

## TBLT VS. CBLT: WHICH IS MORE EFFECTIVE IN ENHANCING EFL WRITING SKILLS?

I.K. Wardana

Universitas Mahasaraswati Denpasar, Denpasar, Indonesia  
e-mail: [ketutwardana71@unmas.ac.id](mailto:ketutwardana71@unmas.ac.id)

The comparison study on the influence of teaching strategies, both Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT), in writing descriptive paragraphs and EFL students' motivation remains limited. Therefore, this research was conducted to investigate the differences in paragraph writing skills through TBLT and CBLT and their influence on student motivation. Based on these objectives, this research used a quantitative approach with a single-sample experimental design. The research population consisted of 8th-grade students at SMPN 1 Kuta Selatan (N=400). Ten percent of this population was selected as the sample using a purposive sampling technique. The research instruments included tests and questionnaires. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired sample t-tests. The findings reveal that both teaching strategies influenced participants' writing skills and motivation. However, CBLT was more effective in stimulating students to write descriptive paragraph content with more grammatically accurate features compared to TBLT, which mainly encouraged the exploration of ideas and positive participant behavior to complete the task. Additionally, although both strategies influenced participant motivation, participants were more motivated to complete tasks with TBLT than with CBLT. Thus, assignments encouraged students to develop writing ideas rather than just focusing on grammar and text structure

**Keywords:** *Content-Based; EFL; Motivation; Task-Based; Writing Skills*

### 1. INTRODUCTION

English teaching in Indonesia involves a variety of techniques designed to enhance students' English language proficiency. The common techniques are mostly based on the Communicative Approach (CA), which emphasizes active communication and contextual understanding (Alamri, 2018). Through this approach, students are encouraged to interact in English through speaking, listening, reading, and writing activities. According to Chang (2011), CA emphasizes fluency. Two techniques within this approach are known as Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT). Both techniques aim to enrich students' understanding of the English language, develop fluent communication skills, and boost confidence in using English in everyday situations (Zhang & Luo, 2018). However, Richards and Rodgers (2014) argue that TBLT represents a natural progression from CLT. In TBLT, tasks are considered the fundamental and central components of both planning and instructional design (Ellis, 2013). Additionally, CBLT is a specialized branch of CLT that emphasizes the concurrent teaching of both language and subject matter (Richards & Pun, 2022). Despite sharing the same goals, each technique has its strengths and weaknesses in application. Thus, numerous factors can influence the success and effectiveness of these techniques. Therefore, to determine whether there are any differences between the two techniques in improving students' English language proficiency, an investigation must be conducted to support this assumption.

Among the ontologies of those techniques, Dooly (2013) and Spada (2022) elaborate that TBLT and CBLT represent two distinct approaches utilized in language education, each possessing its unique strengths and areas of focus. TBLT primarily relies on tasks as the central resource for language instruction (Poedjiastutie et al., 2018). This approach's primary focus is on communication and the practical application of language skills, as articulated by Nunan (2012). This method furnishes learners with a robust foundation and an organized

learning experience (Willis, 1996). It means that the content serves as a means to engage learners in communicative activities, but it is not the central focus. Conversely, CBLT adopts a context-driven approach to language teaching. It prioritizes the use of genuine, real-life situations and materials to facilitate language acquisition (Liu, 2023). CBLT encourages learners to actively engage with the language within meaningful contexts, such as through role-plays, simulations, and real-world interactions. According to Willis (1996), by exposing learners to authentic language usage, CBLT aims to cultivate their communicative competence and promote a deeper understanding of language within its context. Therefore, both techniques may result in different effects on learning outcomes. TBLT is concerned with the hard skills of the language, meanwhile, CBLT focuses on the soft skill or language proficiency of how the language structure is applied in daily language usage.

From these differences, it is evident that both of these techniques influence students' learning outcomes in mastering English. This can be observed in previous research that shows significant differences in learning outcomes between teaching through TBLT and CBLT in the context of EFL. These variations in learning outcomes demonstrate the strengths and weaknesses of these two techniques in language skill acquisition. For instance, (Malmir et al., 2011) indicated that the TBLT group performed better on the reading comprehension post-test than the CBLT group. Furthermore, Shabani and Ghasemi (2014) revealed that subjects in the TBLT group performed better on the reading comprehension post-test than those in the CBLT group. Additionally, Rahmani and Alavi (2017) observed that the TBLT class demonstrated better speaking performance than the CBLT class, even though both showed progress in learning achievement. In Indonesia, Prasetyaningrum (2018) found that TBLT could enhance students' reading comprehension through three stages: pre-task, task cycle, and post-task, which included specific activities. Based on these findings, TBLT instruction in English language learning yields different outcomes compared to CBLT in the context of classroom action research or experimental research. TBLT is declared more effective in improving the reading skills of EFL students.

