

TASK-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING (TBLT) FOR ENGLISH CLASS IN INDONESIA

Dony Efriza¹, Yetti Zainil², Hermawati Syarif³, M. Zaim⁴

¹. Universitas Jambi, ^{2,3,4} Universitas Negeri Padang
donyefriza@student.unp.ac.id

KEYWORD

TBLT, Language Skills, English Class

ABSTRACT

The principal objective of English language instruction in Indonesia is to furnish Indonesian pupils with the ability to communicate effectively in English. The English communicative skills of Indonesian school graduates have been found to be low, which can be attributed to the prevalent use of traditional student-centered approaches that emphasise linguistic structural properties. Additionally, the lack of exposure to and usage of the target language in the classroom further contributes to this issue. A limited number of students possess the ability to effectively convey concepts, perspectives, and emotions utilising English as a means of interaction. The objective of this review article is to advocate for the effectiveness of the task-based language teaching (TBLT) approach in enhancing the communicative abilities of students in Indonesia. This paper utilises various theoretical frameworks and empirical studies to undertake a critical examination of the advantages and drawbacks associated with the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Indonesia. The argument posits that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) facilitates organic learning, engenders inherent motivation among students, and fosters the development of language skills, which may result in an expedited enhancement of communicative proficiency.

INTRODUCTION

English language teaching in Indonesia has been mandated to prioritise communicative competence as the primary objective in various Indonesian national curriculums for several decades (Ariatna, 2016; Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016; Musthafa, 2001). In Indonesia, the pedagogy of English language instruction prioritises equipping Indonesian students with the ability to effectively communicate using the English language, rather than solely emphasising the mastery of grammatical structures and linguistic properties of the language. The English communicative competence of Indonesian school graduates has been observed to remain low. This can be attributed to the widespread use of traditional teacher-centered approaches that emphasised English linguistic forms or grammar, as noted by Kustati et al. (2018), and the insufficient exposure to and utilisation of the target language in the classroom, as pointed out by Musthafa (2001). This observation has been supported by the findings of Gani et al. (2015), Madya (2002), and Nur (2004). According to Musthafa's (2001) findings, English is solely utilised by Indonesian educators in the classroom for the purpose of greeting students at the commencement of the lesson and concluding the lesson at its termination. In addition, it has been observed that classroom learning activities prioritise the instruction of grammar over promoting the utilisation of the target language among students (Kustati et al., 2018). As a result, a limited number of students at the senior high school level in Indonesia possess the ability to effectively articulate their ideas, thoughts, and emotions using English as a means of communication, as noted by Gani et al. (2015). Scholars have contended that the English language education provided in Indonesian educational institutions has not been successful in generating proficient English communicators among its graduates (Lie, 2007; Musthafa, 2001).

The purpose of this review article is to advocate for the utilisation of task-based language teaching (TBLT) as a feasible approach to language instruction in order to attain the objective of communicative competence in English language education as stipulated by the Indonesian national curriculum. This study provides a critical examination of the advantages of implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in EFL contexts, particularly in Indonesia and other similar settings. The analysis focuses on three specific areas: the potential for natural language acquisition, the impact on students' intrinsic motivation, and the enhancement of students' language proficiency. Furthermore, this article also examines some of the primary objections levelled against Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in broader English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, which may have resulted in apprehension, indecision, and opposition among EFL instructors. Despite the abundance of research-based and conceptual-based literature on Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in various English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, there is a dearth of comprehensive studies that explicate its advantages in the three domains and address its critiques in Indonesia. The written discourse is often presented from a distinct perspective to assess its efficacy in enhancing one of the fundamental language proficiencies. This article presents the argument that the advantages of utilising Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in Indonesian and comparable English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings are significant in three distinct areas: natural acquisition, students' inherent drive, and students' linguistic abilities, and that these benefits outweigh any sceptical criticisms. The criticisms directed towards Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) are primarily rooted in a misinterpretation or insufficient comprehension of the notion of tasks. Additionally, there exists a misconception that TBLT is a rigid approach to language instruction, rather than an adaptable one. The purpose of this article is to provide Indonesian educators with insights into the adaptability, viability, and affordances of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as a means of enhancing the communicative competence of Indonesian students. This is considered a primary objective of English language instruction in formal educational settings in Indonesia.

Subsequent to the introductory segment, this scholarly article proceeds with a literature review section as a starting point. The text delves into the current status of English language instruction in Indonesia, while also examining the characteristics of communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based language teaching (TBLT). Subsequently, the present article proceeds with the section outlining the methodology employed. Subsequently, the discourse delves into the advantages of implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) within Indonesian or analogous English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, and the ways in which these benefits can facilitate the development of communicative proficiency. Ultimately, this article culminates with a conclusive section that presents the implications for English language pedagogy in Indonesia.

English language teaching in Indonesia

Since 1994, the Indonesian government has mandated communicative competence as the primary objective of English language learning in response to the growing global demand for individuals proficient in English as an international language. This mandate encompasses the four macro-skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking, as outlined by Musthafa (2001). In 2004, the Indonesian Ministry of Education and Culture implemented the Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi, a competence-based curriculum, followed by the Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan, a school-based curriculum, in 2006. These curricula prioritised the development of communicative competence as the primary objective for English language learning (Ariatna, 2016). The utilisation of the communicative approach remains a consistent requirement in the Indonesian national curriculum of 2013 (K13), as stipulated by the Ministry of Education and Culture in 2016. The Indonesian government has endeavoured to modify the English language teaching methodology from a structure-based approach to a communicative-based approach and has shifted the teacher-centered paradigm to a student-centered paradigm through the utilisation of formal curriculum documents. In Indonesia, English language education endeavours to

augment the English communicative proficiency of students across the four macro skills, rather than solely emphasising formal linguistic structures of the language.

Notwithstanding the persistent and frequent revisions to the curriculum, it should be noted that English Language Teaching (ELT) practises in Indonesia did not undergo a unidirectional transformation. The research conducted by Prianty et al. (2021) revealed that despite holding favourable perceptions and attitudes towards communicative approaches, Indonesian educators continue to implement conventional teacher-centered approaches that prioritise linguistic structures in their instructional practises, as reported by Kustati et al. (2018). Despite Indonesia's cultural philosophy of *Gotong Royong*, which emphasises collaborative work, the teaching of English has traditionally been approached from a teacher-centered perspective, as noted by Sutiah (2011). According to Sutiah (2011), the classroom is still largely dominated by teachers who administer learning on an individual basis. Littlewood (2007) observed that in East Asian countries, teachers composed formal reports that aligned with the curriculum and policy expectations and requirements. However, they continued to adhere to the conventional teacher-centered approach in their instructional practises. Similar to the concept of "old wine in a new bottle" (Nunan, 2004, p. 14), educators appear to adopt novel pedagogical approaches while adhering to conventional teaching methods within the classroom. The aforementioned circumstance underscores the significance of upholding the resonance of the conceptual frameworks and practical applications of communicative language teaching (CLT) that were founded on the learner-centered approach, along with its favourable benefits towards the enhancement of students' communicative proficiency in the milieu of English as a foreign language (EFL) in Indonesia and analogous contexts.

