Journal of Harbin Engineering University
ISSN: 1006-7043

Vol 45 No. 12
December 2024

Integrating Technology with Task Based Language Teaching: Boosting ESL Learners' Listening and Speaking Proficiency

[1]R. Akshaya, [2]Dr. S. Meena Rani
[1]Research Scholar, Department of English,
Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research Institute, Chennai-600095.
[2]Professor, Department of English,
Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research Institute, Chennai-600095.

Abstract
The integration of learning technology and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) may provide a framework for developing language education that improves students' speaking and listening abilities. However, previous studies have not examined how technology-enhanced TBLT can improve learners' speaking and listening skills. Thus, this study aims to use a quasi-experiment with a nonequivalent (pretest and posttest) control-group design to examine how TBLT affects learners' speaking and listening skills. Data was gathered using four tasks: a theme-based presentation, role-play, online group discussion, and the listening portion of the TOEFL exam. Results indicated that the use of technology to improve TBLT had a major impact on students' speaking performance in the role-play and online presentation. The results provide some insight into how students' use of authentic and technological learning materials and media contributes to their acquisition of a variety of language inputs related to their listening and speaking skills. When it comes to improving speaking performance, students might gain from combining technology-enhanced TBLT with various tasks.
Keywords: Technology-enhanced TBLT, Speaking performance, Student satisfaction, Task-based instruction.

Introduction

A major trend in achieving language learning objectives is technological advancement, which is the widespread use of online learning and learning technologies. This development has helped language pedagogical approaches such as online language courses via learning management systems, computer-assisted language learning, and mobile-assisted language learning. Since learning assessments, instructional procedures, and material transfer have significantly improved in flexibility, accessibility, updating, and dynamicity for a variety of language learners, these methods have been deemed successful (Anwar & Arifani, 2016). Thus, learners can improve their learning engagements (Mulyono, 2016), learn the language independently (Tananuraksakul, 2016), and maximize their learning opportunities (Kiliçkaya, Krajka & Latoch-Zielińska, 2014) by integrating technology into language instruction.

In English for Specific Purposes (ESP) language instruction, technologies like learning management systems, online resources, and live online meetings can be used to help students perform well in their productive language skills and enhance their receptive language skills through a variety of online learning sources (Alizadeh, 2018; Anwar & Arifani, 2016; Mulyadi, Wijayatiningsih, Budiastuti, Ifadah, & Aimah, 2020).

However, there are several obstacles to integrating learning technologies into ESL instruction, including inadequate management of the classroom, lecturers' resistance to using technology, and the complexity of managing student access during the e-learning process (Mulyadi et al., 2020). Furthermore, learners have not had enough opportunities to practice communicating in English thanks to ESL training. For example, communication constraints make it difficult for a sample of students to provide excellent speaking abilities (Lu, 2018). Professional care is significantly impacted by difficulties with communication caused by inadequate English proficiency, such as trouble understanding and completing tasks like role-playing, presentations, debates, etc. (Ali & Watson, 2018). Teachers must therefore design learning activities that encourage learners to enjoy practicing their English for informative language learning exercises (Arifani and Suryanti, 2019).

In framework, communicative language teaching (CLT) should be implemented in ESL instruction to empower learners to actively use their learned language (Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Shariq, 2020). One of the well-known showing strategies in CLT is task-based language education (TBLT). This TBLT has advanced student-focused language guidance to further develop ESL students' open skill (Wu, Liao, and DeBacker, 2016) and support their inspiration in rehearsing their language (Tan, 2016; Aliasin, Saeedi, and Pineh, 2019). The execution of this TBLT has been considered a compelling way to deal with supporting ESL students by highlighting significant exercises and performing undertakings to improve their open capabilities in assorted logical conditions (Wu et al., 2016; Bao and Du, 2015). In addition, this TBLT has been advantageous to improve language understudies' learning inspiration and contribution since they have left on the genuine and certifiable correspondence undertakings (Page and Mede, 2018; Wu et al., 2016; Ji and Pham, 2020; Widodo, 2017).

