

The Effectiveness of Content-based Instruction and Task-based Instruction in Teaching Writing

Choiriah Ayu Lestari
English Education Study Program
Yogyakarta State University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
choiriah.ayu@student.uny.ac.id

Margana
English Education Study Program
Yogyakarta State University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
margana@uny.ac.id

Abstract—This research aims to investigate (1) whether the use of Content-Based Instruction is more effective than the use of Task-Based Instruction in the teaching of writing skills, (2) whether the use of Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is more effective than the use of conventional method in the teaching of writing skills, (3) whether the use of Task-Based Instruction (TBI) is more effective than the use of conventional method in the teaching of writing skills, and (4) the most effective method among Content-Based Instruction, Task-Based Instruction and conventional method in the teaching of writing skills. This research was Quasi Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design, which use a quantitative method and belonged to an experimental research. The population of the research was all of students in the tenth-grade students of SMK Muhammadiyah Bungoro and used three classes as the sample of research (one control class and two experiment classes). The researcher used cluster random sampling to determine the experiment and control classes. The variables of research consist of two independent variables; they were CBI and TBI, and dependent variable was the students' writing skills. The researcher used a writing test as the research instrument and assigned the students to write a descriptive text to collect the data. In addition, this research used a content validity and did expert judgment to validate the instrument. The researcher also employed inter-rater reliability to measure the reliability of the instrument. To examine the data, the researcher used SPSS v16 then drawn descriptive and inferential analysis as the result of the research. The research findings showed that all of hypotheses were accepted.

Keywords—content-based instruction, task-based instruction, writing

I. INTRODUCTION

In language learning process, writing is an activity that plays an important role where the students are required to convey and share their thoughts to others through written language. For that reason, it is important to highlight that writing is not only an activity to communicate by using some symbols but it is also a form of track record of the students as an effort to maximize their potential. Unfortunately, writing is often considered as a skills that is not easy to master. It complex and sometimes difficult to teach [1]. It requires not only grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and result of thinking

There are many reasons why students have poor writing ability. Firstly, written language tends to be more formal when compared with the spoken one. Afterwards, the use of vocabularies, punctuation, developing of ideas and the accuracy of grammar can affect meaning in written language. Secondly, mistakes in the written language are something not

easy straightened up. It takes a long process to clarify errors in writing. This is one of the difficulties of written language when compared to the spoken language. Thirdly, the teachers are unable to create a meaningful learning of how to make a good writing. Most of them only provide the material that will be used for the writing without telling the students what aspects to consider in writing. That is why many students have low motivation to practice their writing skills. For this reason, the researcher tries to apply Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Instruction (TBI) as methods in writing learning skills.

The use of CBI and TBI as teaching methods mean a way of language teaching which is based on the systematic principles and procedures related to the theory and application on how a language is best taught and learned through CBI and TBI's view. These methods designs and creates a meaningful learning as a way to reach the goal of learning in teaching and learning process itself. It is expected that by implementing these methods, the students are not only be able to write but they can learning how to write at the same time.

The rest of this paper is organized as follow: Section II describes proposed research method. Section III presents the obtained results and following by discussion in section IV. Finally, Section V concludes this work.

II. PROPOSED METHOD

The design of this research was Quasi Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design, which use a quantitative method and belonged to an experimental research. By this research, the researcher tries to find out the effect of CBI and TBI as the treatment in learning process, especially in writing skills. The design is presented as follows [2]:

A. Research Design

Group E1	O1	X1	O2
Group E2	O3	X2	O4
Group C O5The statistical analysis method used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to evaluate the differences between groups of whole part training methods and groups of mini games training methods in the pretest and posttest. Levene test is used to see whether the data is homogeneous, while kolmogorov smirnov is used to see whether the data is normal			
	-		O6

E1 : Experiment class I
E2 : Experiment class II
C : Control class
X1 : Treatment using CBI
X2 : Treatment using TBI

- O1 : Pretest (Experiment class I)
- O2 : Post-test (Experiment class I)
- O3 : Pretest (Experiment class II)
- O4 : Post-test (Experiment class II)
- O5 : Pretest (Control class)
- O6 : Post-test (Control class)

The research design describes that there are three classes as the sample of this research. Pre-test and post-test were given to both control and experiment class. In this case, experiment class refers to the class where CBI and TBI were implemented as the treatment and control class using conventional method.

