PBLT (PHILOSOPHY-BASED LANGUAGE TEACHING) APPROACH: TEACHING SPEAKING VIEWED FROM STUDENTS' RISK-TAKING

Shelia Anjarani[1], Ngadiso [2], Abdul Asib [3].
Sebelas Maret University
Surakarta, 57126, Indonesia
shelia.anjarani@gmail.com

***Abstract** : PBLT is an approach using philosophical questions to spark the discussion in the classroom in order to increase the students' ability in speaking. This research employed an experimental study. The sampling used in this research was clustering random sampling with two classes as samples, namely experimental class taught using PBLT approach and control class taught using 3P approach. To collect the data, there were two instruments used in this research namely speaking test and risk-taking questionnaire. The data were analyzed by using 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Tukey test. The result of the research shows that: (1) PBLT approach is more effective than 3P approach to teach speaking and (2) students having high risk-taking have better speaking skill than those having low risk-taking. It means that the use of PBLT approach is effective to teach speaking.*

***Keywords:** PBLT approach, 3P approach, speaking skill, risk-taking*

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is a close part of daily life because speaking is an integral part of being human being. Speaking is a very significant skill in language as it is used for expressing our ideas, getting information and messages. Some people often consider that a good English speaker is someone who speaks confidently, fluently, and grammatically. In another learning contexts, a good English speaker is considered if the person sounds like a person from native-speaker countries, such as UK or USA. The goal of people learning language is to be able to speak it. By English lesson given to the students, they are expected to have good speaking skill to communicate and to express themselves in English, such as to discuss, interview, to give speech, debate, and many others. In some universities, speaking class is usually taught in large classes by teacher-centered model. It ends up with the memorisation and recall skills. The central focus is only on grammar and vocabulary mastery. Most often, students are treated as passive recipients of learning process.

According to Ur (1996, p. 120), "of all the four skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing), speaking seems intuitively the most important". Apart from the fact that speaking is important, most of students in Indonesia still apparently get some difficulties in speaking. Hadijah (2014) finds some difficulties faced by university

students in speaking are not only having limited knowledge on the components of speaking skills, such as pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and comprehension but also having another personal reason, such as shy to perform speaking, lack of self-confidence, lack of speaking practice, time management, speaking material, and exposure problems. Fauzan (2014) in his study reveals the barriers of speaking for university students, such as reluctance, hesitation, fear of making mistakes in speaking, and lack of adequate vocabulary.

In EFL context, especially in teaching speaking, the teacher has responsibility to prepare the students in real communication context. Most of the teaching speaking is memorizing the dialogue then practice it in front of the class. Meanwhile, it will not help the students to explore in real life context of communication. The teacher needs to conduct a method, approach, or technique in order to achive that goal. In short, the students are expected to express their thought, ideas, and feeling orally using English. Barnes (2008, p. 2) argues "most of our important learning is a matter of constructing models of the world, finding out how far they work by using them, and then reshaping them in the light of what happens". Previously, Barnes (1992) explains that it is the "exploratory talk", involving finding out new ideas, and not "presentational talk", which is well-shaped and pre-planned. In line with Barnes, Shahini and Riazi (2011, p. 170) argue that by using philosophical questions raised in the English language class, students' word range and the length of their talk increased and the students could stay after the class to continue the discussion in English.

Shahini and Riazi (2011, p. 170) argue that by using philosophical questions raised in the English language class, students' word range and the length of their talk increased and the students could stay after the class to continue the discussion in English. The observation conducted by Shahini and Riazi was supported by a number of studies. Thus, they proposed an idea of this approach in English language teaching context called PBLT (Philosophy-Based Language Teaching). The main core of this approach is to engage the students in discussions that revolve around philosophical questions.

