

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **ANALYSIS**

This chapter presents results of research tools including lesson plan evaluation, written reflections, oral presentations and interviews.

#### **4.1 The Results of Lesson Plan Evaluation**

The first objective of this study was to implement lessons using task-based activities to promote students' speaking-listening skills. In order to find the effectiveness of each lesson plan, the evaluation of all the lessons was conducted by both the instructor and students.

**Table 5: The results of each lesson plan evaluation conducted by the instructor**

Lessons	Terminal Objective		Content		Pre-task		Task cycle		Language Focus		Task		Total		Effectiveness
	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Lesson 1	4	0	3.75	0.5	4	0	3.67	0.58	3.5	0.71	3.8	0.45	3.78	0.43	Effective
Lesson 2	4	0	3.75	0.5	4	0	3.67	0.58	3.5	0.71	3.8	0.45	3.78	0.43	Effective
Lesson 3	4	0	3.25	0.5	4	0	4	0	3.5	0.71	4	0	3.78	0.43	Effective
Lesson 4	4	0	3.5	0.58	4	0	4	0	4	0	4.6	0.55	4.06	0.54	Effective
Lesson5	4	0	3.5	0.58	4	0	3	0	3.5	0.71	3.8	0.45	3.61	0.50	Effective
Lesson6	4	0	4.5	0.58	3.5	0.71	4	0	4	0	5	0	4.33	0.59	Effective
Lesson 7	5	0	5	0	4	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	4.89	0.32	Very Effective
Lesson 8	4	0	3.75	0.5	4	0	4.33	1.15	4.5	0.71	3.8	0.45	4.00	0.59	Effective
Lesson 9	4	0	4.75	0.5	3.5	0.71	5	0	5	0	5	0	4.67	0.59	Very Effective
Lesson 10	5	0	5	0	4	0	4.67	0.58	5	0	5	0	4.83	0.38	Very Effective
Lesson 11	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0	4.5	0.71	5	0	4.94	0.24	Very Effective
Lesson12	4	0	3.25	0.5	3.5	0.71	3	0	3	0	3.4	0.55	3.33	0.49	Moderately Effective
<b>Total</b>	4.25	0.43	4.08	0.75	3.96	0.41	4.11	0.76	4.08	0.73	4.35	0.67	4.17	0.53	Effective

Table 5 shows the results of each lesson plan evaluated by the instructor. Most of them were effective according to the mean score interval of 3.50-4.49. There were exceptions of lessons 7, 9, 10 and 11 which were very effective (4.50-5.00) and lesson 12 which was only moderately effective.

**Table 6: The results of each lesson plan evaluation conducted by the students**

Lessons	Terminal Objective		Content		Pre-task		Task cycle		Language Focus		Task		Total		Effectiveness
	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Lesson 1	4.00	0.58	4.38	0.61	4.46	0.66	4.18	0.77	4.04	0.86	4.29	0.68	4.25	0.23	Effective
Lesson 2	4.25	0.53	4.50	0.50	4.50	0.59	4.22	0.71	4.00	0.71	4.32	0.62	4.32	0.22	Effective
Lesson 3	4.19	0.64	4.17	0.67	4.46	0.66	4.18	0.63	4.08	0.59	4.37	0.66	4.25	0.24	Effective
Lesson 4	4.19	0.64	4.17	0.67	4.46	0.66	4.18	0.63	4.08	0.59	4.37	0.66	4.25	0.24	Effective
Lesson 5	4.17	0.63	4.17	0.69	4.42	0.67	4.14	0.64	4.04	0.60	4.40	0.68	4.24	0.24	Effective
Lesson 6	4.25	0.67	4.46	0.73	4.33	0.71	4.42	0.74	4.46	0.66	4.50	0.67	4.43	0.15	Effective
Lesson 7	4.35	0.76	4.44	0.61	4.27	0.68	4.44	0.71	4.42	0.76	4.49	0.68	4.42	0.19	Effective
Lesson 8	4.50	0.69	4.64	0.67	4.77	0.44	4.61	0.50	4.73	0.45	4.55	0.63	4.62	0.14	Very Effective
Lesson 9	4.50	0.67	4.56	0.66	4.46	0.66	4.25	0.73	4.38	0.77	4.48	0.68	4.45	0.17	Effective
Lesson 10	4.61	0.72	4.67	0.71	4.50	0.73	4.44	0.88	4.44	0.69	4.53	0.72	4.54	0.13	Very Effective
Lesson 11	4.64	0.49	4.57	0.64	4.50	0.60	4.52	0.61	4.59	0.51	4.67	0.65	4.59	0.12	Very Effective
Lesson 12	4.63	0.50	4.56	0.59	4.54	0.52	4.53	0.60	4.58	0.59	4.58	0.55	4.57	0.08	Very Effective
Total	4.36	0.22	4.44	0.21	4.47	0.15	4.34	0.19	4.32	0.27	4.46	0.16	4.41	0.14	Effective