Defining communicative language teaching (CLT)

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can be defined as an approach to language teaching that emphasises the importance of communication in language learning. It is a learner-centered approach that focuses on developing learners' ability to use language in real-life situations. CLT places a strong emphasis on the use of authentic materials and activities that promote interaction and negotiation of meaning between learners. The goal of CLT is to develop learners' communicative competence, which includes not only their ability to use language accurately but also their ability to use language appropriately in different social contexts.

Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) is a pedagogical approach that prioritises the needs and interests of students in language learning. Its primary aim is to enhance students' communicative competence in the target language. This approach has been widely discussed in academic literature by scholars such as Brown (2007) and Richards (2002). According to Brown's (2007) assertion, due to the fact that CLT is associated with a comprehensive theory of language, it is more appropriate to classify it as an approach to teaching rather than a method or technique. Henceforth, the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can be executed through a range of techniques in different settings. Adaptations and modifications of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach can be implemented to accommodate unique contextual circumstances and specific features of the environments in which it is utilised. Despite its versatility, the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) is founded upon a number of fundamental principles that inform its application. As per Brown's (2007) assertions, the successful execution of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) ought to encompass four fundamental principles, namely communicative competence, meaningful communication, fluency, and spontaneity. According to Jacobs and Farrell (2003), the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach is deeply embedded in the student-centered paradigm, with the ultimate goal of fostering autonomous learners who can competently navigate diverse communication contexts.

The emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) can be attributed to a sense of discontentment with the conventional employment of structure-based methodologies that prioritise English formal linguistic features. Educators and pertinent stakeholders expressed apprehension regarding the negligible ramifications of this methodology on the communicative

proficiency of pupils. Scholars contend that conventional approaches such as grammar translation and audiolingual methods have not yielded substantial improvements in students' communicative proficiency and have created a disconnect between classroom instruction and practical communication in the real world (Ariatna, 2016; Brown, 2007; Richards, 2002). Since its inception in the 1970s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has emerged as a prominent language teaching methodology, widely adopted not only in the inner circles of English language users but also in the outer and expanding circles (Ariatna, 2016). The utilisation of this method aims to increase the level of English language exposure and provide ample opportunities for students to engage in English language interactions within the classroom setting, as noted by Harmer (2015) and Richards (2002). Furthermore, it furnishes significant communication contexts to enable students to apply the language in practical situations beyond the confines of the classroom (Thompson, 1996). According to Harmer (2015), communicative competence and meaningful communication are the fundamental components of the communicative language teaching approach. The pedagogical approach aims to develop the students' communicative proficiency in a comprehensive manner and establish a link between the academic curriculum and the practical world outside the classroom (Jacobs & Farrell, 2003).

The concept of CLT pertains to the theoretical framework of communicative competence, which highlights the interconnected nature of language and communication (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). The concept of communicative competence, as introduced by Hymes (1972), encompasses fundamental communicative abilities that pertain to language usage. Canale and Swain (1980) proposed a conceptual framework comprising four distinct components, namely grammatical competence, discourse competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence refers to the ability to apply linguistic rules and patterns to construct meaningful language, while discourse competence pertains to the ability to maintain communication using the language. Sociolinguistic competence involves the ability to use appropriate language according to social situations, and strategic competence refers to the ability to comprehend essential ideas of discourse despite inadequate inputs. Consequently, within the framework of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), the proficiency in both the fluent and accurate use of the target language are deemed as crucial components. Notwithstanding the significance of these two facets, it is noteworthy that CLT accords greater importance to fluency as compared to accuracy, as posited by Jacobs and Farrell (2003). In the context of student-student or teacher-student interactions, it is crucial to bear in mind that prompt corrections of errors should primarily be employed when said errors impede the intended message. According to Richards (2002), the process of trial and error is an integral component of the learning experience in the context of communicative language teaching. Provided that communication remains comprehensible, it is permissible to defer the provision of feedback until the conclusion of the interactions.

The English language teaching approach proposed by CLT, which incorporates the aforementioned principles, has garnered significant attention and enthusiasm from educators and policymakers. Although there is widespread support for this innovative approach, it is inevitable that resistance and rejection will also arise. Bax (2003) posited that the applicability of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which has its roots in western pedagogical approaches, may not be contextually appropriate in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. Bax (2003) posited that the selection of teaching approaches should be based on unique contextual situations and characteristics, as per his contextual approach. According to Bax (2003), the adoption of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach may potentially overlook the unique contextual features of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. In East Asian nations, the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach has been deemed unsuitable for English language instruction due to factors such as the challenges of managing large classrooms, students' reluctance to use English, low expectations for language proficiency,

inconsistency with national assessments, and clashes with local educational customs and principles (Littlewood, 2007).

Likewise, within the Indonesian context, challenges such as teachers' proficiency in implementing CLT, insufficient student engagement, textbooks that prioritise structure over communication, large class sizes, restricted instructional time, and assessments that do not prioritise communicative competence have been cited as factors that have led to a tentative rejection of the CLT approach (Ariatna, 2016). Hence, proponents of this methodology argued that further endeavours must be exerted to ensure the suitable customization of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the English Language Teaching (ELT) for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. The implementation of various strategies such as offering professional development programmes for educators, facilitating collaborative activities within classroom settings, introducing supplementary learning opportunities beyond regular curricular activities, and devising alternative assessment methods have been identified as effective means to enhance educational outcomes (Ariatna, 2016). According to Ariatna (2016), the difficulties that arise when implementing CLT in EFL settings should be viewed as a typical aspect of introducing a novel curriculum aimed at enhancing English language instruction. Although persistent challenges may arise, it is important to acknowledge that surmounting them is feasible. Increased endeavours are required to attain superior results. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology is not a fixed or inflexible approach. It possesses the capability to be flexibly modified and tailored to suit the exigencies of contextual circumstances. Hence, it is imperative to implement precise modifications in order to facilitate the assimilation of this novel English language pedagogy by EFL learners.

Defining Task-based language teaching (TBLT)

Task-based language teaching (TBLT) is an approach to language instruction that emphasises the use of authentic, real-world tasks as the basis for language learning. This approach is grounded in the belief that language learning is most effective when learners are engaged in meaningful, purposeful communication, and that language is best acquired through the process of using it to accomplish specific tasks. TBLT is characterised by a focus on the development of communicative competence, the use of task-based activities to promote language learning, and an emphasis on learner-centered instruction.