Hemmati and Hoomanfard (2014, p. 241) states that PBLT is the approach using series of questions in order to organize students' thought and direct learning. In its implementation, the step is started with watching a short video related to the discussion topic. The video is used to present the topic. Then, the students are asked to make one or two philosophical questions with their peers based on the topic of the video they watch. Each student reads his / her questions to the whole class and the most interesting ones are selected by the students themselves to be discussed. During the discussion, the teacher writes down about the main point discussed by the students, the important words used by the students, and other components of speaking to give feedback or evaluation after the discussion.

The personality factor with a close bearing on language learning is risk-taking. It is suggested that the success of second language learning is associated with a tendency to take risks. Students' ability in taking the risks appears as a significant individual differences, which is considered as a variable of success in second language learning (Gass & Selinker, 2008). In terms of skills, most of the literature regarding risk-taking

has focused on speaking rather on the other macro skills (writing, listening, reading). Wang and Lin (2015, p. 113) state that risk-taking provides students with power and courage to express themselves in another language instead of their mother tongue. Students who acquire this personality tend to seize every chance to communicate with others in English.

In accordance with the elaboration above, the researcher was interested to investigate the effectiveness of PBLT (Philosophy-Based Language Teaching) approach to teach speaking viewed from students' risk-taking.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is an experimental research conducted at one of universities in Purwokerto. Referring to this research, the researcher used a simple factorial design 2 x 2 with post-test only design. This research involved three kinds of variables namely independent variable, dependent variable, and attributive variable. The independent variable of this research was the teaching approaches. The approaches used were PBLT and 3P. The dependent variable of this research was students' speaking skill. Meanwhile the attributive variable of this study was students' risk-taking in learning. This study was conducted on May to July 2017. The target population was the second semester students of Nursing Department. The sampling used in this study was cluster random sampling. In this research, the researcher took two classes from four classes of the second semester students as sample. One class was experimental group taught by PBLT approach and the other was control group taught using 3P approach.

In this research, the researcher used two instruments in collecting the data. They were speaking test and risk-taking questionnaire. Speaking test was used to find out students' speaking skill, while risk-taking questionniare was conducted to know students' risk-taking levels. Both instruments was assessed by using readability of the test instruction and risk-taking questionnaire. The questionnaire must be valid and reliable before it is administered in experimental and control class. After the speaking scores were obtained, they were sorted in accordance with students' risk-taking levels, high and low. The techniques used in analyzing the data of this study were descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis is used to find out the mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of the speaking test. Before testing the hypotesis, normality and homogeneity test were conducted. Then, it was followed by testing the research hypothesis using inferential analysis of variance 2 x 2.

RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The data of this research are distributed into eight groups: (1) the speaking scores of the students taught by using PBLT approach (A$_1$); (2) the speaking scores of the students taught by using 3P approach (A$_2$); (3) the speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking (B$_1$); (4) the speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking (B$_2$); (5) the speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking

taught by using PBLT approach (A_1B_1); (6) the speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking taught by using PBLT approach (A_1B_2); (7) the speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking taught by using 3P approach (A_2B_1); and (8) the speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking taught by using 3P approach (A_2B_2).

The data are analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2. Before that, the normality and homogeneity of the data should be tested as the requirement to use ANOVA and Tukey test. The result of normality using Lilliefors test shows that all data are normal. As it can be seen by comparing the values gained (L_o) and L_{table}, where the values (L_o) are lower than L_t. Thus, it can be concluded that the data on both teaching approaches and risk-taking levels are normaly distributed. The computation of normality test is divided into eight groups of data summarized as follows:

Table 1. The Summary of Normality Test

No	Variables	L_o	N	L_t	Test Decision	Status
1	The speaking scores of the students taught by using PBLT approach (A_1)	0.137	30	0.161	H_o is accepted	Normal
2	The speaking scores of the students taught by using 3P approach (A_2)	0.155	30	0.161	H_o is accepted	Normal
3	The speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking (B_1)	0.135	30	0.161	H_o is accepted	Normal
4	The speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking (B_2)	0.160	30	0.161	H_o is accepted	Normal
5	The speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking taught by using PBLT approach (A_1B_1)	0.130	15	0.220	H_o is accepted	Normal
6	The speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking taught by using PBLT approach (A_1B_2)	0.177	15	0.220	H_o is accepted	Normal
7	The speaking scores of the students having high level of risk-taking taught by using 3P approach (A_2B_1)	0.119	15	0.220	H_o is accepted	Normal
8	The speaking scores of the students having low level of risk-taking taught by using 3P approach (A_2B_2)	0.077	15	0.220	H_o is accepted	Normal