Table 6 shows all 13 students' assessments of the twelve lesson plans. Generally, the students found most lessons effective (3.50-4.49). There were exceptions of lessons 8, 10, 11 and 12 which the students found to be very effective (4.50-5.00).

**Table 7: A comparison of lesson plan evaluation conducted by the instructor and the students**

Lessons	Instructor		Effectiveness	Students		Effectiveness
	Total			Total		
	$\mu$	$\sigma$		$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Lesson 1	3.78	0.43	Effective	4.25	0.23	Effective
Lesson 2	3.78	0.43	Effective	4.32	0.22	Effective
Lesson 3	3.78	0.43	Effective	4.25	0.24	Effective
Lesson 4	4.06	0.54	Effective	4.25	0.24	Effective
Lesson 5	3.61	0.50	Effective	4.24	0.24	Effective
Lesson 6	4.33	0.59	Effective	4.43	0.15	Effective
Lesson 7	4.89	0.32	Very Effective	4.42	0.19	Effective
Lesson 8	4.00	0.59	Effective	4.62	0.14	Very Effective
Lesson 9	4.67	0.59	Very Effective	4.45	0.17	Effective
Lesson 10	4.83	0.38	Very Effective	4.54	0.13	Very Effective
Lesson 11	4.94	0.24	Very Effective	4.59	0.12	Very Effective
Lesson 12	3.33	0.49	Moderately Effective	4.57	0.08	Very Effective
Total	4.17	0.53	Effective	4.41	0.14	Effective

Table 7 shows a comparison of all lessons evaluated by the instructor and the students. There was an agreement between the instructor and students that lessons 1-6 were effective. There were slight differences in giving the degree of effectiveness in lessons 7, 8, and 9 by the instructor and the students. The difference of opinions was in the categories of pre task stage and language focus stage. The students gave high marks to the pre-task stage because their judgments

included the pre test implemented by the instructor as part of the pre-task stage. The students said this stage helped prepare them for the task cycle stage. For lesson 12 there was a clear difference of opinions between the instructor and the students. Since the students couldn't perform the original tasks, the instructor had to adjust the activity to provide students with the opportunity to finish the task cycle stage and continue to the language focus stage. The instructor based the evaluation on the original tasks to make sure all original content and activities designed by the English Department were evaluated. The students, however, based their evaluations on the newly adapted tasks. Overall, the results of the lesson plan evaluation showed that the lessons ranged from effective (3.50-4.49) to very effective (4.50-5.00). There was one exception for lesson 12 which was evaluated as moderately effective (2.50-3.49) by the instructor while the students evaluated it as very effective (4.50-5.00). Details of lesson plan evaluations conducted by the instructor and the students are presented in Appendix P.

**Table 8: The results of lesson plan evaluation**

Lessons	Instructor and Students		Quality
	Total		
	$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Lesson 1	4.02	0.33	Effective
Lesson 2	4.05	0.38	Effective
Lesson 3	4.02	0.33	Effective
Lesson 4	4.16	0.13	Effective
Lesson 5	3.93	0.45	Effective
Lesson 6	4.38	0.07	Effective
Lesson 7	4.66	0.33	Very Effective
Lesson 8	4.31	0.44	Effective
Lesson 9	4.56	0.16	Very Effective
Lesson 10	4.69	0.21	Very Effective
Lesson 11	4.77	0.25	Very Effective
Lesson 12	3.95	0.88	Effective
Total	4.29	0.30	Effective

Table 8 presents the effectiveness of all twelve lessons plans as evaluated by both the instructor and the students. All twelve lessons were effective with the mean score interval of 3.50-4.49.

## **4.2 The Results of Reflection Writing**

Besides using lesson plan evaluation form, another tool used to determine the effectiveness of the lessons was reflection writing. At the end of each lesson, the students and the instructor had the opportunities to write down their reflections concerning the lesson plans (see Appendices K-N).

