Designing Speaking Tasks Based on Students' Learning Style

Sulastri [1]*, HeryYufrizal [2], Muhammad Sukirlan [3]

[1]FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1 Bandar Lampung
[2]FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1 Bandar Lampung
[3]FKIP Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1 Bandar Lampung
*e-mail: trilastri3@gmail.com, Telp: +6285658821006

Abstract: Mendesain task berbicara berdasarkan gaya belajar siswa. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan dari task yang didisain berdasarkan gaya belajar siswa ditinjau dari kuantitas dan kualitas berbicara dan juga untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan dari kuantitas dan kualitas berbicara siswa diantara gaya belajar yang berbeda dan task yang didisain. Penelitian ini menggunakan desain one group repeated measures. Hasil analisis menunjukkan perbedaan yang signifikan dari task yang didisain berdasarkan gaya belajar siswa ditinjau dari kuantitas berbicara, namun tidak pada kualitasnya. Meskipun tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan pada kuantitas dan kualitas berbicara siswa dari gaya belajar yang berbeda dan task yang didisain, perbedaan tetap ada meskipun sedikit. Hal ini dilihat dari fluktuatif siswa ketika berinteraksi. Itu berarti pengelompokkan gaya belajar menurut Willing sesuai dengan konteks pembelajaran bahasa.

Kata kunci : *task berbicara, kuantitas dan kualitas berbicara siswa, gaya belajar*

Abstract: Designing speaking tasks based on students' learning style. The purposes of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference among task design based on students' learning style in the quantity and quality of speaking, and to find out whether there is a difference of students' quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task. One group repeated measures design has been carried out in this research. The result of analysis shows that there is a significant difference among tasks design based on students' learning style in the speaking quantity, but not for the quality.Although there is no difference of students' quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task, there is still relative different. It can be seen from the fluctuation in their interaction. It seems that Willing's classifications of learning style are compatible to language learning context.

Keywords: speaking task, quantity and quality of students' speaking, learning style

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a speech production that becomes a part of our daily activity (Thornburry, 2005:8) in Akhyak and Indramawan (2013). There are many factors and conditions influence the quality and quantity of speaking task accomplishment. The quantity of interaction is measured by three elements, namely the length of speaking time, the number of turns taken, and the number of c- units (Yufrizal, 2007).While (Heaton 1998: 100) in his book assumed that, there are three components of students' language performance quality that can be measured by their English teacher especially for the lower intermediate level of students, such as fluency, accuracy and comprehensibility.As teachers, we have a responsibility to prepare the students as much as possible to be able to speak English in the real world outside the classroom and the testing room. To begin it we can analyze the way of our student learn and it can be started by analyzing their preference in learning or we call it as students ''learning styles''. (Brown, 2000) in (Gilakjani A.P, 2012) defines learning styles as the manner in which individuals perceive and process information in learning situations.

Although learning styles inevitably differ among students in the classroom (Dunn and Dunn 1978) in (Gilakjani, A.P, 2012) say that teachers should try to make changes in their classroom that will be beneficial to every learning style. Some of these changes include room redesign, the development of small-group techniques, and the development of classroom activity packages or tasks.(Nunan, 1992) stated that "task learning" increases students' talks, makes the classroom atmosphere relaxing, and reinforces students' comprehensible input.Therefore the main purpose of identifying students' learning style preferences is to help the teachers design tasks that can facilitate students' learning.In this research, the researcher designed some tasks which were based on four types of students' preference in learning. The names of them are speaking task design for concrete learners, analytical learner, communicative learner and authority oriented learner.

There are some researchers who have done a research in learning style field; (Windu, 2007) in his research found that there is a significant interaction between the writing learning models of individual and group work learning models and the students learning style towards their writing English Achievement. Meanwhile, (Nonetis'ah, 2007) who also focuses on her research in students' learning style found that there is a significant difference in English skill among students with concrete learning style with students who have learning style communicative orientation instruction, analytical and students with a mixture of style. (Claxon and Murrell, 1987:52) in (Ho, 1999) in their research also found that students who were taught in ways that matched with their learning style obtained higher reading scores and viewed their educational experience more positively. (Bidabadi and Yamat, 2012) in their research shows that there is a significant positive correlation between the learners' English listening proficiency levels and their learning style preferences.