According to Richards (2002), TBLT, also known as task-based instruction or task-based learning, is considered to be a prominent pedagogical approach that embodies the practical application of the communicative language teaching (CLT) method in the field of English language instruction. Over a significant duration, it has emerged as a feasible substitute for the conventional structure-oriented techniques such as grammar translation and present-practice-produce (PPP) methodologies (Bryfonski & McKay, 2017). Task-based language teaching (TBLT) emphasises the importance of extensive exposure and meaningful use of the target language in classroom learning interactions, which is in line with the principles of communicative language teaching (CLT). The foundation of language learning is largely based on the importance of social interaction, learning through usage, and the acquisition of language implicitly or incidentally, as stated by Ellis (2019). According to Smith (2018), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) enables the cognitive and interactive dimensions of language acquisition, whereby learners engage in language use while also engaging in cognitive processes. According to Ellis (2009), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) posits that English language acquisition is best facilitated by providing students with meaningful contexts that enable their natural learning capacities to flourish, as opposed to a systematic approach of teaching language incrementally.

The primary characteristic that sets TBLT apart is the utilisation of tasks as the central classroom activities, as noted by Ellis (2009) and Sukma et al. (2020). Various conceptualizations of tasks have been proposed by proponents of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Long (1985) provided a comprehensive definition of tasks as encompassing all forms of communication that bear resemblance to real-world language use, extending beyond the confines

of the classroom environment. The concept of tasks encompasses a wide range of routine activities, including but not limited to reserving hotel accommodations, seeking directions, placing food orders, expressing and receiving viewpoints on significant matters, and undergoing a driving examination. According to Prabhu (1984), one of the pioneers in the development of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), a task is an undertaking that necessitates learners to utilise cognitive processes to arrive at an outcome from provided information, while enabling teachers to manage and regulate the process (p. 24). According to Nunan (2004), tasks refer to classroom activities that require students to comprehend, manipulate, produce, or interact in a target language. In order to accomplish this task, it is necessary for the students to utilise their existing linguistic and multimodal skills as the primary sources for creating and expressing meaning in the language being studied, as suggested by Ellis (2009) and Nunan (2004). Thus, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) involves the incorporation of authentic language use in the learning process, thereby affording learners ample opportunities to independently utilise language (Willis & Willis, 2007). It is anticipated that the inclusion of practical tasks will reduce the gap between classroom discussions and actual communication scenarios, as suggested by Campo (2016) and Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu (2011).

Consistent with the principles of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) methodology, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) similarly places greater emphasis on the development of fluency as opposed to accuracy. The focus is primarily on the interpretation of meaning, encompassing both semantic and pragmatic aspects, rather than on particular grammatical structures, as noted by Ellis (2009), Nunan (2004), and Hashemi et al. (2011). Ellis (2009) hypothesised that the desired goals of task-based language teaching ought to extend beyond the mere utilisation of particular language components or grammatical structures. Despite the emphasis on fluency, it is imperative to acknowledge the significance of form in TBLT, as stated by Nunan (2004). Ellis (2009) categorises tasks into two distinct types: unfocused and focused tasks. According to Ellis (2009), tasks that lack focus are structured in a manner that enables learners to utilise the target language in various communication settings. In this particular task, students are granted the liberty to utilise any language structures that may aid in accomplishing the desired task outcomes. It is recommended that no particular grammatical rules be utilised when performing the tasks. Conversely, the targeted assignments are structured in a manner that facilitates student engagement with particular grammatical constructs, as noted by Ellis (2009). Nevertheless, this task that is being emphasised is distinct from exercises that involve situational grammar. The situational grammar exercises provide clear instructions to students regarding the language patterns they are expected to generate. However, the target linguistic feature of a focused task is not readily apparent (Ellis, 2009, p. 223). Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is implemented through methodologies that diverge from those employed in situational grammar exercises. The TBLT approach places significant emphasis on three distinct phases of meaning-making, namely the pre-task, main task, and post-task stages. This is supported by various scholars such as Ellis (2009), Hashemi et al. (2011), and Roberson (2014). While TBLT (Ellis, 2009) mandates only the main task phase, the remaining task phases are highly advantageous for facilitating both the planning and assessment of main task performance. According to Ellis (2009), explicit language learning can occur during both the pre-task and post-task phases. According to Hashemi et al. (2011), the pre-task is implemented with the purpose of adequately equipping the students to perform the primary task. According to Willis and Willis (2007), this activity prepares the learners for the subsequent primary task. Thus, during this particular stage, educators have the opportunity to provide a series of illustrations on how to execute the primary duties, while also motivating learners to establish a systematic approach prior to commencing the task (Hashemi et al., 2011). During this phase, it is possible to carry out the construction and activation of the students' schemata in order to encourage their involvement with the topic of discussion (Shabani & Ghasemi, 2014; Willis & Willis, 2007). Furthermore, educators have the ability to incorporate key terminology related to the subject matter as a means of fostering student

engagement in more intricate and sophisticated linguistic expression (Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Willis & Willis, 2007). Conversely, during the post-task phase, educators may provide students with opportunities to engage in self-reflection regarding their performance in the primary task. In this stage, participants may also be requested to examine grammatical structures that posed difficulties during the primary task, as noted by Hashemi et al. (2011). According to Willis and Willis (2007), this course of action is advantageous for students for a minimum of three reasons. Initially, it facilitates the learners to attain a lucid comprehension of the language they have employed. Secondly, it serves as a preventive measure against potential errors in the future. Finally, it serves to increase the level of motivation among students.

Despite the potential of the principles and methodologies of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) to foster the English communicative proficiency of learners, this approach has also been subject to critical scrutiny. According to Willis and Willis (2007), the suitability of TBLT is limited to proficient educators who aim to attain a superior level of proficiency. According to Willis and Willis (2007), the material in question lacks emphasis on grammar and is deemed inappropriate for exam readiness. Ellis (2009) posited that the aforementioned allegations were predicated on a misapprehension that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a technique characterised by an inflexible set of guidelines. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is, in fact, a pedagogy that is adaptable to various contexts. According to Ellis (2009), there is not a singular protocol for Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). According to Campo (2016) and Robertson (2014), educators are expected to modify their pedagogical approach to accommodate their unique contextual circumstances. Consequently, it is imperative for educators to consider the requirements of their pupils (Campo, 2016; Jackson & Burch, 2017; Long, 2016). The facilitation of diverse needs in education, arising from various factors including curriculum, school levels, learning objectives, teaching tradition and expectations, can be achieved through the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) as suggested by Jackson and Burch (2017). Smith (2018) suggests that the syllabus for Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) can be customised and adapted to suit the specific requirements of students, including their cultural background, learning goals, and educational environment.