### **4.2.1 Reflections by the students**

The categories that the students reflected on were contents and solutions to the problems which happened during performing tasks. Under the category of content, the students' main emphasis was on the pre-task stage. They agreed that the pre tests before the pre-task stage greatly helped them performed the tasks in the task cycle stage. Students also agreed that from the pre-task stage, they were given sufficient correct language usage, reinforcement of previous knowledge and correction of past misunderstandings.

As for the activities in the task cycle stage, all students gave suggestions on how some activities could be improved. There were four lessons students chose for improvement (the score was 4.24-4.25). Lesson 1 (Moving into a house): more problems about the house should be provided. Lesson 3 (Going shopping): more products to

choose from and more problems to solve. Lesson 4 (Outing): a bigger budget might provide more opportunities for students to make invitation to go to more events. Lesson 5 (Going to the doctor): more current symptoms or pictures were needed to make the lesson more practical. Their comments proved to be very useful for any future revision of these lessons.

The last category was problems and solutions. During the language focus stage, the students discussed their performances, problems and solutions with their peers (see details in Appendix O). Results from students' reflections showed that all 13 students said the lessons were very appropriate to appropriate.

From **Lesson 1**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. received patterns applicable in daily life
2. were able to review past knowledge after pre test and practice new patterns
3. could share knowledge and opinions with peers
4. could develop good relationship with peers
5. gained courage to speak more



For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they:

1. were able to practice new pattern with peers
2. gained more confidence to speak
3. were given the opportunity to exchange ideas with peers
4. received freedom to think and express opinions

Regarding the activity, students suggested that it should be in a form of discussion in a big group.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. These problems were:

1. no courage to speak
2. wrong pronunciations

From **Lesson 2**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. were able to apply learnt pattern to daily life
2. were able to assess peers
3. were able to share opinions with peers

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they received sufficient practice as a group.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. These problems were:

1. grammar consciousness
2. no confidence to speak
3. nervousness

From **Lesson 3**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. were able to reinforce old knowledge
2. received new patterns
3. were able to distinguished the difference between verb and noun

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they were able to exchange information with peers.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. These problems were:

1. pronunciation
2. not being able to keep up with peers

From **Lesson 4**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. learned new patterns
2. were able to review previous knowledge
3. received reinforcement from peers
4. gained more confidence

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they received the opportunities to meet with most of their peers.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. These problems were:

1. too many people to talk
2. not being able to keep up with peers

From **Lesson 5**, students gained more benefits from the content. The students showed that they learned new patterns.

For the second part, students commented on the activities. Concerning the lesson, student suggested that more unusual symptoms should be added.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. These problems were:

1. pronunciation
2. not being able to keep up with peers

From **Lesson 6**, students gained more benefits from the content. The students showed that they were able to use critical thinking skills.

For the second part, students commented on the activities. Concerning the lesson, student showed that they had the opportunities to exchange opinions.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. The problem was word meaning clarification was needed.

From **Lesson 7**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. were able to use creative thinking
2. learned about sequencing events
3. were able to exchange information with peers

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student agreed that it was most amusing and enjoyable.

As for the last part of the lesson, students wrote down their problems they encountered during the lesson. The problem was unfamiliarity with using past tense.

From **Lesson 8**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they:

1. were able to use their imagination
2. used cooperation in group work
3. were able to apply social skills

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student agreed that it was an enjoyable atmosphere.

In this part there were no problems.

From **Lesson 9**, students gained more benefits from the content.

The students showed that they were able to:

1. apply their social skills
2. apply the content for the future usage
3. apply their negotiation skills

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they were able to work as a group.

In this part there were no problems.

From **Lesson 10**, students gained more benefits from the content. The students showed that they:

1. received reinforcement from peers
2. were able to exchange previous knowledge
3. apply the content for future usage

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they were able to converse with most of their peers.

There were no problems in this part.

From **Lesson 11**, students gained more benefits from the content. The students showed that they were able to:

1. concentrate on their listening skills
2. apply problem-solving skills

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student found that the activity was applicable in the future.

There were no problems in this part

From **Lesson 12**, students gained more benefits from the content. The students showed that they:

1. received reinforcement from peers
2. were able to apply problem-solving skills

For the second part, students commented on the activities.

Concerning the lesson, student showed that they were able to use experiences from impromptu speech to help them perform the task.