Besides, the result of homogeneity test shows that χ_o^2 (1.654) at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ is lower than χ_t^2 (7.815), it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous. It means the data obtained from the results for both variables are homogeneous. After finding normality and homogeneity of the data, the data are analyzed by using Multifactor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) 2 x 2. This test is used to know the

effect of the independent variable and attributive variable toward the dependent variable. Besides, ANOVA has the function to know if there is an interaction among the variables. The hypothesis is rejected if F_o is higher than F_t ($F_o > F_t$). The result of the data is presented in the table below.

Table 2. The Mean Scores

Risk-Taking (B)	Teaching Approaches (A)		Total
	PBLT (A_1)	3P (A_2)	
High Risk-Taking (B_1)	$\Sigma = 1280$ $\bar{X} = 85.33$	$\Sigma = 1100$ $\bar{X} = 73.33$	$\Sigma_{r1} = 2380$ $\bar{X}_{r_1} = 79.33$
Low Risk-Taking (B_2)	$\Sigma = 1090$ $\bar{X} = 72.67$	$\Sigma = 1108$ $\bar{X} = 73.87$	$\Sigma_{r2} = 2198$ $\bar{X}_{r_2} = 73.27$
Total	$\Sigma_{c1} = 2370$ $\bar{X}_{c_1} = 79.00$	$\Sigma_{c2} = 2208$ $\bar{X}_{c_2} = 73.60$	$\sum^{x_1} = 4578$ $\sum^{x_2} = 76.30$

Table 3. Summary of a 2x2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance

Source of variance	SS	df	MS	F_o	$F_{t(0.05)}$
Between columns	437.40	1	437.40	14.62	4.00
Between rows	552.07	1	552.07	18.45	
Columns by rows	653.40	1	653.40	21.84	
Between groups	1642.87	3	547.62		
Within group	1675.73	56	29.92		
Total	4961.47	59			

a. As it is seen from the result of ANOVA test, the value of F_{table} at the level of significance is $\alpha = 0.05$ is 4.00, while the value of F_o between columns is 14.62 which means that H_o is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. Besides, it can be seen at the mean score of both classes. The mean score of the students taught by PBLT approach is 79.00, and the mean score of the students taught by 3P approach is 73.60. Thus, it can be concluded that students who are taught by using PBLT approach have better speaking skill than those taught by 3P approach.
b. The result of ANOVA test shows that F_o between rows (18.45) is higher than F_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (4.00). It means that H_o is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. In other words, speaking skill of the students who have

high risk-taking and those who have low risk-taking are significantly different. Then, the mean score of B_1 (79.33) is higher than B_2 (73.27), it can be concluded that the students having high risk-taking have better speaking skill than those having low risk-taking.

If there is an interaction and effect of independent variable toward dependent variable based on ANOVA result, it is necessary to compare the mean of every treatment with the other means by using Tukey test. This test is used to identify which means are significantly different from one another. The following table shows the summary of the multiple comparative test using Tukey Test.