METHODS

The present manuscript is a conceptual review article. As per Hulland's (2020) definition, conceptual review refers to a meticulous amalgamation and contemplation of pre-existing research within a particular domain (p. 27). The process of conducting a literature review involves the gathering, evaluation, and synthesis of previously published works, such as theoretical frameworks and empirical research results, within a particular area of study. This is commonly referred to as secondary data analysis. The purpose of this process is to identify significant findings, areas of deficiency, conflicting viewpoints, or to suggest potential avenues for future research endeavours (Hulland, 2020). According to Hulland (2020), the outcomes of a conceptual review have the potential to enhance, redefine, or substitute the existing perspectives pertaining to the social phenomena under consideration.

The present study involved the compilation, integration, and evaluation of extant literature on the implementation of TBLT approach in Indonesian and comparable EFL settings. The aim was to determine the primary advantages and prevalent criticisms associated with the utilisation of this pedagogical method. The objective is to enhance the feasibility, flexibility, and advantages of implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the context of English language instruction in Indonesia. This is intended to enable educators to utilise TBLT as a means of expediting the development of communicative proficiency among Indonesian learners. Multiple phases are conducted in this study. Initially, the study's focus and scope are delineated. Subsequently, pertinent scholarly works are chosen, incorporated, and amalgamated. Subsequently, the outcome of the comprehensive analysis of existing literature is employed to construct persuasive reasoning. Ultimately, the author presents proposals and counsel for the

implementation of TBLT within English language pedagogy in EFL settings, particularly in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TBLT promotes natural learning

Krashen (1982) made a distinction between language learning and language acquisition and explored their implications for students' language development. According to Krashen's (1982) definition, language learning refers to a deliberate and conscious process whereby individuals acquire a target language by mastering its grammatical rules. Krashen (1982) posits that the language learning process empowers individuals to acquire knowledge of language rules, develop an awareness of them, and engage in discourse surrounding them. Conversely, the process of language acquisition is characterised by a natural and implicit progression, whereby individuals are unaware of their acquisition of the language (Krashen, 1982). The process bears resemblance to the manner in which children acquire their primary language, wherein individuals are not explicitly taught the rules of the language, but rather are expected to utilise the language (Krashen, 1982). According to Krashen's theory proposed in 1982, individuals who undergo the process of language acquisition are capable of effectively communicating using the acquired language. Despite the contention among certain theorists of second language education that the process of language acquisition is exclusive to children, empirical investigations have demonstrated the significance of acquisition for adults as well (Krashen, 1982). Krashen (1982) posits that the capacity for natural language acquisition persists beyond childhood and into adulthood. Therefore, the implementation of this organic learning environment is feasible in educational institutions.

As previously stated, the principal objective of English language acquisition within the educational framework of Indonesia is to attain communicative proficiency. The objective is to foster and expedite the students' proficiency not only in acquiring knowledge of specific linguistic components but also in effectively communicating through the language. Therefore, Krashen's concept of language acquisition, which emphasises solely on the comprehension of grammatical principles of the language being learned, is deemed insufficient. Rather, the utilisation of the language acquisition process should be implemented. According to Krashen (1982), it is imperative that students are not solely instructed on the theoretical aspects of a language, but are also encouraged to acquire practical skills in language usage. Consequently, it is imperative to provide them with increased opportunities to utilise and engage with the language in order to organically assimilate it and aptly communicate through it. Krashen (1982) posits that language acquisition transpires through communication, which is the intended purpose of language. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), which is currently considered the foremost representation of the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, may serve as a feasible option for attaining the process of language acquisition. The proposal advocates for a naturalistic approach to language learning, emphasising the importance of language exposure, usage, and engagement in facilitating students' communicative competence.

Although TBLT is not a completely homogeneous construct and there is no uniform approach to implementing it (Ellis, 2009, p. 224), proponents of TBLT generally prioritise the use of authentic language in the classroom, with a focus on both exposure to and utilisation of English as the target language (Campo, 2016; Ellis, 2009; Nunan, 2004; Willis & Willis, 1986). The primary emphasis of this approach is on the interpretation of meaning, as opposed to the structure of language, as noted by scholars such as Ellis (2009) and Nunan (2004). Long (2016) posited that the role of teachers in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is elevated. According to Long (2016), educators must furnish ample and comprehensive language exposure to their pupils, along with prompts that elicit responses during classroom interactions. In order to accomplish this task, it is imperative that the individual exhibit a high level of confidence in their proficiency of the English language and remain prepared to provide impromptu responses to any inquiries

posed by students during classroom learning exercises. Furthermore, it is imperative that educators possess a strong inclination to actively involve their pupils in English discourse (Willis & Willis, 2007). According to Willis and Willis (2007), it is imperative for educators to provide their students with unrestricted access to the target language and ample opportunities to utilise the language autonomously. According to Thompson (1996), as language is a system of choice, it is imperative that students are provided with opportunities to exercise their choice of language within the classroom setting. According to Thompson (1996), it is imperative to provide individuals with a sense of control over the learning process. By utilising this approach, the level of classroom interaction in the target language can be enhanced and heightened.

Furthermore, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) enhances students' engagement with the language learning process, in addition to their exposure to and utilisation of the English language. The utilisation of tasks that incorporate meaningful communication contexts has been found to enhance engagement, in addition to the benefits of extensive exposure to and usage of the English language. As previously stated, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) aims to reduce the disparity between classroom discourse and authentic communication in real-life situations. Tasks are structured in a manner that emulates the practical application of language in authentic settings. According to Nunan's (2004) assertion, the foundational framework of TBLT is based on experiential learning. This implies that language learning experiences should originate from the students' immediate personal experiences. The subject matter must pertain to the lived experiences of the students. Establishing a communication context that is meaningful and connects students' real-life experiences with language learning can potentially increase their engagement with the language classroom.

Furthermore, the TBLT approach places significant emphasis on promoting active interaction through the use of the target language, as noted by Campo (2016) and Oliver et al. (2017). The significance of this interaction lies in its ability to demonstrate the students' comprehension and focus on the correlations between linguistic structures and significance, as noted by Oliver et al. (2017). The promotion of active interaction between individuals in an academic setting can be facilitated not only through teacher-student interactions, but also through interactions between students themselves. According to Ellis (2009), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) can be executed through various modes such as whole-class instructions, pair work, group work, and individual work. Despite this, it is common practise for students to collaborate in pairs or groups while engaging in tasks within the framework of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) (Hismanoglu & Hismanoglu, 2011; Sholeh, 2020).

