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ABSTRACT

TH. OKY ANDRIANI. S891102049. 2016. The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction to Teach Speaking Viewed from Students’ Creativity. Thesis. first consultant: Prof. Dr. Joko Nurkamto, M. Pd.; second consultant: Dra. Dewi Rochsantiningsih, M.Ed., Ph.D. Study Program English Education Department of Graduate School of Sebelas Maret University.

The objectives of the research is to investigate whether: (1) TBI is more effective than CBI to teach speaking, (2) the students who have high learning creativity have better speaking competence than those who have low learning creativity, and (3) there is an interaction between teaching approaches and learning creativity to teach speaking. This research includes three variables. Two independent variables are teaching approaches: Task-Based Instruction and Content-Based Instruction, and creativity. While the dependent variable is speaking competence.

The research was conducted at the tenth grade of SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo in the academic year of 2015/2016. The sample was two classes out of three. One class was used as the experimental class and the other was used as control class. The experimental class was taught using Task-Based Instruction while the control class was taught using Content-Based Instruction. To define the sample, cluster random sampling was applied. Each class was divided into two groups of which consisted of students having high creativity and those having low creativity. To obtain the data, two instruments were used: speaking test was applied to measure the students’ speaking competence and creativity test was applied to measure the students’ creativity. The data were then analysed using Multifactor Analysis of Variance ANOVA 2x2 and Turkey Test. Before conducting the ANOVA test, pre-requisite test: normality and homogeneity test, were implemented.

The results of the ANOVA show that: (1) F0 between approaches, 32.19, is higher than F0 (0.05), 4.09, and the speaking mean score of students taught using Task-Based Instruction, 82.8, is higher than the mean score of those taught using Content-Based Instruction, 73.2; therefore, it can be concluded that Task-Based Instruction is more effective than Content-Based Instruction to teach speaking; (2) F0 between groups of high and low creativity, 118.28, is higher than F0 (0.05), 4.09, and the speaking mean score of students having high creativity, 87.2, is higher than that of students having low creativity, 68.8; therefore, it can be concluded that students having high creativity have better achievement in speaking than those having low creativity; and (3) F0 interaction, 8.05, is higher than F0 (0.05), 4.09; therefore, it can be concluded that there is an interaction between teaching approaches and creativity. The effectiveness of teaching approaches is affected by the levels of students’ creativity and TBI is appropriate for students having high creativity and CBI is appropriate for students having low creativity.

As the conclusion, Task-Based Instruction is an effective approach to teach speaking for tenth grade students. However, to support the use of Task-Based instruction, a teacher is recommended to select tasks which suit the level of students’ creativity so that the effectiveness of Task-Based Instruction can affect the students’ speaking competence significantly.

Keywords: speaking competence, Task-Based Instruction, Content-Based Instruction, creativity, experimental research
ABSTRAK


Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti apakah: (1) TBI lebih efektif dari pada CBI untuk mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara, (2) peserta didik dengan kreativitas tinggi memiliki kemampuan berbicara lebih baik dari pada mereka yang memiliki kreativitas rendah, dan (3) ada interaksi antara pendekatan pengajaran dan kreativitas untuk mengajarkan keterampilan berbicara. Terdapat tiga variabel dalam penelitian ini: dua variabel bebas yaitu pendekatan pengajaran: Task-Based Instruction dan Content-Based Instruction, dan kreativitas dan variabel terikat yaitu kemampuan berbicara. Penelitian ini dilakukan untuk menguji dampak dua variabel bebas terhadap variabel terikat.


Hasil ANAVA menunjukkan bahwa: (1) rata-rata nilai berbicara siswa yang diajar dengan Task-Based Instruction, 82.8, lebih tinggi dari pada nilai berbicara siswa yang diajar dengan Content-Based Instruction, 73.2; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa Task-Based Instruction lebih efektif dari pada Content-Based Instruction untuk mengajarkan berbicara; (2) rata-rata nilai berbicara siswa dengan kreativitas tinggi, 87.2, lebih baik dari rata-rata nilai siswa dengan kreativitas rendah, 68.8; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa siswa dengan kreativitas tinggi memiliki kemampuan berbicara lebih baik dari pada siswa dengan kreativitas rendah; dan (3) F interaksi, 8.05, lebih tinggi dari F o 0.05, 4.09; maka dapat disimpulkan bahwa ada interaksi antara pendekatan pembelajaran dengan kreativitas dalam mengajarkan speaking.

Kesimpulan dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa Task-Based Instruction merupakan pendekatan pembelajaran yang efektif untuk mengajar speaking pada siswa kelas X SMA Pangudi Luhur St. Vincentius Giriwoyo. Namun, untuk mendukung penerapan Task-Based Instruction, guru disarankan untuk memilih task yang sesuai dengan tingkat kreativitas siswa sehingga efektivitas Task-Based Instruction dapat memengaruhi keterampilan speaking siswa secara signifikan.

Kata kunci: keterampilan berbicara, Task-Based Instruction, Content-Based Instruction, kreativitas, penelitian eksperimental
MOTTO

If you're trying to achieve, there will be roadblocks. I've had them; everybody has had them. But obstacles don't have to stop you. If you run into a wall, don't turn around and give up. Figure out how to climb it, go through it, or work around it.

(Michael Jordan)
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