Table 4. The Summary of Tukey Test

Data	q_o	q_t	Description
$A_1 - A_2$	5.41	2.89	Significant
$B_1 - B_2$	6.07	2.89	Significant
$A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$	3.11	3.01	Significant
$A_1B_2 - A_2B_2$	0.85	3.01	not significant

Based on the computation by using Tukey Test in the summary above, it can be interpreted that:

a. Because q_o between columns A_1 and A_2 (5.41) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), applying PBLT approach gives significantly different result from 3P to teach speaking. In additon, the mean of A_1 (79.00) is higher than that of A_2 (73.60), it shows that PBLT approach is more effective than 3P to teach speaking.

b. Because q_o between rows B_1 and B_2 (6.07) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (2.89), it can be concluded that students having high risk-taking and those having low risk-taking are significantly different in their speaking skill. The mean of B_1 (79.33) is higher than B_2 (73.27), it can be said that students having high risk-taking have better speaking than those having low risk-taking.

c. Because q_o between cells $A_1B_1 - A_2B_1$ (3.11) is higher than q_t at the level of significance $\alpha = 0.05$ (3.01), applying PBLT approach gives significantly different result from 3P approach to teach speaking to students having high risk-taking. Because the mean of A_1B_1 (85.33) is higher than that of A_2B_1 (73.33), it can be said that PBLT approach is more effective than 3P approach to teach speaking for students having high risk-taking.

By considering the data analysis above, the following discuss the result of this research:

1. **The Differences between PBLT and 3P approach**

The research findings reveal that there is significant difference between PBLT and 3P. The result shows that PBLT is more effective than 3P to teach speaking.

The core of PBLT approach is to engage students in the discussions that revolves around philosophical questions. The philosophy here does not mean philosophy as a discipline but it is an approach to encourage the students to discuss a question or set of questions based on their understanding of the concept and reasoning for such an understanding. The questions in this approach cannot be solved by consulting books, calculation, or by referring to one's own memories. Meanwhile, the students answering the philosophical questions have to refer to their depth of thought. As stated by Gholamhossein and Siamak (2010), PBLT demands the students to refer to their own self, ego, depth of thoughts, inward doubts, and reasoning rather than their knowledge, memories, texts, etc. Given these characteristics, the students would be unconsciously stimulated to actively contribute in class discussions.

Another reason why PBLT is more effective than 3P to teach speaking focuses on its activity. PBLT is students-centered rather than 3P. The reason why 3P is less effective than PBLT to teach speaking because 3P is teacher-centered since teacher's role in applying this approach is too dominant. Using 3P, the students are always guided and controlled by the teacher from the first until the last stage causing teachers to neglect the needs of the students and preventing them from responding to the individual challenges that students face during the lesson. Furthermore, it does not reflect the nature of language and the nature of learning because the students are considered as passive recipients.

Lewis (1993) suggested that 3P was inadequate because it reflected neither the nature of language nor the nature of learning. It seems to be quite logical in that the learners are required to merely mimic a model in a fixed linear order without paying attention to the inherent complexities of the language itself as well as the teaching or learning process. Brown (2007) state that in humanistic learner-centered methodologies, teachers as facilitators must provide the nurturing context for students to construct their meanings in interaction with others. The principles are in contrast with the main premises of 3P approach in which teachers are the authority and the model while the students are considered as merely the passive recipients and practitioners of ready-made plans.

Based on discussion above and the result of this research, it can be concluded that PBLT is more effective than 3P approach to teach speaking for second semester students of Nursing Department at University of Muhammadiyah Purwokerto in the academic year of 2016/2017. It is also supported by the mean score of the students taught by PBLT approach to teach speaking which is higher than that of those taught by using 3P approach.

2. **The Differences between Students Having High Risk-Taking and Students Having Low Risk-Taking**

The research findings reveal that students having high risk-taking have better speaking skill than those having low risk-taking. It is proven by the mean score of the students having high risk-taking which is higher than that of those having low risk-taking. High risk-taking students usually speak more and talk in the classroom, therefore they are better than shy students. Furthermore, risk-taking students are willing to make a try to produce words or sentences and not be discouraged by making mistakes and being appeared foolish in order to progress. By this way, these students will improve their learning from the mistake they made. Cervantes (2013) states that high risk-takers are generally advocate of ideas that on some occasions are not supported by others. Such characteristics are conducive to important levels of responsibility management since the exposure to mischance usually implies feelings of danger especially when speaking in front of others. As a result, high risk-takers require courage and responsibility to assume the consequences of their linguistic decisions, even when they are not supported by others, in order to handle risk-taking situation.