Pre-test was conducted before giving the treatment which CBI and TBI in teaching writing skills were used. Finally post-test is conducted at the end of the procedures in both control and experiment classes. Based on the post-test's result, it can be seen the significance of the use of CBI and TBI in teaching writing.

The population of the research was all of students in the tenth grade students of SMK Muhammadiyah Bungoro. In determining the sample, the researcher used cluster random sampling to determine the experiment and control classes. Moreover, to determine which classes would be the experimental and control classes, the researcher used a lottery together with the English teacher as personal judgement to prevent the subjectivity and give the same chance to the classes as the sample of the research.

The sample of the research was the students at tenth grade of SMK Muhammadiyah Bungoro which consisted of the students in X Las 1, X Las 2 and X Las 3. The students in X Las 1 is the group of control class and the students in X Las 2 and X Las 3 are the group of experiment classes.

There were two variables in this research; independent and dependent variables. Independent variables were CBI and TBI as the treatments in the experiment classes and dependent variable is the students' writing skills that reflected through the scores of the writing tests.

The researcher used an inter-rater reliability to measure the reliability of the research instruments. Inter-scorer reliability refers to the degree of agreement by two or more ratters/ scorers [3][4]. Therefore, the researcher used the correlation coefficient between two classes or Intraclass Correlation Coefficients to test the reliability by doing the assessment with the English teacher.

There were five categories of the reliability coefficient [5] as follows: very low (0.000-0.199), low (0.200-0.399), sufficient (0.400-0.599), high (0.600-0.790), and very high (0.800-1.000). The result of the inter-rater reliability is presented in Table I below.

TABLE I. RESULTS OF INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Test	Class	Reliability Coefficient	Category
Pre-Test	Control Class	0.988	Very High
	Experiment Class I	0.990	Very High
	Experiment Class II	0.989	Very High
Post-Test	Control Class	0.994	Very High
	Experiment Class I	0.991	Very High
	Experiment Class II	0.988	Very High

To collect the data, the researcher assigned the students to write a text. The topic of the text was describing things, people and their job. The researcher conducted the pre-test before giving a treatment in the experiment and control classes. Then, the researcher conducted the post-test in both experiment and control class after giving the treatment to the experiment classes. In the end of the research, the researcher analyzes the data obtained to draw conclusions. Through the test result, the effectiveness of CBI, TBI and conventional method will be showed.

The instrument that used to collect the data was designed based on the 2013 curriculum and the English syllabus in Writing Skills for tenth Grade Vocational High Schools. In this level, the students should be able to make descriptive texts by paying attention to the social functions, the text structures, and the appropriate language features. After creating the research instrument, then it consulted to the lecturer as the expert judgment and the English teacher as the personal judgment.

Descriptive and inferential analysis were used as the technique to analyze the data. The purpose of the descriptive analysis is to describe the result of the writing tests. It also facilitates the researcher to summarize the data, so the researcher can make the benchmark of value based on the average of students' scores. Besides, the inferential analysis was used to examine the hypotheses of the research. In this technique, researcher employed ANOVA then continued by Scheffe Test. Before conducting ANOVA test, the researcher ensured that the data meet some criteria related to the normality and homogeneity.

To test normality of the data, the researcher employed a formula of One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Normality test is used to know whether the data distribution is normal or not. Based on the significance level, the conclusion of the test can be concluded as follows:

- If the significance probability > 0.05 , the data have a normal distribution.
- If the significance probability < 0.05 , the data deviate from normal distribution.

To test homogeneity, the researcher employed a Levene test. Homogeneity test is used to know whether the data have the same variance and does not show the significant difference among the data. Based on the significance level, the conclusion of the test can be concluded as follows:

- If the significance probability > 0.05 , the variance is homogenous.

- If the significance probability < 0.05 , the variance is not homogenous.

III. RESULTS

The data analysis consist of the result of descriptive analysis and inferential analysis both pretest and posttest in control and experimental class. The researcher conducted the writing test (pre-test and post-test) to gather the data. Based on the result descriptive analysis, the researcher determined the mean, maximum score, minimum score, average and standard deviation of each class among pre-test and post-test.

In addition, the researcher categorized the data to find out the level of students' skills in writing. There are five categories [14] based on the data such as very poor ($X < 51.49$), poor ($51.5 < X < 58.49$), fair ($58.5 < X < 65.49$), good ($65.5 < X < 72.49$), and very good ($72.5 < X$).