According to numerous studies, integrating TBLT with learning technologies can make learners feel confident and inspired to use their English language proficiency in authentic communication activities (Eslami & Kung, 2016). Furthermore, through enhancing a variety of authentic materials, this integration has been able to motivate students to finish their language tasks (Xue, 2020; Arslanyilmaz, 2012). Teachers must design authentic and contextual exercises in a variety of EFL contexts for remote learning in order to effectively integrate technology-enhanced TBLT in the ESP context (Chen & Wright, 2017; Bryfonski & McKay, 2019). Teachers and students can discuss feasible and achievable tasks in this context. As a result, students can become more excited about completing language performance challenges (Bygate, 2016).

Recent research on TBLT-integrated learning technologies has focused on vocabulary exploration (Page & Mede, 2018), attitudes of EFL students (Chen & Lin, 2018), reviewing articles about new trends (Ziegler, 2016), examining implementation challenges (Iveson, 2015), and creating instructional frameworks (Nielson, Pinckney, & Gómez, 2017).

However, experimental research on technology-enhanced TBLT implementation that focuses on EFL learners' oral language skills as assessed by their speaking and listening comprehension has received little attention up to this point. Conversely, speaking and listening are considered essential as interconnected abilities in face-to-face communication in everyday life (Palmer, 2014). Speaking and listening abilities can both motivate youngsters to actively express their ideas and opinions based on their oral language input (Nation & Newton, 2009). To this end, this paper evaluates the effectiveness of technology-enhanced TBLT on ESL learners' speaking performance.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT)

Language instruction has been widely used and influenced by TBLT. According studies (Khoram & Zhang, 2019; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Ji & Pham, 2020; Ke, 2009), TBLT is a successful language pedagogy that emphasizes how meaningful language learning activities with diverse real-life tasks can attain communicative outcomes. By using authentic tasks to enhance target language input, this TBLT can help students become more motivated to learn the language (Aliasin et al., 2019; Page & Mede, 2018). Several models of pedagogical stages have been proposed by eminent scholars to implement TBLT, including Ellis (2009) (pre-task, main task, and post-task); Nunan (2004) proposed pedagogical tasks and real-world target tasks; and Williams (1996) proposed the pre-task phase, the task cycle, and the language focus. Despite their differences, the main objective of this TBLT should be to improve learners' target language performances through meaningful tasks, regardless of the variations in their pedagogical sequences. To create technology-enhanced TBLT, the current study modified the TBLT pedagogical stages from Willis (1996) and Nielson, Pinckney, and Gómez (2017).

The pre-task phase is the initial stage. The goal of this phase is to activate the prior linguistic knowledge of ESL learners, including the English vocabulary they will use throughout the task cycles. The task cycle phase is then carried out by asking students to participate in language exercises in groups, pairs, and individually to improve their

English speaking and listening skills. ESL teachers act as the learning facilitator during this stage. Following the task cycles, reporting tasks, language form analysis, and practice of related tasks are used to orchestrate the final pedagogical stage.

When it comes to reporting tasks, students who were assigned the tasks should be prepared to showcase their completed tasks. ESL teachers and their colleagues simultaneously monitor and pinpoint language form-related concerns and issues in relation to learners' feedback. The results of its observations are carefully reviewed in class to help learners with language proficiency.

The learners are encouraged to complete an additional language task in order to enhance their language usage as a consequence of the previously mentioned activities.

Technology Enhanced TBLT

In language instruction, TBLT and learning technology are regarded as the most effective innovative pedagogical frameworks. Enhancing applied linguistics students' learning motivation and opportunities for oral language practice has been greatly impacted by the combination of technology and TBLT (K. T. C. Chen, 2019). Chen & Lin (2018) looked into how mobile-assisted tasks could be a manifestation of this integration. Technology-enhanced TBLT has improved enjoyable English learning activities and decreased students' fear of speaking English with teachers and partners. Similarly, Pellerin (2014) discovered that mobile devices have helped with task construction in TBLT to support EFL learners in independently mastering language through self-regulated and meaningful language learning activities.