Different from the previous studiesthe purposes of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference among task design based on students' learning stylein terms of quantity and quality of speaking, and to find out whether there is a difference of students' quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task.

METHODS

One group repeated measures design has been carried out in this research. The total population was 61 students which came from many different of majoring such as informatics system, accounting and management of Darmajaya Language Centre (DLC). The researcher used 16 students as the sample of this research that has been chosen randomly by using learning style questionnaire based on Willing' classification. They were taught in the same class, during ninety minutes in each treatment.

The data sources were taken fromYufrizal' questionnaire which consisted of forty questions and indicated the students into concrete, communicative, authority and analytical learners. The researcher also distributed speaking task in the end of each treatment in order to get the students' speaking quantity and quality. After that the researcher recorded it by using recorder and then transcribed into written form in order to make the researcher more easily analyzing the quantity (length time, turn taking, c- unit) and quality of students' speaking (accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility). Next the researcher analyzed it by using ANOVA. The researcher was also used inter- rater in order to get the quality of students' speaking.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

After getting the students' preference in learning which was taken by using Yufrizal's questionnaire, the researcher determined sample of the research randomly by using lottery. It was determined four students with concrete learning style, four students with communicative learning style, four students with authority learning style and four students with analytical learning style.

After that the researcher taught the students by using speaking tasks which were design based on students' learning style in the treatments activities. Those speaking tasks consisted of speaking task one for concrete students with role playing activity, speaking task two for communicative students with discussion group activity, the speaking task three for authority students with memorizing drill activity, speaking task four for analytical students with problem solving activity, speaking task five for concrete students with the second role play activity but different topic, the speaking task six for communicative students with information change activity, speaking task seven for authority students with lecturing technique activity, and the last the speaking task eight for analytical students with the second problem solving activity but with different topic. In the end of each treatment, speaking task was done in order to see the quantity and quality of students' speaking.

In order to know the student's quantity based on the length time of

speaking, the researcher compute it by using descriptive statistical. It is found that communicative speaking task design makes the longest time for students in speaking. While for the significant difference of students' speaking quantity in term of time among four speaking task design; the researcher analyzed it by using statistical paired t- test as this below:

Table1. The Paired Samples Test of Time

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 TASKCON – TASKCOMM	3.12500	8.76641	2.19160	-7.79629	1.54629	-1.426	15	.174
Pair 2 TASKCON – TASKAUTHO	8.00000	4.67618	1.16905	5.50824	10.49176	6.843	15	.000
Pair 3 TASKCON – TASKANALY	5.28125	6.25292	1.56323	1.94931	8.61319	3.378	15	.004
Pair 4 TASKCOMM – TASKAUTHO	11.12500	7.68440	1.92110	7.03027	15.21973	5.791	15	.000
Pair 5 TASKCOMM – TASKANALY	8.40625	10.07177	2.51794	3.03938	13.77312	3.339	15	.004
Pair 6 TASKAUTHO – TASKANALY	-2.71875	5.45884	1.36471	-5.62756	.19006	-1.992	15	.065

It can be seen that from eight speaking tasks design which was given to the students there were four speaking tasks design which have significant difference on students' speaking quantity in term of time. It can be concluded since the p <0.05. Then in order to know the students' speaking quantity in term of turn taking the researcher analyzed it by using descriptive statistical and it is found that concrete speaking tasks design give have more turn in speaking.

After that the researcher computed the paired simple t test in order to see the significant difference of students' speaking quantity in term of turn takingamong four speaking tasks design as in this below:

Table 2. The Paired Samples Test of Turn Taking

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 TASKCONC – TASKCOMM	2.34375	1.55691	.38923	1.51413	3.17337	6.022	15	.000
Pair 2 TASKCONC – TASKAUTHO	2.31250	1.78769	.44692	1.35991	3.26509	5.174	15	.000
Pair 3 TASKCONC – TASKANALY	2.06250	1.45917	.36479	1.28497	2.84003	5.654	15	.000
Pair 4 TASKCOMM – TASKAUTHO	-.03125	1.68789	.42197	-.93066	.86816	-.074	15	.942
Pair 5 TASKCOMM – TASKANALY	-.28125	1.69282	.42320	-1.18329	.62079	-.665	15	.516
Pair 6 TASKAUTHO – TASKANALY	-.25000	.89443	.22361	-.72661	.22661	-1.118	15	.281