Furthermore, the data is analyzed as inferential analysis to determine whether the hypotheses in this research are accepted or not. To analyze the data, the research uses SPSS v16 Windows computer program.

A. Descriptive Analysis

1) Pre-Test

The purpose of giving pre-test to the students is to determine their level of writing skills before they were given the treatment using CBI for experiment class I and TBI for experiment class II as the learning method.

The following Table II is a descriptive analysis of the pretest between the control class, experiment class I, and experiment class II.

TABLE II. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC OF PRE-TEST

Class	N	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	25	40.25	66.25	1413	56.53	7.733
Experimental 1	25	48.75	70.25	1571	62.85	4.734
Experiment class II	25	48.50	70.25	1518	60.72	5.603

By comparing the scores between the control class and the two experiment classes, the table shows that experiment class I has the greater scores than experiment class II and control class, i.e. $1571 > 1518 > 1413$.

Referring to the data of pre-test in control class, the categorization of students' writing skills is presented in Table III below.

TABLE III. CATEGORIZATION OF STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS IN PRE-TEST

No	Interval score	Category	Control	Exp. 1	Exp. 2
			f	f	f
1	$X \leq 51.49$	Very Poor	6	1	1
2	$51.5 < X \leq 58.49$	Poor	3	1	6
3	$58.5 < X \leq 65.49$	Fair	15	15	14
4	$65.5 < X \leq 72.49$	Good	1	8	4
5	$72.5 < X$	Very Good	0	0	0
Total			25	25	25

From the results of the Table III above, it can be concluded that the most students among the control class, experiment class 1, and experiment class 2 has the same level skills, they are in the fair category. It is proved by the highest frequency of each class at that level. It also shows that the classes are suitable to be used as the sample of the research because they have the same skills level before being given treatment. In addition, this is in line with the mean of the three classes (60.03) where the mean score is in the third interval score ($58.5 < 60.03 < 65.49$) in fair category which is presented in Table IV below.

TABLE IV. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC OF PRE-TEST SCORE

Class	N	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	25	40.25	70.25	4502	60.03	6.620

2) Post-Test

The purpose of giving post-test to the students is to determine their level of writing skills after they were given the treatment using CBI and TBI in experiment classes while control class did not give any treatment. The following Table V is the descriptive analysis of the post-test.

TABLE V. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTIC OF POST-TEST

Class	N	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	25	49.75	70.25	1501	60.04	5.654
Experiment class I	25	62.00	82.00	1783	71.35	5.470
Experiment class II	25	52.50	74.50	1625	65.02	5.412

By comparing the scores between the control class and the two experiment classes after giving the treatment, the table shows that experiment class I has greater scores than experiment class II and control class, i.e. $1783 > 1625 > 1501$.

Referring to the data of post-test in control class, the categorization of students' writing skills is presented in Table VI below.

TABLE VI. CATEGORIZATION OF STUDENTS' WRITING SKILLS IN POST-TEST

No	Interval score	Category	Control	Exp. 1	Exp. 2
			f	f	f
1	$X \leq 51.49$	Very Poor	4	0	0
2	$51.5 < X < 58.49$	Poor	4	0	3
3	$58.5 < X < 65.49$	Fair	15	5	8
4	$65.5 < X < 72.49$	Good	2	7	12
5	$72.5 < X$	Very Good	0	13	2
Total			25	25	25

From the results of the Table VI above, it can be concluded that after giving the treatment, the most students among the experiment class I and experiment class II has difference among pre-test and post-test. In experiment class I, there are thirteen students in *very good* category and twelfth students are in *good* category. It is proven by the highest frequency of each class. So, it can be inferred that students in experiment class I and experiment class II achieved greater significant improvement related to writing skills than control class after conducted the research.

B. Inferential Analysis

1) Pre-Analysis Testing

Pre-testing was done to ensure that the data that used in this research has the normal distribution and the variance of the sample is homogeneous before testing the hypothesis. To test normality of the data, the researcher employed a formula of One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Then, to test homogeneity, the researcher employed a Levene test.

Based on the normality test, the distribution of the data is normal because all of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) both pre-test and post-test in control and experimental class were greater than 0.05. The result of the normality test is presented in Table VII below.