However, none of these studies focused on the writing skills and the motivation of EFL students being taught through those techniques. There are certainly differences in outcomes and motivation or the effects of teaching strategies on outcomes of different language skills. From this gap, this research focuses on examining and explaining whether there is an impact of implementing TBLT compared to CBLT on learning outcomes and student motivation. This research also aims to determine which of these two techniques is more effective in enhancing students' writing skills. The results of this study are expected to contribute to knowledge and empirical evidence about effective teaching strategies for all English language skills. To achieve these objectives, this research formulates two main questions:

1. How do English writing outcomes of students differ between TBLT and CBLT?
2. Do TBLT and CBLT influence student learning outcomes and motivation?

To strengthen the assumption or hypothesis, this study synthesizes and summarizes the teaching theories of TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching) and CBLT (Content-Based Language Teaching) from a broader perspective. The concept of these teaching theories illustrates the framework of English writing instruction and can certainly contribute to bolstering the research hypothesis. Two communicative teaching concepts will be synthesized, namely task-based teaching and content-based teaching.

Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT), known as the latest revolution in language teaching, has significantly impacted the field of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Indonesia. According to Richards and Rodgers, (2014), TBLT is an approach centered around the use of tasks as the core units for planning and instruction in language teaching. Structured and unstructured tasks have become fundamental concepts in both foreign and second-language research and language teaching (Ellis, 2017). Previous evidence reveals that TBLT encourages language learners to genuinely strive for effective communication in the target language they are learning. Ahmadian (2016) argues that Task-Based Instruction (TBI) is essentially a meaning-focused approach that mirrors real-world language use for practical communication. The underlying principle here is that language can be applied to real-world tasks and activities within the classroom. In essence, TBLT aims to transform the

classroom into a real-world environment, necessitating the use of authentic materials and genuine communication (Nunan, 2012). The implementation of task-based instruction has yielded significant outcomes in foreign language teaching across various countries. This approach offers several compelling attributes, including meaningfulness, interaction, cooperation, peer feedback, and the use of language in natural contexts, among others.

Meanwhile, CBLT is concerned more with the content of the language. According to Lyster (2017), CBLT is an instructional approach in which nonlinguistic content is taught to the students through a medium of language as an additional language. The main focus of CBLT is the development of literacy and academic ability with the language. Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT), or Content-Based Instruction (CBI), as it is sometimes referred to, is an educational program in English as a second language in which the focus is on teaching students skills they will need in regular classrooms, i.e. for learning in content areas such as accounting, geography, or chemistry. Ridge (2001) regards Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) as one of the most influential and representative contributions to Foreign language instruction or pedagogy. It means that CBLT promotes critical thinking skills and enables learners to learn language more quickly and with more pleasure. Content-based instruction (CBI) is a teaching method that emphasizes learning about something rather than learning about language. Although CBI is not new, there has been an increased interest in it over the last ten years, particularly in the USA and Canada where it has proven very effective in ESL immersion programs. This interest has now spread to EFL classrooms around the world where teachers are discovering that their students like CBI and are excited to learn English this way. CBLT teaches students the language skills they will need (Brown, 2003; Wardana et al., 2022).

Considering the differences in both concepts and aims, both approaches are believed, in this study, to be capable of improving EFL students' writing skills and their motivation in language learning. However, there may be variations in outcomes due to factors such as the way the approach is applied, the involvement of students and teachers, and the language learning experiences they have undergone. Consequently, the choice of the better approach will depend on the specific language skills being learned.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

The objective of the study is to determine which of TBLT and CBLT is more effective in enhancing students' writing skills. Therefore, this study employed experimental research with a "Within-Group Design." In this design, the same subjects or participants were exposed to both different techniques or treatments alternately or randomly. Each subject experienced both treatments in different sequences. Data in this type of design were collected by measuring the dependent variable after each treatment was administered, and a comparison between the two treatments was conducted to assess the differences in their impact on the dependent variable (Richards et al., 2002). As a result, this design makes it easy to control for individual differences among subjects because each subject is involved in both treatments.