Technology-Integrated Language Learning (TILL) leverages tools like apps, platforms, and multimedia resources to enhance language acquisition. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), a key method within TILL, focuses on engaging learners in meaningful tasks, promoting effective communication. At the tertiary level, incorporating TILL for speaking skills facilitates authentic interaction, immediate feedback, and personalized learning experiences. Technology supports diverse learning styles through simulations, virtual exchanges, and interactive exercises. Mixed-methodology research on TILL shows improved speaking proficiency due to increased motivation and practice opportunities. Integrating diverse tools such as speech recognition and AI chatbots enriches language learning, offering adaptive, context-based learning environments. However, success requires investment in resources, training educators, and ensuring digital equity. Overall, TILL and TBLT together provide dynamic, adaptive approaches to developing speaking skills in complex language environments.

Literature review

Technology Integrated Language Learning (TILL) leverages digital tools to enhance language acquisition. Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) focuses on using meaningful tasks to promote communicative competence. When integrated, these approaches offer innovative ways to improve speaking skills among tertiary-level students. Studies highlight the benefits of using multimedia, virtual reality, and online platforms to create immersive environments for language practice. TILL fosters engagement, immediate feedback, and real-world task simulations, aligning with TBLT's goal of practical language usage. Mixed-methodology research, combining quantitative data like test scores and qualitative data such as student interviews, provides comprehensive insights into TILL's effectiveness. Evidence shows technology fosters motivation and enhances interaction, leading to improved fluency and confidence in learners. Despite challenges, such as access disparities and tech skill gaps, TILL and TBLT integration is increasingly recognized for advancing speaking proficiency.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is a widely recognized pedagogical approach that emphasizes the use of meaningful tasks to enhance language learning. With advancements in technology, integrating digital tools into TBLT has become increasingly prevalent, particularly in improving speaking skills. TBLT emphasizes interaction and communication as central to language learning. Ellis (2003) defines TBLT as a framework where learners

engage in real-world tasks, promoting fluency, accuracy, and complexity in speaking.

Digital tools provide learners with opportunities for immersive and interactive learning. Technology facilitates asynchronous and synchronous communication, enhances access to authentic materials, and provides platforms for collaborative learning (Chapelle, 2001).

Tasks should mimic real-life communication scenarios while leveraging technology to provide diverse speaking contexts (Ellis, 2017). Technology-enhanced environments should offer detailed feedback mechanisms. Tools like AI-based language tutors and peer review platforms foster iterative learning processes (Li & Zhang, 2020).Empowering educators to integrate technology seamlessly into TBLT frameworks ensures successful implementation. Studies emphasize the need for professional development in digital pedagogy (Stockwell, 2012).

Integrating technology with TBLT offers transformative potential for developing speaking skills. While the evidence indicates substantial benefits in fluency, engagement, and interaction, addressing challenges like access and training is essential. Future research should explore emerging technologies to broaden the scope of technology-integrated TBLT.

Research Questions

As mentioned earlier, there is little attention to the effectiveness of TBLT in both listening and speaking skills. Thus, this study attempts to contribute to the existing literature by filling in a gap in this research area. Therefore, the research questions of the present study are as follows.

As previously stated, the effectiveness of TBLT in improving the ability to speak and listen is not given sufficient thought. Thus, this study attempts to fill a gap in this area of investigation and add to the body of existing literature. Therefore, the following are the research questions for the present research.

1. To what extent does integrating technology into Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) influence the speaking abilities of ESL learners?
2. How successful is task-based language teaching in enhancing students' listening comprehension and speaking proficiency?

Method

The learners had previously completed general English courses as a prerequisite before enrolling in the current study. To find the homogeneity of variances, a diagnostic TOEFL pretest from the Longman Introductory Course for the TOEFL Test, 2nd edition was used to evaluate their English competence. Besides, speaking exercises (individual presentations, role-plays, and group discussions) were documented as pre-speaking data. In other words, prior to planning the treatments, the learners' pretest scores in the two groups were equal. With a non-equivalent (pretest and posttest) control-group design, the current study used a quasi-experiment. The task-based language teaching (TBLT) approach was integrated into online learning technologies as the teaching method for the experimental group (i.e., it refer to technology-enhanced TBLT).

Study Design

An online presentation, role-play, online group discussion, and the listening section of the TOEFL exam were the four activities used in this study to gather data. The TOEFL test's listening section, which was taken from the Longman Introductory Course of the TOEFL Test 2nd edition, was used to assess learners' hearing comprehension. The testing process of this test was directed by the standardized listening test that is frequently utilized in the context of ESP (Sakata, 2019; Dashtestani, 2015; Grgurović, 2014; Sheppard, Manalo, & Henning, 2018; Strother, 2005; Tsou & Chen, 2014; Grgurović, 2014; Abdulrahman, 2017).