TABLE VII. RESULTS OF ONE SAMPLE KOLMOGOROV-SMIRNOV TEST

	Control Class		Experimenta I Class I		Experimenta I Class II		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Pre-Test	Post-Test	
N	25	25	25	25	25	25	
Normal Parameters ^a	Mean	56.53	60.04	62.85	71.35	60.72	65.02
	Std. Deviation	7.733	5.654	4.734	5.470	5.603	5.412
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.241	.124	.131	.147	.099	.142
	Positive	.104	.105	.098	.103	.098	.077
	Negative	-.241	-.124	-.131	-.147	-.099	-.142
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.203	.622	.657	.736	.497	.709
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.111	.834	.781	.650	.966	.697

Based on the homogeneity test, the researcher found that the data are homogenous between pre-test and post-test because the significance probability > 0.05. It can be proved from the Table VIII below.

TABLE VIII. RESULTS OF HOMOGENEITY OF VARIANCES

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pre-test	4.252	2	72	.108
Post-test	.043	2	72	.878

2) Hypothesis Testing

After the researcher ensure the data has normally distribution and the variance was homogeneous, then the researcher continued to test the hypothesis to reveal whether the hypothesis proposed by the researcher was accepted or not. There are four hypotheses that were tested using ANOVA followed by the Scheffe test. ANOVA test is used to test the significance of treatment on teaching writing skills using conventional, CBI, and TBI as the learning method. Then, the Scheffe test is used to know the rank of the treatment.

The results of ANOVA is presented in the following Table IV. The table shows that there is a significant different between the groups of control class, experiment class I and experiment class II. It is proved by the value of Sig. (0.000) which is lower than 0.05.

TABLE IX. RESULTS OF ANALYSIS USING ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
posttest	Between Groups	1606.545	2	803.272	26.423	.000
	Within Groups	2188.825	72	30.400		
	Total	3795.370	74			

After knowing the significance of the treatments in the three classes, then the analysis continued by using Scheffe test. The result of the Scheffe test is presented in Table X.

TABLE X. RESULTS OF SCHEFFE TEST

Dependent Variable	(I) class	(J) class	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Post-test	control	exp1	-11.31000 ^a	1.55950	.000	-15.2081	-7.4119
		exp2	-4.98000 ^a	1.55950	.008	-8.8781	-1.0819
	exp1	control	11.31000 ^a	1.55950	.000	7.4119	15.2081
		exp2	6.33000 ^a	1.55950	.001	2.4319	10.2281
	exp2	control	4.98000 ^a	1.55950	.008	1.0819	8.8781
		exp1	-6.33000 ^a	1.55950	.001	-10.2281	-2.4319

The first hypothesis says that the use of CBI is more effective than TBI in teaching writing skills. Based on the table, this hypothesis is accepted. It is proved by the value of Sig. 0.001 that is lower than 0.05. Furthermore, it was indicated that experiment class I performed better than experiment class II, as shown by the value of mean difference which is positive, i.e. 6.33000.

The second hypothesis is accepted. The hypothesis addresses that CBI is more effective than conventional method in teaching writing skills. It could be seen through the value of Sig. 0.000 that is lower than 0.05 with mean difference value which is positive, i.e. 11.31000. It can be

conclude that the experiment class I still performed better than control class.

The third hypothesis indicates that TBI is more effective than conventional method in teaching writing skills. The hypothesis is also accepted because the value of Sig. 0.008 that is lower than 0.05 and mean difference value which is positive, i.e. 4.98000 which shown that experiment class II performed better than control class.

The last hypothesis ensures that CBI is the most effective method among TBI and conventional method in teaching writing skills. It was proved by mean difference value of the experiment class I to the other classes that shows positive results. The value of mean difference of the experiment class I to the experiment class II is 6.33000 and the value of the experiment class I to the control class is 11.31000. In other words, the experiment class I has the highest mean among all classes.

IV. DISCUSSION

As the findings of the research, the researcher claimed that CBI and TBI are effective to be implemented in language teaching and learning. It indicates that there are differences between before giving the treatment (pre-test) and after giving the treatment (post-test). The findings also states that CBI is the most effective method among TBI and conventional in teaching writing skills. It was proven through the value of mean difference of the experiment class I to the other classes. CBI has the highest scores and shows positive results which means that CBI as method in teaching writing skills performed better than the other [8][9].