The research population consists of 400 eighth-grade students at SMPN 1 South Kuta, divided into 5 classes with 32 students in each class. They have been learning English as a foreign language since elementary school. Since the population is more than 100, this study recruited 10% of the total, resulting in only 40 students as research participants. The selection of these 40 students was done using a simple purposive sampling technique, which involves choosing students based on specific criteria, such as equal age, grade, length of studying English, and English proficiency. This group will receive different teaching interventions, namely TBLT during one specific period and CBLT during another period. To assess the effectiveness and changes in students' motivation after the teaching interventions, participants were given tests and questionnaires. Before selecting and enrolling the participants, ethical guidelines were adhered to, which included securing approval from the relevant institutional review board thoroughly and ethically. The rights and dignity of the participants were maintained, guaranteeing their anonymity and the privacy of their answers. Before collecting data, they got informed consent to take part in the research.

This research employed two types of instruments, namely tests, namely written performance tests, and non-tests, namely motivation questionnaires. The type of tests the participants in each group did were descriptive paragraph writing. The test required students to compose a descriptive paragraph about their "nearest environment" such as "daily life", "favorite idols", "food" or "pets". with a minimum of 12 sentences, following English language writing conventions with the correct text structure. To score the participants' writing performance after receiving treatment, this study adopted and adapted the Brown scoring rubric. Meanwhile, to gauge student's learning motivation in the application of TBLT and CBLT, a non-test in the form of a motivation questionnaire is administered to the participants. On the other hand, the questionnaire consists of 20 statements related to elements of student motivation toward both applied approaches.

Data were collected through written tests and questionnaires administered before and after the TBLT and CBLT teaching sessions. Data are gathered by measuring the dependent variables after each treatment is administered, and a comparison between the two treatments is conducted to assess the differences in their impact on the dependent variables. However, before being analyzed through parametric statistical tests, all data must meet the criteria that they are normally distributed and homogenous.

There were three aspects of indicators that were developed into multiple indicators. The scores of the respondent groups were calculated using interpretation criteria and were subsequently modified. The questionnaire responses were assessed using a Likert scale ranging from 0 to 5, with options ranging from "strongly agree" (score of 5) to "strongly disagree". The scores obtained from the respondents were then calculated based on specific interpretation criteria and subsequently adjusted. On the other hand, the responses to the perspective questionnaire were categorized as having a very positive, positive, fair, negative, or very negative perspective.

Data were analyzed using the Paired-Sample t-test method because this study involved the same group of EFL students exposed to both TBLT and CBLT (in a before-and-after design). This test was employed to compare the participants' writing skills and motivation before and after each teaching approach. It aimed to determine whether there was a significant difference in their writing skills after receiving each type of instruction. Descriptive statistical techniques were employed to assess the extent of students' writing ability with TBLT and CBLT, which included calculating the mean and standard deviation. All numerical data were analyzed using SPSS 25 software (Pallant, 2020). Additionally, a statistical test was utilized to assess the strength of the correlation, leading to the formulation of two hypotheses; (1) H0 (Null Hypothesis): There are no significant differences in students' writing ability and motivation after being taught by TBLT and CBLT and (2) H1 (Alternative Hypothesis): There are significant differences in students' writing ability and motivation after being taught by TBLT and CBLT.

### **3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The findings have answered the research questions and described the objectives of this study. The first finding statistically described the achievement of the participants' writing ability and motivation before and after TBLT and CBLT were applied in teaching. In addition, the second finding revealed the influence of those techniques on participants' writing skills and motivation. As a result, each session concerning the findings is chronologically presented.