In the meantime, learners' speaking abilities were evaluated through role-playing, online group discussions, and individual presentations. Based on a classroom-based language assessment, they are given because of related teaching and testing principles (Alberola Colomar, 2014). As a result, these speaking exercises were used to increase students' participation in worthwhile language learning activities and encourage their learning engagement in finishing the assignments that served as their learning evaluation (Gan, He, & Liu, 2019).

Data Analysis

The current study's data were subjected to quantitative analysis. Students in the experimental

and control groups took the speaking pretests at the start of the experiment. Following that, the control group received instruction using the conventional method, while the experimental group received treatment using technology-integrated task-based learning. The following techniques were used to gather data in order to analyze the results of the listening test and speaking assessment rubric scores. To find out how learners' speaking and listening comprehension scores differed, the following methods—frequency and mean, paired sample, and independent sample tests—were used.

The following techniques were used to gather data in order to examine the results of the listening test and the overall speaking testing rubric scores. To find out whether learners' speaking and listening comprehension scores differed, frequency and mean, paired-sample, and independent sample tests were used.

Table 1
Rubrics Criteria for Learners' Speaking Performance

Rubrics Criteria	**Learners' Speaking Performance**			
	Rating score (based on rubrics)	**Role-Play**	**Group Discussion**	**Individual Presentation**
1. Accuracy	1 to 4	√	√	√
2. Fluency and Pronunciation	1 to 4	√	√	√
3. Content	1 to 4	√	√	√
4. Interaction and Communication	1 to 4	√	√	
5. Specific vocabulary	1 to 4	√	√	√
6. Coherence and arguments	1 to 4	√	√	

Findings

This section provides empirical findings regarding the effects of technology-enhanced TBLT on the speaking and listening comprehension abilities of ESL learners. The following sections present and analyze the findings.

Table 2
Learners' listening comprehension between the experimental and control groups

Descriptive Statistics						
		n	**Minimum**	**Maximum**	**M**	**SD**
Experimental Group	Pre-Listening Score	17	11	24	34.62	5.92
	Post-Listening Score	17	13	28	33.53	7.34
Control Group	Pre-Listening Score	15	9	26	32.61	4.32
	Post-Listening Score	15	8	24	31.02	6.02

Paired t test								
	n	**SD**	**SE**	**95%Conf.Interval**		**t**	**df**	**p**
				lower	**Upper**			
Exp. Group (Pre-Listn vs.	-4.30611	7.21377	1.8547	-6.8173	-1.5938	-3.3091	66	0.0002

Post Listn.)								
Control Group. (Pre-Listn vs. Post Listn.)	-1.7164	6.92644	1.2639	-4.59886	1.28117	-1.63244	57	0.16277

The experimental group's significant results suggest that the intervention may have influenced listening comprehension. The absence of significance in the control group highlights a lack of change without intervention. In an overview of descriptive statistics, the experimental group—pre-listening scores (M = 34.62, SD = 5.92)—were slightly higher than post-listening scores (M = 33.53, SD = 7.34). The decrease in mean suggests a potential performance drop.

Meanwhile, in the control group, pre-listening scores (M = 32.61, SD = 4.32) were also higher than post-listening scores (M = 31.02, SD = 6.02). Thus, it can be suggested that TBLT with technology enhancement can significantly improve learners listening comprehension.

On the other hand, in the paired t-test results, the experimental - showed a significant difference between pre- and post-listening scores (t = -3.3091, p = 0.002). The confidence interval (-6.8173, -1.5938) excludes zero, affirming the statistical significance. Further in the Control Group: No significant difference was found (t = -1.6324, p = 0.1627).