From the table above it can be inferred that from those speaking tasks design, there were three speaking tasks design which have significant difference on students' speaking quantity in terms of turn taking. In order to know the students' speaking quantity in term of C- unit the researcher compute it by using descriptive statistical and it is found that concrete speaking task design make the students produce more quantity of speaking in terms of c- unit. In order to know the significant difference the researcher analyzed it by using paired t test statistical as in this below:

Table 3. The Paired Samples Test of C- Unit

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1 TASKCON – TASKCOMM	2.43750	1.32759	.33190	1.73008	3.14492	7.344	15	.000
Pair 2 TASKCON – TASKAUTHO	3.40625	2.25254	.56314	2.20595	4.60655	6.049	15	.000
Pair 3 TASKCON – TASKANALY	2.06250	1.81544	.45386	1.09512	3.02988	4.544	15	.000
Pair 4 TASKCOMM – TASKAUTHO	.96875	1.76511	.44128	.02819	1.90931	2.195	15	.044
Pair 5 TASKCOMM – TASKANALY	-.37500	1.42009	.35502	-1.13171	.38171	-1.056	15	.308
Pair 6 TASKAUTHO – TASKANALY	-1.34375	2.07941	.51985	-2.45179	-.23571	-2.585	15	.021

From the table above it can be inferred that there are three speaking task design which have significant difference of students' speaking quantity in terms of c- unit. After finding the reliability of correlation from students' speaking quality between first rater with the second rater, the researcher also

found the descriptive statistical of interater in order to see the student's speaking quality when they do the interaction between different tasks. It is found the students almost produce similar quality in their speaking when they were taught by using all of speaking tasks design. Next the researcher finds the statistical paired of t testin order to see the significant difference of students' speaking quality between four speaking task designs as this below:

Table 4. Paired Samples Test in Quality

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	INTERTASKCON – INTERTASKCOMM	.03125	.81586	.20396	-.40349	.46599	.153	15	.880
Pair 2	INTERTASKCON – INTERTASKAUTHO	-.28125	.88447	.22112	-.75255	.19005	-1.272	15	.223
Pair 3	INTERTASKCON – INTERTASKANALY	-.29688	.70249	.17562	-.67120	.07745	-1.690	15	.112
Pair 4	INTERTASKCOMM – INTERTASKAUTHO	-.31250	1.01858	.25464	-.85526	.23026	-1.227	15	.239
Pair 5	INTERTASKCOMM – INTERTASKANALY	-.32813	.91615	.22904	-.81630	.16005	-1.433	15	.172
Pair 6	INTERTASKAUTHO – INTERTASKANALY	-.01563	.86828	.21707	-.47830	.44705	-.072	15	.944

From explanation above it can be inferred that there is no significant difference among tasks designed based on students' learning style in terms of quality of speaking. So as a quality the students have similar speaking ability when they are taught by using every speaking tasks design.

To answer second research question whether there is a difference of students' speaking quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task, then the researcher found the statistical analysis in the form of Anova, and in this below is the statistical of time

Table 5. ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Taskconc	Between Groups	113.562	3	37.854	1.180	.358
	Within Groups	384.875	12	32.073		
	Total	498.438	15			
Taskcomm	Between Groups	524.812	3	174.938	1.946	.176
	Within Groups	1078.625	12	89.885		
	Total	1603.438	15			
Taskautho	Between Groups	114.188	3	38.062	2.382	.121
	Within Groups	191.750	12	15.979		
	Total	305.938	15			
Taskanaly	Between Groups	7.422	3	2.474	.318	.812
	Within Groups	93.438	12	7.786		
	Total	100.859	15			

From the table above it can be seen that there is no significant difference of students' speaking quantity in terms of time on every types of task design, since the significant level doesn't show that $p < 0.05$. But although there is no significant effect there is still relative different of students' speaking quantity in terms of time used by the learner. There is also a tendency that the students with communicative learning style achieve a longest time in their speaking among the other students with different type of learning styles. In this below is the statistical for turn taking:

Table 6. ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Taskconc	Between Groups	3.875	3	1.292	.464	.712
	Within Groups	33.375	12	2.781		
	Total	37.250	15			
Taskcomm	Between Groups	15.797	3	5.266	2.484	.111
	Within Groups	25.438	12	2.120		
	Total	41.234	15			
Taskautho	Between Groups	1.812	3	.604	1.568	.248
	Within Groups	4.625	12	.385		
	Total	6.438	15			
Taskanaly	Between Groups	1.688	3	.562	1.174	.360
	Within Groups	5.750	12	.479		
	Total	7.438	15			