Collaborative learning plays a crucial role in Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The utilisation of this approach is founded on the learner-centered paradigm, enabling students to exercise control and take responsibility for their own learning as well as that of their peers (Jacobs & Farrell, 2003). According to Jacobs and Farrell (2003), it was possible for both individuals to offer and receive support from their colleagues. Furthermore, it can furnish a secure milieu and broader prospects for pupils to collaboratively and communicatively cultivate their concepts prior to presenting them to the entire cohort (Thompson, 1996; Sutiah, 2011). Research has indicated that the implementation of cooperative learning strategies can lead to an increase in academic performance among students (Sutiah, 2011) and a heightened level of engagement in the learning process (Herrmann, 2013).

Despite TBLT's proposition of a more natural language acquisition process through extensive exposure to, usage of, and engagement with the target language, it has been criticised for its inappropriateness in low proficiency level contexts, such as EFL, as stated by Swan (2005). This perspective appears to be justifiable as it is not advisable for educators to require students to engage in communication utilising the target language while they are still grappling with grammatical concepts. However, Ellis (2009) has provided strong criticism of this viewpoint, arguing that the initial stage of language proficiency is not contingent upon grammar, but rather on the repetition of scaffolded utterances that TBLT aims to facilitate. The acquisition of the target

language is heavily reliant on the students' exposure to, utilisation of, and interaction with said language in order to facilitate a natural adaptation to it. According to Rozati (2014), the acquisition of grammar is facilitated by internal self-regulating processes, which enable individuals to effectively convey intended meanings in diverse contexts.

TBLT generates students' intrinsic motivation

The motivation of students is a crucial determinant of successful acquisition of the English language, as stated by Bradford (2007). Effective learning occurs not solely through the provision of diverse pedagogical support by educators, but also through the active engagement and motivation of students in comprehending the subject matter. Hence, it is imperative for English language instructors to ensure that their pedagogical choices have the potential to stimulate their students' motivation to actively participate in the language acquisition process. According to Daniels (2010, p. 25), it is not within the power of teachers to instill motivation in their students. However, they can establish a learning environment that fosters motivation. According to Bradford's (2007) argument, motivation is linked to a range of factors, including both extrinsic and intrinsic motivators. The concept of extrinsic motivation is closely associated with the idea of external rewards and punishments, typically administered by teachers, with the aim of regulating students' immediate classroom behaviour (Daniels, 2010). Intrinsic motivation pertains to the internal factors that originate from the students themselves, which subsequently cultivate their inclination to learn and take action to attain favourable results (Daniels, 2010). In contrast to extrinsic motivation, which leads to transient modifications in behaviour, intrinsic motivation fosters enduring student commitment to learning, absent any overt external incentives or penalties (Daniels, 2010). The maintenance of sustainability in the process of learning the English language is contingent upon the existence and stimulation of intrinsic motivation.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) posit that the detection of students' intrinsic motivation can be discerned through three primary dimensions, namely (1) their disposition towards the learning activities, (2) their aspiration to attain a specific objective, and (3) their exertion towards accomplishing the said objective. The presence of these three elements suggests that the process of learning has been relatively effective in creating a stimulating learning atmosphere. Thus, the potential for autonomous language acquisition among students has been enhanced. With regards to Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), scholarly investigations have revealed that its implementation leads to a rise in the inherent drive of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, as evidenced by studies conducted by NamazianDost et al. (2017) and Pietri (2015). Sukma et al. (2020) and Saputro et al. (2021) discovered that TBLT had a positive impact on the students' motivation and eagerness to learn English through purposeful activities, in line with the Indonesian context. According to Saputro et al. (2021), the utilisation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in the classroom was well-received by Indonesian students, who demonstrated a high level of engagement with the learning activities. The implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has resulted in the establishment of a stimulating educational setting for students learning English as a foreign language (EFL). The participants exhibit a favourable attitude towards Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), and its implementation enhances their motivation and dedication towards accomplishing their individual English language learning objectives.

Despite being considered a foreign approach to teaching English as a second language, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been found to elicit favourable responses from EFL students, according to research studies. This is noteworthy given the potential for resistance to arise among students towards this method. Sariçoban and Karakurt (2016) conducted a study in Turkey which revealed that students exhibited a favourable perception towards Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) both during and after its implementation. Moreover, if Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is customised to suit the specific requirements and anticipations of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, it has the potential to augment their curiosity and

drive towards acquiring proficiency in the English language (Vieira, 2017). Within the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), scholarly research has indicated that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been perceived by students as both satisfying (Smith, 2018) and enjoyable (Shabani & Ghasemi, 2014). According to Smith's (2018) findings, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students express contentment with Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), which encompasses its components such as structure, content, and integration of grammar. According to Khand and Memon (2010), this particular method is favoured over other methods. Additionally, Kim and Tracy-Ventura (2017) report that there is an intention to pursue further language learning courses that utilise TBLT. Furthermore, Shabani and Ghasemi (2014) assert that TBLT is perceived as a pleasurable approach by learners due to its ability to offer extensive prospects for active engagement and collaboration among students, learning materials, and texts. According to Daniels (2010), the implementation of active learning strategies can provide students with autonomy over their decisions, cognitive processes, and behaviours during the learning experience. This approach has the potential to enhance students' intrinsic motivation to attain their academic objectives. The findings mentioned were also observed in research studies conducted in the context of Indonesia. According to Sahrawi (2017) and Yulianti (2020), Indonesian students hold a favourable perception of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). According to Saputro et al. (2021), the participants' perception of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) was more enjoyable and engaging in contrast to their prior learning encounters. Consequently, the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) elicited a high level of enthusiasm among students, resulting in their active participation in the language learning process (Yundayani & Ardiasih, 2021).

Furthermore, scholarly investigations have revealed that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has resulted in favourable attitudes among EFL students. Additionally, TBLT has been shown to enhance EFL students' motivation and exertion towards attaining higher levels of proficiency in the English language. The students were motivated to exert effort in utilising and acquiring more intricate structures of the language being studied. Ahlquist's (2013) study demonstrated that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in language instruction resulted in increased confidence among students to utilise the target language for speaking purposes, as well as improved comprehension of auditory language stimuli. According to Ahlquist (2013), the use of this technique encouraged individuals to produce lengthier sentences utilising more linguistically intricate texts. Additionally, it facilitated their involvement in more intricate and sophisticated language interaction, as noted by Yuan and Ellis (2003). The findings were also reflected in research studies conducted in the Indonesian context. The implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been observed to result in increased motivation and engagement among students in their English language learning process (Sukma et al., 2020). This, in turn, has been found to significantly enhance the students' inclination to express their thoughts through written communication (Yundayani and Ardiasih, 2021). Moreover, the written outputs produced by them exhibited superior quality as per the findings of Hakim (2019). According to Sundari et al. (2018), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has effectively motivated Indonesian students to exert greater effort in producing more intricate written works. The favourable outcomes observed from the application of TBLT suggest that this approach to teaching English has effectively stimulated the students' inherent drive, as evidenced by their heightened exertion and aspiration, to attain superior proficiency in their language acquisition.