Table 3

Learners' scores of speaking performance from three different tasks between experimental and control groups

		n	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Descriptive presentation Statistics-Individually online						
Experimental Group	Pre-Speaking Score	17	15	22	34.62	5.92
	Post-Speaking Score	17	16	21	33.53	7.34
Control Group	Pre-Speaking Score	15	11	20	32.61	4.32
	Post-Speaking Score	15	10	21	31.02	6.02
Descriptive Statistics- Role-Play						
Experimental Group	Pre-Speaking Score	17	10	23	34.62	5.92
	Post-Speaking Score	17	12	25	33.53	7.34
Control Group	Pre-Speaking Score	15	11	22	32.61	4.32

	Post-Speaking Score	15	14	18	31.02	6.02
Descriptive Statistics- Online Group Discussion						
Experimental Group	Pre-Speaking Score	17	14	24	34.62	5.92
	Post-Speaking Score	17	16	21	33.53	7.34
Control Group	Pre-Speaking Score	15	10	22	32.61	4.32
	Post-Speaking Score	15	11	24	31.02	6.02

Independent Samples Test (Pretest Scores of Speaking Performance between Experimental and Control Group)

		f	t	df	p
Online Presentation	Equal variances assumed	0.4987	0 .5736	123	0.4814
Role-Play	Equal variances assumed	0.3439	2.2936	123	0.7823
Online Classroom Discussion	Equal variances assumed	0.0027	0.0385	123	0.9796

Independent Samples Test (Postest Scores of Speaking Performance between Experimental and Control Group)

		f	t	df	p
Online Presentation	Equal variances assumed	0.0381	0 .5736	123	0.5921
Role-Play	Equal variances assumed	1.0348	2.2936	123	0.0391
Online Classroom Discussion	Equal variances assumed	0.2271	0.0385	123	0.9835

The experimental group demonstrated improved speaking performance in the role-play task compared to the control group, potentially due to targeted intervention. The lack of significant differences in other tasks suggests varied task-specific impacts. In descriptive statistics, across tasks (online presentation, role-play, online group discussion), mean scores slightly declined post-test in both groups, but the experimental group's pre- and post-test scores were generally higher. Additionally, in the Independent Samples Test (Pre-test Scores), there were no significant differences

between experimental and control groups in all tasks ($p > 0.05$), indicating comparable baseline performance. Meanwhile, in the Independent Samples Test (Post-test Scores), a significant difference was found in the **Role-Play** task ($t = 2.2936$, $p = 0.0391$), indicating the experimental group outperformed the control group, but there were no significant differences for Online Presentation and Online Classroom Discussion ($p > 0.05$).

The findings highlight that the experimental intervention notably enhanced listening skills and speaking performance in specific tasks, particularly in the role-play activity. These results suggest the efficacy of targeted methods for improving ESL learners' communication skills. Limitations such as slight mean decreases and non-significant outcomes in other tasks warrant further exploration.

On the other hand, in the paired t-test results, the experimental group showed a significant difference between pre- and post-listening scores ($t = -3.3091$, $p = 0.002$). The confidence interval (-6.8173, -1.5938) excludes zero, affirming the statistical significance. Further in the Control Group: No significant difference was found ($t = -1.6324$, $p = 0.1627$).

Discussion

1. To what extent does integrating technology into Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) influence the speaking abilities of ESL learners?

The integration of technology in TBLT significantly impacts ESL learners' speaking abilities:

Experimental vs. Control Groups:

In the experimental group, post-speaking scores across online presentations, role-play, and online classroom discussion tasks showed improvement compared to pre-speaking scores. However, the control group showed minimal changes. The experimental group demonstrated higher mean scores and lower standard deviations in post-speaking tasks, indicating more consistent improvement among learners.

Significance of Improvement:

The independent samples test for posttest scores (role-play task) indicated a significant difference between experimental and control groups ($p = 0.0391$). This suggests that TBLT with technology integration is effective in improving speaking abilities.

2. How successful is task-based language teaching in enhancing students' listening comprehension and speaking proficiency?

The success of TBLT in improving both listening comprehension and speaking proficiency is evident from the data:

Listening Comprehension: Paired t-test results for the experimental group showed a significant difference in pre- and post-listening scores ($t = -3.3091$, $p = 0.002$). This indicates that TBLT improved listening comprehension. The control group did not exhibit significant changes in listening scores ($p > 0.05$).

Speaking Proficiency: Across all speaking tasks (online presentation, role-play, and classroom discussions), the experimental group consistently outperformed the control group in posttest scores. The role-play task showed the most significant improvement, emphasizing TBLT's impact when learners engage in interactive tasks.