In addition, CBI influences the students' learning outcomes and it also giving some benefits when CBI is applied in the classroom. It also proposes some benefits such as facilitate the students to connect the materials and the real-life experiences as their needs in learning. Of course, it can attract and motivate them to learn because the learning environment becomes meaningful, friendly and natural [10]. Furthermore, CBI leads the language development in many ways, such as motivated them to learn because the material that they used in study was meaningful, interesting and links their present and future needs. In addition, the use of CBI also served the students to emphasize the meaning of the language by using authentic material [11].

Like the application of CBI in the classroom, the application of TBI as a learning method is also recommended by some experts. TBI is defined as a method of language teaching and learning in which tasks are the central points. In other words, TBI is a method that use task as the main activities in language teaching and learning. Need to be emphasize that the most important thing of the tasks was the students should be enjoy the task itself. The role of the teacher was a guide and monitoring the learning process [12].

In some studies, the use of TBI is useful to stimulate the integrated skills of the students when implemented in language learning. TBI was claimed can help the students to incorporate the abilities through the series of task. It trains writing, speaking, reading, and listening skills at the same time [6][13].

The series of task that applied in TBI provides some opportunities to the students to be more motivated and interested in learning. The use of different set of tasks, following the cycle of the task that is given, utilizing the cooperative learning to maximize the students' interaction, and various types of feedback provoke students' interest in what they were writing. Giving feedback in a discussion was helpful in improving their scores because the task involves the interaction among the teacher to the students and among the students to the students [5].

V. CONCLUSION

This paper has presented the effectiveness of content-based instruction and task-based instruction in teaching writing. Based on the previous studies above, it can be concluded that the use of CBI and TBI as methods of language learning becomes important to be considered by teachers. Not only can it enhance the students writing skills, but also it creates a meaningful learning for the students. In addition, the use of CBI and TBI can stimulate the students to develop their own language skills communicatively without any pressure. They will be enthusiastic to enjoy the process of learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express the highest gratitude and appreciation to my husband and my parents for all of the endless love and support that are given to me. The gratitude is also delivered to the big family of Yogyakarta State University, especially for the lecturers and all of the friends in English Education Post Graduate Program to be a great teamwork. I convey a bunch of thank you to the Principle and the teachers in SMK Muhammadiyah Bungoro, Pangkep, Sulawesi Selatan for the chance thus I can conduct and finish this research. The last but not least, I would recommend this journal to the researchers who want to create a meaningful learning for the students.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.B. Heaton, *Writing English Language Test*. London: Longman Group Ltd, 1988.
- [2] S. Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta, 2006.
- [3] W. Widhiarso, *Mengestimasi Reliabilitas*. Yogyakarta: Fakultas Psikologi UGM, 2005
- [4] D. Mardapi, *Pengukuran Penilaian & Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Nuha Medika, 2012.
- [5] S. Payman and B. Gorjian, "Effects of Task-Based Strategies on Students' Writing Skills Among Translation Students, *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3, 201-216
- [6] E. C. Zuniga, "Implementing Task-Based Language Teaching to Integrate Language Skill in an EFL Program at a Colombian University", *Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 2, 13-27.
- [7] D. Nunan, *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [8] M. Amiri and A. H. Fatemi, "The Impact of Content-Based Instruction on Students' Achievement in ESP Courses and Their Language Learning Orientation", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4, 2157-2167.
- [9] M. Asadi, I. Noroozi, R. Asadi, S. Asadi, & A. Mardani, "Does Iranian Content Based English Language Instruction Improve High

Schools Students' Proficiencies More Than The Conventional?"
International Journal of Advanced Research, 4, 1114-1119.

- [10] M. P. Omoto and W. J. Nyongesa, "Content- Based Instruction: A Study of Methods of Teaching and Learning English in Primary Schools in Butula District", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4, 236-245.
- [11] K. Corrales and C. Maloof, "*Student Perceptions on How Content Based Instruction Supports Learner Development in a Foreign Language Context*", unpublished.
- [12] H. Marashi and L. Dadari, "The Impact of Using Task-Based Writing on EFL Learners' Writing Performance and Creativity", *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, 2500-2507.
- [13] S. H. Seyedi and A. A. K. Farahani, "The Application of Task-Based Writing and Traditional Writing on The Development of Reading Comprehension on EFL Advanced Iranian Learners", *International Journal of English Language Education*, 2, 225-240.