Despite its potential to foster students' intrinsic motivation, TBLT has been subject to criticism by Swan (2005) and Butler (2005) for its condemnation of traditional pedagogy, which is still widely used by Asian teachers. Ellis (2009) provided a response to this critique, stating that the intention of TBLT is not to diminish traditional pedagogical approaches. Conversely, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is designed to enhance language learning. There are potential avenues for integrating it with conventional pedagogical approaches. Shabani and Ghasemi

(2014) delineated three distinct phases of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), namely pre-task, main-task, and post-task phases. Each of these phases serves a unique purpose in facilitating language acquisition among students. Conventional pedagogical approaches, such as the Present-Practice-Produce (PPP) and grammar-translation methods, which emphasise teacher-centeredness and the compartmentalization of language components, such as grammar and vocabulary (Long, 2016; Mao, 2012), can be effectively integrated into post-task instruction (Shabani & Ghasemi, 2014). Consequently, it is possible to integrate TBLT with conventional pedagogical approaches (Ellis, 2009).

TBLT improves language skills

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) encompasses a broader scope beyond the development of oral communication abilities. This tool has the potential to enhance the proficiency of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in the four fundamental language skills, namely reading, listening, writing, and speaking. According to scholarly sources such as Smith (2018) and Zúñiga (2016), Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) facilitates the development of English communicative competence in both oral and written forms by providing learners with opportunities to engage with the target language and engage in meaningful interactions. According to Ellis (2009), it is possible to utilise technology to improve both productive skills, which involve generating language output, and receptive skills, which involve comprehending language input. As demonstrated by Campo's (2016) research, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has proven effective in enhancing the oral and written communication skills of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students. This includes the development of fluency, vocabulary acquisition, pronunciation, and grammatical accuracy. Several research studies have indicated that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has yielded favourable outcomes for the development of the four macro skills of English in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings.

In relation to oral communication, scholarly investigations have revealed that task-oriented exercises exert a noteworthy impact on enhancing the listening and speaking proficiencies of learners in English as a Foreign Language contexts. Sarıçoban and Karakurt (2016) conducted a study which revealed that the implementation of task-based activities resulted in a noteworthy improvement in the listening and speaking abilities of students studying English as a foreign language. Chou's (2016) research revealed that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has had a positive impact on the metacognitive awareness of listening strategies among EFL students, ultimately leading to an improvement in their listening skills. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has emerged as a promising approach to mitigate the common challenges faced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in utilising English during verbal interactions. These challenges include linguistic barriers such as insufficient vocabulary and non-linguistic barriers such as low self-assurance (Ulla, 2020). Rohani (2011, 2013) and Safitri et al. (2020) conducted research in the Indonesian context and discovered that the implementation of TBLT was effective in reducing the challenges faced by Indonesian students. Research conducted in Indonesia has demonstrated that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has yielded positive outcomes in terms of enhancing students' spoken language proficiency, specifically with regards to their vocabulary repertoire and confidence levels (Rohani, 2011, 2013; Safitri et al., 2020). According to Safitri et al. (2020), the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) led to an improvement in the accuracy and confidence of Indonesian students' English speaking abilities, as well as an expansion of their vocabulary range. Furthermore, it is possible for individuals to utilise constructive techniques to manage speech-related difficulties (Rohani, 2011, 2013). The utilisation of TBLT in the context of listening proficiency has facilitated Indonesian learners to enhance their ability to comprehend auditory stimuli through the application of constructive techniques (Rohani, 2011, 2013).

Several studies have validated the efficacy of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in enhancing the reading and writing proficiencies of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners

in written communication. Research has indicated that the implementation of task-based language teaching (TBLT) which emphasises the utilisation of authentic and practical assignments, has resulted in enhanced reading comprehension skills among English as a foreign language (EFL) learners (Chalak, 2015; Sukma et al., 2020). In a study conducted by Shabani and Ghasemi (2014), it was discovered that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) resulted in superior reading comprehension performance among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students compared to those who were instructed using Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) methodology. The research was experimental in nature. Furthermore, the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in reading tasks has demonstrated efficacy in enhancing the motivation and reading habits of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners (Chen, 2018). The utilisation of task-based activities in the Indonesian context has been observed to enhance students' creativity and reading comprehension, as it provides a more authentic application of the target language (Sukma et al., 2020). Moreover, it has been observed that this practise has resulted in a heightened level of engagement among students and has also instilled in them a proclivity towards reading (Arifuddin, 2019).

In addition to enhancing reading proficiency, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been empirically demonstrated to facilitate the development of writing abilities among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. The implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has yielded diverse enhancements in the writing skills of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. As demonstrated by Campo's (2016) research, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) has been shown to enhance students' writing abilities, progressing them from the mere translation and composition of isolated sentences to the composition of coherent and meaningful short paragraphs. Furthermore, Kafipour et al. (2018) revealed that the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) leads to an improvement in multiple facets of writing, such as content, vocabulary, organisation, language use, and sentence mechanics. According to Hakim's (2019) research in the Indonesian context, the implementation of TBLT in teaching resulted in an improvement in the quality of students' writing products. According to Yundayani and Ardiasih (2021), the implementation of task-based learning materials has been found to be effective in enhancing the writing skills of Indonesian students, while also fostering their motivation to express their ideas through written output. According to Sundari et al. (2018), the implementation of this approach resulted in improved writing organisation, content, format, grammar, and increased levels of lexical complexity and accuracy among the students.

Despite the demonstrated benefits of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in enhancing students' communicative competence across the four macro skills of English, research has shown that TBLT places limited emphasis on the grammatical aspects of language, as noted by Swan (2005). This assertion is partially false. Despite not being considered a central aspect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), grammar plays a significant role in the approach, as noted by Ellis (2009). As previously indicated, task-based language teaching encompasses not only unfocused tasks, but also focused tasks that enable instructors to address grammar, linguistic content, or sentence structures (Ellis, 2009). Furthermore, the topic of grammar can be deliberately addressed using retrospective, inductive, or whole-to-part methods during the post-task phase subsequent to the students' meaningful utilisation of the target language to perform primary tasks (Jacobs & Farrell, 2003; Long & Crookes, 1992). Upon receiving significant language inputs during the pre-task and main task phases, students may be prompted by educators to deduce the fundamental principles of specific discourse, as suggested by Uddin and Ahmed (2012). Musthafa (2001) asserts that this particular approach is considered to be more efficacious due to the fact that the acquisition of grammar occurs within the context of communicative usage. According to Thompson (1996), the students' capacity to comprehend the language inputs prior to drawing inferences or reaching conclusions on the language forms employed in the texts is acknowledged. Furthermore, it fosters inquisitiveness, promotes self-sufficiency, and equips learners with practical assignments (Valijärvi & Tarsoly, 2015).