#### **Writing performance and motivation in TBLT and CBLT**

The first finding of the study describes the differences in writing achievement and motivation before and after the treatments were conducted. The distribution of participants' writing skills and motivation is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution Of Participants' Writing Skills And Motivation

Achievement	Pretest	Motivation	Post-test TBLT	Motivation	Post-test CBLT	Motivation
Total	2665	2609	2915	3205	3275	3066
mean	66.62	65.22	72.87	80.12	81.87	76.65
median	70	65	75	81	80	76.5
Sd	9.37	8.51	7.24	6.45	6.06	6.01

Table 1 provides evidence of a difference in students' writing abilities before and after the treatment. Prior to the intervention, the participant's writing skills were categorized as "fair," which was lower than the grade point average (GPA). However, after the implementation of TBLT, their writing abilities were categorized as "quite high," which scored 73, still lower than the GPA. On the other hand, CBLT led to an increase in students' writing ability, scoring 80, which was higher than the GPA and categorized as a "very high" achievement. Furthermore, the motivation of the participants before the treatment was categorized as "quite low," scoring 65. After the application of TBLT, the participant's motivation for writing in English increased to 80, being categorized as "very high." In contrast, their motivation during the application of CBLT was only 77, categorized as "quite high." Although there is a difference in achievement between these two approaches, the participants' motivation in developing ideas and sentence quality in their writing is categorized as "high." The percentage of differences in students' writing ability and motivation between the pretest and posttest is presented in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Differences In Participants' Writing Ability And Motivation

Based on the provided Figure 1, it appears that the study is examining the effects of two different teaching methods, TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching) and CBLT (Content-Based Language Teaching), on students' achievement scores in terms of pretest scores and motivation levels. The findings reveal that both teaching strategies influenced participants' writing skills as well as their motivation. However, CBLT was a more effective strategy in stimulating students to write the message accurately than TBLT, which mostly encouraged participants' positive behavior to finish the task. In addition, even though both strategies increased participants' motivation, participants were more motivated to write the task with TBLT than with CBLT.

### The influence of TBLT and CBLT on student learning outcomes and motivation

The following analysis employs a paired t-test to determine the extent of the difference between students' writing outcomes in the pretest and posttest after two different strategies have been implemented. The subsequent findings also measure the differences between TBLT and CBLT, as well as differences in participants' motivation between the pretest and



post-implementation of strategies. Therefore, as a prerequisite for conducting the t-test, the data must be homogeneous and normally distributed. The Test of Homogeneity can be found in Table 2.

Table 2. Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene	df1	df2	Sig.
		Statistic			
Writing Skill	Based on Mean	.322	1	78	.572
	Based on Median	.061	1	78	.805
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.061	1	69.834	.805
	Based on trimmed mean	.331	1	78	.567

Based on the test of homogeneity of variances, the significance values for English writing scores with TBLT and CBLT are 0.572, 0.805, 0.805, and 0.567. Since the Sig. value of  $0.572 > 0.05$ , it can be concluded that the variances of student writing outcomes with TBLT and CBLT are equal or homogeneous. This suggests that there is no significant difference in variances between the groups under these conditions. This is good news because it indicates that the assumption of homogeneity of variances may hold for your data, making it more suitable for subsequent statistical analyses. Furthermore, a test of the normality of Shapiro-Wilk indicated that the data for both TBLT and CBLT treatments were tested for normality using the Shapiro-Wilk test (because the sample was less than 50) with a significance level of 0.05. The null hypothesis for this test is that the data is normally distributed. Since the significance values (Sig.) for both treatments (0.320 for TBLT and 0.318 for CBLT) are less than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data significantly deviates from a normal distribution. To see whether there were or not any differences between the pretest and post-test or writing skill levels before and after the TBLT and CBLT were conducted, a paired sample t-test was conducted. The output of a paired sample t-test is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The Output Of A Paired Sample T-Test On Descriptive Writing Paragraph  
 Pretest Posttest

		Paired Differences				t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	pretest post-test TBLT	-6.250	6.864	1.085	-8.445	-4.055	-5.759	39	.000
Pair 2	pretest post-test CBLT	-6.250	6.864	1.085	-8.445	-4.055	-5.759	39	.000

The findings from the paired samples test show that there is a significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores for both TBLT (Task-Based Language Teaching) and CBLT (Content-Based Language Teaching). For TBLT, the mean difference between the pretest and post-test scores is -6.250, with a standard deviation of 6.864. The standard error of the mean is 1.085, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -8.445 to -4.055. The t-statistic is -5.759, with 39 degrees of freedom, and the p-value is  $<0.001$  ( $p < .000$ ), indicating a highly significant difference.