There were no problems in this part.

Students experienced fewer problems or none at all towards the latter lessons because they received sufficient information before the pre task stage. This lead to more proficiency during the task cycle stage and the students gained more confidence after oral presentations.

#### **4.2.2 Reflections by the instructor**

By having the opportunity to write down reflections after each lesson, the instructor was able to focus on the teaching techniques used in the three stages of task-based learning based on Willis's task-based framework. The results of the instructor's reflections were divided into three categories. The first category was pre-task. In this stage, the instructor found that implementation of pre test before each lesson, was beneficial to students. This gave them a preview of what the lesson would be and the opportunity to activate previous knowledge concerning the topic to be studied. As a result, the instructor had the opportunity to adjust the contents or activities according to the students' needs.

The second category that the instructor focused on was task cycle. For this stage, the activities and tasks for each lesson were practical for daily usage. All topics were related to situations that students might encounter in the future and thus were appropriate in preparing them for social usage of the target language.

The last category was language focus. For this stage, the students discussed problems and mistakes that occurred during the task cycle stage. As a result, students had the opportunities to share



their knowledge and experiences with their peers. Thus, students were able to learn from each other no matter what ability levels they were at.

### 4.3 The Results of Oral Presentation

The second objective of this research is to find out whether students' speaking-listening skills are improved after the task-based lessons have been implemented. The results of oral presentation are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

**Table 9: English speaking -listening abilities of the students assessed by the instructor**

Participants	Assessment tasks: 5 points per each task						Mean	Standard Deviation	Quality
	Role Play 1	Role Play 2	Role Play 3	Election Speech	Impromptu Speech				
Student 1	4.66	4.66	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.85	0.19	Very Good	
Student 2	4.00	4.33	3.33	4.00	3.66	3.86	0.38	Good	
Student 3	4.66	5.00	3.66	4.33	4.00	4.33	0.53	Good	
Student 4	4.66	5.00	4.33	4.66	5.00	4.73	0.28	Very Good	
Student 5	4.66	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.33	4.46	0.38	Good	
Student 6	4.00	4.66	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.40	0.43	Good	
Student 7	4.00	4.33	4.00	3.66	4.00	4.00	0.24	Good	
Student 8	4.33	4.66	4.66	4.33	4.66	4.53	0.18	Very good	
Student 9	4.66	5.00	4.66	4.33	5.00	4.73	0.28	Very Good	
Student 10	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.00	4.26	0.15	Good	
Student 11	4.66	5.00	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.53	0.30	Very Good	
Student 12	4.66	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.33	4.66	0.34	Very Good	
Student 13	3.66	3.66	4.00	3.66	4.66	3.93	0.43	Good	
<b>Total Mean</b>	4.38	4.66	4.25	4.22	4.44	4.41	0.31	Good	

Table 9 shows the results of 5 separate assessment tasks. These assessment tasks (Role Play 1, Role Play 2, Role Play 3, Election Speech and Impromptu Speech) were carried out by the instructor. There were 6 students who were considered to be very good with the mean score interval of 4.50-5.00 while 7 students were considered to be good with the mean score interval of 3.50-4.49.

**Table10: English speaking -listening abilities of the students assessed by peers**

Participants	Assessment Lessons 5 points per each lesson							Quality
	Role Play 1	Role Play 2	Role Play 3	Election Speech	Impromptu Speech	Mean	Standard Deviation	
Student 1	4.22	4.23	4.34	4.42	4.33	4.31	0.08	Good
Student 2	4.33	4.19	4.05	4.56	3.92	4.21	0.25	Good
Student 3	4.07	4.22	3.88	4.08	3.89	4.03	0.14	Good
Student 4	4.58	4.73	4.61	4.69	4.31	4.58	0.16	Good
Student 5	4.67	4.33	4.36	4.19	4.25	4.36	0.19	Very Good
Student 6	4.17	4.23	4.57	4.61	4.03	4.32	0.26	Good
Student 7	4.11	4.22	4.25	4.44	3.86	4.18	0.21	Good
Student 8	4.22	4.30	4.67	4.56	4.36	4.42	0.19	Good
Student 9	4.70	4.73	4.75	4.72	4.85	4.75	0.06	Very good
Student 10	4.58	4.22	4.36	4.61	4.64	4.48	0.18	Good
Student 11	4.75	4.73	4.58	4.92	4.89	4.77	0.14	Very Good
Student 12	4.50	4.70	4.75	4.75	4.33	4.61	0.19	Very Good
Student 13	4.56	4.33	4.57	4.22	4.28	4.39	0.16	Good
<b>Total Mean</b>	4.42	4.40	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.42	0.21	Good

Table 10 shows the results of 5 assessment tasks (Role Play 1, Role Play 2, Role Play 3, Election Speech and Impromptu Speech) conducted by all the students. There were 4 students who were considered to be very good with the mean score interval of 4.50-5.00 while 9 students were considered to be good with the mean score interval of 3.50-4.49.