Conclusion

This study investigated the impact of ESL learners' speaking and listening comprehension, which were impacted by technology-enhanced TBLT. The listening test results showed a significant impact of technology-enhanced TBLT on learners. Additionally, there is variation in the analysis results from the three speaking performance tasks (online group discussion, role-play, and individual online presentation). Technology-enhanced TBLT significantly impacted the speaking performance of ESP students as measured by the results. Interesting pre-task activities, such as watching videos, using technology tools about the subjects being learned, and actively participating in the activity to express themselves in English, may have encouraged this improvement. This highlights that integrating technology into TBLT enhances ESL learners' speaking abilities and listening comprehension. These improvements are most notable in interactive tasks, where learners actively use language in meaningful contexts. Further research investigating the learners perception using

more technological tools can positively contribute to the practicality assessments of the similar learning approach.

References

1. Alberola Colomar, M. (2014). A Classroom-Based Assessment Method to Test Speaking Skills in English for Specific Purposes. Language Learning in Higher Education, 4(1), 9–26. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/cercles-2014-0002
2. Aliakbari, M., & Jamalvandi, B. (2010). The Impact of "Role Play" on Fostering EFL Learners' Speaking Ability: A Task-Based Approach. Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 14(1), 15–29. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ920501.pdf
3. Aliasin, S. H., Saeedi, Z., & Pineh, A. J. (2019). The relationship between EFL teachers' perception of task-based language teaching and their dominant teaching style. Cogent Education, 6(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1589413
4. Alizadeh, I. (2018). Discovering the identity and suitability of electronic learning tools students use in English for specific purposes (ESP) programs. Call-Ej, 19(2), 213–229.
5. Anwar, K., & Arifani, Y. (2016). Task-Based Language Teaching: Development of CALL. International Education Studies, 9(6), 168. https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v9n6p168
6. Arslanyilmaz, A. (2012). An Online Task-Based Language Learning Environment: Is It Better for Advanced-or Intermediate-Level Second Language Learners? Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology, 11(1), 20–35.
7. Bao, R., & Du, X. (2015). Implementation of task-based language teaching in Chinese as a foreign language: benefits and challenges. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28(3), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2015.1058392
8. Bryfonski, L., & McKay, T. H. (2019). TBLT implementation and evaluation: A meta-analysis. Language Teaching Research, 23(5), 603–632. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817744389
9. Chen, K. T. C. (2019). The Effects of Technology-Mediated TBLT on Enhancing the Speaking Abilities of University Students in a Collaborative EFL Learning Environment. Applied Linguistics Review, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0126
10. Chou, M. (2017). A Task-based Language Teaching Approach to Developing Metacognitive Strategies for Listening Comprehension A Task-based Language Teaching Approach to Developing Metacognitive Strategies for Listening Comprehension. International Journal of Listening, 31(1), 51–70. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2015.1098542
11. Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson.
12. Dashtestani, R. (2015). Examining the use of web-based tests for testing academic vocabulary in EAP instruction. Teaching English with Technology, 15(1), 48–61.
13. Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 19(3), 221–246. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x
14. Harper, J., & Widodo, H. P. (2020). Perceptual mismatches in the interpretation of task based ELT materials: a micro-evaluation of a task-based English lesson. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 14(2), 114–132. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1502773
15. Irmawati, Basri, Rosniati, & Ashar. (2016). Needs Analysis of English for Nurse. Metalingua, 14(1), 57–70. Iveson, J. (2015). Challenges of Task-Based Language Teaching in Online and Blended Learning Contexts. CSEDU 2015 - 7th International Conference on Computer Supported Education, Proceedings, 2, 277–282. https://doi.org/10.5220/0005474802770282
16. Ji, Y., & Pham, T. (2020). Implementing task-based language teaching (TBLT) to teach grammar in English classes in China: using design-based research to explore challenges and strategies. Innovation in Language Learning and

Teaching, 14(2), 164–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1545021