Based on the result it can be inferred that there is no significant difference of students' speaking quantity in terms of turn taking among students with different learning style and every speaking

task. Moreover, although there's no significant difference but there is a fluctuation of students' speaking quantity in term of turns taken. Then in this below is the statistical of Anova in term of C- unit:

Table 7. ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Taskconc	Between Groups	13.047	3	4.349	1.133	.375
	Within Groups	46.062	12	3.839		
	Total	59.109	15			
Taskcom m	Between Groups	11.672	3	3.891	2.736	.090
	Within Groups	17.062	12	1.422		
	Total	28.734	15			
Taskauth o	Between Groups	4.625	3	1.542	1.495	.266
	Within Groups	12.375	12	1.031		
	Total	17.000	15			
Taskanaly	Between Groups	8.172	3	2.724	1.441	.280
	Within Groups	22.688	12	1.891		
	Total	30.859	15			

From the table above it can be conclude that there is no significant difference of students' speaking quantity in terms of c- unit among students with different learning style and speaking tasks design. Although there is no significant but there is a tendency that student with communicative learning style dominates the number of C- unit in their utterance.

In this below is the statistical of Students' speaking quality;

Table 8. ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
INRTERTASKCO N	Between Groups	11.094	3	3.698	6.544	.007
	Within Groups	6.781	12	.565		
	Total	17.875	15			
INRTERTASKCO M	Between Groups	5.891	3	1.964	1.969	.173
	Within Groups	11.969	12	.997		
	Total	17.859	15			
INRTERTASKAU THO	Between Groups	5.828	3	1.943	2.512	.108
	Within Groups	9.281	12	.773		
	Total	15.109	15			
INRTERTASKAN ALY	Between Groups	6.293	3	2.098	2.180	.143
	Within Groups	11.547	12	.962		
	Total	17.840	15			

From this result it can be inferred that there is no significant difference of students' speaking quality among students with different learning style and speaking tasks. However there is a tendencythat concrete students have better performance in their speaking quality compares to another type of students with different learning style. The researcher also found that the student with analytical learning style has better performance on their speaking quality when they are taught by using analytical speaking tasks design which is appropriate with their characteristic in learning.

From result of analysis it can be inferred that there is a significant differenceamong tasks designed based on students' learning style in terms of students' speaking quantity (length time, turns taken and c- unit). It can be seen from the value of F count in statistical analysis of students speaking quantity which shows the significant level where is $p<0.05$. The reason why there was a significant difference might be caused by the design of speaking task that was designed by the researcher matched with the students' preference in learning language especially in the quantity of speaking. The result of this finding supported the previous research by Dunn and Price (1979) in Jhaish (2010) who said that if teachers can give students a kind of task that is relevant to their learning styles, the performances are usually better. The researcher also found that discussion group and information exchange speaking tasks design for communicative learner make the students have longest time in their speaking. It can be seen from the means score of those speaking task design which have greatest number compares to another type of different

speaking tasks design. While role play speaking tasks design for concrete learner make the students have more turn and also produce more c- unit in their speaking

Even there is a significant difference between tasks on the students speaking quantity but the significant difference cannot be found in the students' speaking quality, It might be caused by the result of speaking performance measures which were vary according to a great variety of factors, such as tasks, a test-taker's proficiency, real-time processing, and other individual variables. This finding in line with Saville-Troike (2006: 177) states that Quantity and quality of L2 input and interaction are determined by social experience, and both have significant influence on ultimate success in L2 learning.But although there is no significant differenceamong tasks design on the quality of students' speakingthe researcher found that the speaking tasks that was designed by the researcher compatible with the characteristic of students' learning style. For example concrete students have greatest number of turn taking when they were taught by using role play speaking task design for concrete learner. While analytical students have better performance in their speaking quality when they were taught by using problem solving speaking task design for analytical learner.This finding in line with Ho (1999) in Bidabadi and Hamidah (2012) who suggested that identifying the students' learning style preferences at the beginning of each course can assist their teachers in making adjustments in the proportion of task types to facilitate the learning of the students.