CONCLUSION

This conceptual review article endeavours to enhance the adaptability, viability, and affordances of utilising TBLT in Indonesian contexts by drawing on a diverse range of theories and research findings. The primary objective of this discourse is to explicate the fundamental principle of task-based language teaching (TBLT) as a prominent manifestation of the communicative language teaching (CLT) paradigm. Additionally, this discussion aims to elucidate the advantages of utilising this pedagogical approach in the Indonesian setting. The argument posits that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) represents a feasible pedagogical alternative for attaining communicative competence, which is the ultimate objective of English language acquisition in Indonesian educational settings. This is due to its ability to foster organic learning, stimulate students' inherent motivation, and enhance their language proficiency. The implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) enables learners to be exposed to, utilise, and interact with English as a target language, thereby fostering a natural process of language acquisition. The favourable attitudes of EFL students towards TBLT, coupled with their heightened inclination and exertions in TBLT learning pursuits, suggest that this pedagogical approach has effectively stimulated the students' intrinsic motivation. Thirdly, empirical investigations have evidenced the efficacy of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in expediting the development of the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' four primary language competencies, namely speaking, listening, reading, and writing. The advantages associated with Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) render it a feasible approach for enhancing the English communicative proficiency of Indonesian students.

Furthermore, this article has addressed explicit criticisms directed towards Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in both Indonesian and broader English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings. According to the assertion made, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is not suitable for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners who possess limited proficiency in English, disapproves of conventional teaching methods, and disregards the importance of grammar. The aforementioned allegations primarily stem from a misapprehension of the TBLT framework as an inflexible approach to language instruction. Advocates of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) have proposed adapting the approach to specific contextual situations, rather than simply adopting it as is. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a pedagogical approach that is designed to be flexible and responsive to the individual needs of students. Furthermore, Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) allows for the inclusion of explicit grammar instruction through a retrospective approach during the post-task phase. Consequently, it has the potential to be integrated with conventional methods of language acquisition.

This review article provides an expanded discourse on the implementation of foreign language teaching methodologies in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, with a particular focus on Indonesia. This finding bears implications for the implementation of English language instruction in Indonesian educational institutions. Educators may utilise this article as a foundation for their pedagogical choices when implementing Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) in their instructional practises. By doing so, educators can become proficient instructors who possess the ability to implement Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) effectively and possess a sound rationale for selecting TBLT as their preferred pedagogical approach. As stated by Robertson (2014), educators who are highly proficient possess a well-defined structure of comprehension that guides their pedagogical approaches, rendering them more efficacious in their teaching endeavours.

REFERENCES

- Ahlquist, S. (2013). "Storyline": a task-based approach for the young learner classroom. *ELT Journal*, 67(1), 41–51. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs052>
- Ariatna. (2016). The need for maintaining CLT in Indonesia. *TESOL Journal*, 7(4), 800–822. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.246>

- Arifuddin, A. (2019). Task-based language learning in extensive reading practices. In Proceedings of The International English Language Teachers and Lecturers Conference 2019 (pp. 26–30). Retrieved from <http://ineltal.um.ac.id/ineltal-2019-proceedings/>
- Bax, S. (2003). The end of CLT: A context approach to language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 57, 278–287.
- Bradford, A. (2007). Motivational orientations in under-research FLL contexts: Findings from Indonesia. *RELC Journal*, 38(3), 302–323. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688207085849>
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Longman. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=8vPtAAAAMAAJ>
- Brown, H. D. (2007a). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2007b). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New York: Pearson.
- Bryfonski, L., & McKay, T. H. (2017). TBLT implementation and evaluation: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(5), 603–632.
- Butler, Y. G. (2005). Comparative perspectives towards communicative activities among elementary school teachers in South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan. *Language Teaching Research*, 9(4), 423–446. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1191/1362168805lr176oa>
- Campo, A. C. B. (2016). Improving 10th graders English communicative competence through the implementation of task-based language teaching. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(2), 95–110.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approach to second language teaching and setting. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1–47.
- Chalak, A. (2015). The effect of task-based instruction on reading comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. *Applied Research on English Language*, 4(1), 19–30.
- Chen, I.-C. (2018). Incorporating task-based learning in an extensive reading programme. *ELT Journal*, 72(4), 405–414., 72(4), 405–414. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy008>
- Chou, M.-H. (2016). A task-based language teaching approach to developing metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension. *The International Journal of Listening*, 31(1), 1–20. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1098542>
- Daniels, E. (2010). Creating motivating learning environments: What we can learn from researchers and students. *The English Journal*, 100(1), 25–29. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20787687>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221–246., 19(3), 221–246. Retrieved from <https://doi-org.ezproxy.lib.monash.edu.au/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ellis, R. (2019). Towards a modular language curriculum for using tasks. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(4), 454–475. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818765315>
- Gani, A. S., Fajrina, D., & Hanifa, R. (2015). Students' learning strategies for developing speaking ability. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 2(1), 16–28.
- Gardner, R. ., & Lambert, W. . (1972). *Attitudes and Motivation in Second- Language Learning*. Newbury House.
- Hakim, A. R. (2019). The influence of task-based language teaching and learning motivation toward writing achievement. *Journal of English Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, 1(1), 37–53. Retrieved from <https://ettli.unmuhbabel.ac.id/index.php/ettli>
- Harmer, J. (2015). *The practice of English language teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson. Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. New Edition. England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hashemi, M., & Azizinezhad. (2012). Using task- based language teaching, learning practically in English classes. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 526–529. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.098>
- Herrmann, K. J. (2013). The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: Result from an intervention. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(3), 175–187. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787413498035>
- Hismanoglu, M., & Hismanoglu, S. (2011). Task-based language teaching: what every teacher should do. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 15, 46–52. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.049>
- Hulland, J. (2020). Conceptual review papers: revisiting existing research to develop and refine theory. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 10(1), 27–35. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00168-7>
- Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. *Sociolinguistics* (J. B. Prid). Penguin.

