajabhat University through an E-Learning.” *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 91(1999):444–52. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.08.442.
- Yundayani, Audi, Dian Kardijan, and Tutut Herawan. 2019. “Integrating ICT in English for Academic Purposes Materials through Task-Based Approach.” *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning* 14(17). doi: 10.3991/ijet.v14i17.10753.
- Yundayani, Audi, and Lidwina Sri Ardiasih. 2021. “Task-Based Material Design for Academic Purposes: Learners’ English Writing Skill Improvement.” *Studies in English Language and Education* 8(1). doi: 10.24815/siele.v8i1.18169.