**Table 11: A comparison of oral presentation assessment by the instructor and by peers**

Student	Instructor Total		Quality	Students Total		Quality
	$\mu$	$\sigma$		$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Student 1	4.85	0.19	Very Good	4.31	0.08	Good
Student 2	3.86	0.38	Good	4.21	0.25	Good
Student 3	4.33	0.53	Good	4.03	0.14	Good
Student 4	4.73	0.28	Very Good	4.58	0.16	Good
Student 5	4.46	0.38	Good	4.36	0.19	Very Good
Student 6	4.40	0.43	Good	4.32	0.26	Good
Student 7	4.00	0.24	Good	4.18	0.21	Good
Student 8	4.53	0.18	Very Good	4.42	0.19	Good
Student 9	4.73	0.28	Very Good	4.75	0.06	Very Good
Student 10	4.26	0.15	Good	4.48	0.18	Good
Student 11	4.53	0.30	Very Good	4.77	0.14	Very Good
Student 12	4.66	0.34	Very Good	4.61	0.19	Very Good
Student 13	3.93	0.43	Good	4.39	0.16	Good
<b>Total</b>	4.41	0.31	Good	4.42	0.21	Good

Table 11 shows a comparison of students' English speaking-listening abilities assessed by the instructor and peers. Most of the assessment from the instructor and the students were the same. There were differences for student No. 1, 4, 5, and 8.

**Table 12: The results of students' speaking-listening skills**

Students	Total		Quality
	$\mu$	$\sigma$	
Student 1	4.58	0.38	Very Good
Student 2	4.04	0.25	Good
Student 3	4.18	0.21	Good
Student 4	4.66	0.11	Very Good
Student 5	4.41	0.07	Good
Student 6	4.36	0.06	Good
Student 7	4.09	0.13	Good
Student 8	4.48	0.08	Good
Student 9	4.74	0.01	Very Good
Student 10	4.37	0.16	Good
Student 11	4.65	0.17	Very Good
Student 12	4.64	0.04	Very Good
Student 13	4.16	0.33	Good
Total	4.42	0.23	Good

Table 12 presented the results of students' speaking-listening skills assessed by both the instructor and peers. Eight students were good while 5 students were very good.

#### 4.4 Interview

**Table 13: The results of students' pre-interview and post interview**

Participant	Pre Test Scores 25	Post Test Scores 25	Change in %	Quality
Student 1	<b>25.00</b>	<b>25.00</b>	<b>0</b>	Very Good
Student 2	23.33	23.60	1.08	Very Good
Student 3	21.33	24.00	10.68	Very Good
Student 4	<b>24.66</b>	<b>24.66</b>	<b>0</b>	Very Good
Student 5	21.33	22.66	5.32	Very Good
Student 6	22.66	23.66	4	Very Good
Student 7	21.66	23.66	8	Very Good
Student 8	24.00	24.66	2.64	Very Good
Student 9	22.66	23.00	1.36	Very Good
Student 10	22.66	23.00	1.36	Very Good
Student 11	24.66	25.00	1.36	Very Good
Student 12	23.66	25.00	5.36	Very Good
Student 13	21.33	22.33	4	Very Good
Average	23.00	23.71	3.47	Very Good

\*The bold figures refer to scores that remained the same for both pre and post interview.

Table 13 shows the results of the pre-interview and the post interview. The results show the average of students' scores were above the mean of 23.36. In general, the scores between the pre and the post interviews were not that different. However, they showed an

average increase of 3.5% in the categories of fluency (5.3%), accuracy (3.7%), and comprehensibility (2.7%). Details of changes in the categories of fluency, accuracy, and comprehensibility are listed in Appendix Q. All students are considered to be very good at speaking-listening through the interview.

PAYYAP UNIVERSITY