- Jackson, D. O., & Burch, A. R. (2017). Complementary theoretical perspectives on task-based classroom realities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(3), 493–506. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.393>
- Jacobs, G. M., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2003). Understanding and Implementing the CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) Paradigm. *RELC Journal*, 34(1), 5–30. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820303400102>
- Kafipour, R., Mahmoudi, E., & Khojasteh, L. (2018). The effect of task-based teaching on analytic writing in EFL classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 5, 1–16. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1496627>
- Khand, Z., & Memon, R. (2010). Developing reading skills through task-based activities at university level. *International Research Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 38(38), 31–67. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1112688406/>
- Kim, P., Jung, Y., & N, T.-V. (2017). Implementation of a localized task-based course in an EFL context: A study of students' evolving perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(3), 632–660. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.381>
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kustati, M., Yusuf, Y., & Maarof, N. (2018). English teachers' voices on communicative language teaching for reading in Indonesian rural classrooms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 76(5), 649–662. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/2343793546/>
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lie, A. (2007). Education policy and EFL curriculum in Indonesia: between the commitment and competence and the quest for higher test score. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18(1), 1–14.
- Littlewood, W. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>
- Long, M. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition. In *Modelling and assessing second language acquisition* (In Hyltens, pp. 77– 100). *Multilingual Matters*.
- Long, M. (2016). In defence of tasks and TBLT: nonissues and real issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 36, 5–33. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190515000057>
- Long, M. H., & Crookes, G. (1992). Three Approaches to Task-Based Syllabus Design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 27–56. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/3587368>
- Madya, S. (2002). Developing standards for EFL in Indonesia as part of the EFL teaching reform. *TEFLIN Journal*, 13(2), 142–151.
- Mao, Z. (2012). The application of task-based language teaching to English reading classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2430– 2438. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.11.2430-2438>
- Minister, E. and C. (2015). Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia no. 21/2016 tentang Standar Proses Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah [Decree of Ministry of Education and Culture of Republik of Indonesia no. 21/2016 on Content Standards for Primary and Secondary]. Retrieved from <https://bsnp-indonesia.org/standar-isi/>
- Musthafa, B. (2001). Communicative language teaching in Indonesia: issues of theoretical assumptions and challenges in classroom practice. *TEFLIN Journal*, 12(2), 184–193. Retrieved from <http://journal.teflin.org/index.php/journal/article/view/247/233>
- NamazianDost, I., Bohloulzadeh, G., & Pazhakh, A. (2017). The effect of task- based language teaching on motivation and grammatical achievement of EFL Junior High School Students. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 8(2), 243. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.8n.2p.243>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nur, C. (2004). English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practical constraints. In *English language teaching in East Asia today: Changing policies and practices* (H. W. Kam, pp. 178–186). Eastern Universities Press.
- Oliver, R., Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2017). Children working it out together: A comparison of younger and older learners collaborating in task-based interaction. *System*, 69(C), 1–14. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.08.001>
- Pietri, N. J. M. (2015). The effects of task-based learning on Thai students' skills and motivation. *ASEAN Journal of Management & Innovation*, 3(4), 72–80.
- Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford University Press.

- Prianty, T., Ngadiso, & Wijayanto, A. (2021). Indonesian EFL teachers' perceptions of task-based language teaching approach. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 9(1), 26–37. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.metrouniv.ac.id/index.php/pedagogy>
- Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2002). 30 years of TEFL/TESL: a personal reflection. *RELC Journal*, 33(2), 1–35. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/003368820203300201>
- Robertson, M. (2014). Task-based language teaching and expansive learning theory. *TESL Canada Journal*, 31(8), 187–198. Retrieved from <https://teslcanadajournal.ca/index.php/tesl/index>
- Rohani, S. (2013). Positive versus negative communication strategies in task-based learning. *TEFLIN Journal*, 24(2), 158–179. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v24i2/158-179>
- Rozati, S. M. (2014). Language teaching and task-based approach. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(6), 1273–1278. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.4.6.1273-1278>
- Safitri, H., Rafli, Z., & Dewanti, R. (2020). Improving students' speaking skills through task-based learning: An action research at the English department. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 7(6), 88–99. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v7i6.1647>
- Sahrawi. (2017). Students' and teacher's perception of task-based language teaching and the implementation in listening class. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 6(2), 169–178. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.31571/bahasa.v6i2.620>
- Saputro, T. H., Hima, A. N., & Farah, R. R. (2021). Benefits and challenges of doing task-based language teaching in Indonesia: Teachers' perception. *KEMBARA: Jurnal Keilmuan Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 7(1), 131–142. Retrieved from <https://ejournal.umm.ac.id/index.php/kembara/index>
- Sarıçoban, A., & Karakurt, L. (2016). The use of task-based activities to improve listening and speaking skills in EFL context. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 13(6), 445–459. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17265/1539-8072/2016.06.003>
- Shabani, M. B., & Ghasemi, A. (2014). The effect of task-based language teaching (TBLT) and content-based language teaching (CBLT) on the Iranian intermediate ESP learners' reading comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1713–1721. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.598>
- Sholeh, M. B. (2020). Implementation of task-based learning in teaching English in Indonesia: Benefits and problems. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 15(1). Retrieved from <http://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/LC>
- Smith, R. O. (2018). *Examining Task-Based Language Teaching and its Second Language acquisition Underpinnings Through the Design and Implementation of a Task-Based Unit in a Basic English class at the University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez*. (Master Thesis).
- Sukma, D., Rozimela, Y., & Ratmanida. (2020). Exploring the use of drawing task to enhance students' reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on English Language and Teaching (ICOELT 2019)* (pp. 7–13). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200306.002>
- Sukmadinata, N. (2001). *Development of Theory and Practice Curriculum*. Bandung: Rosdakarya Youth.
- Sundari, H., Febriyanti, R. H., & Saragih, G. (2018). Using task-based materials in teaching writing for EFL classes in Indonesia. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 7(3), 119–1124. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.119>
- Sutiah. (2011). The implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT) within group-work in an English as foreign language (EFL) elementary classroom in Indonesia. *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 4(24), 205–258. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1315903662/>
- Swan, M. (2005). Legislation by hypothesis: the case of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(3), 376–401. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami013>
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9–15. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/50.1.9>
- Uddin, M. K., & Ahmed, T. (2012). Inductive and contextual approaches to English Grammar Teaching. *Language in India*, 12(11). Retrieved from <http://www.languageinindia.com/>
- Vieira, S. (2017). Task-based instruction for autonomy: connections with contexts of practice, conceptions of teaching, and professional development strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 51(3), 693–715. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.384>
- Willis, D., & Willis, J. (2007). *Doing task-based teaching*. Oxford University Press.

- Yuan, F., & Ellis, R. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 monologic oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1–27. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/24.1.1>
- Yulianti, A. M. (2020). Students' perceptions of the implementation of task-based language teaching. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 6(1), 1–10 Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.26486/jele.v6i1.1027>
- Yundayani, A., & Ardiasih, L. S. (2011). Task-based material design for academic purposes: learners' English writing skill improvement. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 8(1), 258–275. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i1.18169>
- Zúñiga, E. C. (2016). Implementing task-based language teaching to integrate language skills in an EFL program at a Colombian university. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(2), 13–27. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v18n2.49754>