Based on the analysis of second research question the researcher found that there is no difference of students' quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task. It might be caused by some other factors that could not be explained by Anova analysis. In another word, the success of students' speaking may come from the internal factor such as motivation on the students themselves and the external factors like the role of the instructor, teaching media, the design of the curriculum or the way the test was conducted. This finding in line with Dincer and Yesilyurt (2013) who found that factor affecting students' speaking can be from the students themselves as some students feel incompetent in oral communication though they have different motivational orientation about English speaking skill.

Even there is no significant difference of students' quantity and quality in speaking among students with different learning style and the speaking task the researcher also found that the students who have communicative learning style has greatest dominance in their speaking. It might be caused by the characteristic of communicative students who have a desire for a communicative learning approach, they prefer to learn English by talking much to friends in Englishand learning by conversation. The result of this research confirmed the finding of Yufrizal (2007) who found that in terms of the interaction amount, communicative learners were found to spend the longest time in speaking, took the most turns, and produced the most of C unit compares to another type of learning

style. However in terms of students' speaking quality the researcher found that the students with concrete learning style have better speaking quality in their performance among students with four different learning. This finding in line with Yufrizal (2007) who found that the students with concrete learning style made the most of opportunities in negotiation of meaning (including the most modification of input and modification of output).

In finding the answer of research questions the researcher also found that learning style classifications by Willingis compatible for language learning compares to another classification of learning style from other experts. It can be seen from the result of this research where was more than one of speaking task design which was designed based on the students' characteristic match with students' preference in learning the language, such as concrete speaking task design and analytical speaking task design. This finding in line with Ho (1999) in HamidahYamat (2012) who said that the learner's types identified by Willing (1988) and the learning methods mentioned in the questionnaire are more comprehensive, understandable, applicable and relevant to second/foreign language (L2/FL) learning contexts. From the explanations above it seems that Willing's classifications of learning style are more general comprehensive, applicable and educationally oriented, additionally Willing's classifications of learning style are relevant to language learning contexts.

CONCLUSION

Considering all the data gathered after finishing the research which was conducted in Darmajaya Language Center, some conclusions were taken as follows:
1. The students will learn easier and get better understanding when they are taught by using speaking task design which is based on their learning style.
2. There are no studies that examined the relative effect of each factor on speaking performance measures.
3. The students' success in speaking is not significantly affected by their preference to employ particular learning style.

Based on the result of the research and the conclusion stated previously, the researcher would like to propose some suggestions as follows:
1. It is better for English teachers to know their students learning style when they are teaching in the class since learning style help the teacher to create the variety of speaking tasks design and avoid the dominancy of particular students' learning style in their class. While for the students, they can get better understanding about the material which is given
2. It is suggested for the next researcher to also focus on the student speaking achievement with their learning style.

REFERENCES

Bidabadi, F. S and Yamat, H. 2012. *The Relationship between English Listening Proficiency Levels and Learning Styles.* University Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Dincer, A., &Yesilyurt, S. 2013. *Pre-Service English Teachers' Beliefs on Speaking Skills Based on Motivational Orientations. English Language Teaching, 6(7), 88-95.*

Gilakjani, A. P .2012.*Visual, Auditory, Kinaesthetic Learning Styles and Their Impacts on English Language Teaching.* Islamic Azad University, Iran.

Ho.Belinda. 1999.*Identifying students' learning style preferences and task design.* University of Hongkong.

Jhaish, M.A. 2010. *The Relationship among Learning Styles, Language Learning Strategies, and the Academic Achievement among the English Majors at Al-Aqsa University.*The Islamic University Deanery

Nonetis'ah. 2009. *Perbedaan Gaya BelajarSiswa, Gaya Mengajar Guru danLamanya BelajarSiswa di luarSekolah TerhadapKemampuan BerbahasaInggrisSiswa Kelas IX SMPN 16 B. Lampung.*Unpublished Thesis.Lampung University.

Troike, S. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition.* University of Arizona

Windu, Y. 2009. *Perbandingan PrestasiMenulisB.Inggris BerdasarkanStrategi Pembelajarandan Gaya BelajarSiswa di Politeknik Negeri Lampung.* Unpublished Thesis. Lampung University

Yufrizal, Hery.2007. *Negotiation of Meaning by Indonesia EFL Learners.* PRC Book