Similarly, for CBLT, the mean difference between the pretest and post-test scores is also -6.250, with a standard deviation of 6.864. The standard error of the mean is 1.085, and the 95% confidence interval for the difference ranges from -8.445 to -4.055. The t-statistic is -

5.759, with 39 degrees of freedom, and the p-value is <0.001 ( $p < .000$ ), showing a highly significant difference. In both cases, the results suggest that both teaching strategies (TBLT and CBLT) led to a significant improvement in students' scores from the pretest to the post-test. The output of a paired sample t-test on motivation is presented in Table 4

Table 4. The Output Of A Paired Sample T-Test On Motivation  
 Pre- Post Motivation

		Paired Samples Test					t	d f	Sig. (2- tailed)
		Paired Differences							
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	motivation - TBLT	-14.900	10.556	1.669	-18.276	-11.524	-8.927	39	.000
Pair 2	motivation - CBLT	-11.425	10.605	1.677	-14.816	-8.034	-6.814	39	.000

The finding above revealed that the p-value is less than 0.001 ( $p < .000$ ), signifying a highly significant difference between pre- and post-motivation scores. This suggests that TBLT had a substantial impact on increasing motivation. Furthermore, The p-value is less than 0.001 ( $p < .000$ ), indicating a highly significant difference between pre-and post-motivation scores. This suggests that CBLT also had a substantial impact on increasing motivation, although it may be slightly less effective in this regard compared to TBLT. In summary, both TBLT and CBLT resulted in a significant increase in students' motivation levels, as indicated by the highly significant p-values and the magnitude of the mean differences. The output of a paired sample t-test on motivation is presented in Table 5

Table 5. The Output Of A Paired Sample T-Test On The Influence Of TBLT And CBLT

		Paired Samples Test					t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
		Paired Differences							
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference					
				Lower	Upper				
Pair1	TBLT - CBLT	-9.000	5.796	.916	-10.854	-7.146	-9.821	39	.000
Pair 2	TBLT- CBLT	1.950	6.876	1.087	-.249	4.149	1.794	39	.081

The analysis of the data reveals that there is a highly significant difference between TBLT and CBLT in terms of their effectiveness in improving participants' accurate writing. The p-value, which is less than 0.001 ( $p < .000$ ), underscores this notable disparity. This implies that CBLT outperforms TBLT as a strategy for enhancing accurate writing skills in

participants. Conversely, when it comes to motivation, the p-value of 0.081 is greater than the conventional significance level of 0.05. This finding suggests that the variance in motivation between TBLT and CBLT is not statistically significant. In other words, both teaching methods have a similar impact on participant motivation. In summary, the findings indicate that there is a significant difference between the effectiveness of TBLT and CBLT in the context of strategy, with TBLT being more effective. However, in the context of motivation, the difference between the two teaching methods is not statistically significant, as the p-value exceeds the typical threshold of 0.05. It means that both strategies can influence participant's motivation.

Based on the statistical data analysis above, this research has addressed two research questions and objectives. This means that there are two significant findings in line with the research objectives. In addition to the findings related to student writing abilities, it is important to note that these results also have implications for the applied teaching theories. The first finding indicates that both TBLT and CBLT can improve students' English writing abilities, which aligns with the principles of communicative language teaching. This is evidenced by the participants' writing scores in the post-test for both strategies being significantly higher than their pre-test scores. However, it's essential to consider that participants' abilities before any intervention were below a GPA of 75.

After the implementation of the TBLT approach, participants showed improvement in conveying ideas in writing compared to the pre-test. However, they were still unable to develop their ideas into coherent sentences and had inappropriate vocabulary choices, keeping them below the GPA threshold. On the other hand, after being exposed to the CBLT approach, participants demonstrated the ability to express their ideas with well-structured paragraphs, minimal grammatical errors, and near-adequate adherence to writing conventions. This suggests that CBLT effectively integrates principles of genre-based and process-oriented writing instruction. Although TBLT can enhance students' writing abilities in line with communicative language teaching principles, CBLT proves more effective in assisting participants in producing writing with accurate and clear content, thereby emphasizing the benefits of a genre-based and process-oriented approach to writing instruction.

Additionally, the second finding sheds light on the application of motivation theory in the context of language learning. Before the intervention with TBLT and CBLT, students exhibited very low motivation for writing in English. This lack of motivation was attributed to the previously employed strategies, which had failed to ignite their interest and advance their knowledge in writing, resulting in a pervasive sense of monotony during writing lessons. However, with the introduction of TBLT and CBLT, a transformation occurred (Cao, 2018). Students started to feel more self-assured and responsible for their writing assignments, aligning with the principles of self-determination theory and intrinsic motivation. This shift in conditions not only influenced their motivation but also enabled them to enhance their writing skills, reflecting the significance of motivation in the language learning process.