17. Ke, C. (2009). A Model of Formative Task-Based Language Assessment for Chinese as a Foreign Language. Language Assessment Quarterly, 2(2), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15434311laq0302
18. Khoram, A., & Zhang, Z. (2019). The impact of task type and pre-task planning condition on the accuracy of intermediate EFL learners' oral performance. Cogent Education, 6(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1675466
19. Kiernan, P. J., & Aizawa, K. (2004). Cell phones in task-based learning are cell phones useful language learning tools? ReCALL, 16(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0958344004000618
20. Kiliçkaya, F., Krajka, J., & Latoch-Zielińska, M. (2014). E-learning in Foreign Language Instruction in Turkey: Curriculum Models and Course Design Guidelines. Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7(3), 165–183.
21. Lai, C., & Li, G. (2011). Technology and task-based language teaching: A critical review. CALICO Journal, 28(2), 498–521. https://doi.org/10.11139/cj.28.2.498-521
22. Moore, P. J. (2018). Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT). The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0175
23. Mulyadi, D., Wijayatiningsih, T. D., Singh, C. K. S., & Prastikawati, E. F. (2021). Effects of technology enhanced task-based language teaching on learners' listening comprehension and speaking performance. International Journal of Instruction, 14(3), 717-736.https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14342a
24. Mulyadi, D., Wijayatingsih, T. D., Budiastuti, R. E., Ifadah, M., & Aimah, S. (2020). Technological pedagogical and content knowledge of ESP teachers in blended learning format. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 15(6), 126–139. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i06.11490
25. Mulyadi, D., Arifani, Y., Wijayantingsih, T. D., & Budiastuti, R. E. (2020). Blended Learning in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) Instruction: Lecturers' Perspectives. Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal, 21(2), 204–219. http://callej.org/journal/21-2/Mulyadi-Arifani-Wij
26. Nget, Seanghai, Omthajit Pansri, & Chanadda Poohongthong (2020) "The Effect of Task-Based Instruction in Improving the English Speaking Skills of Ninth-Graders. Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal, vol. 13, no. 2, July.
27. Nunan, D. (1991). Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers. NJ: Prentice Hall.
28. Nunan, D. (2004). Task-based language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
29. Oxford, R. L. (2006). Task-based language teaching and learning: An overview. Asian EFL Journal, 8(3), 94-121.
30. Pattison, P. (1987). Developing communication skills: A practical handbook for language teachers, with examples in English, French and German. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
31. Palmer, E. (2014). Teaching the Core Skills of Listening and Speaking. Igarss.
32. Pellerin, M. (2014). Language Tasks Using Touch Screen and Mobile Technologies: Reconceptualizing Task-Based CALL for Young Language Learners. Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 40(1), 1–23.
33. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching. UK: Cambridge University Press.
34. Richards, J. (2006). Communicative language teaching today. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Richards, J., & Schmidt, R. (2010). Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
36. Rivers, W. M. (1981). Teaching foreign-language skills. University of Chicago Press.
37. Sakata, N. (2019). Profiling vocabulary for proficiency development: Effects of input and general frequencies on L2 learning. System, 87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102167
38. Shariq, M. (2020). Feedback and Speaking Skills in Task-Based Language Teaching: Proposed

Corrective Measures for EFL Learners. Asian ESP Journal, 232–248.

39. Sheppard, C., Manalo, E., & Henning, M. (2018). Is ability grouping beneficial or detrimental to Japanese ESP students' English language proficiency development? English for Specific Purposes, 49, 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2017.10.002
40. Willis, J. (1996). A framework for task-based learning. Essex, UK: Longman.
41. Willis, J. (2006). Adapting your text book for task-based teaching. IATEFL Conference, Harrogate.
42. Wu, X., Liao, L., & DeBacker, T. K. (2016). Implementing Task-based Instruction in ESP Class - An Empirical Study in Marine Engineering English. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7(5), 936–945. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0705.14
43. Xue, S. (2020). A conceptual model for integrating affordances of mobile technologies into task-based language teaching. Interactive Learning Environments, (January), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1711132
44. Zhang, X., Ardasheva, Y., & Austin, B. W. (2020). Self-efficacy and English public speaking performance: A mixed method approach. English for Specific Purposes, 59, 1– 16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.02.001
45. Ziegler, N. (2016). Taking Technology to Task: Technology-Mediated TBLT, Performance, and Production. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36, 136–163. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190516000039