On the contrary, low risk-takers tend to use less complex structures. They avoid reducing their linguistic accuracy levels when speaking. They sacrifice fluency for the sake of accuracy leading to the development of an unnatural type of language full of pauses. They become very concerned users of the language when they express their structures, they are accurate but lack of fluency. According to Cervantes (2003), low risk-takers avoid reducing their linguistic accuracy levels when speaking; then they become very concerned users of the language. Before being uttered, their linguistic products are edited. When their structures are expressed, they are accurate but lack fluency. It can be seen from the result of this research in which the speaking scores of students having low risk-taking are lower than that of those having high risk-taking from both classes given treatment. Thus, students having high risk-taking are better in speaking skill than those having low risk-taking.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result of this study, the researcher draws some research findings: (1) PBLT approach is more effective than 3P to teach speaking; and (2) Students having high risk-taking have better speaking skill than those having low risk-taking. Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that PBLT approach is effective to teach speaking.

Besides, it is suggested that: (1) applying PBLT approach gives great impact to students' speaking skill. Therefore, other English teachers are suggested to use this approach in their teaching and learning process; (2) it is better for the students to use PBLT approach so that they will be able to proceed good speaking including content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, and comprehension aspect; (3) the result of this study can be useful as an additional reference in conducting similar research with different variables.

REFERENCES

Alshalabi, M. Fadi. (2003). *Study of theories of personality and learning styles: Some implications and sample activities to support curriculum change in a higher education TESOL program in Syria*. (University of Edinburgh). Retrieved from http://www.era.lib.ed.ac.uk//handle/1842/193.

Barnes, D. (1992). *From communication to curriculum*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Barnes, D. (2008). Exploratory talk for learning. In N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring Talk in School*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (5th, ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Cervantes, I. M. (2003). The role of risk-taking behavior in the development of speaking skills in ESL classroom. *Revista de Lenguas Modernas, 19*, 421-435.

Clark, H. and Clark, Eve V. (1973). *Psychology and Language*. New York: Harcourt Brice Jovanovich, Inc.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc. (2012). Personality: Personality traits as independent and dependent variables. In Mercer, Ryan, & Williams, *Pyschology for Language Learning: Insights from research, theory, and practice*. (42-57). United States: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fauzan, Umar. (2014). Developing EFL speaking materials for the second semester students of STAIN Samarinda. *Proceedings of 61th TEFLIN International Conference*, 861-864.

Gass, Susan & Selinker, Larry. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. Third Edition. New York: Routledge.

Gholamhossein, Shahini & Siamak, Samani. (2010). The development of L2 speaking skill and the related components: insight from philosophical questions. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 716-721.

Hadijah, Sitti. (2014). Investigating the problems of English speaking of the students of Islamic Boarding School Program at STAIN Samarinda. *Dinamika Ilmu, 14(2)*, 240-247.

Hemmati, F. & Hoomanfard, M. H. (2014). Effect of Philosophy-Based Language Teaching on EFL learners' speaking ability and their willingness to communicate. *Journal of Social Issues & Humanities, 2(10)*, 240-246.

Lewis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach: The State of ELT and a Way Forward*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Nga, L. (2002). From chatting to confidence. Retrieved from http://www.public. iastate.edu/~nkerli/526/CMC.doc

Shahini, G. & Riazi, M. A. (2011). A PBLT approach to teaching ESL speaking, writing, and thinking skills. *ELT Journal, 65(2)*, 170-179.

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wang, Yang & Lin, Yuewu. (2015). A study on correlation of risk-taking and the oral production of English majors in China. *English Language Teaching*, 8(10), 113-122.

Wen, W. P., & Clement , R. (2003). A Chinese conceptualization of willingness to communicate in ESL. Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 16(1), 18-38.