Although both TBLT and CBLT effectively elevated students' motivation compared to the pre-intervention phase (indicating no significant difference in motivation for writing between TBLT and CBLT) Marashi and Mirghafari (2019) mentioned that it is worth noting that CBLT marginally surpassed TBLT in enhancing participant motivation for writing. This observation suggests that CBLT, with its emphasis on genre-based and process-oriented writing, may better resonate with the psychological needs of autonomy, competence, and relatedness as proposed by self-determination theory, thereby underlining its potential to significantly enhance students' motivation for writing. In essence, this study underscores that both strategies can positively impact students' motivation for writing, with CBLT exhibiting a slight edge in this regard.

In light of the findings from previous research studies, it is evident that Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) have distinct impacts on participant motivation and language skill development. These studies help delineate the differences, similarities, and unique contributions of each approach. (Shabani & Ghasemi, 2014) observed that the TBLT group performed better than the CBLT group in a



reading comprehension post-test. This outcome suggests that TBLT is more effective in teaching reading comprehension to Iranian ESP learners. This finding underscores the potential benefits of TBLT in improving specific language skills like reading. A subsequent study by Namaziandost et al (2019) revealed that both TBLT and CBLT groups showed significant progress in their reading skills from the pretest to the posttest. However, the TBLT group outperformed the CBLT group in the posttest, indicating that both methods are effective in enhancing reading comprehension. This demonstrates that participants can benefit from both TBLT and CBLT in terms of reading skills.

It is noteworthy that in both of these studies, TBLT was found to be more effective than CBLT in developing reading skills, which can be attributed to the frequent reading tasks integrated into TBLT. However, a contrast was observed when it came to writing skills. TBLT was ineffective in improving writing skills as writing requires content accuracy, which is more aligned with the principles of CBLT. Thus, the research findings lend support to the idea that CBLT may be more effective than TBLT, especially in the context of writing skills. This underscores the importance of considering the specific language skills and goals when choosing between TBLT and CBLT for language instruction.

This statement is supported by Amat et al (2022) that Content-Based Language Teaching (CBLT) and Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) provide strong evidence as to the effectiveness of these two language teaching approaches. With all the evidence and results provided in this journal, we come up with the conclusion that CBLT and TBLT will increase motivation among students of the second language in a language classroom. Through interdisciplinary integration of L2 and task/activity-based teaching, learning can be an easy process for students learning a second language.

In summary, CBLT's influences in enhancing the accuracy of students' writing is driven by its content-centered approach, integration of grammar and vocabulary, and emphasis on practical language use. The implications of this effectiveness include influenced language proficiency, academic success, enhanced communication skills, and a lasting commitment to lifelong learning.

#### **4. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS**

In conclusion, this research aligns with its objectives, revealing two significant findings. Both TBLT and CBLT effectively influenced participants' English writing abilities as demonstrated by higher post-test scores. TBLT helped participants convey ideas in writing but struggled with coherence and vocabulary. In contrast, CBLT helped participants to express ideas with structured paragraphs, minimal grammatical errors, and adherence to writing conventions, highlighting its success in integrating genre-based and process-oriented writing instruction for clearer and more accurate content in student writing.

The implications of these findings are far-reaching and have important implications for language educators, learners, and policymakers. Participants exposed to CBLT are likely to develop a stronger grasp of the language, which can influence them to have higher academic success in writing proficiency. For educators, these findings underscore the importance of tailoring language instruction methods to specific language skills and goals. TBLT and CBLT can be viewed as complementary approaches, each with its unique strengths, depending on the desired language outcome. Therefore, instructors should carefully consider the objectives of their language programs and select the appropriate approach accordingly.

In light of the research findings, it is recommended that language education programs incorporate a balanced mix of TBLT and CBLT to address the diverse needs of language learners. This approach ensures that students have the opportunity to develop a comprehensive set of language skills, including both reading comprehension and writing accuracy. Overall, the research highlights the significance of a well-rounded language education approach that integrates the strengths of both TBLT and CBLT, ultimately preparing students for success in a multilingual and multicultural world.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmadian, M. J. (2016). Task-based language teaching and learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 377–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1236523>
- Alamri, W. A. (2018). Communicative language teaching: Possible alternative approaches to clt and teaching contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 11(10), 132–138. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v11n10p132>
- Amat, E., Tejada, J. K., & Ilustre, R. (2022). Content-Based and Task-Based Language Teaching in L2 Classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 4(3), 24–34. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2022.4.3.3>
- Brown, A. (2003). Interviewer variation and the co-construction of speaking proficiency. *Language Testing*, 20(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt242oa>
- Cao, P. T. H. (2018). Task-based language teaching: Affordances and challenges in TBLT implementation at the Vietnamese tertiary level. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(2), 510. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.19.510>
- Chang, S.-C. (2011). A contrastive study of grammar translation method and communicative approach in teaching English grammar. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 13. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p13>
- Dooly, M. (2013). *Promoting Competency-Based Language Teaching Through Project-Based Language Learning BT - Competency-based Language Teaching in Higher Education* (M. L. Pérez Cañado, Ed.; pp. 77–91). Springer Netherlands. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5386-0\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5386-0_5)
- Ellis, R. (2013). Task-based language teaching: Responding to the critics. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 8.
- Ellis, R. (2017). Task-based language teaching. In *The Routledge handbook of instructed second language acquisition* (pp. 108–125). Routledge.
- Liu, W. (2023). The theory of second language development for international students. *Journal for Multicultural Education*, 17(3), 367–378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-08-2022-0106>
- Lyster, R. (2017). *Content-based language teaching*. Routledge.
- Malmir, A., Sarem, S. N., & Ghasemi, A. (2011). The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) vs. Content-Based. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(6), 79–94.
- Marashi, H., & Mirghafari, S. (2019). Using content-based and task-based teaching in a critical thinking setting to improve EFL learners' writing. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 6(1), 26–43. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v6i1.11745>
- Namaziandost, E., Nasri, M., & Ahmadi, S. (2019). The comparative effect of content-based language teaching and task-based language teaching on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners' reading skill. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(10), 1278–1286. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpis.0910.03>
- Nunan, D. (2012). *Learner-centered English language education: The selected works of David Nunan*. Routledge.
- Poedjiastutie, D., Darmaji, D., Musrina, M., & Novikasari, R. (2018). Task-Based Language Teaching: An Alternative Approach in Teaching Reading Comprehension in Indonesia. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 15(3), 856. <https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.3.22.856>
- Prasetyaningrum, D. I. (2018). Improving agriculture students' reading comprehension through task-based language teaching (TBLT). *EnJourMe (English Journal of Merdeka): Culture, Language, and Teaching of English*, 3(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.26905/enjourme.v3i1.2202>

- Rahmani, A., & Alavi, M. (2017). Comparing the impact of culturally laden task-based language teaching (TBLT) and content-based language teaching (CBLT) on Iranian intermediate learners' Speaking improvement. *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies*, 5(3), 69–88.
- Richards, J. C., & Pun, J. (2022). *Teaching and learning in English medium instruction: An introduction*. Routledge.
- Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Ridge, E. (2001). Diane Larsen-Freeman. 2000. Techniques and principles in language teaching AND Jack Richards and Theodore Rogers. 2001. Approaches and methods in language teaching. *Per Linguam*, 17(2).
- Shabani, M. B., & Ghasemi, A. (2014). The Effect of Task-based Language Teaching (TBLT) and Content-based Language Teaching (CBLT) on the Iranian Intermediate ESP Learners' Reading Comprehension. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1713–1721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.598>
- Spada, N. (2022). Reflecting on task-based language teaching from an Instructed SLA perspective. *Language Teaching*, 55(1), 74–86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000161>
- Wardana, I. K., Dharmayanti, P. A. P., & Arsana, A. A. P. (2022). ELT lecturers' communicative language teaching approach in directing students' emotions in distance learning. *Studies in English Language and Education*, 9(3), 1071–1092. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i3.24830>
- Willis, J. (1996). A flexible framework for task-based learning. *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*, 52, 62.
- Zhang, Y., & Luo, S. (2018). *Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Task-Based Language Teaching in Chinese as a Second Language Classrooms*. 41(3), 264–287. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1515/cjal-2018-0022>